

**Lost and not fully found: accusative as marker of Pāṇini's 'karman'  
in history of Indo-Aryan**

Having defined - in sections 1.4.23-55 of his Sanskrit grammar ('*Aṣṭādhyāyī*') - the notion 'semantic roles' (*kāraṅkas*), introduced by him, Pāṇini has afterwards described (in subchapter 2.3) the morphosyntax of nominals treating their functions as bunches of the direct relations between roles and triplets of case-number affixes (*vibhaktis*); thus, syntactic categories - such as, e.g., 'subject', 'direct object', etc. - were not used by him. The hyper-role of 'karman' 'Undergoer' was characterized by Pāṇini as "the most desired result of the action performed by the Actor" (1.4.49), and accusative (*dvitīyā* 'second') was stated as *karman*'s primary marker (in 2.3.2). Our data (from Rgveda and Sanskrit texts of AIA) show that this type of marking was taking place regularly, irrespectively of such NPs features as specificity, definiteness, animacy, humanness and person binding.

Each of the remaining *kāraṅkas* implied the corresponding *vibhakti*-triplet as its typical marker: dative for Goal, locative - for Locus, etc. However *karman* was unique as, besides serving as Undergoer, it might also optionally replace - under certain lexico-semantic conditions - any *kāraṅka* (with the seeming exception of the Actor). Accusative, correspondingly, might be used not only in its **primary** function (as typical marker of *karman*), but also in the **secondary** one - as substitute of practically any other case-number triplet; the exemplifying samples will be provided in the talk. It is significant that in passive transforms of sentences with either transitives or motion verbs *karman*-associated NPs were not necessarily promoted and marked by nominative - their accusative marker might retain in situ. E.g., *kaṭa-ḥ* (NOM SG) / *kaṭa-m* (ACC SG) *kriyate* 'The mat is being made (by someone)' (< *kaṭa-m* (ACC SG) *karoti* '(Someone) makes the mat'); *grāma-o* (NOM SG) / *grāma-m* (ACC SG) *gamyate* 'The village is being gone (by someone)' (< *grāma-m* (ACC SG) *gacchati* '(Someone) goes to the village'). This peculiarity and also the morphological fact that in more than a half of declensional paradigms of nominals in AIA there was no differentiation between nominative and accusative, may be looked at as a precondition for the situation in Later Prakrit (Apabhramsha) where the former nominative and accusative got merged in one absolute case.

Usage of *karman* in its secondary function and of the 'substitutive' accusative was constrained by some characteristics of the speech act (namely, by speaker's intention to avoid reference to any specific *kāraṅka* - see 1.4.51) and by lexico-semantic properties of the selected verbs. - Pāṇini and his commentators have analyzed a number of the corresponding occurrences but remained silent on variations of meaning determined by alternative usages of *karman* and its marker. An attempt to supply the necessary semantic interpretations will be made in our talk where also a certain hypothesis explaining the expanded functional repertoire of *karman* and accusative in AIA will be formulated.

An interesting outcome of the use of 'substitutive' accusative in transitive sentences with predicates of three or more valencies was the formation of the so called 'double accusative construction'(DAC) in AIA. Being limited lexically, DAC was not rare in Rgveda, but with the evolution of Indo-Aryan its usage was diminishing - the last occurrences of it we find in rare data from Ardha-Magadhi and Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit texts. In ergative Apabhramsha with its absence of independent accusative DAC could not survive. In later periods of history of New Indo-Aryan (NIA) attempts to work out forms of independent accusative have been repeatedly made in languages of Western India, but all of them may be qualified as only partially successful as split ergativity existing in those systems was regularly blocking them. Typical, for example, is the situation in Modern Hindi where the so called 'accusative' (postulated by the grammarians) does not possess any affixes of its own and borrows them from either nominative or dative.

## References:

- Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini. Roman Transliteration and English Translation by Sumitra M.Katre, Delhi – Varanasi – Patna – Bangalore – Madras: Motilal Banarsidass, 1989
- Bubenik, Vit.* A Historical Syntax of Late Middle Indo-Aryan (Apabhraṃśa), Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. – Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science. Series IV, Current issues in linguistic theory, volume 165, 1984
- Cardona, George.* Pāṇini. His Work and its Traditions. Volume one: Background and Introduction, Delhi – Varanasi – Patna – Bangalore – Madras: Motilal Banarsidass, 1988
- Deshpande, M.M.* Pāṇinīyan Syntax and the Changing Notion of Sentence // Studies in Sanskrit Syntax. Edited by H.H. Hock, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1991
- Kāśīkā.* Chaukhamba Saṃskṛt Pustakālay, tṛtīyaṃ saṃskaraṇam, Banāras: 1952
- Macdonell, A.A.* A Vedic Grammar for Students, First Indian Edition: Motilal Banarsidass, 1995
- Speijer, J.S.* Sanskrit Syntax, First Edition: Leiden, 1886. Reprint: Delhi, 1993