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List of abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa</td>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>Atharvaveda</td>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVP</td>
<td>Atharvaveda</td>
<td>act.</td>
<td>active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paippalāda recension</td>
<td>aor.</td>
<td>aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AĀ</td>
<td>Aitareya-Āraṇyaka</td>
<td>caus.</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa</td>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JB</td>
<td>Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa</td>
<td>desid.</td>
<td>desiderative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KB</td>
<td>Kauśitaki-Brāhmaṇa</td>
<td>impv.</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Mantra-Brāhmaṇa</td>
<td>inj.</td>
<td>injunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Maitrāyani-Saṃhitā</td>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa</td>
<td>int.</td>
<td>intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV</td>
<td>Rigveda</td>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Saḍviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa</td>
<td>med.</td>
<td>middle-voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBK</td>
<td>Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa</td>
<td>opt.</td>
<td>optative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kāṇva recension</td>
<td>part.</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŚBM</td>
<td>Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa</td>
<td>pass.</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mādhyaṇḍina recension</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ppp.</td>
<td>perfect passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>Sāmaṇḍa</td>
<td>pres.</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TĀ</td>
<td>Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka</td>
<td>red.</td>
<td>reduplicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB</td>
<td>Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa</td>
<td>subj.</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Taittirīya-Saṃhitā</td>
<td>voc.</td>
<td>vocative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YV</td>
<td>Yajur-Veda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The place of the imperative in the Rigvedic verbal system

The greatest challenge to those working on the Rigvedic verbal system is visualising it as a system. It is full of asymmetries, big functional gaps on the one hand, and functional overload – two or even more forms having seemingly identical functions, on the other. This makes any system-wide analysis – seeing the big picture, as it were – tricky. Moreover, and this is a point which can hardly be emphasized strongly enough, it is very difficult to appreciate the function of a single item within the system, without being able to understand how it relates to the rest of the system.

The imperatives are a good example of these gaps in the system. Whereas some verbs, as for instance कृ, श्रु, भृ, अव, गम, दधां and other, mostly common verbs have fully attested present and aorist systems with reasonably numerous examples of each, other, equally common verbs, such as अस and ई, have no aorist system. Many other common verbs, such as भित्र, have very limited attestation of their aorist systems and no attested aorist imperatives or injunctives. It is highly debatable, in my opinion, whether this situation can be reasonably be blamed simply on the vagaries of limited attestation in a limited corpus.
Within the aorist system, the second person singular imperative has several endings – \textit{-dhí} for root-aorists, \textit{-si} for sigmatic aorists\(^1\), and \textit{-a} for thematic aorists, while the \textit{-iṣ}-, \textit{-siṣ}-, and reduplicated aorists are prevented by a morphological limitation from forming an imperative that is differentiated from the injunctive – and the imperative is, after all, differentiated from the injunctive only in the second person singular, third person singular and third person plural – and thus uses the injunctive instead.

This creates a situation where some verbs have two or even three imperative stems – aorist, present, and perfect – while others only have one. Furthermore, within the aorist, some verbs have two forms, injunctive and imperative, which we would expect, as linguists, to have different functions, while others only have one, the injunctive. The implication of this situation is that all of the functions of the aorist imperative are, under certain circumstances, totally contained within the aorist injunctive. In other words, there is nothing that one can do with an imperative that cannot be done with an injunctive, although the opposite is not true.\(^3\)

Even allowing for the possibility that many forms that may have existed are not attested, this is an anomalous situation.

Furthermore, two verbs, \textit{dā} and \textit{dhā}, cannot differentiate the injunctive and imperative in the 2nd person singular but can in the 3rd: the forms \textit{dās} and \textit{dhās} function as both injunctive and imperative, while in the 3rd person we have both \textit{dāt}, \textit{dhāt} and \textit{dātu}, \textit{dhātu}\(^4\).

The lack of distinction between the injunctive and imperative, even in cases where both exist as separate entities, is easily demonstrable. The following two sentences mean basically the same despite the use of the injunctive in one and the imperative in the other: 6.44.18b \textit{asmābhīyām māhi vārīvāḥ sugāṃ kah}, and 1.102.4c \textit{asmābhīyām indra vārīvāḥ sugāṃ krdhi 'For us, O Indra, make space, wide and

\(^1\) See page 43ff.

\(^2\) Except for the unique form \textit{avidhī}. Some roots have 2nd pers. sing. root aor. impvs. ending in \textit{-ihi} while the rest of the paradigm has \textit{-iṣ}- aor. forms. See page 94.

\(^3\) See page 37ff.

\(^4\) The verbs \textit{sthā} and \textit{gā} have the same limitations. See pages 37ff and especially 42ff.
easily passable⁵.

Furthermore, there is no possible distinction between the imperative and the injunctive in the negative, as the injunctive with the particle mā functions as the negative of the imperative.

**The third person imperative**

The Rigvedic verbal system, in common with that of other ancient Indo-European languages, has both second and third person imperatives. Later Sanskrit also has what is described as a first person imperative, but this is in fact a relic of the Vedic first person subjunctive, which has joined the imperative paradigm in the later language.

The question needs to be asked what the province of the third person imperative is, and how it relates to the second person imperative.

Whether the third person imperative is indeed an imperative depends, of course, on the definition given to the imperative. The imperative mood, contrary to conventional wisdom, expresses far more than just commands and orders. Lyons (1977), rather than using the term ‘command’ for imperative expressions, terms them ‘mands’, and includes in the term not only commands, but also requests, entreaties, etc. He sees the mand as a subclass of the “directive”, which can also include warnings, recommendations and exhortations.

The term mand actually originates with B.F. Skinner⁶, who gave it a far wider, if somewhat cryptic definition:

> A verbal operant in which the response is reinforced by a characteristic consequence and is therefore under the functional control of relevant conditions of deprivation or aversive stimulation.

He later explains it in terms of formal grammar, giving it a very wide force:

---

⁵ See also page 41f.

⁶ Skinner (1957: 35ff.).
‘The mand obviously suggests the imperative mood, but interrogatives are also mands, as are most interjections and vocatives, and some subjunctives and optatives.’

He also details various subclasses, one of which is the “magical mand”, such as ‘Would God I were a tender apple blossom’, and other wishes, ‘the consequences of which have never occurred as a result of similar verbal behaviour’.

Skinner’s definition is psychological more than grammatical, and much too wide for our purposes, but a modification of Lyons’ definition seems suitable for the Vedic imperative.

Lyons (1977: 745) emphasizes the connection between the imperative and the second person:

‘... the imperative is intimately connected with the second person (or vocative). It is implicit in the very notion of commanding and requesting that the command or request is addressed to the person who is expected to carry it out. In so far as the imperative is the mood whose function is that of being regularly and characteristically used in mands, the subject of an imperative sentence will necessarily refer to the addressee.’

and he is dubious about the status of Indo-European third person imperatives:

‘What are traditionally described as first-person and third-person imperatives, however, in the Indo-European languages at least, are not true imperatives, ... The subject of these so-called imperatives does not refer to the addressee.’

However, Lyons’ definition of the mand is far narrower than that of Skinner, and I believe that a certain widening of Lyons’ definition would allow the admission of third person imperatives as mands, somewhere between the very narrow definition of Lyons, and the very wide one of Skinner.7

7 Any categorical statement to the effect that “the imperative expresses mands” would therefore need to vary the definition of the mand accordingly. This would of course make the definition somewhat circular, as the answer to the question “what is a mand” would be
The addressee of the second person imperative

The addressee of the second person imperative in the Rigveda is almost always a living being. There are some examples of the 2nd pers. imperative addressing inanimate objects, but in these cases the objects are divine beings in their own right, such as sacrificial instruments, e.g. when the gambler addresses the dice at 10.34.14a mitrāṁ kṛṇudvam kḥālu mṛḍāā no ‘Grant us your friendship⁸, have mercy on us . . .’.

The Soma-stones also appear as the addressees of an imperative: 10.175.2 grāvāno ṛpā duchānām, ṛpā sēdhata darmātim / usrāh kartana bheṣajām ‘You Pressing-stones, drive away harm, drive away malevolence. Make the cows⁹ into a medicine’.

The addressee of the third person imperative

Most examples of the third person imperative of transitive verbs such as kṛṇotu, kṛṇvantu or avatu, avantu are of a type which is analogous to a similar sentence with a second person imperative: e.g. 10.42.11cd ṛndrāh purāṣtād utā madhutatō naḥ, sākāḥ sākhibhyo vārīvaḥ kṛṇotu ‘Let Indra from the front and from the middle as a friend to his friends make free space for us’ is exactly parallel to 9.85.4c urāṁ no gātāṁ kṛṇu soma mīdvah ‘Make us a wide road, O generous Soma’ as is 8.80.4c purāṣtād enam [rātham] me kṛdhi ‘Put it (my chariot) in front for me’ with 8.45.9ab asmākaṃ sā rātham purā, ṛndrāh kṛṇotu sāṭaye ‘Please let Indra put our chariot in front for booty’ bearing in mind of course that the former has an aorist and the latter a present imperative.

Furthermore, we have 1.84.3cd arvācīnaḥ sā te māno, grāvā kṛṇotu vagānā ‘Let the pressing-stone through its noise make your mind well-disposed’, which has exactly the same ostensibly inanimate subject as 10.175.2 (above).

⁸ or ‘make us into your friend’.

⁹ This is the usual translation of this passage, as it appears, e.g., in Geldner. However, as the plural of words meaning ‘cows’ often means ‘milk’, such an interpretation for this passage would make far more sense.

“anything that can be expressed by an imperative”, and to the question “what does the imperative express”, the answer would be “mands”. I use the term mand anyway, as a practical alternative to “commands, requests, wishes, entreaties, etc.”.
In 6.69.2cd \(\text{prá vā/munderdot gíra/hunderdot śasyámānā avantu, prá stómāso gīyámānāso arkaí/hunderdot}\)

‘Let the hymns being recited aid you (two), and the praises that are sung in songs’, the subject of the verb is the poet’s hymns and praises, which cannot be addressed directly.\(^{10}\)

In addition to these, there are a great many examples of subjects which are inanimate objects or even abstracts, for which there is no 2nd person parallel, e.g. 1.8.5b \(\text{mahitvám astu vajrí/nunderdote}\) ‘May there be greatness for the Vajra-bearer’ or 1.24.9b \(\text{urvī gahitrā sumatīś te astu ‘may your compassion be profound and broad’}\).

An interesting example is: 1.30.12 \(\text{táthā tád astu somapā/hunderdot, sákhe vajrin táthā kṛnu / yāthā ta uśmāśī/sunderdot/tunderdotáye}\)

‘May it be so, Soma drinker, our friend, the Vajra bearer, make it as we want, that you hurry,’ which contains a third person mand which fits even Lyons’ narrow definition. “May it be so” in (a) is an exact paraphrase for “make it so” in (b). Both are requests addressed to Indra, as shown by the vocatives somapā (V.) and sákhe vajrin and are on exactly the same level. \(\text{kṛnu}\) here could be seen semantically (but obviously not morphologically) as a causative of \(\text{astu}\), thus making (b) the exact second person parallel of (a). This is not the same as the previous examples, in which the third person imperatives are wishes not addressed to anyone specific, of the type “may there be . . . ”.

Given that the range of possible third person subjects is considerably wider than those of the second person, it is understandable that a strict syntactical paradigmatic relationship is not easy to demonstrate. This is however the same for any other forms in the second and third person. The second person environment, sometimes termed interlocutive, and the third person one, termed delocutive\(^{11}\), cannot, by definition, have a one-to-one paradigmatic correspondence; each in many ways has its own grammar and language.

However, a semantic paradigmatic relationship is certainly demonstrable, provided that we accept the definition of the mand. Both the second and third person imperatives are used exclusively for the delivery of mands.

\(^{10}\) Indeed this use of the third person imperative may be a substitute for the direct addressing of a hymn or artifact found in other literature. This wish is fairly reminiscent of the Greek or Roman asking the Muse for success in composing his poem, a form which does not exist in the Rigveda.

\(^{11}\) These terms date back to Damourette and Pichon (1952).
Imperative vs. optative

The next question that needs to be asked, having established the function of the imperative, is whether the above-mentioned functional overload really exists in the case of mands, or, in other words, did the Vedic poets have any other choice when they wanted to convey a mand but to use the imperative?

It is precisely the kind of wish or hope such as that expressed in 1.84.3cd or 6.69.2cd, which is supposed to be the province of the optative.

The imperative and the optative would seem, according to the conventional descriptions of their functions, to overlap quite considerably. This phenomenon has been recognised for quite some time. Macdonell (1916: 348), for instance, writes of the imperative:

‘The impv. does not express commands only, but also a desire in the widest sense, such as a wish, a request, advice, a direction.’

and of the optative 12:

‘The second person is much less common. It is almost exclusively used to express a wish or a request addressed to a god; …We might here often rather expect the impv., which indeed frequently either precedes or follows the 2. opt. …The third person is used in the three different senses of wish, precept, or supposition.’

One case where they do not overlap at all is where optatives are used in subordinate clauses to denote a specific kind of conditional clause, as in 6.47.15ab kā ī/m stavat kāh pṛṇāt kó yajāte, yād ugrām īn maghāvā viśvāhāvet ‘Who would (will) praise him, who would give abundantly, who would worship him, if the generous one always were only to help the powerful?’

Here, the optative is totally distinct from any imperative, as the latter cannot appear in subordinate clauses.13

12 op. cit.: 360.

13 For the few examples where si-imperatives supposedly occur in relative clauses, see p. 59f.
Another set of optatives which do not enter this discussion are the examples of the first person, simply because there is no first person imperative and thus no possible overlap in function.

Therefore where we apparently have a total or partial overlap in function is in the second and third person, present and aorist, between the imperative – including those injunctive forms which function as imperatives – and the optative.

It is quite easy to find examples of pairs of sentences, one of which has an optative and the other an imperative, which are extremely similar if not identical, e.g. 6.68.6-7 ...asmé sá [rayī] indrāvaruṇāv āpi syāt ... utā naḥ ... sūrībhya indrāvaruṇā rayih syāt ‘[The riches that you (two) give to the sacrificer] ... may that belong to us . . . also may our patrons have ... riches ... O Indra and Varuna.’ compared to 1.184.4a asmé sā vām mādhvī rāṭīr astu ‘Let this gift of yours belong to us, O Sweet Ones’.

Occasionally one may feel that optative sentences have more emotional content, to be more pleading: 3.1.23cd syān naḥ sūnās tānayo vijāvā, āgne sā te summātīr bhūtv asmé ‘May we have a son of our own, to carry on the clan. Agni, let us have your goodwill’. However, note the imperative in the same sentence. Furthermore, very often imperatives are not lacking emotion either: 1.16.7ab ayām te stōmo agrīyō, hṛdpṛgf astu śā/munderdottama/hunderdot ‘Let this superior prayer touch your heart, and be most beneficial to you’.

In the case of the verb as, the distinction may be semantic; among the examples of the form syāt there seems to be a preoccupation with riches and property; sentences whose basic theme is “make me rich”, which are so commonly expressed elsewhere with the second person imperative.

In other words, the optative appears to be used for requests for tangible objects, as in 6.68.6c and 3.1.23c above, and the imperative for hopes and wishes, and intangibles, such as grace, kindness, well-being etc., as in 1.24.9b. These seem fairly typical of the average use of these forms. Further examples of the kind of environment typically occupied by astu are: 1.185.11ab idā/munderdot dyāvāp/hunderring thivī satyám astu, pītar mātar yād ihópābruvē vām ‘May this come true, O Heaven and Earth, Mother and Father, what I am asking you (two) for’, 1.172.1a citrō vo 'stu yāmaś ‘May your path be bright’ and 1.140.11ab idā/m agne sūdhita/hunderdot dārdhītād ādhi,
priyād u cin mānmanaḥ prēyo astu te ‘O Agni, may this well-formed (hymn) be better than the ill-formed hymn, and even dearer to thee than a dear hymn’.14

There is perhaps a grey area with a certain amount of overlap, but for a good proportion of the examples, this distinction works.

Finally it is worth mentioning that in the absence of any injunctive forms for the verb as the only example of a negative contains an optative: 8.19.26cd nā me stotāmatīvā nā dārhitah, syād agne nā pāpāyā ‘Let my priest be neither poor nor wretched, O Agni, nor badly off.’

As to verbs other than as, the situation appears to be far different. The key lies in the extreme rarity of the optative. The table (below) shows the number of attestations of optatives versus imperatives for eight very common verbs in the Rigveda. It is obvious that the optatives are very uncommon. There are 1593 imperatives, vs. 76 optatives, of which 44 are from the verb as. Without as the score is 1344 vs 32, a ratio of exactly 1 to 42. Even as, which is the only verb in the group with a significant number of attested optatives, has nearly six times as many imperatives as optatives. In all of the other cases, only dāhā reaches double figures.

In fact, the reality is that even the meagre numbers shown in the table inflate the actual number of attestations. There are no examples whatsoever of the third person singular active optative of any of these verbs in main clauses. Two attestations of avet occur in subordinate clauses, while all of the others – and even these total less that ten examples – are in fact second and third person precatives ending in -yās. The rest of the examples are of isolated single middle-voice forms rather than full paradigms, as for instance dadīran, krṇīta and dādhīta.15

---

14 Translation from Klein (1978: 143).

15 This is confirmed in Michael Meier-Brügger’s unpublished work on the subjunctive and optative, in which he lists no third person singular aorist optatives in yāt, except for vavṛyāt, which can also be interpreted as a perfect form – and just a few in -yās, the ending -vāt thus being limited to the present and the perfect. Meier-Brügger also confirms that with the exception of the forms syās and syāt, the second and third present active present optative also appear only in a few isolated forms. Plural and middle voice forms appear to be even rarer, with 2nd person plural middle voice forms totally absent.
Forms which appear in grammar books, such as bhavet, bhūyāt and gamyāt are in fact completely unattested in the Rigveda.\(^{16}\)

Whatever the explanation for the extreme rarity of the optative is, we can only reach one conclusion from the available data – that the chief and indeed virtually the only medium possessed by the language of the Rigveda for the expression of what Lyons call mands, in other words the spectrum of utterances between an order and an entreaty, is in fact the imperative.

**Comparative number of examples, imperative vs. optative**

(The table includes 2nd and 3rd persons active and middle, and excludes “syntactical” optatives, i.e. optatives in subordinate clauses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kr</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>av</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhā</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śru</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dāi</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gam</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dhā</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>5</td>
<td><em><strong>175</strong></em></td>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1593</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

* dāi has no 2nd pers. aorist imperative.

**Examples of the present optative are med., imperatives are all active.

*** dhā has no 2nd pers. aorist imperative.

All numbers from Lubotsky (1997).\(^{16}\)

---

\(^{16}\) It would be fair to mention that this information is to be found in Whitney (1924: §§564-568), but is hidden, as all Vedic information is in his book, by the author’s presentation of Vedic and Classical forms side by side, and by his quoting forms which are allowed by Indian grammarians, but are never attested in the actual texts.
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The imperative is one of five moods of the Rigvedic verb. It is different to the subjunctive and the optative in that it doesn’t have a separate stem, but rather a set of endings, which are, as mentioned above, differentiated morphologically from the injunctive only in the 2nd person singular active and middle, the 3rd person singular active and middle and the 3rd person plural, active and middle. It can be formed from all three of the main verbal stems: present, aorist and perfect. There is no 1st person imperative in the RV; the forms which are in later texts considered to be 1st person imperatives are part of the subjunctive paradigm in the RV.

All Vedic verb stems fall into one of two classes, thematic and athematic. Both present and aorist stems may belong to either one of these, and are conjugated in the same way in each case. In other words, there is no difference in conjugation between a thematic present and a thematic aorist, or a root (athematic) aorist and a root present.

The endings of the impv. are shown in the following table. Separate thematic endings are only shown when they are different to the corresponding athematic ones.
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### Active

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>sing.</th>
<th>dual</th>
<th>pl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 athematic</td>
<td>Ø/-dhí/-hi/-tam</td>
<td>-ta / -tana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 thematic</td>
<td>Ø/-tāt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 athematic</td>
<td>-tu</td>
<td>-tām</td>
<td>-a(n)tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 thematic</td>
<td></td>
<td>-antu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Middle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>sing.</th>
<th>dual</th>
<th>pl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 athematic</td>
<td>-sva</td>
<td>-āthām</td>
<td>-dhvam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 thematic</td>
<td></td>
<td>-ethām</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 athematic</td>
<td>-tām</td>
<td>-atām</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 thematic</td>
<td>-etām</td>
<td>-antām</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thematic stems are characterised by their lack of ablaut, so that the stem remains the same in all persons and numbers. A characteristic imperative conjugation of a thematic stem would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>sing.</th>
<th>dual</th>
<th>pl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>bhava</td>
<td>bhavatam</td>
<td>bhavata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>bhavatu</td>
<td>bhavatām</td>
<td>bhavantu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>sing.</th>
<th>dual</th>
<th>pl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>bhavasva</td>
<td>bhavethām</td>
<td>bhavadhvam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>bhavatām</td>
<td>bhavetām</td>
<td>bhavantām</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Athematic stems, on the other hand, have ablaut throughout, although the rules for its application are not entirely consistent.
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The ending -dhí/-hí

The conditions which differentiate between the allomorphs -dhí and -hí are fairly simple, but there are a number of exceptions that need explaining17. For most of the attested forms the following is a general rule: all stems ending in a consonant take -dhi, while -hí normally appears after a vowel, e.g. addhí (ad), but pāhí (pā). There are, however, a number of cases where -dhi occurs after a vowel:

1) Root forms containing an original *-zdḥ- or *-zdh- cluster: edhī (as), šādhī, šaśādhī (śās), tādhī (takṣ).

2) Disyllabic root aorists from roots ending in -/runderring/: k/runderringdhí (k/runderring), v/runderringdhi (v/runderring), sp/runderringdhi (sp/runderring).

3) The form śiśādhī (śā), for which see p. 171.

4) The form śurdhī (śru), which is explained by Lubotsky (1995) as being due to the prevalence of the form in the interior of the pāḍa, and the high proportion of its occurrences in formulae, especially, śurdhī hāvam. Likewise the form śurdhī. As will be shown below, this latter form was coined especially to enable the use of the formula śurdhī hāvam in certain metrical environments, we may actually entertain the notion that the form śurdhī itself is an archaism preserved due to the influence of this same formula, which appears to have had special ritual significance. For more on both of these forms see the chapter ‘Aorist versus present imperative’, especially pp. 82ff.

5) The forms yódhī (yudh) and bodhī (budh), which may not have the -dhi ending at all, and for which see p. 26.

6) The form bodhī (bhū), for which see p. 25, and yuyodhī (yu2).

Stem-final consonants have regular sandhi before the -dhi ending, e.g. mumugdhī (muc), šagdhī (śak), etc., while stem-final consonant clusters are simplified so that *-nddhi > -ndhi and *-ṅg-dhi and *-ṅk-dhi > *-ṅgdhi > -ṅdhi. The examples of this development, most of which are derived from -n-infix presents, are aṅdhi (aṅc), undhī (ud), chindhī (chid), trṇdhī (trd), prṇdhī (prc), bhanḍhī (bhaṅj), bhindhī (bhid) and vṛṇdhī (vrj). The root aṅc is exceptional in also having a form aṅgdhī.18

17 See also Lubotsky (1995).

18 See also Insler (1972: fn 9).
The ending is always accented where the accent is preserved: andhī (aṇī), addhī (adī), ēhi, ēnhi (ēi), kṛṇhī, kṛdhī (krī), jāṛghī (grī), gṛṇhī (grī), cinuhī (ci), cikiddhī (cit), chindhī (chī), daddhī, dehī (dāi), didīhī, didīhī (dī), dādṛhī (drī), dhehī (dāhī), dhṛṇhūhī (dhṛṛī), pāhī (pā₁ and pā₂), pipīhī (pī), punīhī (pū), pārddhī (pṛṛī), pipīhī (pṛṛī), bhindhī (bhī), bodhī (bhū), mamaddhī (madī), mimiḥī (mū), mumudhī (mucī), yandhī (yamī), yāhī (yā), yuyodhī (yu₂), rārandhī (ranī), rārandhī (randī), vāvandhī (van₂), viddhī (vidī), vihī, vihī (vi₁), āṇṛṇuḥī (āṛ₁), śaṇḍīhī (śak), šaṇḍādīhī (śuc), śṛṇuḥī, śṛṇudhī, śrudhī (śru₂), śiśīhī (śā), šaṇīhī (śf), stuhī (stu), jahī (han), with the single exception of the form yodhī (see below). 19

The second singular forms ending in -dhī/-hī usually have zero-grade of the stem. There are, however, a fairly large number of forms with full grade stems, a full list of which is: addhī (adī), edhī (asī), cākandhī (kanī), tālīhī (taks), pāhī (pā₁ and pā₂), bodhī (budhī), bhāhi (bhū), bodhī (bhū), mamaddhī (madī), mamandhī (man₂), māhī (mā₁), yandhī (yamī), yāhī (yā), yuyodhī (yu₂), yodhī (yudhī), rārandhī (ranī), randhī, rārandhī (randī), vāvandhī (van₂), vāhī (vā), śaṇḍīhī (śak), sādhī, sāsadhī (sās), sīśadhī (śī), sīṇadhīhī (śṇath), sāhī (sā), stanihī (stanī).

The exceptions may be classified in a number of groups:

1) addhī and edhī are easily explained as analogical reconstructions of root-syllables that would have been lost in zero-grade: *h₁d-dhī would have yielded *sdhī (a form which is attested in Avestan zdī), and *h₁d-dhī would likely have yielded *dhi. To this group must also be added mamaddhī, saṇḍīhī and tālīhī, whose roots cannot form zero-grades.

2) pāhī, vāhī, sāhī, yāhī, bhāhī and māhī show the generalisation of full-grade in root-stems of the type CeH. There are no exceptions to this in the second person singular root present and aorist, although there are zero-grade reduplicated-present forms like rirīhī from rā, mimīhī from mā, sīśīhī from sā₂ and jihīṣya from hā. This generalisation of the full-grade in this type of root is carried through into the other persons and numbers too, although the retention of the pair saṇḥịṣṭam from the root sā shows that it is most likely an innovation.

19 For the possible existence of an archaic form ēhī see footnote 141.
20 Which also has a full-grade variant sīśādhi. For another possible explanation of this form see p.171.
3) śnathihi and stanihi have -iṣ- aorist forms in the rest of their paradigm. The form avidhi may originally have belonged to this group. See page 94.

4) The root sās has no ablaut variation in its present stem. See also p. 26.

5) cākandhi, mamandhi, yuyodhi, rārandhi (from ran) and vāvandhi show that reduplicated perfects from set and anit bi-literal roots of the type Ceu and Cen(H) always have full-grade in the root in the second person singular impv. There are no exceptions to this. Roots of the form Cev have zero grade in the same forms: jāgrhi, dādrhi, piprihi. Insler (1972:54ff.), and later Kümmel (2001: 414) ascribe these forms to an analogy with unattested but very probable 3rd pl. forms such as *rāraur, Kümmel adding the extra justification (already implied by Insler) that this is the regular ante-vocalic allomorph of a syllabic /n/ followed by a laryngeal, as in the sequence *-r/nH-ur. If this is the case, then this process must of course have begun with set roots and spread to anit roots later.

6) yandhi and bodhi (bhū) are genuinely problematic. Insler (1972: 551ff.) explains the former as being patterned after the 3rd pl. ind. aor. form ayamur, in the same way as both 2nd pers. sing. impv. gahi and 3rd pers. ind. aor. āgman have zero grade. However, the problem is not only yandhi, there are no zero grade aorist forms of this verb at all. Thus, there is only yantām and yānta, where e.g. gam has both zero-grade and full-grade variants. Probably there was more than one influence that brought about this situation. The above rule, under which reduplicated forms of roots of type Cen(H) always have full grade in the second person singular imperative was one – there were many forms ending in -andhi and almost none ending in -ahi. Likewise, bodhi could have come under the same influence from forms like yuyodhi, and again, there are few root-imperatives ending in -ūhi. In the case of the verb yam, another influence was probably its sigmatic aorist forms, most notably the form yānsi, which also all have full-grade of the root.

As for bodhi, since Wackernagel (1896: 1-274) it has been accepted that the form bodhi is unoriginal. It is considered to be a redactional replacement for *buddhi. This theory is often accepted unquestioningly, e.g. by Insler (1972: 559).

Jamison (1997) accepts that the form is unoriginal, but considers that original bhava would have been weakened in unemphatic position to *bho, and then the impv. ending -dhi added, finally Grassmann’s Law working to replace the initial aspiration. Thus she places bodhi in the present system, as an unemphatic variant of bhava. Gotō (1987: 218 fn. 454) is cautious, limiting himself to calling this form
“unklar”, but suggesting that the diphthong may have come into being under the influence of such forms as edhi from as. He calls Wackernagel’s idea “unconvincing”.

Lubotsky (1995: 224ff.), however, suggests another solution. Following Kortlandt, he reconstructs bhū as *bʰeH₂u- rather than *bʰeH₂, thus allowing bodhi to be explained as an original, full-grade root aorist impv. *bʰeH₂u-dʰi, of the same type as yandhi.

7) yódhi, bodhi (budh) and possibly randhi may not be conventional root-aorist imperatives at all.

Insler (1972) explains yódhi as an acrostatic (“Narten”) aorist. In the present he quotes the example of the root śás – śásti – śadhī, for which the accentuation of the imperative is unfortunately not preserved. Root aorist forms of this type are rarer, although Insler is able to quote the form jáníśva. Insler explains bodhi as an analogical formation on the basis of yódhi.

Mayrhofer (1986: 111f.) suggests that the form yódhi is the result of a resyllabification of *jeuṭh-dhi to *jeuṭ-dhdhi, with consequent simplification of the geminate. He makes no attempt, however, to explain this form’s unique accentuation.

Jasanoff (2002: 292ff.) counters Insler’s argument with two arguments. Firstly, quoting later studies than Insler’s, Jasanoff denies the existence of Narten-style root aorists with *e : *e ablaut. Secondly, he states that even if it were to be shown that the root yudh did have such an aorist, it could not be shown that it would have an aorist imperative of the type *jeuṭ-dhi rather than the more conventional *jeuṭh-dhi, since the only actual example of a “Narten” present which has an imperative is stāuti, whose imperative is stuhī. Jasanoff then goes on to suggest that the form yódhi and bodhi were formed by analogy to the -si impv. jóśi citing parallel forms throughout the conjugations of the two verbs. jóśi, he claims, was reanalysed by speakers as jóś-i, and this i-imperative was extended to the parallel roots yudh and

---

21 On page 30 I suggest that the form jáníśva is the exact middle-voice equivalent of the forms of the type stanihi.

22 For more details see also p. 140.

23 This form is considered secondary by Insler (1972: 557), who posits original *stóđhi. It is unclear to me why Jasanoff rejects Insler’s example of the verb śás.
budh by analogy. A similar process took place in late Hittite, according to Jasanoff, where the -si imperative induced the creation of i imperatives such as zāhi ‘fight’ and ḥāni ‘draw water’.

Bammesberger (1983) reaches the opposite conclusions to those of Jasanoff, claiming that the i imperative is inherited from PIE. Bammesberger’s idea seems to me to suffer from a lack of comparative data; there is no i imperative in any other IE language which cannot also be shown to have been formed by analogy (as, e.g. the late Hittite forms quoted above).24

It is clear to me that the crux of any discussion of these forms must be the unique accentuation of the form yódhi. Nobody, as far as I can see, has ever explicitly called attention to the fact that every other impv. in -dhí whose accent is preserved is accented on the ending. The solutions of both Insler (1972) and Jasanoff (2002) would account for the accent, but the problem with the former, as mentioned by Jasanoff, is that there are no other forms of this type to compare it to, and that even the examples that we do have of -dhí impvs. which have full-grade in the root are still accented on the ending.

Whatever the historical explanation, we have a pattern created on the basis of the form jōṣi, by which impvs can be formed of the type *CēRC-i. The hitherto unexplained form ghōṣi is constructed in exactly the same way, as is cāṣi, and the lack of the rest of the parallel forms, indeed the lack of any aorist at all for these verbs, indicates that it is constructed by analogy to jōṣi. Furthermore, there is at least one other form of precisely this type: randhi, from the root randh. Unfortunately, the accentuation of this form has not been preserved.

Not least among the parallel forms in the conjugations of yódhi and jōṣi are the aorist subjunctives yodhat and jōṣat, which alongside the imperative forms exhibit the ubiquitous -i/-at pattern seen throughout the examples of the -si imperative.25

There is one further attested step in the story of the analogically created -i imperative; some of them were at a later date replaced by forms in -a. Thus we have jōṣi : jōṣa, pārṣi : parṣa, bodhi : bōdhī, and nēṣi : nēṣa. This could have originated when some of the originally aorist subjunctive forms (see p. 34 and p. 24 See also p. 45.

25 Further afield, the intensive form barbhī, which is plainly analogical, could have been derived from the subjunctive form barbhhat.
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140), such as bódhat, were reanalysed as thematic presents, and thus would have developed thematic imperatives. Thereafter the other aorist forms of the same type followed suit.

The ending -dhi/-hi only occurs with athematic present stems, root aorists, with the exception of the unique form avidhī, which is an iś-aorist, and perfects. However, not all athematic stems take it all the time, the exception being the present stems with the -nu and -nā suffixes. Thus occur both kṛṣṇa and kṛṣṇi, śṛṇa and śṛṇi etc. There is no semantic difference between these forms; the difference is purely metrical and is part of the system described fully in the chapter on the aorist imperative. In the -nā-conjugation, two verbs with roots ending in laryngeals, aś, and grh have 2nd pers. sing. forms – asāṇa, grhāṇā. Since, as has been known since de Saussure, punāti is constructed in the same way as yunakti, then the form punīhi is constructed in the same way as bhaṇḍhī (< *bhangdhi) i.e. *punHdhi. This is also, of course, exactly analogous to the form śṛṇuhi. The forms such as grhāṇā are likewise probably analogous to forms such as śṛṇa. Gotō (1987: 331) claims that it is “universally accepted” that these forms arose through dissimilation from an original *grḥāṇā, the ending -na being formed from the same particle that appears in the 2nd pers. pl. ending -tana. Beekes (1999) disputes this, asserting that the form was originally *grṛḥā < *grṛbhānH, to which the above mentioned particle was added. While this explains the forms asāṇa and grhāṇā, it does not explain two other forms, prṇā and mṛṇā.

These are usually explained as secondary thematisations, e.g. by Strunk 1967: 40, LIV 435 fn. 8, and Kellens 1984: 181. Rather, these too are most probably -dhi-less variants of the corresponding forms such as mṛṇihi (*prṇihi is not attested in the

---

26 See page 94.

27 Other similar forms, such as badhāṇā and stubhāṇā, are found in later Vedic but not in the RV.

28 The attested forms of this type are: grṇṭhi, from ṣṛ, “to praise, welcome”; jānthi, from jāṇa, “to know”, mṛṇihi, from mṛṇ, “to crush”, punihi, from pū, “to purify”, śṛṇihi, from śṛṇ, “to crush”, and śṛṇihi, from śṛṇ, “to prepare”.

29 For the possible conditions under which zero-grade laryngeals produced ī in Indic see Jamison (1988).
RV), related in the same way as śṛṇu and śṛṇuhi. As to their construction, we lack both internal and comparative evidence. The most likely explanation is that it is a full-grade form *p/lunderringneh₁ of the same type as other PIE endingless imperatives from laryngeal-final stems. If this is true, then Gotō’s version of the reconstruction of the forms aśāna and grhāṇā must be correct – the form *grbhnaH-na was simplified to grhāṇā by dissimilation.

**dehī and dhehī**

These are two more highly problematic forms. Hoffmann (1956: 21) suggests that they are the result of dissimilation of an original *d(h)adzdhi, via intermediate forms *d(h)azdhi and *dhedhi. A further dissimilation of the two /dh/ sounds would have achieved the final forms, as noted by Lubotsky (19951: 34). This explanation is accepted by Mayrhofer (19862: 111). According to this theory, it is the presence of the three /d(h)/ sounds in the word that caused a different treatment to similar forms such as viddhi.

The situation is complicated by the fact that the verb dā₁ also has a form daddhī. Thus, we need to suppose that 1) either this form was reconstructed on the basis of forms such as viddhi, or 2) that dehī was coined by analogy to the form dhehī. Basically, both scenarios are possible. In either case, we are missing an analogous form *dhaddhi form the verb dhā because Grassmann’s Law would have acted on it, causing the creation of an identical form *daddhī.

**The ending -sva**

All second person singular middle-voice forms end in -sva, ablauting stems are usually zero-grade, and, where the accent is preserved, the ending is accented. A full list of examples is īr/sunderdotva, ūr/nunderdotu/sunderdotva, k/runderring/nunderdotu/sunderdotvá, k/runderring/sunderdotvá, jihī/sunderdotva, tanu/sunderdotva, dhatsva, dhi/sunderdotvá, dadhi/sunderdotvá, dhuk/sunderdotva, mimik/sunderdotvá, vanu/sunderdotva, vav/runderringtsva, v/runderring/nunderdotī/sunderdotvá, ś/runderring/nunderdotu/sunderdotvá and yukvā. However, unlike the ending -dhi, on those occasions where the stem is full-grade, the stem is accented (where preserved) and not the ending: īḷīsva, jānīsva,

---

30 Cf. Klingenschmitt (1982: 253), who calls the Avestan form pərənə ‘endungslose Form . . . oder von einem thematisierten Stamm . . .’.

31 See page 42.
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mātsva, māsva, rāsva, sākṣva, sāksva, trāsva, vāṃsva, vāsīṣva, yāksva.

The forms īśṣva, jānīṣva and vāsīṣva appear outwardly to belong to a single subclass, however upon further investigation it becomes clear that they are most likely quite different from each other.

The form jānīṣva is probably a full grade root aorist, of the same type as śnathihi and stanihi, the rest of whose forms were replaced by -iṣ-aorist forms, as happened frequently with root-aorist forms from set roots. It is also possible the usual zero-grade second person sing. form *jāsva would have been replaced by levelling with the rest of the paradigm - jānīṣta etc. On the other hand, vāsīṣva is usually considered to be an -iṣ-aorist form. The root vas is anīt, thus precluding any possibility that this is a root-form.

īśṣva is more problematic. Narten (1964: 238) considers it to be an innovation constructed on the basis of the root present īṭe. Since a form *īśṣva is apparently phonetically impossible in Vedic, this explanation is probably correct. The stem is a reduplicated present < *h2īh2isd-, with the accent on the reduplicated syllable, as it is throughout the entire paradigm of attested finite forms of this verb. There are very few parallel forms to compare. mimīkṣvā is one, which has the accent on the suffix, but the closest comparison may be the form sākṣva, which could go back to *sē-ṣgh-, and which could thus be originally a perfect form.

The ending -tu

The third person singular ending -tu is never accented and always attaches to the full-grade stem, e.g. anaktu, āstu, etu, gantu, grinītu, cinotu, jīgātu, dādātu, dātu, darzātu, dādhātu, bravītu, vētu, hantu, etc. The only exceptions to this are the zero grade bhūtu and babhūtu.

32 See Narten (1964: 118) and p. 93 below, under avī.

33 E.g. by Narten (1964: 238f.).
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The second person plural: -ta and -tana

The 2nd pers. pl. may have both zero and full-grade, e.g. the forms gata and kṛta, which exist side-by-side with gánta and kárta. A full list of full-grade second person plural forms, and full-grade/zero-grade second person plural variants is: iyarta (r₁), unáta (ud), kṛṣṇatā/kṛṣṇóta, kṛta/kárta (kṛ), gata/gánta/gantá (gam), jigāta, gāta (gā₁), gāta (gā₂), datta/dádáta (dā₁), dhātā/dádhāta, dhāta (dhā), pāta (pā₁), pāta (pā₂), punūth/punúta (pū), yánta (yam), yátā (yā), yuyóta (yu₂), yunāktá (yuj), varta (vrṭ), śṛṇutā/śṛṇota, śṛṇatā/śṛṇota (śṛu), sunutá/sunóta, sóta (su), stota (stu), hinóta, heta (hi), jhūtā/jhūtā (hu).

While the accent is usually on the stem when it is full-grade and on the ending when the stem is zero grade, there is a noteworthy exception to this in the forms gánta and gantá. The forms pātá and yātá exhibit the same accentuation, but they also have the characteristic generalisation of full-grade throughout the paradigm of CeH roots.

The following forms have the -tana ending: attana (ad), anaktana (añj), avīṣṭāna (av), itana, étana (i), kártana, kṛṣṇotana (kṛ), gántana (gam), gātana, jigātana (gā₁), citana (ci), jujūṣṭana (juṣ), dādātana (dā₁), didiśṭana (diś), dādhātana, dhattana, dhätana, dhētana (dhē), nāhyatana (nah), pinaṣṭana (piṣ), punūtna (pū), pipartana (pr), pṛṇītana (pṛ₁), braviṭāna (bru), bhajatana (bhaj), bhētana (bhē), mamattāna (maḍ), yantana (yam), yātāna (yā), yuvōtana (yu₂), rāniṣṭhana (ran), vavṛttana (vṛt), sātāna (sā), śnathiṣṭhana (śnath), śṛṇītana (śṛṇi), śṛṇotana (śṛṇota (śṛu), sadatana (saḍ), sunōtana, sotana (su), hantana (han), hīnotana (hi ), jhūtāna (hu).

The -tana ending is generally attached to the full-grade stem, the exceptions being itana, citana, jujūṣṭana, didiśṭana, dhattana, punūtna, pṛṇītana, vavṛttana and śṛṇītana. As can be seen all of these belong to one of three types: 1) those with the -nā/-nī- suffix, 2) reduplicated perfects of roots ending in a consonant, and 3) forms which have three syllables. Thus, in four-syllable forms, even in cases where the ending is attached to the zero-grade stem, the syllable preceding the ending is long. The reason for this, as noted by Renou (1952: 264) and Lubotsky (2004) is metrical. If the ending were attached to a zero-grade stem like kṛṣṇ-, the resulting *kṛṣṇatana would have four consecutive short syllables and would be metrically awkward. Obviously the forms which have only three syllables are immune to this problem.
A special case is the three occasions in the entire RV where the -tana ending occurs with a thematic stem: the form bhajatana in 7.56.21c á na spárhé bhajatanā vasavyè ‘give us a share in the desirable riches’, nahyatana in 10.53.7a aksānāho nahyatanotá somyāḥ ‘Bind fast the ties (straps) to the wagon shaft, O Soma-worshippers’ and sadatana, the aor. impv. of sad, at 2.36.3ab améva nah suhavā á hi gāntana, nī bharhiśi sadatanā rāṇiśtana, ‘Come to us like you come home, sit down on the altar-grass and rejoice’. The last of these is formed to match the two -tana forms gāntana and rāṇiśtana. In the second example the poet’s intention seems to be to use the form nahyatana to gain another -na- syllable to enhance this line’s consonance: aksānāho nahyatanotá somyāḥ. In all cases the last syllable of the suffix is lengthened, thus solving the metrical problem.

There is no difference in meaning between the two endings; they are used where metrically convenient, and may allow the use of the same phrase in metres of different lengths, as in 10.78.8c ádhi stotrásya sakhyásya gāta and 5.55.9c ádhi stotrásya sakhyásya gātana, where the former appears in the cadence of a triṣṭubh pāda and the latter in that of a jagati pāda. See also p. 72f.

The second person dual

Athematic dual active forms usually have zero grade and an accented ending, as e.g. kṛtām, but again, the verb gam has both gatām and gantām, while the verb yam, again, has only yantām.

A full list of full-grade dual forms, and stems which have both full and zero-grade forms in the dual are: gantām (gam), dhātam (dhā), pātām (pā1 and pā2), yantām (yam), yātām (yā), yuyutām/yuyotam (yu₂), volbhām (vah), vartam (vṛ₁), hinotam (hi).

In those cases where the stem shows full-grade, the accent is still on the ending.

The third person plural ending -a(n)tu

While this ending would originally have undergone ablaut, there is in fact only one example of the zero-grade form -atu in the entire Rigveda: the form dadhatu (dhā), which occurs at 7.51.1d.

---

34 Trans. Klein (1985: 2-39). According to Klein, this is the only place in the RV with the sequence V₁ utā V₂ P utā V₃ (where P=preverb).
Of the attested forms which preserve accentuation, almost all have the accent on the ending and a zero-grade stem: sántu (as), yántu (i), kr̥yántu (kr̥), ciyántu (ci), punántu (pā), vanántu (van̥), vyántu (vi), śr̥yántu (śr̥). The only exceptions to this are the root-present form sasántu (sas), whose root cannot form a zero grade but whose accentuation is regular, and gámantu (gam), in place of the expected *gmántu, which appears to be built on the aorist subjunctive stem, as in gámat.

Other endings

The rest of the athematic imperative endings are poorly attested. The 3rd pers. dual act. ending -tām occurs with accentuation only in the forms dhattām (dhā), pātām (pā), pīpytām (pr̥) and sastām (sas), while the 3rd sing. med. form occurs only in kr̥nātām (kr̥). As can be seen, the ending is always accented, while the stem behaves in a similar way as it does in the case of the -tam ending.

The 3rd du. med. athematic ending -ātām is only attested once in the entire Rigveda, in the form jihātām (hā1), while the 2nd dual med. ending -āthām occurs in the forms īrāthām (rā1), mīnāthām (mā1), yuñjāthām (yu), rarāthām and rāsāthām (rā). This last form is one of the very few athematic sigmatic aorist imperatives in the RV. In the case of this ending, the accent is attested once on the ending and once on the stem.

The athematic 3rd pl. med. ending never occurs in a form whose accent is preserved, appearing only in the forms indhatām (idhā), īratām (rā1), jānatām (jñā), dadhatām (dhā) and jihatām (hā1).

The 2nd pl. ending -dhvam, while not uncommon, does not occur often in forms which preserve their accent. The attested examples are: kr̥udhvām (kr̥), yuṅdīhvām (yu), vṛṭdīhvām (vṛt2), which are accented on the ending, and the sigmatic aorist form īrdhvam, which is accented on the stem. This ending exhibits similar behaviour to -dhi in contact with stems ending in consonants, as shown by forms such as indhvām (idh) < *indh-dhvam, and vavrddhvam (vṛt) < *vavr̥d-dhvam, however the form yuṅdīhvām preserves the /g/, which is most often lost before -dhi.35

35 See p. 23.
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Thematicisation of athematic stems

A small number of mostly perfect athematic stems have secondary thematic forms, seemingly derived from the subjunctive stem. Examples are: dīdayatam (dī), pīpaya, pīpayata (pī), piprāyasva (prī), māmahasva (māṃh), mumócatam, mumócata (muc), vārydāsva36 (vṛdh) and vāṛṣasva (vṛṣ).

From the present stem we have dadhantu (dhā), and from the aorist we have the forms bódha, etc. from the root budh, for which see p. 26 and 140, gámantu (gam), yakṣatām (yaj), and rāsatām (rā).

The imperative of the desiderative

There are a very small number of desiderative impvs. in the RV. The most common is the stem śikṣa, which, although formally a desiderative of sak has to all intents and purposes become a separate root in its own right. Other attested forms are cikitsa, from cit, vivāsa and vivāsata, from van1 ‘to win’37 and didhiṣantu from dhā ‘put’.38

The desiderative cikitsa appears at 6.47.20cd bhūṣpate prā cikitsā gāviṣṭāv, itthā satē jaritā indra pānṭhām ‘Bhūṣpati, strive to perceive the path for the singer who is so involved in searching for cows, O Indra’ and the same formula appears later at 1.92.23d -ubhāyebhyaḥ prā cikitsā gāviṣṭau ‘for both sides (?) strive to perceive (the path?) in the search for cows’ in a context where it seems to make far less sense. vivāsa- appears five times in the impv.; in the sing. only in the formula vivāsā námasā, ‘seek to win (him) with homage’, at 5.83.1b, 8.96.12b, and 10.63.5c. In the pl. it appears at 6.15.6c and 8.15.1c. The form vivāsati may, as suggested by LIV, indeed be due to an analogy with the form sīsāti, the desid. of san. However, it is also possible that there was a laryngeal in the desid. -s- suffix, as proposed e.g. by Rasmussen (1997: 254), and thus the proto-form is *ṭī-ṭṇ-Hṣe- as

36 This form may have been created to disambiguate the regular form *vāṛṣasva, which could have been misinterpreted as belonging to the root vṛṛ. See also p. 170.

37 For the distinction between the roots van1 ‘win’ and van2 (van) ‘love’, see p. 162.

38 See page 125.
shown also by such forms as *cikīrṣati* from *kṛ (*kui-kur-Hse-), *yāyūṣa- (*ju-ju-Hse-*) from *yū* 'bind' and *cikīṣa- (*kui-kui-Hse-) from *ci* 'consider'.

### The stative (‘t-less’) middle-voice

The form *duhām*, from the root *duh* 'to (give) milk' is the only imperative form attested in the RV 39 derived from the IE stative (t-less) middle conjugation, corresponding to the third pers. sing. and pl. present med. forms *duhé* and *duhré*. A unique imperfect form *āduha* is attested in the MS. The form *duhām* is attested twice at 4.57.7c sā naḥ páyasvatī *duhām* 'Let the milk-laden one give us milk' and 1.164.27c *duhām aśvībhāyām páyo aghnyēyām* 'may this milch-cow give milk for the Aśvins.'

### The -tāt imperative

The -tāt imperative is quite rare in the Rigveda, there being only 21 separate attested forms, two of which occur more than once in repeated pādas.

Semantically, it is something of a wildcard. It is always 2nd person, except in the late funeral hymn 10.154, in which the form *gachatāt* appears several times, all of which are apparently 3rd person. It is in all cases singular, except for 10.24.5cd, *nāsatyaś abravan devāḥ, pūnar ā vahatād iti, ‘The gods said to the Nāsatyas, “Bring them back here”’*, where it is dual, addressed to the Aśvins. 5.60.6cd, although directly addressed to Agni, could also be addressed to the Maruts, which would

---

39 The form śāyām is attested in the AV, and padām in the AVP.

40 These forms were first identified by Wackernagel (1907: 310ff). See Narten (1969), Oettinger (1976). The latter disagrees with Wackernagel’s basic premise, that the mid. impf. (or inj.) stative form ended in *o*, claiming that such forms as āduha are actually later innovations. This is based entirely on its appearing only in post-Rigvedic texts, no explanation having been given on how such an irregular form came to be introduced.

41 The attested forms are: avatāt (8.3.2c), oṣatāt (4.4.4b), kṛputāt (2.30.5d), carkṛtāt (1.104.5c), gachatāt (10.154.1-4d, 10.154.5d), dattāt (10.16.2b), dḥatāt (3.18.1d), yacatāt (1.48.15c), yācatāt (9.86.41d), rākṣatāt (4.50.2d), vahatāt (10.24.5d), vocatāt (5.61.18a), viṣatāt (5.60.6d), viṅgatāt (10.11.8d), vrhatāt (1.174.5c, 4.16.12d, in identical pādas), hīnumatāt (10.16.1d).

42 Oldenberg (1909: ad loc.) believes it to be 2nd pers. but also raises the possibility that it is 3rd pers.
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make it plural: áto no rudrā utá vā nv āsyā / āgne vittād dhaviśo yād yājāma ‘From there, O Rudrā or Agni, take note now of this oblation of ours, which we will sacrifice.’

The -tāt ending is generally attached to the present stem, however it occurs once with an aorist – vocatāt – and once with a perfect stem – vittāt. Both of these roots have very scant attestation of their present stems, and these are the principle, or indeed only, imperative stems, and thus exactly equivalent to the present stems of the other roots.

The -tāt forms are considered by most scholars to be a ‘future imperative’, although this tendency is most pronounced in the Brāhmaṇas. Thus Macdonell (1916: 348) says: ‘The form in -tād has a tendency in V. to express the more remote future, and in B. does so distinctly’ while Whitney (1924: 214) claims that ‘this form appears to have prevailingly in the Brāhmaṇas, and traceably but much less distinctly in the Vedic texts, a specific tense-value added to its mode-value – as signifying, namely, an injunction to be carried out at a later time than the present...’ Renou (1952: 368), on the other hand, is less positive, saying only that ‘L’impératif en -tāt n’a pas de valeur distinctive: toutefois, en tel ou tel passage ..., il dépend d’une condition qui doit d’abord se réaliser.’

It is true that there is a tendency for the -tāt impv. to appear in the apodosis of conditional or temporal clauses; eight of the attested examples appear thus, e.g.: 10.30.5d yād āsīncā ēṣadībbhiḥ punītāt ‘when you pour them in, purify with grass’, or 10.16.1cd-10.16.2ab yadā śṛṇāṃ kṛṇāvō jātavedō, āthem enam prá hinūtāt pīṭbhyāḥ / śṛṇāṃ yadā kārasi jātavedō, āthem enam pāri dattāt pīṭbhyāḥ ‘when you make him ready (i.e. cooked), O Jātavedas, send him to the fathers. When you have made him ready, entrust him to the fathers.’ The ‘futurity’ of this latter example is assured by the next clause 10.16.2cd yadā gāčāty āsūntīṃ etām, āthā devānām vaśanī bhavāti* ‘when he goes on that path of life, then he will be led by the will of the gods’, which appears to be the same structure but in the third person.

That said, it is hardly difficult to find similar clauses with regular imperatives: 10.38.2d yāthā vayām uśmāsī tād vaso kṛdhi, ‘as we wish, that you (will) do’, or 4.16.17cd ghorā yād ayaṃ sāmṛțir bhāvāṭty, ādha smā nas tanvō bodhi gopāḥ ‘when

---


44 For the meaning of vaśanī- see Scarlata (1999: 290).
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The fearsome collision shall come, O protector of the stranger, then become the protector of our bodies.\textsuperscript{45}

The rest of the examples of the \(-t\acute{a}t\) imperative appear to show no special semantic features to differentiate them from other imperative forms: e.g. 3.23.2cd āgne vī paśya bṛhatābhī rāyā, īśāṁ no netā bhavatād ānu dyān ‘O Agni, look here with great wealth, be our leader to refreshment daily’, or the previously quoted example at 10.24.5d.

The modal aorist injunctive

As noted elsewhere, sigmatic and reduplicated aorists do not form a second person singular aorist imperative, and instead employ the second person singular of the aorist injunctive in the same function.

More problematic are four root aorists from roots ending in \(-ā\): dhā, dā, gā and sthā, which have no attested 2nd pers. impv. forms, despite the fact that other verbs of a similar root structure do, e.g. pāhi (both aor. impv. of pā‘ drink’ and pres. impv. of pā‘ protect’), yāhi (yā), sāhi (sā), vāhi (vā), māhi (mā‘ measure’). These four roots appear to have nothing in common phonologically which would act as a constraint to forming a 2nd pers. impv. form, and differentiate them from those that do. While it is possible to claim that in the case of dhā, Grassmann’s Law would have reduced a form *dhāhi\textsuperscript{46} to *dāhi, thus creating confusion with an equally unattested form from the verb dā, this doesn’t explain the absence of an imperative from sthā, although Grassmann’s Law might in this case have created a form such as *stāhi. It certainly does not explain the absence of *gāhi.

It is not always simple to decide whether any individual occurrence of the injunctive is modal. Hoffmann (1967: 255-264) cites many examples which he considers ambiguous. Most examples could, if taken individually, be interpreted either as being modal or as belonging to Hoffmann’s “general” category (loc. cit.: 135-145) e.g. 6.26.1cd sāṁ yād vīśo ‘yanta śārasātā, ugrāṁ nō ‘vah pārye āhan dāh ‘When the tribes meet each other in battle, you give us mighty help on the crucial day’, or ‘give us mighty help on the crucial day’.

\textsuperscript{45} Translation Klein (1985: 2-105).

\textsuperscript{46} Most certainly not **dhīhi, **dihi as suggested, e.g. by Jamison (1997).
Ideally, it should be possible to find some kind of formal sign as to whether a form is modal or not. Often there is none. However, there are three particles which do seem to be associated with modality and which occur often with the aorist injunctives in examples of this kind; sá (of the type known as sá-figé), sú, and tú. While the status of the former is somewhat controversial, it is apparent that it occurs practically exclusively with imperatives and imperative-like forms47. Likewise sá is confined virtually always to modal formations, while tú mostly is.48

As they are so common with unambiguous imperatives, I think it is justifiable to consider these as markers of modal injunctives.

Thus of 39 occurrences of the form dāh, 1749 could be considered to be positive modals, the rest being either negative modal50 (which of course are always unambiguous) or else belong to Hoffmann’s historical or mythological class of injunctives.51 Of these 17, five are verb initial, and are not marked by either sú or tú (as sá-figé always occurs at the beginning of a pāda it cannot occur here). Of the remaining 12, one occurs with tú: 1.169.4a tvāṁ tú na indra tām rayiṁ dāh ‘You give us that property, O Indra’, one with sú: 6.33.1a yā ojīśṭha indra tām sū no dāh ‘That (exhilaration) which is mightiest, O Indra, give that to us’, and two have sā-figé: 5.33.6cd sā na ēnīṁ vasavāno rayiṁ dāh ‘Give us colourful property . . .’ and 9.97.25cd sā naḥ sahāsraḥ bṛhatī īśo dāḥ, bhāvā soma draviṇōvā punānāḥ ‘Give us

47 Jamison (1992) finds that of 180 occurrences of sá-figé, approx. 160 are associated with imperatives and other modals. A further ten examples occur as correlatives for yá- relatives, and there is a further residue of approx. 10 cases which can be explained by "solutions of varying degrees of ad hoc-ness". See also Klein (1996: 22).

48 Klein (1982: 12) counts 223 examples of sú, of which 130 occur with imperatives, 19 with subjunctives, 11 with optatives and 20 with injunctives, all of which he considers to be modal. tú occurs in 46 different sentences, of which 28 are in imperative clauses with expressed verb. Klein details secondary meanings of both of these particles, but the most characteristic occurrences are undoubtedly with imperatives and other modals.

49 Verb initial: 2.2.7a, 3.24.5a, 7.1.5a, 10.85.38d, 10.148.4b, Verb not initial: 1.169.4a, 2.4.8d, 5.24.2b, 5.33.6c, 6.13.6b, 6.19.6d, 6.26.1d, 6.33.1a, 7.100.2b, 9.97.25c, 10.30.4c, 10.47.1d.

50 1.104.5d, 1.104.8a, 1.189.5d, 7.1.19a, 7.46.4a, 8.2.15b, 8.48.8d, 8.71.7a, 10.59.4a, 10.128.8d.

51 1.121.4a, 6.20.7d. 6.351b is possibly a subjunctive.
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thousand-fold, great refreshment, be the property-finder as you are purified, O Soma.

In addition to this, several of the examples appear together with unambiguous imperative forms, like 9.97.25 above. While this is not necessarily a guarantee that the forms are in fact modal, it is at least a strong indication that they are, e.g. 6.19.6 śāviśṭham na ā bhara śāra śāva, ājīśṭham ojo abhibhūta ugrām / vāsvā dyumnā vṛṣṭyā mānuṣānām, asmābhyām dā harivo mādayādhyai ‘Bring us the mightiest might, the strongest strong strength, O Exceller. Give us all the mighty strength of men, O Bay-rider, so we may rejoice.’, 5.24.1-2 āgne tvām no āntama uta trāṭā, śivō bhavā vārāṇīyaḥ / vāsur agnīr vāsuṣravā āchā nakṣī, dyumāṭtamaṇṛ rayīṁ dāḥ ‘Agni you are the closest to us and our protector. Become our wholesome shelter-giver. Come here, (being) good Agni, with good fame. Give us brilliant wealth’, and 3.24.5 āgne dā dāāśē rayīṁ, virāvantam pārṇīṣam / śiśīhī nāh sūnamātah ‘Agni, give the devout wealth, an abundance of heroes. Sharpen us for sons.’

Again, it would not be impossible to interpret some of these as belonging to Hoffmann’s ‘general’ category, e.g. 3.24.5, ‘Agni, you give the devout wealth’. The verb with the greatest number of instances of the modal injunctive is dhā. The form dhā/hunderdot occurs 45 times, of which 40 are probably modal. Of the other five, four are “historical”, while one appears to be a subjunctive.55

52 For an alternative translation see Klein (1985: 1-315).

53 Verb initial: 6.19.10d. Verb not initial: 1.26.10c, 1.48.12c, 1.54.11a, 1.54.11d, 1.61.16c, 1.72.7b, 1.171.5c, 2.4.9d, 3.8.3d, 3.17.5d, 3.29.8d, 3.31.19d, 3.36.1a, 3.36.10c, 3.51.6d, 3.56.6d, 4.6.11b, 4.17.18b, 4.32.12c, 5.7.9d, 5.36.5d, 5.83.7a, 6.4.4c, 6.10.6a, 6.13.5b, 6.40.1d, 6.47.9a, 6.47.30a, 7.20.10a, 7.24.5d, 7.77.6c, 7.79.5c, 9.8.8c, 9.90.6c, 10.46.10c, 10.69.3d.

54 Verb initial: 3.30.3c, Verb not initial: 1.63.1b, 5.32.5d, 8.96.16d.

55 Both dhā/hunderdot and dā/hunderdot occasionally seem to be subjunctive forms, e.g.: 3.28.5 āgne trīye sāvane hi kāniṣṭah, puruṣāṣaṁ sahasaṁ sūnav dūtān / āthā devēye ṛdhvariṁ vīpanyāya, dhā rātnavantam anmētusā jāgrīvīṁ ‘Agni, you will enjoy the offered rice cake at the third pressing, O son of might. Then you will place the sacrifice among the gods, the immortal, with approval, full of gifts, awake. 4.6.11ab ākāri brāhma samidhāna tūḥhyaṁ, śaṁsātya ukhṭham yājate vy ā dhāḥ ‘The prayer has been made for you, O inflamed one. He will recite the incantation, and you will distribute to the sacrificer. One example of dāḥ which could possibly be subjunctive is: 6.35.1ab kadā bhuvan rāthakṣayāṁ brāhma, kadā stotṛē sahasrāpoṣyāṁ dāḥ ‘when will the priests take their seats in the chariot, when will you give the praiser thousandfold nourishment’, however see Hoffmann (1967: 246). The translation of brāhma in this example follows Geldner, ad loc.
Interestingly, the negative modal syntagma *mā dhāḥ never occurs.

Of the modal examples, nine appear with sā-figé, and a further one example with sū, and many appear together with unambiguous imperatives, e.g. the following example, which exemplifies two of the three: 10.69.3cd sá revāc choca sá gīro jujasva, sā vājam darsi sā ihā śrāvo dhāḥ ‘Burn richly, enjoy the songs, break out the booty, bring glory here’.

In the case of sthā, the root-aorist second person singular injunctive is only attested twice, one of which is modal: 6.24.9bc préṣō yandhi sutapāvan vājān / sthā ā sū ārdhvā ātī árisanyann ‘Extend to us refreshment, booty, O Somadrinker, and stand upright with aid, unfailing.’

Here we have not only the particle sū to mark the modality, but also the presence of a second aorist imperative.

The last of the imperative-less ‘-ā’ aorists, gāḥ, is attested eight times in the RV, four of which are modal. Of the other four, three are negative modals, and one is ‘mythical’. Of the modal examples, one has sā-figé: 7.62.2a sā sūrya práti puró na ūd gāḥ- ‘O Sūrya, rise again in front of us’.

The other group of injunctives which are commonly employed modally are those of verbs which cannot, for morphological reasons, form a 2nd pers. sing. aor. impv. These are primarily -iṣ- aorist forms, of which Hoffmann (1967: 264) quotes examples for the forms avīḥ, tārīḥ (3x), yodhiḥ and sāvīḥ (3x). Of these 6.25.1c

---

56 1.48.12c, 1.54.11a, 1.171.5c, 4.6.11b, 6.4.4c, 7.20.10a, 7.77.6c, 10.46.10c, 10.69.3d.

57 3.36.1a.

58 The other example is at: 4.30.12c.

59 The particle ū here is a sentence connector. For the combination ū sū see Klein (1982: 16ff.).

60 1.67.6b, 4.16.9a, 7.62.2a, 10.56.3b.

61 3.53.2a, 4.3.13a, 10.108.9c.

62 10.1.2d.

63 This despite Geldner’s translation: ‘Du, Sūrya, gehst vor uns wieder auf’. I believe, on the basis of the evidence here and below, that the presence of sā-figé is enough to classify the example as modal.
tābhīrū sū vṛtrahāye vīr na ‘with that help us in the slaying of obstacles’ and 10.120.3d adāh sū mādhu mādhumābbhi yodhī ‘fight for that sweet thing with sweetness’ have the particle sū. Aside from this, the usual mixture of injunctives and imperatives in many of the other examples at least gives a strong indication that they are modal too.

The reduplicated aorist injunctive may also be used modally. There are no examples of a second person singular reduplicated aorist imperative, unless Kümmel (2000: 298ff.) is correct in classifying pīpihī as such. An example of such usage is the form tatanāḥ, from the root stān/stān ‘to sound’. For the sole example of this form see p.148.

The thematic aorist injunctive is used modally, despite the apparent ability of this type of aorist to form imperatives. Thus we have both sādāḥ (6x) / sada (5x), vocāḥ (9x) / voca (1x), and vidaḥ (4x) / vida (1x), As can be seen, the injunctive is more common than the imperative, and furthermore there is a tendency for the imperative forms to appear in later parts of the RV, suggesting that for some reason the formation of imperatives from this class of aorists was inhibited in the earlier language.

At the other end of the scale are some verbs which have commonly attested root-aorist imperatives. The verb śru, for instance, has no attested aorist injunctive forms at all. gam has only one attestation of the form gan (7.50.1b), which is a negative modal.

A case in point is the verb kṛ, which has the very widely attested aor. impv. kṛdhī, the most commonly attested of all of the aorist imperatives with 100 attestations. The aorist injunctive form kaha is attested 28 times, of which only two examples are modal. It never occurs with sū or with sā-figē. Conversely, the imperative form kṛdhī occurs with these two modality-markers numerous times. As Hoffmann correctly points out, one of the occurrences of modal kaha is a metrical variation of an otherwise almost identical line which contains the form kṛdhī:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{tristubh} & \quad 6.44.18b \quad \text{asmābhīyaṁ māhi vārīvaḥ sugām kaha} \\
\text{jagāti} & \quad 1.102.4c \quad \text{asmābhīyaṁ indra vārīvaḥ sugām kṛdhī}
\end{align*}
\]

64 See p. 134.
The other modal example is 1.164.49d sārasvatī ūm thā dhatave kah, ‘Sarasvatī, bring it here (for us) to suck.’ This is undoubtedly modal and is very similar to other expressions of more or less the same meaning such as kṛdhī arvānc- etc.

Of the other examples of the form kah, probably 15 are in fact third person, seven are negative modals and the remainder are either ‘mythical’ injunctives or are ambiguous and unclear.

The form bhāh, which Hoffmann says has no certain modal examples, does nevertheless occur once with sā-fīgē (6.15.3a), thus making at least one example which I would consider modal, besides the impv. form bodhī.

The conclusion must be, as previously shown by Hoffmann, that on the whole there is a complementary distribution between the aor. inj. and aor. impv. in cases where the imperative, for whatever reason, is missing.

The forms dhāh, dāh, sthāh, and gāh, could have their origins in full-grade, endingless, 2nd pers. sing. imperatives, *dhā, *dā, *sthā, and *gā65. W. Schulze (1892)66 identified other endingless full-grade imperatives in Greek dialects, such as πω and ζεη, and Latin ce-do, which he compares to Lithuanian duo-k. Two out of these three examples are exactly paralleled by two of our four Vedic injunctive forms; sthāh and dāh. It is likewise noteworthy that the verbs corresponding to dhā and dā in Greek lack the -Ω imperative, instead exhibiting the unusual forms θεζ and δόζ. On the other hand, both have genuine third person imperatives, θετω and δέτω, corresponding to the attested Vedic forms dātu and dhātu. The Vedic evidence would seem to indicate 2nd pers. *dhā, 3rd pers. dātu, etc. While the two paradigms are not directly comparable they do at least indicate that the second person imperative did not end in -dhī, while the third person form had the same normal ending as all other verbs.

In favour of this hypothesis is the fact that there really is no reasonable explanation for the lack of these imperative forms. Besides, irregularities of this

65 See also Insler (19722: 559). Such forms are also discussed by Dunkel (1985), on which see further discussion on page 95.

66 Quoted in Dunkel (1985).
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kind are usually best explained as archaisms rather than innovations. Furthermore, all four of them are very common forms, which are more likely to preserve archaic morphology than less common ones.

The corresponding negative modal injunctives must have also played a role in this process, since the negative counterpart of the imperative *dā was mā dās. Thus confusion was probably inevitable and the highly irregular endingless imperative a prime candidate for reanalysis. The imperative use of the injunctive could have originated in this way, but this doesn’t seem to be a necessary step in our argument, as the fact that the injunctive is used in negative modals, and the fact that the second person plural imperative and injunctive are always identical, means that it would only take the most simple of analogies to move the second person singular injunctive into the imperative paradigm. Once the practice of using the injunctive as an imperative had taken hold, it spread to those verbs which do have a separate imperative form, and thus we see examples of forms such as bhūḥ and kaḥ occasionally used in this way.

The -si imperative

There is a group of verb forms, fairly common in the Rigveda, which are formed from the full-grade, accented root and the ending -si. They function as imperatives, and on the basis of various evidence, can be shown to be aorists. Quite common in Vedic, there is also one example in Avestan, dōišt, at Y.33.13a, from the verb dis (Ved. diś), ‘to show’. Cardona (1965) provides a quite comprehensive survey of the existing forms. After drawing up a list of forms which he considers belong to this category, he splits them into three groups. Group 1 consists of the roots mad, yaj, dah, sah, ji and nī, which have thematic presents and sigmatic aorists, e.g. yaja-/yak/sunderdot-. Group 2 consists of three further roots – pr, pṛ, and rā, which have other types of presents and

---

67 Dunkel (1985: 66) explicitly says that these forms belong to an earlier morphological layer than the zero grade forms.

68 Insler (1972: 559) suggests that the aorist injunctive form yodhīs, used modally at 10.120.3cd is in fact formed on the basis of the anomalous imperative form yōdhi.
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Sigmatic aorists, e.g. prṇāti/prās-. His third group consists of dr, yam, mā, kṣi,70 vī, juṣ, sad, śru, yudh, hu, cakṣ, naś and rad, which do not have sigmatic aorists. Despite the relatively large number of roots in the third group, the forms in the first and second groups account for 112 occurrences of the -si imperative, or over two thirds of the total number of attested instances. Thus, he justifies the classification of the -si imperative as part of the sigmatic aorist system.

Next, Cardona goes on to show that very often, third person commands or requests are made by means of the subjunctive. In particular, this is true in the case of the sigmatic aorist system, because of the lack of a third person aorist imperative form for these stems, and the forms of the type yakṣi supply second person singular aorist imperatives corresponding to the third person singular aorist subjunctives of the type yakṣat – a result of the levelling of the contrast between the subjunctive and the imperative which took place within the sigmatic system (1965: 10). This correlation, or, as Cardona sees it, the usage of an originally imperative form in a subjunctive function (1965: 9), is furthermore assured by the usage of -si forms in relative clauses, for which see p. 59 below.

Szemerényi (1966) takes the opposite view. While he accepts Cardona’s basic premise that the -si imperative belongs to the sigmatic aorist, he suggests that these forms are originally subjunctives which have come to be used as imperatives, again primarily basing his argument on the fact that these forms may appear in subordinate clauses. More precisely, he claims that the -si forms are in fact the result of a haplology of the original -sasi subjunctive ending – this latter only being attested in one case – dārsasi. Thus, while the 3rd sing. may either end in -sat or -sati, the 2nd sing. regularly ends either in -sas or -si. In this, as he himself notes, he is accepting an idea which was specifically rejected by Cardona (1965: 9).

Watkins (1968: 140ff.) sees the -si imperative forms as inherited from Indo-European, and compares them to the Greek sigmatic aorist imperatives in -son, as in, e.g. Homeric λέξον, δείξον, etc., noting that the Greek sigmatic aorist, like its Vedic counterpart, cannot take the 2nd sing. aor. impv. ending -dhī/-dī.

Watkins analyses the forms as full-grade root + s + i, where i is the deictic particle, presumably the same one as seen in the primary indicative endings -mi, -si

---

70 See footnote 98, below.
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and -ti. He considers these forms to be morphologically identical to the 3rd sing. medio-passive, both of which he describes, following Kuryłowicz, as ‘zero-person’.

Bammesberger (1983) rejects Watkins analysis, on the grounds that the particle -i is found only in primary endings and is thus excluded both from the sigmatic aorist and from the imperative. However, he accepts the idea of the haplology of the subjunctive, but only in the cases where the -si forms occur in relative clauses. For the rest of the forms, Bammesberger suggests that there was an imperative morpheme -i, which was added to the full-grade stem to produce such forms as yódhi, bodhi and jósí. This -i was then transferred to the sigmatic aorist by analogy.71

Further afield, Jasanoff (1986 and 1987) has claimed to have found similar forms in Old Irish, Tocharian, and possibly Hittite, Old Prussian and Messapic. See under śrośi, jósí and nakśi, and page 62.

There are several difficulties with these forms, not the least of which is identifying them, as there are several other forms which can end in -si, such as the 2nd sing. of root presents, the 1st sing. s-aor. med., and the 3rd sing. aor. medio-passive, a fact considered significant by Watkins (1968) (see above). Some verbs have more than one of these homophonous forms.

Each scholar who has dealt with the subject has produced a different list of extant forms. This work will take as a starting point 26 of the 27 forms appearing in Lubotsky (1997)72.

71 Jasanoff (2002) comes to precisely the opposite conclusion, that the forms bodhi and yódhi were created by analogy to jósí, and the -i subsequently reanalysed as an -i imperative morpheme. See page 26.

72 I am omitting consideration of the form vásí, which is not a -si imperative. This form appears neither in Cardona’s list of forms, nor in other lists quoted by Cardona in his paper. It is however classified as a -si imperative by Lubotsky (1997). Narten (1964: 235) and Geldner both consider it to be a 1st pers. middle injunctive, and indeed it is difficult to see how it can be considered an imperative. It occurs once at 5.70.1 purārānā cíd dhy āṣy, āvo nānān vāṃ varaṇa / mitra vāṃsi vāṃ sumatiṁ ‘Because it exists so widely, I would win your grace now, O Varuṇa, your goodwill, O Mitra.’
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cakṣi ‘show, look’

Root: cakṣ; pres. caṣṭe; aor. –; no. of occurrences: 2

Occurs at 7.3.6d and 9.97.33a. This is one of only two active forms of this root, the other being the injunctive present form cakṣur. The examples are: 7.3.6cd divó ná te tanyatūr eti sūrmaś, citrō nā sūraḥ prāti cakṣi bhānūm, ‘Your hissing comes like thunder from heaven, show your brilliance, being bright like the sun,’ and 9.97.33ab divyāḥ suparn̄o ‘va cakṣi soma, pīvan dhārāḥ kārmaṇā devāvītau, ‘Look (down) like the heavenly eagle, O Soma, fattening your streams with a sacrificial act at the divine feast’.

ghōṣi ‘listen’

Root: ghūṣ; pres. ghōṣati; aor. –; no. of occurrences: 2

This form is controversial. Cardona (1965) mentions it in a footnote, but as it has been considered an imperative in the past, especially by Geldner, and as it appears as an imperative in Lubotsky (1997), it should be considered here too.

The two passages in which it appears are 4.4.8a árcāmi te sumatiṁ ghōṣy arvāk ‘I sing to your goodwill, listen here’ and 6.5.6d tāj juṣasva jāritūr ghōṣi mānma ‘favour this (song) of the singer, listen to his prayer’.

Grassmann treats the first as a 3rd pers. sing. medio-passive, and the second as an adjective. Cardona (1965) agrees with Grassmann on the second example, as does Oldenberg (1909: 1, 270) who interprets both passages as ‘lautōnend’. The small number of occurrences of this form and the large number of possibilites preclude a decisive definition.

It is possible that this is in both cases an imperative (see also page 27). However, as the verb has no other attested aorist forms we would have to resort to explaining it as having been formed by analogy from other imperatives of this type.

chantsi ‘appear’

Root: chand; pres. chadāyati; aor. achān, chantsat; no. of occurrences: 1

The form chantsi only occurs once, at 1.163.4c utēva me vārunaṁ chantsy arvan, ‘and appear to me as Varuṇa, O swift horse’.
Earlier scholars, such as Whitney (1924) and Macdonell (1916) classed this form as a root present, but the existence of several s-aorist forms indicates that this is a -si imperative.73

**jéši** ‘win’

Root: ji; pres. jéyat; aor. ajaišam, jeh; no. of occurrences: 7

This form is clearly derived from the sigmatic aorist stem jaiššeš. As usual, it bears a strong resemblance to the subj. aorist jéšat. The form appears at 1.132.4, 2.30.8, 2.30.9, 3.54.22, 6.45.15, 9.4.1 and 9.44.6, e.g. 9.4.1ab sánā ca soma jéši ca pávamāna māhi śrávah, ‘Win and conquer great fame (for us), O purified Soma’,74 where it is clearly an imperative.

**jóši** ‘like’

Root: juš; pres. -; aor. juša-; no. of occurrences: 3, of which two are repeated.

All the forms of this verb appear to be aorist,75 with the addition of some perfect forms. A present stem juša- was later built on the basis of the aorist.76

Given the pervasive association between the aorist subjunctive forms in -sat and the imperatives in -si, we can recognise the existence of a similar pattern here. Cardona (1965: 14) suggests that jóši is derived from jóšat, which itself appears to be part of a root aorist system, as is the form ajusran, whereas most other forms derive from a thematic aorist stem juša-. This derivation is possible, given the absence of any other sigmatic forms for this root. Others, the most recent of whom appears to be Narten (1964: 120), have attempted to explain jóšat as being derived from jóši. Furthermore, it is possible that this form was created analogically on the basis of jéšat/jéši.

---


74 Translation Klein (1985: 2-72).

75 As well as the common root aorist forms of this verb, one -iš aorist form exists, jóšišat, at RV 2.35.1.

The most far-reaching study of the origin of this form is that of Jasanoff (1986), who sees an exact cognate for this form in the Old Irish tog, which, he claims, derives from *tōgōss with loss of final i. See also nakṣi and śroṣi.

Another imperative form from the same stem, jōṣā, is attested once, for which see p. 27 and p. 113.

For the possibility that the form jōṣi gave rise to the forms bodhi (budh) and yōḍhi see also page 26.

dārṣi ‘pierce’

Root: dɐ̱ / dɐ; Pres. –78; aorist: dārṣa-; No. of occurences: 10

The root dɐ has several s-aorist forms, including dāraṣat and dārṣasi, and also has what are classified as root aorist injunctive forms, dər, and dart. The existence of these forms would seem to undermine the assertion of Cardona (1965: 8) that the possible classification of yakṣi, parṣi, satsi, yaṇṣi and dārṣi (the -si imperative forms which can appear in relative clauses) as presents ‘would have some support’ in the case of dārṣi, unless dar and dart were themselves considered to be present injunctives, as for one verb to have both a root present and a root aorist would be inconceivable. The verb would accordingly have a root present, with attested forms dar, dart and dārṣi, and a sigmatic aorist with a -si imperative.

It is also conceivable that dar and dart are themselves sigmatic aorist forms, *dars-s and *dars-t.

Most of the examples of dārṣi are to be classified as imperatives, e.g. 8.24.4 ā nirekām utā priyām, indra dārṣi jānānām / dhṛṣatā dhṛṣo stāvamāna ā bhara, ‘Boldly break out the exclusive and private (possession) of the people, O bold Indra, and, being praised, bring it here to us,’ where the parallelism between the forms ā-darṣi and ā-bharā is obvious.

77 See under parṣi and neṣi for other, similar forms.

78 Werba (1997: §414), gives dṛṇāti, although this form is not attested in the Rigveda. This verb does have an intensive present dardarti.

79 The forms *dar-s and *dar-t would both regularly yield ḍabh (cf. kabh from *kar-s and *kar-t), so the latter form must have been rebuilt in a similar way to ḍprāt (see prāṣi).

80 8.24.4; 1.110.9, 4.16.8; 5.39.3; 6.33.3; 8.6.23; 8.33.3; 9.68.7; 10.69.3.
The one exception is 6.26.5ab, where the form *darṣi* occurs in a relative clause. See p. 59.

**dhāksi** ‘burn’

Root: *dah*; pres. *dabati*; aor. *dhakṣa*; no. of occurrences: 4

This form appears 3 times, together with the further appearance of a form *dakṣi*.

Examples are: 1.76.3ab *prā viśvān rakṣasas dhāky agne, bhāvā yajñāṇām abhiśasstripāvā*; ‘Burn up all the Rakṣasas, O Agni, become the defender of the sacrifices from curses’, 4.4.4 *ūd agne tiṣṭha práty ā tanuṣva, nyāmitrāḥ oṣatāt tigmahete / yó no ārātim samidhāna cakrē, nīcā tām dhakṣy atusāṁ nā śāśkam, ‘O Agni, stand up, spread yourself wide, burn our enemies to the ground, sharp-projectile-wielder, he who committed a hostile act against us, O Ignited one, burn him to the ground like dry bushes.’ The parallel between (b) and (d) shows again that this form was considered equivalent to an imperative. Strikingly similar is 6.18.10ab *agnir nā śāśkam vānam indra heti, rākṣo nī dhakṣy aśāṁ nā bhīmā, ‘Like fire (or Agni) burns dry wood, Indra, with your weapon, burn to the ground the Rakṣas like a terrifying thunderbolt.’

Finally, in 2.1.10c appears the form *dakṣi*: *tvāṃ viḥ bhāsy ānu dakṣi dāvāne*; ‘you shine out, ... to give’. Geldner thinks this is the -si form from *dakṣi*, translating ‘sei bereit(?) zu schenken’. This interpretation is made difficult both by the fact that there is no s-aorist attested from this verb, and by the fact that there is no attested combination of *anu-dakṣ*. Although the combination *anu-dah* does exist, the semantics make this interpretation difficult. Grassmann suggests the form may be a vocative. For the present, at least, it seems this form must remain unclear.

**nakṣi** ‘come, reach’

Root: *nas*; pres. *aśnoti*; aor. *ānāt* (root aorist); no. of occurrences: 1

This form appears once, at 5.24.2b *āchā nakṣi dyumattamaṃ rayin dāh ‘Come here, give us the most shining property’.*

All the other attested aorist forms of this verb in the Rigveda are root aorists. However, there exists for this verb a derivative present stem *nakṣa*-. Gotō (1987: 191-192), citing the Young Avestan form *nāṣmna (-nakṣa-māna-)*, states that this form originated in the Proto-Indo-Iranian period, and quotes Narten (1964: 160): ‘Ob es sich hier um eine alte Wurzelweiterung handelt oder ob das sa-Präs. vielleicht Weiterentwicklung eines ursprünglichen sa-Konj. darstellt, läßt sich aus
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dem vedischen Material nicht mehr ersehen." Despite this, the presence of such ‘sigmatic’ forms as these, including the attested forms nakṣat and nakṣati, would provide an ideal environment for the creation of an imperative form in -si, on the basis of such pairs as yakṣat/yakṣi.81

Jasanoff (1986), meanwhile, assigns an even earlier, PIE, date to this form, comparing it directly to the Old Irish tair, which he derives from *to-ar-inksi.

néṣi ‘lead’

Root: nī; pres. nayati; aor. anaisti, neṣat; no. of occurrences: 10

This verb is conjugated, both in the present and the aorist, in a very similar way to the verb ji, and like jēṣiṭēṣat from ji, shows the pair néṣi/néṣat. All aorist forms of this verb in the Rigveda are sigmatic, although in the Atharvaveda there is an -iṣ aorist form ānayīt. Furthermore, two athematic forms exist, nethā and ānikītām, which have not been satisfactorily explained, although perhaps they should be classed together with the similarly difficult form jītām, from ji.

The form neṣi appears 10 times,82 e.g.: 3.15.3c váso néṣi ca pāṛsi cāty āṁhāḥ ‘Lead us, O good one, and pass us over troubles’, in which also note the presence of another -si imperative, pāṛsi.

An imperative form neṣa, similar to joṣa and parsa, is attested at Atharvaveda 7.97.2.

pāṛsi ‘pass, bring’

Root: pr; pres. piparti; aor. parsat;83 no. of occurrences: 16

This is one of the commoner examples of the -si imperative, which, in the light of the widely attested sigmatic aorist forms of the verb pr, leaves little room for doubt

81 See śru(s) for a similar example.

82 1.31.18; 1.91.1; 1.19.5; 2.1.16; 2.2.13; 3.15.3; 5.42.4; 6.47.8; 6.61.14; 8.16.12.

83 As well as the sigmatic aorist, which is the most commonly attested, this verb has -iṣ-aorist forms (pāṛisat) and reduplicated aorist forms (apīraran). This latter form is the only indicative (augmented) form attested for this verb. All the others are subjunctives, and the -si imperatives.

84 1.129.5; 1.174.9; 2.7.2; 2.33.3; 3.15.3; 5.3.11; 5.4.9; 6.4.8; 6.20.12; 6.48.10; 7.23.2; 8.67.11; 8.97.15; 8.103.7; 9.1.3; 9.70.10.
The morphology of the imperative

as to its morphological affiliation. All of the other attested sigmatic forms of this verb are subjunctives, a fact which has provided ammunition to those wishing to derive the -si forms from the aorist subjunctive. The ubiquitous pairing of -si/-sat forms is well attested for this verb too; parśi/parṣat.

Another imperative is also attested, parṣā, at 1.97.8ab sā naḥ sīndham iva nāvāyā-, -āti parṣā svastāye ‘Bring us over like with a ship over a river for wellbeing’. The semantics, plus the fact that this form appears to occur in a sā+imprv. construction, leave little doubt that this is an imperative.85

The form parṣi occurs once in a relative clause, for which see p. 59.

praśi ‘fill’

Root: praśi; pres. praśāti; aor. āpras (3rd sing. sigmatic); no. of occurrences: 2

This form is attested twice, 1.42.9 and 8.1.23, both times in the expression praśy udāram ‘fill (our) stomach’. In the former example, the form is part of a remarkable string of imperatives, for which see p. 138.

In the light of the context in which it occurs, there can be little doubt either as to the root from which this form is derived, or that it is part of the sigmatic aorist system.

bhakṣi ‘share’

Root: bhakṣi; pres. bhakṣati/-te; aor. bhakṣy; no. of occurrences: 1

The only occurrence of this form is at 7.41.2d:

prātarjitaṁ bhāgam ugrām huvema
vayām putrāṁ ādīte yō vidhart/ā
ādhrāś cid yām mānāyānas turāś cid
rājā cid yām bhāgam bhakṣīy āha ∥

‘We would like to call Bhaga, the morning-victor, the mighty one, the son of Aditi, who is the distributor, to whom even he who considers himself weak, even he who is powerful, even a king says: “Share the fortune”’.

This is a somewhat ambiguous example. Geldner sees this as a first person middle injunctive, while the absence of this example from Hoffmann (1967) indicates that he probably considered it to be an imperative. Semantically, the

85 For an account of these forms, see p. 26, Narten (1964: 48, 163,171), and Cardona (1966: 13-14, 17).
imperative strikes me as the better option. In later texts this root also has a reduplicating aorist.

*mátsi* ‘exhilarate’

Root: mad; pres. mádati; aor. matsu-; no. of occurrences: 15

This verb has numerous sigmatic aorist forms, including the characteristic pair *matsa/matsi*. Fifteen obviously imperative examples exist.86

As this verb is associated with Soma, it occurs mostly in Book 9, and almost all of the examples are contained within the two verses 9.90.5 and 9.47.42, which also share a line in common. For a translation of 9.90.5, and more on the semantics of the form *mátsi*, see p. 146.

*mäsi* ‘measure’

Root: mä; pres. mimete; aor. mähi, mäsi, mäsva; no. of occurrences: 5

This form occurs 5 times.87 The only attested aorist forms of this verb are the imperatives *mähi*88 and *mäsva*, and the form *mäsi*.

An example of *mäsi* is 1.92.7cd prajävato nṛvāto dāvabudhyān, uṣo gōagrāḥ āpa mäsi vājān ‘measure out booty, rich in offspring and men, with horses at the bottom and with cows on top, O Uṣas’, which is identical in meaning to the root-aorist imperative *mahi*, 4.22.10b asmābhyaṁ citrāṅ āpa mahi vājān ‘to us, measure out shining booty.’

*Mäsi* can occur among other imperatives, e.g. 2.17.7cd krhī praketām āpa mäsy ā bhara, daddhī bhāgāṁ tanvō yēna mānāḥ ‘Make light, share out, bring here, give a share of your self, with which you will be bountiful.’ All the examples of both forms appear with the preverb *upa*.

In later texts, a sigmatic aorist arose for this verb, apparently on the basis of the form *mäsi*.89

86 1.9.1; 1.175.1; 1.176.1; 9.90.5a (x2); 9.90.5b; 9.90.5c (x2); 9.90.5d; 9.94.5b; 9.97.42a; 9.97.42b; 9.97.42c (x2); 9.97.42d.

87 1.92.7; 1.142.2; 2.17.7; 8.71.9; 9.76.3.

88 Three occurrences, at 4.22.10; 7.26.5 and 10.28.12.

89 Narten (1964: 47).
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yákṣi 'sacrifice, worship'
Root: yaj; pres. yajati/te; aor. ayāḥ (2nd sing. ind.), yakṣat; no. of occurrences: 3390
Yakṣi is the most common -si imperative form, and like vakṣi, the second-most common, presents few problems. All of the aorist forms of this verb are sigmatic. For examples and further information see p. 153.

yáṃsi 'grant, extend'
Root: yam; pres. yachati; aor. áyāṃsam, yamsat, yamat; no. of occurrences: 4
This verb is well attested both in root and sigmatic aorists, and the form yáṃsi exists alongside the somewhat more common root aorist imperative yandhī. This is another form which appears in the string of imperatives at 1.42.9 (see p. 138), thus cementing its status as an aorist imperative. The other two examples are at 5.36.4 and 3.1.22.
It also appears once in a relative clause, at 1.63.8, for which see p. 59.

yótsi 'fight'
Root: yudh; pres. yúdhyaṭi; aor. yódhat, áyodhīt; no. of occurrences: 1
This verb has no sigmatic aorist forms at all in the Rigveda, and Narten (1964: 215) only quotes one form, yutsmahi, from the Atharvaveda. Even the eminently derivable form *yotsat fails to appear, leaving the single attestation of yótsi as a lone, obviously analogically derived, oddity. The form appears at 1.132.4e asmáḥhyāṃ jesi yótsi ca ‘for us win and fight’, together with the form jesi, on the basis of which it was probably derived ad hoc.

rátsi 'dig'
Root: rad; pres. radati; aor. –; no. of occurrences: 1

90 1.13.1; 1.14.1; 1.31.17; 1.36.6; 1.75.5; 1.105.13; 1.142.11; 2.3.3; 2.6.8; 2.36.4; 3.4.1; 3.14.5; 3.17.2; 3.17.3; 5.26.1; 5.28.5; 6.4.1; 6.16.2; 6.16.9; 6.16.24; 6.48.4; 7.9.5; 7.9.6; 7.11.3; 7.16.5; 7.17.3; 7.39.4; 8.102.16; 10.1.6; 10.70.4; 10.70.9; 10.110.3; 10.110.9.
91 There is one attested occurrence of yakṣi in a relative clause in Taittiriya-Saṃhitā 2.16.12.5, but not in the Rigveda. Also, for the very interesting 3rd dual form yakṣatām, see p. 153.
This verb, meaning ‘to dig, to clear (a way)’ has, apart from this form, no other attested aorist forms. Joachim (1978: 142) compares the forms of this verb to those of mad, which as well as the forms madati and matsi has other attested sigmatic aorist forms. This may, then, be a case where other sigmatic forms existed but our limited documentation of the language doesn’t include them.

The one occurrence of the form rátsi is at 5.10.1cd prá no rāyā pārīnasā, rátsi vājāya pānthām ‘with wealth and abundance clear the way to booty’. In this example the imperative nature of the form is also well supported by the appearance of ḍ bhara in (a).

### ráṣi ‘give’

Root: rā; pres. rirīhi; aor. rāsat; no. of occurrences: 10

The reduplicated present of this root is not particularly well attested, outside of the imperative rirīhi. The verb has a strongly attested sigmatic aorist, which lacks indicative forms, but in which we find the usual threesome rāsat / rāsi / rāsva. Beginning in the Rigveda, but more so in later texts, a new thematic present rāsa-was derived from the aorist subjunctive forms such as rāsate.

The passage 2.11.13-14 contains 4 examples of the form; almost half of those in existence:

2.11.13d asmé rayīṁ rāsi vīrāvantam
2.11.14a rāsi kṣāyaṁ rāsi mitrāṁ asmé
rāsi śārdha indra mārutam nah

‘Give us property, consisting of men, give us a dwelling place, give us a covenant. Give us a Marut army, O Indra.’

---

92 For the meaning of pārīnas, and for the formula rāyā pārīnasā, see Lubotsky (1988). Cf. p. 39.

93 1.140.12; 2.11.13; 2.11.14a (2x); 2.11.14b; 2.33.12; 3.4.1; 6.4.8; 7.95.6; 9.9.9.
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vakṣi ‘bring, carry’
Root: vah; pres. vahati/te; aor. ávā/tunderdot, vakṣat; no. of occurrences: 2495
Narten (1964: 240), cites Lat. vēxi, and Cypriot Greek ἐξεῖ to show that this is a very ancient sigmatic formation. To this LIV2 adds Old Church Slavonic oto-vêsta. Nearer to hand we also have Avestan (uz-)yuažat, which corresponds exactly to Vedic (ud)-vakṣat.

Virtually all of the existing aorist forms of this verb are sigmatic,96 making this form both one of the best attested, and one of the least problematic.

Two examples of this form are listed under satsi. The addressee of these forms is usually Agni, requesting that he bring the gods to the sacrifice. Hence the prevalence of the formulations such as 2.36.4 ॐ vakṣi devāṁ ihā vipra yākṣi ca, which account for approx. half of the total occurrences of this form, and also the common proximity of other -si imperatives satsi and yakṣi, other actions associated with Agni in his sacrificial role.

vēṣi ‘pursue’
Root: vē; pres. vēti; aor. vēṣat; no. of occurrences: 597
Vēṣi, strictly speaking, is the 2nd sing. pres. of the verb vē ‘to pursue.’ However, there is little doubt that it is sometimes used imperatively, and as witness to this, we have the aorist subjunctive form vēṣat. These two are the only aorist forms existing for this verb.

95 Lubotsky (19971) shows 24 examples of this form, while both Narten (1964) and Cardona (1965) mention 25 examples without listing them. The form vakṣi is also the second pers. sing. present of the verb usi, and it is attested twice in the Rigveda, so it is possible that one of these occurrences was originally assigned to the list. The occurrences listed by Lubotsky (19971) are: 1.188.3; 2.3.11; 2.26.4; 3.4.1; 3.7.9; 3.14.2; 3.15.5; 5.4.4; 5.9.1; 5.26.1; 5.43.10; 6.15.18; 6.16.2; 6.47.9; 7.1.18; 7.78.1; 8.54.6; 8.102.16; 10.3.7; 10.70.3; 10.70.10; 10.73.4.

96 A couple of root imperative forms also exist: volhām and volhām. There have been attempts in the past (Debrunner, Nachtr. zu Wackernagel I 275, 8) to explain these forms as sigmatic. Narten disagrees with this on the grounds that the sigmatic forms should most likely have full-grade in the root. LIV2 ascribes them to the root present, on semantic grounds. See also p. 164.

97 Once again we have a disagreement on the number of attested forms, Lubotsky (19971) giving five, while Cardona (1965) mentions four. With a form this ambiguous, this is hardly surprising. The five forms mentioned by Lubotsky are: 1.76.4; 4.9.5; 4.9.6; 6.4.8; 7.16.5.
Examples include 6.4.8a-c ná no agne `vrkēbhīḥ svastī, vēṣi rāyāḥ pathibhiḥ pārśy āṁhaḥ / tā sārībhyyo gnataḥ rāsi sumnām ‘Now seek out for us on safe (‘wolf-free’) roads well being, property. Bring us over troubles. Give these to our patrons, (and give) goodwill to the singer’, where the presence of vēṣi in the same sentence as two other -si imperatives would make it hard to interpret it any other way. Likewise 7.16.5d yāksī vēṣi ca vāryam ‘Make an offering, and seek desirable things’ is hardly mistakable as being an imperative.98

śrōṣi ‘hear’

Root: śru ; pres. śṛṇōti; aor. aśravam, aśrot; no. of occurrences: 1

This verb, in the Rigveda, has almost exclusively root aorist forms. The form śrōṣi and the subjunctive form śroṣan, are the only sigmatic forms. In the later language, the root aorist dies out (Narten 1964: 260) and is replaced by sigmatic forms such as aśrauṣam, aśrauṣīs, etc.

Here, therefore, we must conclude that the -si imperative was formed by analogy. Jasanoff (1987) not only assumes this, but places the derivation in the PIE period, based on the existence of a Tocharian form (pāklyauṣ, which he compares directly with Vedic śrōṣi.

Furthermore, he explains the secondary stem śroṣa- as having been derived from a sigmatic aorist subjunctive, in a similar way to the stems nakṣa- and rāsa-, but also as early as the PIE period. This extended root appears widely in other Indo-European languages, forms appearing in LIV include, with varying levels of certainty, the unclear Avestan form sraosānē, Lithuanian klāusti (which is shown by its accentuation to be a desiderative and which actually means ‘to ask’), and

98 The similarly conjugated verb kṣi, ‘to dwell’, has a present form kṣesi, which is not a -si imperative. However, it also has a subjunctive form kṣesat. Whether this means that the imperative usage is simply unattested, or that the subjunctive form was derived by analogy, e.g. to vēṣat, is unknown. Cardona (1965: 13) does class one occurrence of this form as an imperative, but I see no conclusive reason to do so. The example is 6.4.4cd sā tvām na ārjasana ārjāma dhā, rājeva jer avṛkē kṣesy antāḥ, which Cardona translates as ‘give us nourishment; like a king conquer, abide in safety’. While the first injunctive is very likely modal, as it is preceded by sā tvām, the second injunctive could belong to Hoffmann’s ‘general’ category, thus corresponding well with an interpretation of kṣesi as a present indicative – ‘you (always) conquer like a king, you live in safety’. Hoffmann himself takes this approach (1967: 262), except that he also classifies dhāḥ as ‘general’, an interpretation which I do not accept, for the above reason (see also Narten (1964: 104), Joachim (1978: 72) under kṣā).
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klausyti, Tocharian B klyausām, Old Church Slavic slyša, Old High German (h)losēn, etc.

The form šroši is attested once at 6.4.7ab tvām hī mandrātām am arkasokair, vavṛnāhe māhi naḥ śrōsy agne ‘For we have chosen you, the most delightful, with bright flames (or ‘song-flames?’), hear our great (song), O Agni’.

sátsi ‘sit’

Root: sad; pres. sīdati; aor. asadat; no. of occurrences: 12

The forms satsi and satsat are the only sigmatic aorist forms existing for this verb. Narten (1964) and Cardona (1965: 11) both believe the latter to have been formed from the former on the basis of such pairs as yakṣi / yakṣat. Satsat occurs only once, and so perhaps is rightfully termed an Augenblicksbildung on the basis of satsi by Narten (op. cit.: 262).

The form appears in contexts such as 1.12.4c devair ā satsi barhiśi ‘With the gods, sit on the sacrificial grass’. The god sitting on the sacrificial grass is of course a recurring theme in the Rigveda, and this form satsi barhiśi occurs in seven out of the ten occurrences of this form. In two of the remaining three, satsi occurs together with the form vakṣi, e.g. 3.14.2cd vidvāḥ ā vakṣi vidūṣo ni ṣatsi, mādhyā ā barhīr āttāye yajatra ‘Being wise, bring the wise ones here, sit in the middle on the altar grass . . . ’ where the altar grass is of course also the object of satsi, albeit with slightly different wording.

The forms satsi occurs in a relative clause at 3.30.18bc. See p. 59.

sakṣi ‘defeat’

Root: sah; pres. sahati; aor. asākṣi, sakṣat; no. of occurrences: 1

Most of the sigmatic aorist forms of these verbs derive from the stem sākṣ-, and, according to Narten (1964: 264ff.), those which derive from the stem saks-originate from the -si imperative form saks. These are (predictably) sakṣat and sakṣya. The verb also has root aorist forms, e.g. optative sahyāḥ, and -iṣ- aorist forms, such as āsahiṣṭa.

99 For the possibility that this was originally a perfect stem and that the aorist forms are analogically derived from it see p. 30 and p. 176.

100 See also p. 176 for the possibility that the form sākṣya may be derived from the root sac.
The sole appearance of the form sakṣi is at the unfortunately very unclear 5.33.2cd yā itthā naghavann ānu jōsān, vākṣo abhī práryāḥ sakṣi jānān, translated by Geldner as ‘Komm hierher, du Freigeber, nach deinem Wohlgefallen; fahre her, werde mit den vornehmen (Nebenbuhlern), den (anderen) Leuten fertig!’

Despite all the difficulties of this passage, jānān and aryās are probably the direct object of prá-sakṣi, the meaning being ‘defeat the people of the stranger.’ This translation is necessary since arī is not an adjective but a masculine noun, and thus aryās is best seen as being its gen. sing, rather than an acc. pl. in concord with jānān. It is possible that they are two nouns in apposition, but ‘defeat the strangers, the people’ makes far less sense than the previous alternative.

stoṣī ‘praise’

Root: stu; pres. stavāsi, stavānti.102 aor. astoṣī, stoṣat; no. of occurrences: 1

All of the attested aorist forms of this verb are sigmatic, and thus it exhibits the combination, which was rare in the early language,103 of a root present and sigmatic aorist.

The form stoṣī occurs once in a difficult passage at 10.22.4d srjānā stoṣy ādhvanah ‘having freed (the horses) onto the roads, praise (them)’. Cardona (1965: 4) makes a case, following Oldenberg (1909: ad loc.) that the form is a 3rd singular med. injunctive instead.
The morphology of the imperative

hoṣi ‘sacrifice’

Root: hu; pres. juhoti; aor. - ; no. of occurrences: 1

The verb *hu* has no other aorist forms in the Rigveda, except a medio-passive form *āhāvi*, which occurs twice, at 5.86.6 and 10.91.15. Therefore this form was presumably derived by analogy to similar forms from other verbs. The form *hoṣi* itself only appears once, at 6.44.14cd *tām u prā hoṣi mādhumantam asmāi, sōmaṃ* . . ., ‘and sacrifice this sweet Soma to him,’ which in itself is unproblematic in its interpretation as an imperative.

-si forms in relative clauses

As already mentioned, there are four examples in the RV\(^\text{104}\) of forms ending in -si which occur in relative clauses. The attested examples are:

*parśi* occurs in a subordinate clause at 1.174.9cd *prā yāt samudrām āti śāra pārśi, pārāyā turvāśaṁ yādāṁ svasti* ‘When you cross the sea, O hero, then take T. and Y. across to well-being’.

*satsi* – at 3.30.18bc *sāṁ yān mahīṁ iṣa āśāśi pārviḥ / rāyō vantāro bṛhatāḥ syaṁa* ‘when you gain the great, abundant refreshments, may we be the winners of great wealth’.

*yaṁsi* – at 1.63.8 *tvāṁ tyāṁ na indra deva citrāṁ, iṣām āpo nā pīpayah pārijman / yāyā śāra práty asmāḥyaṁ yāṁsi, tmānam īrjaṁ nā viśvādaṁ kṣāradhyai* ‘You, O god Indra, will swell that shining refreshment like water all around for us, with which, O hero, you will bestowed upon us our life’s breath, so it will flow always like a strengthening drink’.

And finally *darśi* at 6.26.5ab *tvāṁ tād ukhāṁ indra barhānaṁ kah, prā yac chaṭā saḥāśrā śāra dáṛsi* ‘O Indra, you make this word powerful, when you destroy hundreds, thousands, O hero.’

Of these four forms, *darśi* can, I believe, be disregarded, if it is indeed a root present\(^\text{105}\). It is also different semantically from the other examples, in that it

---

\(^\text{104}\) As well as one example of *yākṣi* in a relative clause at TS 2.6.12.5: *yād agne kavyayadhanaṁ pitṛn yākṣyṝ ṛṭṝḍhah* ‘O Agni, when you sacrifice to the Fathers . . .’ which, interestingly enough, corresponds to a third-person passage in the RV containing an aorist subjunctive *yakṣa*: 10.16.11a *yō agniḥ kṛvayadhanaḥ pitṛn ſakṣad ṛṇḍhah*. ‘Agni, who shall sacrifice to the Fathers . . .’.

\(^\text{105}\) See p. 48.
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denotes a habitual or inherent act (corresponding to the aorist injunctive *kāh*), while the other three all denote future actions, in a manner corresponding to that of the subjunctive in relative clauses.

Hoffmann (1967: 183) takes the form *dārśi* to be a subjunctive, following Szemerényi (1966), and translates the passage: ‘Du Indra, machst das Wort (*tād ukthām*) machtvoll (*brahānā kāh* Inj. Aor.), damit (*yād*) du Hunderte, Tausende herausschlagest (*dārśi*)’. Hettrich (1988: 391 and elsewhere) makes no mention of the imperative and always considers these *-si* forms to be subjunctives.

Narten (1964: 202) and Szemerényi (1966: 3) reach opposing conclusions from these examples; while Narten considers them to be a misuse of an imperative, Szemerényi believes that they prove that the *-si* forms are in fact subjunctives, ‘both originally and in actual use’.

While ‘in actual use’ there is no doubt that these forms do behave like subjunctives, accepting that this is what they originally were involves accepting Szemerényi’s conclusions concerning haplology of an original *-sasi* form. Given the almost complete absence of such forms, it has to be said that Szemerényi makes a compelling case. However, if Jasanoff and Dunkel are right (see below), and the *-si* imperative actually has an Indo-European origin, then the date for the haplology must be set in Indo-European times. However, the haplology is effectively ruled out by Beekes (1981), who claims that the use of primary endings in the subjunctive is an Indo-Iranian innovation. Thus, if the *-si* imperative is indeed of Indo-European age, then its origin must be something else.\(^{106}\)

There can be no doubt that Cardona and Szemerényi are right in assigning the *-si* imperatives to the sigmatic aorist, at least synchronically; not only do most of the verbs discussed here have sigmatic aorists, but a majority of attested forms come from verbs whose aorist forms are exclusively sigmatic. It is, then, no accident that *vakṣi* and *yakṣi* account between them for over 50 instances.

This said, however, it must also be asked how many of the extant *-si* forms actually belong to verbs that have sigmatic aorist forms other than *-si* and *-sat*. These two forms unquestionably belong together. The existence of one implies the

---

\(^{106}\) It has been suggested to me by Kortlandt, that the *-si* imperatives may be a sigmatic aorist in *-dhi* that has undergone assimilation to *-si*. While this is not impossible, it does raise issues of accentuation – all *-dhi* forms are accented on the ending – and ablaut, in that most imperatives in *-dhi* have zero grade stems.
existence of the other. However, once this became the case, then any verb to which was added a secondary -si imperative would also then receive as a side effect a sigmatic aorist injunctive in -sat.107

Of the verbs in question, the following have other sigmatic aorist forms in addition to those in -si and -sat:

chand – achān, achāntsuḥ etc.; chantsi : chantsat.
ji – ajaiśam, ājaiḥ; jēṣi : jēṣat.
dah – adhāk; dhāksi : dhākṣat
nī – naiṣṭa; nēṣi : nēṣat
pṛ – aprāḥ; prāṣi. *prāṣat is unattested.
bhaj – bhāk; bhaksī : bhakṣat
mad – amatsuḥ etc.; māṭi : māṭat
yaj – ayāḥ, yāḥ; yāksi : yākṣat
yam – ayāṃsam, ayāṃ; yāṃsi : yāṃṣat
vah – āvāṭ; vāksi : vākṣat

The following verbs have other sigmatic aorist forms, but only the -si and -sat forms are active:
rā – ārādhvam, ārāṣata etc.; rāṣti, rāṣat
stu – astoṣi, āstodhvam etc.; stoṣi : stoṣat. The present has both active and middle, the aorist active only subjunctive, and the aorist indicative only middle.

The following have only -si and -sat forms:
juṣ – jōṣi : jōṣat
dṛ – dārṣi : dārṣat
pr – pārṣi : pārṣat
vī – vēṣi : vēṣat
śru – śrōṣi : śrōṣan
sad – sāṣi : sāṣat

107 Indeed, this mutual implication is so all-pervading that it may have played a role in the formation of the forms yodhi and bodhi on the basis of (inter alia) the aorist subjunctive forms yodhat and bōdhät (see also p. 26). Furthermore we may bring into consideration the unquestionably analogical form barbyhi and its probably subjunctive counterpart bārbyhat.
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sah – sakṣi : sākṣat. Other aorist forms from the stem sākṣ- probably originate in a reduplicated stem.

The following have other no sigmatic aorist forms:
- mā – only māhi, māsi and māsva.
- yudh – only yōṭsi
- rad – only rāṭsi
- naś – nakṣi. Although an aorist subjunctive form is unattested there is a secondary present stem nakṣa- which is likely to be derived from it.
- hu – hoṣi

Cardona (1965) has already shown that the large majority of attestations, as opposed to roots which have -si forms, come from roots which have other sigmatic aorist forms, thus cementing the connection between the -si forms and the sigmatic aorist. My grouping shows that once a -si form has been coined for a particular root, whether it has other sigmatic aorist forms or not, it is practically automatic that it will also develop a sigmatic aorist subjunctive form. Of those which do not have the subjunctive forms, all but māsi are hapax legomena. In the case of māsi, the lack of a form *māsat could easily simply be due to a random lack of attestation.

The lack of a form *prāsat is most likely random, given the comparatively strong status of the sigmatic aorist of pṛ. Thus, the -si forms may have their origin in the sigmatic aorist, but also, at a later date, some sigmatic aorist forms have their origin in the corresponding -si forms.

The question of the origin of these forms has undergone a certain shift since Cardona and Szemerényi. Dunkel (1992:108 1997) and Jasanoff have suggested a much earlier derivation, and a much more widespread occurrence of these forms than was originally assumed. Jasanoff’s theories concerning the antiquity of these forms have already been mentioned under the forms śroṣi, jōṣi and nakṣi. Dunkel (1997: 41) suggests that both the derivation of the -si forms by haplology from the subjunctive (if it indeed occurred) and the spreading of the -si imperative ending to

---

108 In which he suggests that -si imperative forms are preserved in the first element of Greek and Latin nominal compounds such as τερψίμπροτος, versipellis and flexanimus. Furthermore, he compares πλησίτιος with prāṣi, Κλευσίππος with śroṣi, 'Αναβισίνας with Vedic gāṣi, 'Ανεξικώμη with sākṣi, Гεωσυστράτη with jōṣi, and 'Ησιόδος with Vedic yāsi.
The morphology of the imperative

other aorist stems, in cases such as *klēy-si (šroṣi) actually occurred in what he terms the Middle Indo-European period. As already mentioned, the haplology theory has been seriously challenged by Beekes (1981).

Whatever the actual chronology may be, it seems there is a fairly complicated series of analogical derivations at work. The stages, roughly, were:

- *-si imperative formed during PIE period

  ↓

- *-si impv. spreads to verbs that do not have sigmatic aorists

  →

  new sigmatic aorists formed on the basis of *-si imperative.

  ↓

  Sigmatic present stems formed on basis of sigmatic aorist subjunctives – rāṣa-, nakṣa-, śroṣa-.

  Formation of neṣa, parṣa and joṣa from sigmatic, thematic, subjunctives.

  The existence of *-si forms implies the existence of subjunctive forms in -sat.

  Conversely, bodhi formed on basis of bodhat.

  Root presents reinterpreted as *-si imperatives spawn new aorist systems, thus, veṣi > veṣat.

Of course, different processes can occur simultaneously and at differing rates with different verbs. However, the most important point is that first the *-si ending became productive, and then spawned new aorist systems. On the basis of Jasanoff’s theories, this may have already begun in the PIE period. Once this happened, other *-si endings, such as root presents, could be reinterpreted and then spawn aorist systems, as in the case of veṣi. The three endings, *-si / -sva / -sat became inextricably associated with each other, and the existence of one or two of them implied the other(s).

As to the place of the *-si forms within the synchronic Vedic verbal system, there is ample evidence to place them as functionally identical to the root aorist imperatives in -dhi; they occur many times together with them and indeed in mixed chains of several forms, the most remarkable of which is at 1.42.9. There is also no other way for the sigmatic aorists to form a second person singular imperative. Thus
we have a case of complementary distribution, the root aorists forming the 2nd sing. imperative with -dhi, the thematic aorists with -a, and the sigmatic aorists with -si. The -is- aorists have no way of forming it (except for the isolated form avidhiti) and thus use other modal forms instead.
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The precise nature of the functional difference between the present and aorist imperative in the RV has never been properly defined.

The most likely difference between the aorist and present imperatives, should such a difference exist, would be aspectual; the present being imperfective and the aorist perfective. Although the basis for this assumption is principally that in the Greek verbal system this is the difference between them, the Indo-European verbal system seems to have been principally aspect-based rather than tense-based. The category of aspect was inherent in the present and aorist verbal stems.

In Greek this distinction exists from the earliest times and survives until today, so that e.g. τοὺς γονέως τιμᾶ (Isocrates 1.16) means ‘honour thy parents’ (now and forever more), while βλέψον πρὸς τὰ ὅρη (Xenophon, Anabasis 4.1.20) means ‘Look (glance) towards the mountains’. An interesting example that illustrates the rather subtle nature of the relationship between the aorist and the present in Greek is the following from Xenophon’s Cyropaedia 4.5.47: εἰ μὲν οὖν ἄλλους ἔχετε οἶστισίν ὃν δοῦτε σὺν τούσκα . . . ἐκείνοις δίδοτε· εἰ μέντοι ἡμᾶς βούλεσθε . . . ἡμῖν σὺν τούσκα δότε, ‘If you have someone else to whom you would rather give [the horses], then offer them to them. However, if you want us [as comrades], then give them to us’. Here the present imperative δίδοτε has an inchoative meaning, translated in all editions as “offer”, while the aorist δότε is perfective ‘give them to us (and have done with it)’. 
Hoffmann (1967: 105f. and 269ff.) finds an aspectual distinction for the aorist and present injunctive, particularly when used as negative imperatives “prohibitively” and “inhibitively” respectively, in his terminology.

He also tentatively shows (270ff.) an aspectual distinction even when the injunctive is not used prohibitively, although he is fully aware that this is very difficult to prove.

This difficulty to prove the existence of a distinction is demonstrated even more clearly by Gonda (1962). While showing that the various imperative stems sometimes appear to behave in exactly the same way as in Greek, he is forced to admit that in other cases they behave in exactly the opposite manner. Despite a detailed study of individual verbs, he is unable to find a consistent aspectual distinction, although it seems that he would very much like one to exist.

Other scholars who have researched the matter have come to the conclusion that there is no difference, notably Bloomfield-Edgerton\(^{109}\) and Whitney\(^{110}\).

This work will show that there is in fact no regular aspectual or semantic difference of the kind that exists within the Greek verbal system. The forms are used interchangeably and are in fact under most circumstances metrical variants. This situation exists, as the data suggests, because the aor. impv. was almost extinct at the time of the composition of the RV, existing only in formulae and as an archaism in places where it was metrically convenient to use it.

However, it will also be shown that the pre-Vedic Indo-European aspectual distinction between the present and aorist modal stems has been preserved in a number of frozen formulae, which were coined at a time when the distinction was still productive.

**The aorist imperative as an archaism**

The aor. impv. can be demonstrated to be moribund at the time that the RV was composed. It is less common in Book 10 than in the other books, and by the time of the composition of the Brāhmaṇa texts it was in fact completely extinct, only occurring in quotations.

In the RV, the aor. impv. is used interchangeably with the present, often occurring in the same or extremely similar sentences. The hypothesis that there is an

\(^{109}\) Bloomfield-Edgerton (1930-34: 1-63, 130).

\(^{110}\) Whitney (1924: 220).
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As an aspectual distinction between the two must be discounted, as they both appear in environments in which, if an aspectual distinction did exist, one or the other would be called for.

It is not hard to find instances where the two forms appear in practically the same sentence, as, e.g. 3.47.3a utā īrūbhīr īrūpāh pāhi sóman\textsuperscript{111} and 2.37.1d hotrād sóman \textsuperscript{111} dravinodāh pība īrūbhīh. This example is significant because the adverb īrūbhīh implies a repeated action; if the aorist truly denoted perfective aspect then it shouldn’t appear in this environment.

The demise of the aorist imperative

The aorist imperative is a fairly common form in the Rigveda; it appears about 1100 times altogether. By the time of the Brāhmaṇa texts, it had disappeared as a living form, existing only in quotes from earlier texts and in a few mantra lines. The process of elimination of the aor. impv. can be seen to be gradual; by the time that Book 10 of the RV was composed it was rarer than it had been in the earlier books.

The total number of imperative forms in the RV is approximately 5500.\textsuperscript{112} Of these, as already mentioned, about 1100 are aorists. The break-down by book is shown in Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{111} Throughout this work the backslash (\textbackslash) is used to denote the caesura.

\textsuperscript{112} Where a pāda appears more than once, it is usually counted as more than one example. The only exception to this are the common ending of hymns of Book 7 yāyām pāta svastibhiḥ sādā naḥ, which occurs dozens of times but which I counted as one example of the form pāta, and the examples of the form nābhantām, which although it has 40 attestations in the RV, only actually occurs in two related formulae: nābhantām anyakē same and nābhantām anyakēśām. See also p. 128.
Table 1

These data will be examined in two different ways. First we will consider the average number of imperatives per hymn in each book, and more importantly, the percentage of imperatives in each book which are aorists.

For the first calculation the results are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4354</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>5494</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

The main conclusions that can be gained from the data in Table 2 are: The imperative is by a long way more common in Book 8 than in any other book. This will be seen to be the case according to all forms of reckoning. However, the ratio between present and aorist imperatives in Book 8 is not significantly different to that in the other books. The aor. impv. is least common in Book 9, followed by Book 10.
This is of course significant because Book 10 is later than the other books, although a way must be found to explain the even greater rarity of the form in Book 9.

More pertinent information can be gathered from a comparison of the percentage of the total number of imperatives in each book which are aorists, as shown in Table 3. The number of pres. impvs. was added to the number of aor. impvs. in each book, to find the total number of imperatives, and then the percentage of this total number of imperatives comprised by the aorists was calculated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Percentage of aorists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>28.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here again we can see that the aor. impv. is actually the most common in Book 2, and the least common in Book 9, closely followed by Book 10. In the rest of the books the aorist imperatives are in the region of 20-30% of the total number of imperatives.

As we can see, the aor. impv. appears in every case to be least common in Book 9. This is a problem, because if we want to claim that it is rarer in Book 10 because Book 10 is later than the rest of the RV, then we must, on the face of it, make a similar claim for Book 9. No-one, as far as I am aware, has ever made this claim,
although there is a consensus that Book 9 was compiled after the other books from material that was originally contained in them.\textsuperscript{113}

However, no such claim is in fact necessary, as the reason for the comparative rarity of the aor. impv. in Book 9 has nothing to do with the date that it was composed, but rather it is a result of the special vocabulary used in this book.

The most common imperative forms in Book 9 are shown in Table 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Number of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pavasva</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ārṣa</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>srava</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhara</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viśa</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dhanva</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhava</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jahi</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4**

The first three of these forms, as well as dhanva, are highly characteristic Soma-vocabulary, which appear practically exclusively in Book 9. To this list may also be added a further 22 forms of the verb pū, bringing the total to 149. So we have a highly dominant element of special vocabulary in this book and none of them have any attested aor. impv. forms. If we subtract the number of occurrences of these special key-words from the total number of pres. impvs. in Book 9 we are left with 219, and the percentage of aor. impvs. after this subtraction is 18%, which is only very slightly lower than the percentage in the other books, and higher than the

\textsuperscript{113} This is the idea behind Oldenberg’s (1888: 251) statement: “Uebrigens ist ohne Weiteres klar, dass Buch IX nicht, wie die Bücher II-VII, vor der Vereinigung dieser Bücher eine Sonderexistenz geführt haben kann, sondern dass es selbst erst ein Product jener Vereinigung ist.” One of the few scholars who has attempted to date the language of Book 9 is Wist (1928: 170), who claims that it is the oldest in the entire RV. Bloomfield (1916: 644) is noncommittal, owing to the fact that most of the repetitions in this book are of verses from the same book. Among more recent scholars Oberlies (1998: 153 fn. 37) has no hesitation in placing Book 9 together with the family Books 2-7 in the earliest stratum of the RV, as does Witzel (1997: 262).
percentage of aorist imperatives in Book 10. There are other forms that only exist in Book 9, such as ksara ‘flow’ (4 attestations), and the addition of these forms would get the percentage even closer to that of the rest of the books.

Thus we may conclude, on all these grounds, that the aor. impv. is significantly less common in Book 10 than in all of the other books of the RV.

By the time of the Brāhmaṇa texts, the process of the extinction of the aor. impv. was far more advanced, to the point where it is found practically exclusively in quotes from earlier texts. For example, of the 27 examples\(^{114}\) of the form kṛdhi in the entire Brāhmaṇa corpus – a paucity which in itself gives an indication of the status of this form at this period – 14 are quotes from the RV\(^{115}\), one from the Atharvaveda, and nine from the various texts of the Yajurveda. Of the residue of three examples, all are mantra verses of unknown provenance.\(^{116}\) Likewise in the case of gahi, of 10 examples\(^{117}\) (counting the two recensions of the Satapathabrāhmaṇa as one example), four come from the RV, one from the SV and two from the YV. Of the remainder, two are mantra verses of unknown origin, and one is a prose passage (ŚBM 1.1.4.12 and ŚBK 2.1.3.16): tāni vā etāni catvāri vaca ehi brāhmaṇasya gahī ādraveti vaśyasva ca rājanyabandhoścādhaveti śūdrasya. ‘These then are the four types of speech. ehi belongs to the brahmin, gahī and ādrava to the vaśya and the rājanya, and ādhava to the śūdra.’\(^{119}\) This

\(^{114}\) TB 2.8.2.7, 3.6.1.2, 2.4.2.3, 2.4.4.2, 3.7.6.21, 2.7.5.2, 2.7.7.5, 2.8.8.7 (x2), 3.7.8.1 (repeated 3 times). AB 2.2.21 (x2), 5.27.2, 7.3.2. ŚBM 3.2.1.30, 3.2.2.22, 4.1.1.13 (=ŚBK 4.2.1.21, 4.2.2.22, 5.1.1.11). TĀ 1.12.1, 2.5.1. JB 1.72, 1.92, 1.221. PB 6.10.13, 15.4.3. MB 1.2.19.

\(^{115}\) MB 1.2.19 has supatrāṃ subhāgām kṛdhi whereas RV 10.85.45 has supatrām subhāgām kṛdu(!). One can only speculate as to the circumstances which led to this substitution.

\(^{116}\) TB 2.4.2.3, 3.7.6.21. TĀ 1.12.1.

\(^{117}\) ŚBM 1.1.4.12 (=ŚBK 2.1.3.16), 6.6.3.4, 9.1.2.27. TB 2.4.3.13. TĀ 10.1.5. JB 1.228, 2.145, 3.200, PB 9.2.22. KB 25.8. The form gadhi appears at JB 3.232 and PB 14.12.2, each time quoting RV 8.98.4a, which is the only time this form is attested in the RV.

\(^{118}\) TĀ 10.1.5. PB 9.2.22.

\(^{119}\) These words are apparently chosen in what the author feels is a decreasing level of politeness. The form ehi is adjudged to be both yajñyatamam ‘most appropriate for sacrifice’ and śānantam[am?] ‘quietest, gentlest’. A look at the attestations of the form gahī in the RV
passage bears a strong affinity to RV 8.13.14a: ā tā gahi pra tā drava, from which it appears to at least partially receive its inspiration. In any case, the forms are not here used in a directly imperatival sense, and gahi certainly need not be part of the living language of the Brahmins of the time.

The form śrudhi appears eight times in the Brāhmaṇas, all of which are quotes from the RV. Likewise pāhi “drink” appears 10 times, of which all are quotes from the RV, except TĀ 4.8.2, a mantra verse: úsra gharmāṁ śiṁṣa / úsra gharmāṁ pāhi, where pāhi could be from pā ‘protect’ or pā ‘drink’. Houben (1991: 75) translates the line as: ‘O Bull (calf), leave the Gharma (milk), O bull (calf), protect the Gharma’, which in this case would be a present imperative of pā ‘protect.

The aor. impv. as a metrical variant

The aor. impv. is used, with no discernable difference in meaning, as a metrical variant of the present imperative. The basic criterion for the use of any given form is the number of syllables it contains and the metrical structure of the word, rather than the semantic or aspectual value of the verbal stem.

M. Parry (1971: 6 ff.) shows that the traditional composer of oral poetry had at his disposal a large arsenal of alternate forms of differing metrical value, which could be used without distinction of meaning to fit into the metre where convenient. Parry’s subject matter was Homeric Greek, and his examples – such as the endings -ou / -oι, -ω / -oι, -ι / -εισι and variant forms such as ἡμέις and ἕμμεις – are variants of the type which is also abundant in Rigvedic, examples being 1st pers. sing. subj. -ā, -āni, 3rd pers. sing. aor. subj. forms such as gamat, gamati, and 1st pers. plural active endings -mas and -masi, the locatives with and without -i and the

will show that it actually belongs to the gods, who are its sole addressee, as they are in almost every case for the aorist imperative in general. Thus the question must be asked why the form āgahi is considered so harsh that it is reserved for the third-ranked vaiśya caste. For the accentuation of the form āhi see footnote 141.

120 ŚBM 2.3.4.31 (=ŚBK 1.4.1.22). TB 2.5.8.11, 2.7.12.5. AB 5.4.13, 5.4.19. KB 22.7. JB 3.56. PB 12.6.4.

121 AB 5.12.10, 6.11.8. AĀ 5.1.1. KB 22.7. ŚBM 4.3.3.13. TB 2.4.3.13, 2.5.8.11. TĀ 4.8.2. SB 3.1.3. GB 2.2.21.

122 The actual meaning of the term “oral poetry” is beyond the scope of this work. For works on the subject see Parry, Nagy (1974), Matasović (1996) and Finnegan (1977).
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second plural ending -ta and -tana. This kind of variant can be shown to be metrically motivated, as in the case of the formulaic paramé vyòman, which appears in triśṭubh cadences, and its metrical variant paramé vyòmani, which appears in jagati cadences. Likewise, the phrases 10.78.8c ádhi stotrásya sakhyásya gāta and 5.55.9c ádhi stotrásya sakhyásya gātana are differentiated only by the variant verbal endings -ta and -tana, the former being suited to the cadence of a triśṭubh pāda and the latter to that of a jagati pāda.123

The main difference between these examples and the relationship between the pres. and aor. impvs. is that while the former are variant endings, the latter are two different verbal categories, the difference between which has been neutralised. However, since the aor. impv. has been shown to have been an archaism at the time of the composition of the Rigveda – as were the other variants such as the “endingless” locative and the 1st person sing. subj. verbal endings without -ni – there is really no reason to suppose that it could not have been simply another variant that the poet kept in his stock of variant forms which could be used whenever the metre demanded.124

Limitations on the placement of words within the pāda

A form of a given metrical structure can appear in the overwhelming majority of cases in a fixed position in the pāda. While some types of words are quite versatile and may appear in one of a fixed set of positions, some, most noticeably short-short (∪∪) and short-short-short (∪∪∪) forms are highly limited in their placement. On the whole, they only appear in one or two positions in any line of a given metrical type. Almost all metrical types can also appear at the beginning of a pāda.

123 See also Korn (1998: 171ff.).

124 This is not the first time that it has been suggested that different verbal categories act as metrical variants. Hoffmann (1967: 263) shows that the aorist imperative and aorist injunctive act in a similar manner in 6.44.18b – asmābhyaṁ māhī vārvīvah sugāṁ kah and 1.102.4c – asmābhyaṁ indra vārvīvah sugāṁ krīḍhi, where an aorist injunctive stands at the end of a triśṭubh pāda, and an aorist imperative at the end of a jagati pāda. Renou (1925: 45f.) suggests that the perfect and imperfect act as metrical variants in pseudo-narratives such as RV 1.32.
Aorist versus present imperative

For the purposes of this study, the placement of \( \Box \Box \) and \( \Box \Box \Box \) forms in 8-, 11-, and 12-syllable lines was examined in detail, as well as the placement of words of some other metrical structures in triśṭubh pādas.

Disyllabic words \( \Box \Box \)

In hendecasyllabes

Short-short disyllabic words are very limited in their placement, and thus are quite rare in the triśṭubh, basically falling into two categories, with a small number of exceptions:

\( \text{pāda-initial} \) – Very common. In this case, obviously, the verb is accented. The form \( gahi \) is never found in this position. The reason for this is that the form \( gahi \) never appears without the preverb \( ā \). When the verb and preverb are juxtaposed, the combination \( ā-gahi \) will in effect behave in the same way as a trisyllabic form with the metrical structure \( \Box \Box \Box \); cf. the common placement of the form \( gātana \) in the cadence of jagatī pādas.

\[ \text{10.116.1a pibā sóamā \ mahatā indriyāya, pibā125 vrtrāya \ hántave śāvīṣṭha} \]

\[ \text{10.116.1c piba ráyē \ sāvase hāyāmānāh, piba mádhvas \ trpād indrā vrṣavva} \]

Immediately before the caesura – This is very common, but only occurs where the caesura is after the fourth syllable.

\[ \text{3.35.9d agnēḥ pibā \ jihvāyā sóamam indra} \]
\[ \text{2.30.10b vīrya kṛdhi \ yānī te kārtvāṇi} \]
\[ \text{6.5.6a sā tá kṛdhi \ iṣitās tāyam agne} \]
\[ \text{6.23.7d urum kṛdhi \ māvāyatā ulokām} \]
\[ \text{7.25.5c satrā kṛdhi \ suhānā stīra vrtrā} \]

\[ \text{125 The purpose of the vowel lengthening is not always immediately obvious. It is highly} \]
\[ \text{likely that some syllables are lengthened regularly even when not marked as such. See the} \]
\[ \text{conclusions for more details.} \]
Other possibilities – The two aforementioned positions are by far the most commonly found positions for the ∪∪ type. However, a few examples show them in other positions, almost always in conjunction with an enclitic or a preverb. The combination of a monosyllabic particle and the disyllabic impv. form behaves exactly like a trisyllabic word.

6.47.10d táj jūśasaśva \ kṛdhī mā devāvantam
8.96.8c āpa tvēmaś \ kṛdhī no bhāgadhēyaṃ
10.104.1d dadhanvirā \ indra pībā sutāsyā

In octosyllables
If anything, these forms are even more limited in their possible placements within the octosyllabic line than within the triṣṭubh.

Pāda initial – This is a fairly unusual placement for the verb, which in the vast majority of cases is situated at the end of the pāda.
1.10.11d kṛdhī sahasrasām ṣyām
9.61.28b kṛdhī no yaśāso jāne
1.44.13a śrudhī śrutkar/nunderdota váññibhir

Pāda-final – As mentioned, this is by far the most common position for the verb. The following are just a few of hundreds of examples.
1.4.2a úpa naḥ sāvanā gahi\(^{126}\)
1.4.3c má no āti khya ā gahi
6.2.10c samṛdho viśpate kṛṇu
6.53.7a ā rikha kikrā kṛṇu (also 6.53.8d)
10.85.45b suputraṃ subhāgaṃ kṛṇu
1.14.7b -āgne pātnīvatas kṛdhī
1.42.6c dhānāni susānā kṛdhī
1.127.11d máhī śavīṭha nas kṛdhī
5.51.14d svasti no adite kṛdhī

---

\(^{126}\) See however my remark above about juxtaposition of gahi with the preverb ā. The form gahi appears exclusively with the preverb ā in gayatrī cadences.
Other examples: śṛudhī ḫāvam – Aside from 9.104.6a sānemi kṛdhū asmād ā, most of the examples in which the verb is not either at the beginning or the end of the pāda contain the syntagm śṛudhī (...) ḫāvam.

8.66.12d śāviśtha śṛudhī me ḫāvam
8.82.6a īndra śṛudhī sī me ḫāvam
8.6.18c māmēd ugra śṛudhī ḫāvam
8.74.11c sā pāvaka śṛudhī ḫāvam

A few examples contain variations on the theme of drinking soma:
1.15.1a īndra sōmam pība rtūnā
1.15.3b gnāvo nēṣṭaḥ pība rtūnā
1.15.4c pārī bhūṣa pība r tūnā
4.46.1a āgram pibā mādhūnāṁ
8.17.1b īndra sōmam pibā imām
8.32.19c īndra pība sutānām

In dodecasyllables
Behave as in octosyllables:

Pāda-initial
2.17.7c kṛdhī praketām āpa māśī y ā bhara
7.16.6a kṛdhī rātmaṁ yājamānāya sukraṭo

Pāda-final
2.23.7d sugāṁ no asyaī devāvītaye kṛdhī
8.66.8c sēmāṁ na stōmaṁ jujuśaṇā ā gahi

Two exceptions:
6.51.13c āviṣṭhām asya ā satpate kṛdhī sugām
9.85.4d uraṇī no gātāṁ kṛṇu soma mūdhyāvaḥ
Disyllabic forms — \[ \textcircled{\text{1}} \]

This is a far more versatile type, and thus far more common. There are five possible positions:

**Pāda-initial** — The examples of pāda-initial pāhi are, with one exception, all from the verb pā ‘protect’. The aorist imperative of pā ‘drink’ only occurs once in this position. The form pība is common at the beginning of the pāda. The examples of forms in other positions are all from pā ‘drink’.

1.121.14b \[ \text{pāhi vajrivo } \text{durit/amacronacuted abhā/amacronacuteke} \]
1.129.9f \[ \text{pāhi na } \text{dūr/amacronacuted ār/amacronacuted abhí/sunderdot/abhí/sunderdotibhi/hunderdot} \]

Immediately after the caesura

2.11.15b \[ \text{trpāt sómam } \text{\pāhi drabyád indra } (10 \text{ sylls}) \]
2.11.17b \[ \text{trikadrukeśu } \text{\pāhi sómam indra} \]

**Pāda-final**

3.35.6b \[ \text{śaśvattamā/munderdot } \text{sumānā asyā } \text{pāhi} \]
3.35.8c \[ \text{tāsyāgātyā/i } \text{sumānā } \text{ṛṣva } \text{pāhi} \]

Immediately before the caesura

3.36.3d \[ \text{eva } \text{pāhi } \text{pānyo ady/amacronacute nāvīyān} \]
4.34.7b \[ \text{sajōśaḥ } \text{pāhi } \text{girvāṇo marudbhīḥ} \]

Third and fourth syllable before end

3.47.3a \[ \text{utā rtābhīr } \text{ṛuptāḥ pāhi sómam} \]
3.51.7a \[ \text{インド marutaḥ } \text{ihā } \text{pāhi sómaṇ} \]
5.43.3c \[ \text{hōtea naḥ } \text{prathamaḥ pāḥ/y asyā} \]

Trisyllabic words \[ \text{∪ ∪ ∪} \]

In hendecasyllables

This is the most limited form of all, occurring virtually only immediately after the caesura.

1.31.8b \[ \text{yaśāsaṃ kārūṃ } \text{krūhi stāvānaḥ} \]
3.30.6d viśvam satyam \krṣuhi viṣṭam astu
1.100.1d maruvaṇān no \bhavatuṁ indra āti
4.1.20d surūpikā \bhavatu jātāvedaṁ

Only one exception to this has been found in the test corpus:
3.58.7d sōmam pibam \asrīdhā sudānā

In octosyllables

Pāda-initial
1.18.1b \krṣuhi brahmaṁ pate
8.13.7b \śṛuddhī jariṁ āvam

Middle of pāda
At 3rd syllable
1.13.2c adya \krṣuhi viṭāye
6.53.10c nyāt \krṣuhi viṭāye
10.60.11d niyag bhavatu te rāpaṁ

At 4th syllable
8.84.3b nṛṣṭ pāṁ \śṛuddhī gīraṁ
4.9.7c asmākām \śṛuddhī āvam
8.74.8b cāṇīṁhā \bhavatu priyā

In dodeca-syllables

In this case the behaviour is the same as in hendecasyllables.
6.48.4c arvācāṁ sīṁ \krṣuhlī agnē avase
9.82.4b pājṛāya garbha \krṣuhi brāvīṁī te
1.94.8a pūrvo devā \bhavatu sunvato rātho

Trisyllabic words

The most common place for this metrical structure is at the end of the pāda. It is also to be found immediately before the caesura, and pāda-initially.

Pāda-final
5.2.6cd brāhmāṁy ātrer\āva tāṁ \ṛjantu, ninditāro \nindīyāso bhavantu
Aorist versus present imperative

7.35.5c śām na oṣadhiṁ vanino bhavantu

Immediately before caesura
5.83.7d samā bhavantu- \-udvāto nipādāḥ
7.17.5b satyā bhavantavyā \āśī no adyā

Pāda-initial
6.51.11d bhāvantu naḥ \sutrāṛasāḥ sugopāḥ
1.114.11b śṛṇōtū no \hāvaṃ rudrō marāvān

One exception
One example is completely unlike the others:
10.67.11c paścā médho \ápā bhavantu viśvās

Traditional phraseology, metre, and linguistic considerations
This study shows that there was a highly organized and predictable system of constraints on the possible position of verbal forms in the Rigvedic poetic technique. Indeed, there is no reason to suppose that only verbal forms were limited this way, and especially, that these rules apply only to the imperative.

The Rigvedic poet, it seems, saw each word as a brick of a certain size and shape which would fit into a slot in the appropriate place in the line. In this system, the chance of finding semantic differences between different verbal stems is reduced. In some cases, especially where there is a different clause each side of the caesura, the poet is “locked in” by the metre, and has no choice but to use the form he does, thus neutralizing any possible difference between the verbal forms. A partial example would be 10.147.5b urū kṛdhī \maghavaḥ chagdhī rāyāḥ. It is true that in this example the second verb is also aorist, thus we have an aorist environment and a possible justification for the use of the form kṛdhī. However, the point here is that in this case, because of the fixing of the sentence, the poet could not have used the present in the first clause even had he wanted to, as the \∪ \∪ \∪ forms can only go after the caesura, but in this example, that position is occupied by a different clause. The form kṛṇu is unattested in triṣṭūbh pādas, and so the only choice the poet had here, if he wished to use any form of the verb kṛ, is the form kṛdhī. Even if the caesura were after the fifth rather than the fourth syllable, the
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opening *urú krṇuhi \ would, according to the findings of this work, be exceptionally rare, only one similar example having been found.

The reason for this rarity lies in the scheme of the triśṭubh metre, which before the caesura, is either 1) ⎯ ∪ ∪ or 2) ∪ ∪ ⎯ ∪.

In the case of variant 2, in which the caesura is after the fifth syllable, forms such as krṇuhi and bhavatu would only fit in this position in a non-standard metrical line. Similarly problematic, and also rare, are the cases where a — ∪ form such as pāhi occurs immediately after the caesura. This study unearthed only three such examples.

The almost universal use of ∪ ∪ ∪ forms such as krṇuhi and bhavatu immediately after the caesura also raises questions as to the actual quantity of the final vowel in these forms, as the first three syllables after the caesura are supposed to be ∪ ∪ ⎯. While stating that the final syllable of śṛṇuhi is always long, Arnold (p.118) suggests that the vowel in other forms ending in -uhi was considered short, inter alia because of its “rather frequent occurrences before consonant groups”. This would appear not to be the case. In fact krṇuhi only occurs four times before a consonant group127, thus indicating that either the final vowel of krṇuhi was in fact lengthened, or that the sequence ∪ ∪ ∪ was not only admissible immediately after the caesura, but actually common, both in variants 1) and 2) of the triśṭubh metre.

The similarity of the behaviour of the forms such as pibatam, where the final syllable is often lengthened by position, and krṇuhi, and the lack of distinction between cases where krṇuhi occurs before a consonant cluster and where it does not, would seem to indicate either a constant and regular lengthening of the final vowel in the third position after the caesura, or that that syllable is anceps, i.e. ∪ rather than ⎯.

Likewise, pāda-initial ∪ ∪ and — ∪ raise the same questions about the length of the final vowel. While the a in piba is sometimes marked as long in this case, in many cases it is not, and the final syllables of the forms gahi and krđhi, when occupying the third and fourth syllables, never are. Does this mean that we should

---

127 1.31.8, 1.165.9, 4.22.9, and 9.91.5.
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assume the second syllables of these forms are always long whether marked or not, or that this syllable is also anceps, \( \cup \) ?

Another piece of evidence which brings into doubt the length of the final syllable of the \( \cup \cup \) forms is the fact that in 11-syllable lines they can only appear immediately before the caesura if the caesura occurs after the fourth syllable. The fourth syllable is long, but the second syllable of forms such as *krdhi* may occur in this position. When the caesura is after the fifth syllable, the fourth syllable is still long, but the first syllable of these forms, which now falls in this position, may not be lengthened and thus they cannot occur.

It is also worth noting that it is only forms ending in *a* and *i* which may undergo lengthening of the last syllable. The vowel *u* is never lengthened, and thus the form *kṛnu*, for example, cannot (and does not) occur in any position in an 11-syllable line.

The tristubh metre is commonly considered (e.g. by Watkins and Nagy) to be catalectic variant of the jagatī; in other words, it was derived from the latter by subtracting the last syllable of the cadence. This explains why the latter jagatī in some cases has more in common with the octosyllables than with the hendecasyllables. For Nagy (1974: 166ff.), the dimetre (8-syllable line) is composed of a 4-syllable opening + a 4-syllable closing, while the 12-syllable trimetre (jagatī etc.) is composed of the same two elements plus an extra 4-syllable colon, i.e. either opening + opening + closing, or opening + closing + closing. Although there are

---

128 The length-neutrality of these syllables does seem a likely conclusion in the light of the long-held view of Indo-European metre, each line of which, according to a succession of scholars, originally had an opening consisting only of a given number of syllables, with no stipulation of length, and a fixed cadence. This idea originated with Meillet, although it did have precursors in the work of Wilamowitz and Bergk. It was later developed by Jakobson, Watkins and Nagy, among others. Watkins (1963) actually goes so far as to describe the scheme of the *jagatī* line, of which the tristubh is a catalectic variant, as \( \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \) for the late-caesura variant and \( \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \) for the early-caesura one. By his reasoning the scheme of the tristubh would be the same, but minus the last syllable, and the new last syllable would then become anceps, thus: \( \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \) and \( \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \). As far as the final syllable of the forms *krdhi* and *kṛnuḥ* is concerned, for the former, in the majority of cases, we can draw no conclusion, as it occurs in the opening, however in the few cases when *krdhi* occurs in the cadence, as in 7.27.5a *nī indra rāyē \ vārvivas kṛdbhi naḥ*, its final syllable always occurs where a long syllable is expected, and is indeed marked as long. For the latter, in the early-caesura variant the final syllable would also fall on an anceps syllable, while in the late-caesura variant it would fall on a lengthened one in the “partially regulated inner colon” as Watkins terms it.
several details and complications involved which need not concern us here, the important thing is that the cadence of most octosyllables (∪ — ∪ ∪)\(^{129}\) is the same as that of the jagatī and thus can accommodate the ∪ ∪ forms such as kṛdhi. The hendecasyllables have a different cadence, — ∪ — ∪, and thus cannot accommodate them.

**Phraseological exceptions and archaisms**

The fixed placements thus far have been explained as metrical constraints. In other words, verbs of a certain shape are always or usually placed in a certain position or positions in a line because that is where they fit the metre.

Some of the fixed positions are not wholly the result of the metre. The verb could fit in other places, but very seldom does – an example being the short-short forms which practically always occur at the end of eight and twelve syllable lines. This type is most likely the result not only of metrical constraints, but also of phraseological convention; the usual unmarked word order is verb-final and if the verb can be in this position that it usually will be, even though it can theoretically also fit into the two preceding syllables. The explanation of the exceptions to these conventions is critical in the search for the relics of a difference between the present and aorist imperative, since they belong to an older level of phraseological convention and thus allow us to identify archaisms within the text.

A case in point is the formulaic śrudhi hávam. This is the only word order attested for this formula, even though it meant that the overwhelmingly common octosyllable phraseology, where the verb was placed at the end of the pāda, was violated. This despite the fact that *hávam śrudhi would both fit the meter and conform to the usual standard verb-final phraseology.

The poets, who appear to have been well aware of the problematic nature of the phrase śrudhi hávam, took some measures to accommodate it more easily within the octosyllabic line. On one occasion the phrase was actually split across two lines, so that the verb is at the more usual final position:

1.25.19ab imām me varaṇa śrudhi, hávam adyā ca mṛlaya

---

\(^{129}\) Except for the trochaic gāyatrī. The anuṣṭubh has no such variant.
The other method used to regularise this formula was to use the form śṛudhī to replace the verb śṛudhī. It has already been noticed by Lubotsky (1995) that this form is typically (in fact only) used in the same formulae as śṛudhī (p. 135) and that the ending -dhi is ‘probably due to the influence of śṛudhī.’ However, in addition to Lubotsky’s observations, we may now add that the form śṛudhī only occurs in octosyllabic lines. Within these lines it occurs four times out of five at the fourth syllable, a position at least more characteristic of octosyllable phraseology than the formula śṛudhī hávam allows. I believe that the form śṛudhī was specially coined to allow easier accommodation of the formula śṛudhī hávam within octosyllabic lines.

The suggestion that a word can be coined in order to comply with the metrical environment in which a formula is used is not unprecedented. Nagy shows that the original formula śrāvas ák/sunderdotiti was replaced by the later ák/sunderdotiti śrāvas because it fits better into the cadence of the Rigvedic octosyllable (1974: 153ff.).

Thus, the fact that śṛudhī hávam behaves in a phraseologically uncharacteristic manner shows that there is something special about the phrase, more precisely, we are dealing with an archaic fixed formula.

Another syntagma which may well be a traditional formula is kṛdhī sugám, in 6.51.13c. This is the only example found of a ∪ ∪ form which does not appear at the end of a dodecasyllabic line. In all other occurrences of this formula, the word order is reversed. Two things are worth noting: the word order in kṛdhī sugám is the same as that in śṛudhī hávam, and book six is known to be extremely conservative, and thus possibly more likely to conserve ancient phraseology.

Likewise formulae containing pība or pāhī and sōmam or a paraphrase thereof, such as sutāsyā, sutānām or mādhūnām are likely to behave in an uncharacteristic manner. In all of these cases the traditional formula which is shown to be preserved in this manner is of the form VO.130

---

130 Klein (1994: 98) also finds that the VO word order is characteristic of formulae. In his study, he found that the verb han always preceded its object when used in the context of Indra smiting the serpent.
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The form *śrudhi*, as a part of a formula used in prayers to invoke the gods, furthermore, has a precise counterpart in Homeric Greek, where the form *klóthi* is used exclusively in prayers. A selection of examples is:

**Iliad**
1.37 – *klóthi* μεν, ἀργυρότεξ, ὡς Χρύσην ἀμφιβέβηκος
“hear me, you of the silver bow, who have under your protection Chryse . . .”

5.115 – *klóthi* μεν, αἰγιόχοιο Διός τέκος, Ἀτρυτώνη
Hear me, child of Zeus who bears the aegis, Atrytone!

10.278 – *klóthi* μεν, αἰγιόχοιο Διός τέκος, . . .
Hear me, child of Zeus who bears the aegis, . . .

**Odyssey**
5.445 – *klóthi*, άναξ, ὡς ἑσσί πολύλλιστον δέ σ’ ἵκανο
Hear me, O king, whosoever thou art, as to one greatly longed for do I come to thee

9.528 – *klóthi*, Ποσείδοιον γατήχοιε κυανοχάτα
Hear me, Poseidon, earth-enfolder, thou dark haired god

3.55 – *klóthi*, Ποσείδοιον γατήχοιε, μηδὲ μεγήρης
Hear me, Poseidon, earth-enfolder, and grudge not in answer . . .

4.762 – *klóthi* μεν, αἰγιόχοιο Διός τέκος, Ἀτρυτώνη
Hear me, child of Zeus who bears the aegis, unwearied one
4.767 – ὡς εἶποδον ὀλόλυξε, θεά δέ οἱ ἐκλυεν ἄρης

---

131 For the lengthening of the vowel in *klóthi* see Schmitt §400, and LIV s.v. *kleyo*.

132 This exclusivity extends to Hesiod and the Homeric hymns.

133 Translations by A.T. Murray, from the Loeb Classics editions of Homer’s Iliad and Odyssey.
So saying she raised the sacred cry, and the goddess heard her prayer.

Schmitt (§§ 400-405) considers the formula *kludhi moi (which would have been uttered “mit ausgestreckten Händen”) to be of Indo-European antiquity, although other scholars, such as Matasović (1996) would no doubt disagree, saying it can only be proven to be Graeco-Indo-Iranian. Since it is accepted now that there is no special affinity between Greek and Indo-Iranian, then any commonality between them must be a shared preservation rather than a shared innovation, thus we can accept Schmitt’s assertion of Indo-European age for this formula.

Matasović, who attempts to formulate a methodology for the study of comparative Indo-European poetics, goes to great pains to point out that it is not enough that there is a phonological and morphological correspondence between the compared phrases in order to show that they form a poetic formula; there has to be a correspondence of the textual contexts in which the phrases appear (p. 68ff.). In any other case there is a good chance that we are dealing with simple coincidence, as in the case of phrases meaning “green grass” (p. 74). While it is hard to imagine what other adjective could be used to describe grass, he also dismisses the phrase “living fire” which occurs in Latin and Slavic literature, because there are no contextual correspondences between their occurrences (p. 75). Thus it is vitally important that the expression klađh moo occurs only in prayers in the Iliad. When humans spoke to each other, they used a different expression for “hear me”. The Vedic phrase śrudhi me (and śrudhi hāvam) also occurs only in prayers, but that is not really remarkable considering the subject matter of the Rigveda. In any case, it appears that even by Matasović’s rules, Schmitt was justified in considering *kludhi to be a method of addressing the gods in prayers.

The later replacement of an aorist imperative by a present – even a newly-coined one such as ś/runderring/nunderdotudhi – for the sake of metrical or phraseological convenience does not bode well for our chances of finding a semantic difference between the present and aorist imperatives at the time of the Rigveda.

However, the basic formula itself is always older than the attested text, and sometimes may be shown to be of Indo-European antiquity. If the formula contains

134 The final example is noteworthy, because the “sacred cry” reminds us of the Rigvedic hāva. Obviously this similarity is only semantic, not etymological or syntactic.
an aorist imperative, then it is in effect a pre-Vedic aorist imperative rather than a Vedic one. Since we can be sure that in Indo-European times there was a semantic distinction between the aorist and present modal forms, we thus have a ‘micro-environment’ in which this distinction has been preserved in Vedic, despite the fact that elsewhere it has been lost. Thus, if we can identify the basic form of the formula, then we can identify which form of the verb it originally contained and find the original semantic meaning of the verbal stems.

The above gives a criterion which may be used to select candidates for the original formulae - a prevalence or exclusivity of VO word order where OV would be the norm according to the above rules.

As already shown, a few examples have been found. The most obvious is śrudhi hávam, for which there are basically no exceptions. The poets may have been aware of the great antiquity and inviolability of this formula. Another is piba sómam. This formula is of lesser antiquity than śrudhi hávam, and may have consciously been considered less inviolable. Nonetheless there is a preference for VO word order and several examples where the usual word order is violated. This formula does sometimes ‘mutate’, even becoming sómam pāhī to fit the cadence of 11-syllable lines. A noteworthy fact in this case is that the form pāhī, when meaning ‘drink’ rather than ‘protect’, almost never occurs pāda-initially. The reason for this is that in cases where the VO word order may be preserved, and where the metre permits it, the underlying formula piba sómam is preserved as closely as possible.

These two examples seem to show well the aspectual distinction between the present and aorist that must have existed in Proto-Indo-European, and in Indo-Aryan at a period before the composition of the Rigveda, when many of the later fixed formulae may have been coined. śrudhi hávam clearly has perfective and resultative aspect; i.e. it means ‘hear our call now and do as we ask’, or even ‘obey our call’. piba sómam, on the other hand, shows imperfective aspect. It is inchoative, the god is not being asked to ‘drink up all of his Soma’ like a child being told to ‘eat up his vegetables’.

---

135 In this case, in effect, we have a complementary distribution between pība at the beginning, and pāhī at the end of hendecasyllables. Again, hardly a situation that would indicate any semantic difference between the two forms.
On the basis of this, I would add another formula to this list: *jeṣi śātrūn*. While *ji* + acc. usually means ‘capture’ or ‘win something’, in this case it clearly means ‘defeat our enemies’, and thus preserves perfective aspect.

**Further observations**

Having established this, many occasions of seemingly inexplicable usages become clear. For instance, cases where an entire hymn is written with present-stem forms, among which is one or two aorist forms seemingly with the same meaning and usage.

One example is RV 8.35. Although it is not a simple hymn metrically, largely written in the rare *upariṣṭājyotis* metre, it has a fairly simple poetic structure with many repetitions and semi-formulaic phrases in which the basic pattern is maintained but the words are replaced. Each pāda (d) occurs three times, of which I only list the first:

4cd *sajośasā uṣ sā sūryeṇa ca, īṣam no volham aśvinā*

7cd *sajośasā uṣ sā sūryeṇa ca, trir vartir yātam aśvinā*

10cd *sajośasā uṣ sā sūryeṇa ca, ārjām no dhattam aśvinā*

13cd *sajośasā uṣ sā sūryeṇa ca, ādityāir yātam aśvinā*

While 7-15d contain disyllabic present imperatives, 4-6d contain the rare form *volham*, the aorist imperative of *vah*. This form only occurs in one other place in the entire Rigveda. It seems fairly obvious that the reason this form was chosen was because it has the same number of syllables as the other forms in the rest of the hymn, not because of any perfective value it may have.

Likewise, in the same hymn, 22cde *yātam aśvinā gatam, avasyūr vām ahāṁ huve, dhattāṁ rāṁnāṁ dāśiṣe*, it seems clear that *gatam* was chosen because it sounds similar to *yātam* and *dhattam*, and also because it fits into the characteristic *∪ ∪* position at the end of a pāda, especially as the form *hatam* has also appeared recently in the same vicinity (16-18b).

Another case in point is RV 7.35, which has approx. 40 imperative forms, mostly third person forms from *bhū* and *as* in the expressions *sám astu* and *sám bhavatu*. The following is the text in full:
1 śāṁ na indrāṅgī \ bhavatāṁ ávobhiḥ, śāṁ na indrāṅgūnā rātāhavyā śāṁ indrāṅgūmā suvītāya śāṁ yoh, śāṁ na indrāṅgūṃsāṇā vājasātāu

2 śāṁ no bhágah \ śāṁ u naḥ śánso astu, śāṁ naḥ pūramdhīḥ \ śāṁ u santu ráyaḥ śāṁ naḥ satyāsyā suyāmasya śāṁsah, śāṁ no aryamā \ purūjātō astu

3 śāṁ no dhātā \ śāṁ u dhartā no astu, śāṁ na urācī \ bhavatu svadhābhīḥ śāṁ rōdasi brhaśīt śāṁ no ādriḥ, śāṁ no devānām \ suhāvāni santu

4 śāṁ no agnír \ jyōtiraniṅko astu, śāṁ no mitrāvṛūṇāv asvīnā śāṁ śāṁ naḥ sukṛtāṁ \ sukṛtāni santu, śāṁ na iśīrō abhi vātu vātaḥ

5 śāṁ no dyāvāprthivī pārvāhūtau, śāṁ antāriyaṇaḥ \ drāṣye no astu śāṁ na ṣoḍahīr \ vanīno bhavantu, śāṁ no rājasas \ pāṭir astu jīṣāḥ

6 śāṁ na ṣ́dṛro \ vīsubhir devō astu, śāṁ ādityēbhīr vāraṇaḥ susāṁsāḥ śāṁ no rudrō rudrēbhīr jālāsah, śāṁ nas tvāṣāḥ \ gnābhīr ihā śṛṇtu

7 śāṁ naḥ sōma \ bhavatu brāhma śāṁ naḥ, śāṁ no grāvānaḥ \ śāṁ u santu yajñāḥ śāṁ naḥ svārūnām \ mitāyō bhavantu, śāṁ naḥ prasvāḥ \ śāṁ v astu vēdāḥ

8 śāṁ naḥ sārya urucākṣāḥ ūd etu, śāṁ naḥ cātasrah praddiśo bhavantu śāṁ naḥ pārvatā \ dhruvāvo bhavantu, śāṁ naḥ sindhavāṁ śāṁ u santv āpāḥ

9 śāṁ no ādītir \ bhavatu vratēbhīḥ, śāṁ no bhavantu \ marūtaḥ svarkāḥ śāṁ no viṣṇūḥ \ śāṁ u pṛṣāḥ no astu, śāṁ no bhavitramaṇ \ śāṁ v astu vēyūḥ

10 śāṁ no devāḥ savitā trāyamāṇaḥ, śāṁ no bhavantī sāso vibhāṭīḥ śāṁ naḥ parjānyo \ bhavantu prajābhyaḥ, śāṁ naḥ kṣīrāsya pāṭir astu ūmbhāḥ

11 śāṁ no devā \ viśvādeva bhavantu, śāṁ sārasvatī \ sahā dhībhīr astu śāṁ abhiyācaḥ śāṁ u rātīsācaḥ, śāṁ no divyāḥ pārthivāḥ śāṁ no āpyāḥ

12 śāṁ naḥ satyāsyā \ pātayo bhavantu, śāṁ no árvantah \ śāṁ u santu gāvāḥ
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śāṁ na ṭīhāvah sukṛṭāḥ suhāśṭāḥ, śāṁ no bhavantu \pitāro hāvesu

13 śāṁ no ajā \ekapād devō astu, śāṁ nó ṛhir budhnyāḥ śāṁ samudrāḥ
śāṁ no apāṁ \nāpāt perūr astu, śāṁ naḥ prśnir \bhavatu devāgopā

14 ādityā rudrā \vāsavo jujanta, ċidāṁ brāhma kriyāmānaṁ návīvaḥ
śṛṇvāntu no \divyāḥ pārthivāso, gōjātā utā yē yajñīyāsah

15 yē devānāṁ yajñīyā yajñīyānām, mānor yajjāṭā amṛṭā ṛtajñāḥ
té no ṛəsantām \vrugāyāṁ adyā, yūyāṁ pāta \svastibhiḥ sādā naḥ

As can be seen, the forms astu and santu occupy the characteristic positions of
—∪ forms, either at the end of the pāda or in the third and fourth syllables from the
end. As this is one case where as and bhū have hardly any difference in meaning, is
it too far fetched to suggest that the author wished to vary the lines not only in
vocabulary but also in the possible positions in which he could place the verb? If he
had consistently used astu and santu, the hymn would have ended up not only very
repetitive and monotonous in content, but also would have looked somewhat like a
railway timetable, with every verb in the same place (actually two places) in the
line! By varying the usage, he is able to place the verb further back in the line,
bhavatu can (indeed must) go immediately after the caesura, and bhavantu
immediately before it, as well as at the end.
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Root notation and classification are based on that of Lubotsky (1997). As that work keeps to a strictly traditional classification it has occasionally been found necessary to reclassify forms under different roots, or, in a few cases, to change the notation of roots. All such instances have been noted. If the form is attested with accentuation then it will appear accented here, otherwise it is listed without accentuation. The number of occurrences of each form is noted in brackets. Hapax legomena are referenced explicitly.

*aj* 'drive'


**pres. med.** 2nd pl. *ajadhvam* (6.48.11b)

*aṅc₁* 'bend'

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *aṅc₁* (9.97.54d)

*aṅc₂* 'draw (water)'

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *aṅc₂* (5.83.8a)
For the meaning of this verb see Hoffmann (1965). Though Hoffmann considers this meaning to be a semantic development from the meaning ‘bend’ of añc, Mayrhofer (1986: s.v.) suggests this is a separate root.136

añj ‘anoint’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. añgdhi (9.5.10b), añdhí (10.156.3c), 3rd sing. anaktu (6), 2nd pl. anaktana (10.76.1b), 3rd pl. añjantu (2)

ad ‘eat’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. addhí (6), 3rd sing. attu (10.15.8d), 2nd pl. attá (10.15.11d), attana (10.100.10a), 3rd pl. adantu (2)

With the exception of the form addhí, the imperative of this verb only appears in late texts; eight times in Book 10, and once at hymn 1.164.40c. Of the occurrences in Book 10, 4 are in syntagmas with hávis or hav/ima ‘oblation’. Since the oblation consisted of ghee, this corresponds with the description of ghee as ‘food’ (anna-) of the gods, as in e.g. 2.35.11c hiranyavarṇam gṛtāṁ āṇnam asya ‘gold-coloured ghee is his food’ (of apām nāpāt). Soma, on the other hand, never occurs together with the verb ad–.

arthaya ‘strive for’

**pres med.** 2nd sing. arthayasva (2)

The two occurrences of this forms are in fact repetitions of the same pāda – 2.13.13ab asmābhyaṁ tād vaso dānāya rādhiṁ, sāṁ arthayasva bahū te vasavyāṁ, “Strive to give us a gift, O Good One, great is your goodness” in the repeated verses 2.13.13 and 2.14.12.

arṣ ‘flow’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. ārṣa (38), 2nd pl. arṣata (4.58.10a), 3rd pl. arṣantu (2)

The second person singular of this Soma key-word is entirely restricted to Book 9. This verb characteristically appears – usually with the preverb abhí – in expressions such as 9.20.4 abhy ārṣa bṛhād yāśo, mughāvadbhyo dhruvāṁ rayāṁ / īṣāṁ stotbhyā ā bhara ‘flow high honour, secure property for the liberal ones, bring

136 See also Joachim (1978: 37).
nourishment for the praisers’. Gotô (1987: 104-105) is adamant that this verb is always intransitive, the acc. being an acc. of goal. This could often be the case, as in 9.63.12 abhy ārṣa sahasrīnām, rayiṁ gōmantam āsvīnaḥ / abhī vājam utā śrāvaḥ ‘flow for thousand-fold property, rich in cows and horses, for booty and for glory’.

However, in 9.20.4a (above), there is an extra dative element as well as the accusative. Thus it is entirely possible that abhī-arṣa + acc. + dat. and ā-bhara + acc. + dat. are in effect synonymous. In other words, abhī-arṣa yāṣas (acc.) maghāvadbhyas (dat.) is exactly parallel to ā bhara īṣam stotībhyas. Another example with the extra dative (if naḥ is indeed to be analysed as dative and not genetive as is done by Geldner) is 9.97.51ab: abhī no arṣa divyā vāśīn, abhī vīśvā pāṛthivā pūyāmānaḥ ‘Flow heavenly goods to us, and all things on earth as you are purified’ 137.

**āvī ‘help’**

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. āva (37), avatāt (8.3.2c), 3rd act. āvatu (15), 2nd dual āvatam (23), 3rd dual āvatām (2), 2nd pl. avata (10), avitā (7.59.6), 3rd pl. āvantu (32)

**aor. act.** 2nd sing. aviddhī (7), 2nd pl. aviṣṭu (3), 2nd dual aviṣṭām (9), 3rd dual aviṣṭām (2), 2nd pl. aviṣṭa (7.34.12a), aviṣṭāna (7.18.25c)

**[aor. inj. āvīḥ (6.25.1c)]**

For a discussion of the form avitā, which appears at 7.59.6 ā ca no barhiḥ sādatāvītā ca naḥ “sit on the altar-grass and help us” and for a history of attempts to classify it as a form of the verb av, see Narten (1964: 87). Narten (op. cit.: 88) also suggests a different reading, ā ca no barhiḥ sādatā vītā ca naḥ, ‘sit on the altar-grass and visit us’, which solves the problem of the irregular form of the verb av, and, as she herself admits, introduces a shortened zero-grade form of the verb vī which is not attested elsewhere. If we are to classify this form under the verb av, then it must be a root aorist with full grade stem (< *ḥeH-t, analogous to the form gantā), as originally suggested by Meillet (1933: 128). Narten points out that in this case the accent should be on the stem rather than the ending, but there are other such examples, in addition to gantā (which Narten mentions), there is also pūtā and yātā, although in both of these cases the full grade has been generalised throughout the paradigm. There are other forms from this verb that could still be

---

137 For the semantics of this verb see also Joachim (1978: 64, particularly fn. 111).
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classified as root-aorists, such as inj. ávīt (<*h₁eyH-t, analogous to the form kar(t)
),138
avidhī and aviṣṭu are the only specifically imperative forms created from an -iṣ-
aor. The -iṣ- aor. is often to be seen as a secondary development from an earlier root aor.
of a set root.139 While in other verbs of the same type, the root aorist form of the
2nd pers. sing. is generally preserved (e.g. śnathīhi, stanihi, etc.), the original zero-
grade root aorist form would probably have been *ūhi < *h₁uH-dhī, and thus the
form avidhī would have been formed by analogy to the rest of the paradigm for the
sake of comprehensibility.

aś ‘eat’

pres. act. 2nd sing. aśāna (2)
For the form aśāna, and similar forms, see p. 28.

as1 ‘be’

pres. act. 2nd sing. edhi (16), 3rd sing. āstu (171), 2nd dual stam (10.85.42a), 3rd
pl. sāntu (61)
edhi is a perfectly regular development of *as-dhi, which must have replaced an
earlier form from *h₁s-dhi, cf. Av. zdī, Gk. ἰδέ

as2 ‘throw’

pres. act. 2nd sing. asya (6), 3rd sing. asyatu (1.114.4c), 2nd dual asyatam
(7.104.25c)
pres. med. 2nd pl. asyadhvam (10.30.2d)

āś ‘sit’

pres. med. 3rd sing. āstām (2), 2nd pl. ādhvam (7.33.14c)
Both attestations of āstām occur in the repeated pāda: barhīr na āstām āditiḥ
supatrā ‘may Aditi sit on our barhis, she of good sons’, at 3.4.11c and 7.2.11c.

138 For the variation between long and short i from zero-grade laryngeals see Jamison
(1988).
139 Narten (1964: 68).
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*i* ‘go’


**pres V. (caus.)** 2nd sing. *inú* (9.29.4c), *inuhí* (6.10.7a), *inva* (5.4.7c), 3rd sing. *invatu* (4), 2nd dual *invatam* (2), 3rd dual. *invatām* (6.70.6d)

The stem *inu*- is effectively the causative of *i*, as in i.e. 6.10.7a ví *dvēśāṁsiḥuhí vardḥyēlām* ‘scatter the enemies, enhance the refreshment’. Another example of a similar causative stem formation is *jiv-/*jīva-. It would be tempting to describe *hinu*- as the causative of *hā*, but Mayrhofer (1986: s. HAY) specifically rejects this, with ample justification.140

Dunkel (1985) suggests that the form *ēta* which appears in such expressions as 5.45.5a *ēto nṝ ādyā sudhṛyo bhāvāma* ‘come let us have good thoughts today’ and 8.24.19a *ēto nṝ īndraṁ ṭāvāma* ‘come let us praise Indra now’ is in fact a full grade imperative and not *ā+i* as it is usually interpreted. He bases this on what he considers to be a full-grade endingless 2nd pers. impv. form *ēi* in such Greek examples as *ēi* ... ṭoṣon ‘come listen’ (Il. 9.262). This is to my mind highly unlikely, because if it were true, we would have to consider the form *ēhi*, in the singular counterpart of this construction, which occurs several times in Book 8 in the formulaic *ēhi drāva pibha* ‘Come, hurry, drink’ to be the same kind of full-grade imperative. However, in this case, the accentuation clearly shows that the form is actually *ā+ihi*. If it really were a full-grade imperative form the accent would be on the second syllable, cf. *yandhī*. 141

140 For further discussion of the connection between *eti* and *inoti* see Mayrhofer (1986: s. AY1, AY2, Joachim, (1978: 39f. and 138). Also Insler (1972). 141 As shown on page 23, the ending *-dhi* is always accented, except for the single form *yōdhi*, if indeed this form does have the *-dhi* ending. Insler (1972) has suggested that imperative forms with full-grade roots and root-accent could have existed, although he is unable to provide a convincing example. Since the form *ēhi* is preserved only in an archaic formula, then maybe this is what we are dealing with here. On the same subject, note the accentuation *ēhi* which occurs in the quoted form at ŚBM 1.1.4.12 and ŚBK 2.1.3.16 (see page 71). Since the other forms in the same sentence are accented on their preverbs, this may show that the composers of that text did not recognise a preverb in this form. See also page 123.
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*i₂, inv* see *i*

*ìng* ‘set in motion’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *ìngaya* (4.57.4d)

*idh* ‘kindle’

**pres. med.** 2nd pl. *indhavam* (10.101.1b), 3rd pl. *indhatām* (1.170.4b)

*il* ‘come to rest’

**pres. act.** 2nd pl. *ilāyata* (1.191.6d)

*iṣ₁* ‘send’

**pres. act.** 2nd pl. *isyata* (1.15.9c)

*iṣ₂* ‘seek’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *ichā* (4), *ichatu* (7.102.1c), *ichāta* (7.104.18a)

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. *ichasva* (10.10.10d)

*iṣany-* ‘drive’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *iṣanya* (3.50.3d), 2nd pl. *iṣanyata* (5.52.14d)

For a discussion and bibliography on the connection of this stem to *iṣ₁* ‘send’ see Mayrhofer (1986: s. *EŠ²*).

*īnhaya-* ‘to swing, rock’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *īnhaya* (3)

All three attestations of this form are in 9.52.3: *carūr nā yās tām īnhaya-, īndo nā dānam īnhaya / vadhār vadhasnav īnhaya* ‘that which is like a pot, rock it, O drop, rock the gift, rock with weapons, O weapons bearer’.

*iḍ* ‘praise’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *ṭīṣva* (8.23.1a)

*īr* see *t₁*
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\textbf{\textit{u}} ‘weave’
\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. \textit{vaya} (10.130.1d 2x), \textit{vayata} (10.53.6c)
Originally an -\textit{áya-} form built on the \textit{ani}t root \textit{u}, < *\textit{h}_{2}\textit{y}-\textit{éje-}. From this present stem were later on secondarily derived such forms as the future \textit{vayiyánt}.

The form \textit{vaya} occurs only in 10.130.1d: \textit{prá vayápa vayéty āsate taté} ‘they (the Fathers) sit at the stretched (sacrifice) saying ‘weave this way, weave that way’.

\textbf{\textit{ukṣ}} ‘sprinkle’
\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd dual \textit{ukṣatam} (6), 2nd pl. \textit{ukṣata} (1.87.2d)
\textbf{pres. med.} 2nd dual \textit{ukṣéthām} (7.64.4c)
A verb with a very limited semantic application; of the eight attestations of the imperative, six occur with the instrumental singular or plural of \textit{ghṛtā-}, and one with the accusative. The other example shows \textit{páyas} instead. There are thus two basic valencies attested: either + acc. + instr. as in e.g. 7.62.5b \textit{ā no gávyātīm ukṣatam ghṛtēna} ‘sprinkle our pastures with ghee’, or + acc. + dat. as in 1.87.2d \textit{ā ghṛtām ukṣatā mādhuvarṇaṁ árcate} ‘sprinkle honey-coloured ghee for the singer’.

\textbf{\textit{ud}} ‘wet’
\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. \textit{undhi} (5.83.8c), 2nd pl. \textit{unātta} (5.42.3b)
Appears in exactly the same environment as the impv. forms of \textit{ukṣ} – with the instr. of \textit{ghṛtā-}: 5.83.8c \textit{ghṛtēna dyāvāprthīvī vy ūndhi} ‘moisten the heavens and the earth with ghee’ apparently addressed to the rain, and 5.42.3ab \textit{ūd īraya kavitamaṁ kavīn, unāttainām abhī mādhyā gḥṛtēna} ‘enliven the wisest of the wise, moisten him with honey and ghee.’

\textbf{\textit{ubj}} ‘subdue’
\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd dual \textit{ubjátam} (2), 3rd pl. \textit{ubjántu} (6.52.1c)
This is a secondary root, originally the -\textit{sk-} present of the root \textit{vabh}. First suggested by Osthoff (1884). Osthoff’s position is confirmed by Lubotsky (2001: 39).

\textsuperscript{142} Mayrhofer (1986: s. O).
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**uruṣṭy-** ‘protect’


**uṣ** ‘burn’

- **pres. act.** 2nd sing. *oṣa* (2), *oṣatāt* (4.4.4b), 2nd dual *oṣatāt* (8.7.13c)

**ṛṛ** ‘go, move, rise’

- **pres. act. III** 2nd pl. *īyarta* (8.7.13c)
- **pres. caus.** 2nd sing. *arpaya* (2.33.4c), 2nd dual *arpayatām* (7.104.1b)
- **pres. X. med.** 2nd sing. *īrayasva* (2), 2nd pl. *īrayadhvam* (4.34.2d)

The single attestation of the transitive reduplicated present impv. *īyarta (<*h3ī-ḥ3er-te>)* is 8.7.13 ā no rayīm . . . ʿyartā maruto divāḥ ‘Set in motion for us property from heaven, O Maruts’. The middle voice forms *īṛṣva* etc. correspond to this stem. They are predominantly late, and are reflexive, as in e.g. 10.18.8a ūd *īṛṣva nāry abhī jīvalokā/munderdot ‘Move yourself, O Woman, to the world of the living’.

*arpayati* means ‘to raise up, erect’, while *īrayati* means ‘to set in motion’, as in 4.34.2c suvīrām asmē rayīm ērayadhvam ‘bring us the good-heroed property’ and is derived from the middle voice present *īṛte*, which had been reanalysed as belonging to a root *īr*.

Jamison (1983: 124) derives *arpayati* from the root *ḥ2er* ‘to fit’, whence also e.g. Greek ἀραπίσκο. Mayrhofer (1986: s. ἀραμ) appears to agree with this (despite treating all the finite forms together under AR1), however synchronically speaking the two roots *ḥ2er* and *ḥ2er* have merged into a single root *ḥ3er*.

**ṛṛ** ‘arrive, hit’

- **pres. act.** 3rd sing. *ṛchatu* (2), 3rd pl. *ṛchantu* (10.87.15c)

---

143 See Mayrhofer (1986: s. AR1), LIV under l.*ḥ3er.*
This verb is unattested outside of Book 10. The two examples of the form *ṛchatu* both occur in the same verse, 10.164.5de: *yām dvismās tām sā ṛchatu, yō no dvēṣī tām ṛchatu* ‘he whom we hate, may it hit him, he who hates us, may it hit him’.

*ṛc* ‘sing’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *ārc(a) (25), 3rd sing. arcatu (10.36.5b), 2nd pl. árcata (24). 3rd. pl. árcantu (2)

*ṛd* ‘agitate, slay’

**pres. act.** ṛdantu (7.104.24c), caus. pres. ardaya (2)

*ṛdh* ‘attain, thrive’

*-ya-* **pres.** ṛdhyaṭām (10.85.27a)

Only occurs once at 10.85.27a *ihā priyām prajāyā te sām ṛdhyaṭām*. Kulikov (2001) rules out a passive meaning, translating ‘Here let the pleasant thing succeed for you in respect to your offspring’, asserting that the instrumental *prajāyā* refers to the scope of prosperity, as in the case of other verbs of similar meaning, such as *pūṣya-*. Earlier scholars, such as Thieme (1958), have understood this forms as passive: ‘Let the dear thing be attained here by your offspring’. This verb has a *-nu-* present, *ṛdhnoti*, as well as a *-na-* infix present *ṛṇadhat*, for which no imperatives are attested.

*ṛj* ‘move’

**pres. act.** 3rd sing. ējatu (5.78.7c)

*kan* ‘enjoy’

*iṣ-aor. caniṣṭām* (7.70.4a)

**perf. act.** cākandhi (10.147.3a), cākantu (1.122.14d)

*cānīṣṭām* is probably a nonce-form built on the basis of the superlative *cānīṣṭha-*. See Narten (1964: 111f.), and Hoffmann (1952). For the long reduplication vowel of *cākandhi* see Kümmel (2000: 130f.). For the irregular full grade in the root of this form see p. 25.
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**kr** ‘do’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. **kṛṣṇu** (8), **kuru** (2), **kṛṣṇuhí** (28), **kṛṣṇatāt** (2.30.5d), 3rd sing. **kṛṣṇatu** (14), 2nd dual **kṛṣṇtām** (6), 2nd pl. **kṛṣṇātā** (9), **kṛṣṇāta** (5), **kṛṣṇotana** (5), 3rd pl. **kṛṣṇantu** (5)

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. **kṛṣṇsvā** (14), 3rd sing. **kṛṣṇām** (2.5.7b), 2nd pl. **kṛṣṇādvām** (27)

**root aor. act.** 2nd sing. **kṛdhī** (100), 2nd dual **kṛtām** (16), 2nd pl. **kṛta** (2), **kārta** (9), **kārtana** (6)

**root aor. med.** 2nd sing. **kṛsvā** (8), 2nd pl. **kṛdhvam** (7.34.15b)

**a-aor. act.** 2nd dual **karatam** (7.65.2b), 3rd dual **kāratām** (4.55.3d)

[**aor. inj. kah** (2)]

One of the most common verbs in the RV. It is always transitive, and the middle-voice forms are in addition affective, as in 2.26.2bc **bhadrāṁ mānaḥ kṛṣṇasva vṛtraśyeyo āvāsyo yātāśasi** ‘make (for yourself) blessed inspiration for surpassing obstacles, make yourself an oblation, so you will be lucky’, or affective-possessive as in 4.4.5b **āvīs kṛṣṇasva daivādyāy aneg** ‘Make your (own) divine [powers] visible, O Agni’.

The expression **prā kr** (med.) + dat. means ‘make [a god] well disposed towards yourselves’, as in 1.186.10ab **prā aśvināv āvase kṛṣṇādvām, prā pūṣānaṁ svāvāsyo hī śānti** ‘make the Āśvins well-disposed towards you, so they will help, (make) Pūśan (well-disposed), because they are powerful in themselves’.

The form **kuru** occurs twice in the RV, at 10.19.2b **pūnar enā ny ā kuru** ‘make them [the cows] go back’ and 10.145.2d **pāṁ me kēvālm kuru** ‘make my husband mine alone’. This, and the form **kurma/hunderdot** (10.51.7a), are the only occurrences in the RV of the later present stem of the verb **kr**144. The a-aorist forms are a secondary derivation from the root-aorist subjunctive stem **kara**-

**kṛṣṇu** and **kṛṣṇuhí** have a metrically complementary distribution: whereas the former – with one exception – usually appears at the end of eight-syllable lines, **kṛṣṇuhí** generally occurs in eleven-syllable lines immediately after the caesura. **kṛṣṇuhí** also appears twice in eight-syllable lines at the third, fourth and fifth syllable.

144 For the formation of the **kar-**k**ur**- stem see Hoffmann (19762)
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\textit{kṛṣ} ‘pull’

\textbf{pres. act.} 1 \textit{karsa} (5.83.7c)

\textbf{pres. IV.} \textit{kṛṣatu} (4.57.4b), \textit{kṛṣantu} (4.57.8a)

\textbf{pres. med.} \textit{kṛṣasva} (10.34.13a)

For the difference between the two present stems see Gotō (1987: 112f.).

\textit{kṛṣī} ‘scatter’

\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. \textit{ki \textacute{r}a} (2)

\textit{kṛṣī₂} ‘praise’

\textbf{int. pres.} 2nd sing. \textit{carkṛṭā́t} (1.104.5c)

\textit{klp} ‘put in order, fit together’

\textbf{pres. med.} 2nd sing. \textit{kalpasva} (1.170.2d)

\textbf{caus. act. pres.} 2nd sing. \textit{kalpaya} (10.18.5d), 3rd sing. \textit{kalpayatu} (10.184.1a)

\textbf{caus. med. pres.} 2nd sing. \textit{kalpayasva} (2)

\textit{Kalpasva}, in its single attestation means ‘to be tolerant’, or ‘to be in accord with’: 1.170.2cd \textit{tēbhīḥ kalpasva sādhuyā, mā naḥ samāraṇe vadhiḥ} ‘Be in real harmony with them [the Maruts], do not kill us in battle’.

The causative means ‘to arrange’, as in 10.18.5cd \textit{yāthā nā pārvam āparo jāhāty, evā dhātar āyūṃśi kalpayaisāṃ} ‘So that the young doesn’t abandon the old, thus arrange their lifetimes’, while the middle-voice causative is affective, meaning ‘arrange for oneself’: 10.10.12c \textit{ānyēna māt pramūḍaḥ kalpayasva} ‘Arrange lustful pleasures (for yourself) with some else than me’.

With the exception of the present form \textit{kalpasva}, this verb is only attested in Book 10. \textit{Kalpasva} occurs at 1.170.2d, making this a verb of uniformly late distribution.\footnote{See also Jamison (1983: 124.).}

\textit{kranda} ‘cry out’

\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. \textit{kranda} (2), 3rd sing. \textit{krandatu} (5.58.6)

\textbf{pres. caus.} 2nd sing. \textit{krandaya} (6.47.30a)
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**kram** ‘stride’

- **pres. act.** 2nd sing. krāma (10.164.1b)
- **pres. med.** 2nd sing. kramasva (4)
- **aor. act.** 2nd dual. kramiṣṭam (1.182.3c)

Gotō (1987: 119) shows that the middle voice forms are durative, meaning “hindurchschreiten, weit dahinschreiten”, as e.g. 4.18.11d (trans. quoting Geldner) sākhe viṣṇo vitarāṁ vi kramasva “Freund Viṣṇu, schreite so weit als möglich aus!” while the active forms are “terminative”, vi-krāma translated by Gotō as ‘auseinanderschreiten, auseinandergehen’. There is only one example of an imperative from the active stem, with the preverb apa: 10.164.1ab āpehi manasas patē, ‘pa krāma parāś cara ‘Go forth, Lord of Thought, stride away, wander far’

**kṣam** ‘pardon, be favourable’

- **pres. med.** 2nd pl. kṣāmadhvam (2)

Both examples of the imperative of kṣam occur in consecutive hymns in Book 2: 2.29.2cd abhikṣattāro abhi ca kṣāmadhvam, adyā ca no mṛjāyatāparaṁ ca ‘as distributors (of goods), pardon us and have mercy on us today and later’ and 2.28.3d abhī kṣāmadhvam yājyaeva devāḥ ‘(You sons of Aditi) be favourable to an alliance, O gods’. Of the other three occurrences of this verb, two of them are in 2.33, and the only one to occur outside Book 2 is the present middle participle form kṣāmamāṇam at 10.104.6c. Thus, finite forms of this verb are restricted to Book 2 only.

**kṣar** ‘flow’

- **pres. act.** 2nd sing. kṣāra (4), 3rd pl. kṣarantu (9.86.37c)

All of the imperative forms, and many of the other occurrences of this characteristic Soma-keyword are restricted to Book 9. With the preverb abhi the valency of this verb is highly reminiscent semantically of that of the verb arṣ (see p. 92) as in 9.35.3c kṣārāḥ no abhi vāryam ‘flow choice property to us’, again assuming that nah

---

146 For literature on the stems krāmati : kramate see Mayrhofer (1986: s. KRAM') and LIV s. kRemH.

is a dative and not an accusative as translated by Geldner, “Fließe uns, zu begehrenwertem Besitz”.

\textit{kṣi} ‘dwell’

\textit{pres. caus.} 2nd sing. \textit{kṣayāya} (3.46.2d)

\textit{kṣip} ‘throw, launch’

\textit{pres. act.} 2nd sing. \textit{kṣipā} (2.30.5a)

\textit{khud} ‘insert (penis)’

\textit{pres. act.} 2nd pl. \textit{khudāta} (10.101.12b)

This is the only appearance of this verb in the RV. 10.101.12ab \textit{kårṇ naraḥ kapṛthāṁ úd dadhātana codāyata khudāta vájasātaye} ‘The penis, O Men, erect the penis, thrust it, insert it for the winning of booty!’

\textit{gam} ‘go, come’


\textit{pres. med.} 2nd sing. \textit{gachasva} (2), 2nd pl. \textit{gachadhvam} (10.191.2a)

\textit{aor. act.} 2nd sing. \textit{gahi} (84), \textit{gadhi} (8.98.4a), 3rd sing. \textit{gantu} (7), 2nd dual \textit{gatám} (68), \textit{gantám} (14), 2nd pl. \textit{gata} (12), \textit{gānta} (8), \textit{gantā} (6.49.11b), \textit{gántana} (9), 3rd pl. \textit{gómantu} (6)

\textit{-i/aor.} 2nd dual \textit{gamiśtam} (2)

\textit{caus. pres.} 2nd sing. \textit{gamaya} (10.152.4d), \textit{gāmaya} (5.5.10c)

With the exception of the forms \textit{gachatam} and \textit{gachatām}, the pres. impv. of the verb \textit{gam} only occurs in Books 9 and 10 of the RV. All of the middle-voice forms of the present impv., which only occur with the preverb \textit{sām}, occur in Books 9 and 10. The form (\textit{sam})\textit{gachasva} occurs twice, but in the same verse of the same hymn – 10.14.8a and d: \textit{sām gachasva pitṛbhiḥ sāṁ yaména- ... sām gachasva tanvā suvárcāḥ} ‘Come together with the fathers, with Yama ... come together with a (new) body (when you are) well-shining’
The second person singular root-aorist form *gadhi* is a hapax legomenon, occurring only at 8.98.4a.\textsuperscript{148}

The -\textit{i/-i} aorist form *gamiṣṭam* occurs twice in the same hymn in Book 10 at 10.106.3b *paśvēva citrā yājur ā gamiṣṭam* ‘like two bright animals, come to the sacrifice’ and 10.106.4d. *śruṣṭivāneva hávam ā gamiṣṭam* ‘like two attentive (attendants), come to our call’. Narten (1964: 107) calls this a “metrisch bedingte Kunstbildung”, and also classes this with other cases of -\textit{i/-i} aorist forms which are based on superlatives, such as *caniṣṭam* (see p. 99). The basis for this derivation is the form *āgamiṣṭha-*, an epithet associated elsewhere with the Āśvins.

For the ablaut variants *gata, gánta* see page 31.

For the form *gachatā* see page 35.

\textsc{gā1 ‘go’}


\textbf{aor. act.} 2nd pl. *gāta* (3), *gātana* (5.55.9c)

\textbf{[aor. inj. gāḥ (4)]]

This verb is actually entirely missing a second-person singular imperative. The aorist injunctive form *gāḥ* fills the gap. It is attested four times in its modal function, making it the most common “imperative” form of the verb *gā*. See page 40.

\textsc{gā2 ‘sing’}


\textbf{aor. act.?} 2nd pl. *gātā* (8.2.38)

The form *gātā* appears only at 8.2.38 *gāthāśravasaṁ sátpatim, śrāvaskānam purutmānam / kānvāso gātā vājīnam* ‘The famous-in-song, the true-leader, the desirous-of-fame, the great-souled; Kānvas, sing to (or of?) the prize-winner!’ This translation, in which I agree with Geldner, makes far more sense, considering the context (*gāthāśravasaṁ* etc.) than translating *gātu* as ‘go!’ However, it is problematic, as the verb *gā2* has a sigmatic aorist, and no other root forms at all. Grassmann classes this form under *gā* ‘to go’, but translates it “jemand angehen (mit

\textsuperscript{148} See Lubotsky (1995\textsuperscript{1}: 133ff.).
Liedern) besingen”, and remarks that “der Form gāta, die auch zu gā, singen gezogen werden könnte”. While gā ‘to sing’ + acc. often means ‘to sing (a song)’ as e.g. 2.43.2a udgātēvā śakune sāma gāyasi ‘O bird, you sing like an udgāt singing a sāman’ or 10.71.11b gāyatréṁ tvo gāyati sākvarīśu ‘the one sings a song in Śakvarī stanzas’, it can also mean “to sing of, praise” as in 1.21.2 tā yajñēśu prā śamsata-, indrāgni sāmhatā naraḥ / tā gāyatréśu gāyata ‘Praise them (two) at the sacrifices, adorn Indra and Agni, O Men, sing of them in songs.’ There is therefore at least no syntactical problem in assigning this form to gā ‘to sing’.

**gātuy-** ‘make way’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. gātuyá (8.16.12b).

**guh** ‘hide’

**pres. act.** 2nd pl. gāhata (1.86.10a)

The form gāhatām, which Lubotsky (1997: 491) classifies as an imperative, is in fact a 3rd person dual active injunctive: 2.40.2ab imaü devaü jyāmānau jusanta-, imaü tāmānsi gāhatām ājūṣṭā ‘(All the gods) were happy when these two gods were born, these two abolished the unhappy darkness.’ For long vowel in stem as generalisation of gūdhā- see Gotō (1987: 296 fn. 704).

**gūrdhay-** ‘praise’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. gūrdhaya (8.19.1a)

Appears only at 8.19.1ab tām gūrdhayā svārṇaraṁ, devāso devām aratīṁ dadhanvire ‘Praise him, the Sun-man, the gods have run to the god, the one with (rays like) spokes149’. Oldenberg (1909: ad loc.) suggests this is an instr. sing. of a fem. noun gūrdhā, but this idea has received little or no acceptance. There are no other finite forms of a verbal root gūrdh. 150

**gr** ‘be awake’

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. járasva (2)

---

149 Meaning of aratī from Mayrhofer (1986: s.v.), following Thieme (1949: 26ff.).

150 Jamison, (1983: 82) suggests that this form may be a ‘dh-extension’ of the root grā/gṛ ‘to greet’, or it may secondarily be built to a posited impv. *gūrdhī, as śrūdhīya to śrūdhī. Jamison herself has severe doubts as to the plausibility of this theory.
The long vowel in *jāg/runderringhí* is a result of a laryngeal at the beginning of the root, \(^{151}\)h₁ger\(^{151}\).

The aor. impv. examples of this verb are all transitive, the reduplicated stem ájīgar- being the aorist of the pres. caus. stem jāraya-, which is attested three times in the RV\(^{152}\); e.g. 1.158.2c jigṛtām asmē revāṭih pūraṇḍhīḥ, ‘make rich wealth awaken for us’.

The aorist occurs twice with pūramḍhīḥ ‘riches’ as direct object (1.158.2c and 4.50.11c, which is repeated several times elsewhere) and once with rāyāḥ ‘property’ (7.57.6d). The examples of the perfect and present impvs. are intransitive. jarasva means ‘wake up’, while jāṛhī means ‘be watchful, awake’. The aor. impv. forms have a short reduplicating syllable, cf. didhṛtam (q.v. under dhṛ).

**grbhī/grbhī** ‘seize’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. grbhāyā (13), 2nd pl. grbhāyāta (2)

**pres. IX act.** 2nd sing. grhrānā (10.103.12b), 3rd sing. grhrāntā (4.57.7a)

For ‘deverbative’ grbhāya- besides grhrāntā see LIV s. gṛrebh₂ and bibliography in Gotō (1988: fn. 5), Mayrhofer (1986: s. GRABHI). For class IX impv. in -āna, see p. 28.

**gṛ** ‘praise, welcome’

**pres. IX act.** 2nd sing. grṛṭhī (9), 3rd sing. grṛṭṭu (2), 3rd dual. grṛṭṭām (10.47.8c), 2nd pl. grṛṭṭa (10.15.6b)

**pres. I med.** 2nd sing. jarasva (7.9.6c), 3rd sing. jaratām (4.4.8b)

**aor. med.** gurasva (3.52.2b)

This “polymorphic” root receives thorough treatment in Gotō (1987: 153ff.). The form gurasva appears once at 3.52.2ab: puroḷāśam pacatām, jusāsvendrā gurasva ca ‘Enjoy the cooked rice-cake, and welcome it, Indra’. For its classification as an

---


\(^{152}\) Jamison (1983: 126ff.).
aorist imperative, constructed from *gūṛṣva on the basis of the form juśasva, see Gotō (1987: 154, fn. 242). Joachim (1978: 75f.) suggests the forms could be derived from gṛ2 ‘to swallow’. For the possibility that the root *gūrdh may be secondarily derived from this root, see page 105.

gopāy- ‘guard’
pres. act. 2nd dual gopāyātam (6.74.4d)

gras ‘swallow’
pres. med. 2nd dual grāsetām (3.53.3c)

ghuṣ ‘hear’
aor. si-impv. ghūṣi (2)
See discussion of this controversial form on page 46.

cakṣ ‘look’
aor. -si-impv. 2nd sing. caksi (2)
aor. med. 2nd sing. cakṣva (3)
caus. 2nd sing. cakṣaya (2)
Almost all occurrences of this secondary root are middle voice: e.g. 7.104.25ab práti cakṣva vi cakṣva-, -indraś ca soma jāgṛtam ‘Look here, look around, O Indra and Soma, be aware’.
The active -si-impv. caksi means, on one occasion, with the preverb práti ‘to show’ 7.3.6cd divó ná te tanyatār eti śūṣmaś, citrō ná sāraḥ práti caksi bhānīṁ ‘Your crash comes like thunder from heaven, show your brilliance, bright like the sun’, while the other instance of this form, with the preverb áva, means ‘to look down’: 9.97.33a divyāḥ suparno ‘va caksi soma ‘Look down like a heavenly eagle, O Soma’.
The causative form cakṣaya appears twice with the preverb prá with the meaning ‘to reveal’ or even ‘illuminate’: 1.134.3def prá bodhayā pūrṇaḥpiṭhp, jārā dā sasaṭīm iva / prá cakṣaya rōdasī vāsayaṃśaḥ ‘awaken riches, like a lover (awakens) a sleeping woman, reveal the two worlds, let the dawns shine,’ Cf. Jamison (1983: 125), who asserts that cakṣaya is the transitive counterpart of an intransitive use of the form ví caṣṭe ‘appear’. No such transitive use with ví occurs in the imperative form.
cat ‘hide’
caus. med. 2nd sing. cātáyasva (3)
The form cātáyasva + acc. + abl. means ‘to make X hide from Y’ \(^{153}\) i.e. to drive away’: 2.33.2cd vy āsmād dvēsō vitarām vy ānho, vy āmīvāś cātáyasvā viśucīḥ ‘drive all hostilities, all trouble far away from us, all distress in all directions’.

canasy- ‘take pleasure in’
pres. act. 2nd dual canasyātam (1.3.1c)
A “tertiary derivation” denominative verb from the noun cánas-, which in turn is from the verbal root kan\(^{154}\); cf. manasya- < mánas- < man-.

car ‘move’
pres. act. 2nd sing. cara (11), 3rd pl. carantu (3)

ci ‘clear, pile’
pres. act. 2nd sing. cinuhí (6.53.4b), 3rd sing. cinotu (10.87.5d)
root aor. act. 2nd pl. citana (4.37.7b), 3rd pl. ciyántu (1.90.4b)
iṣ-aor. active 2nd dual caviṣṭam (6.67.8d)
The form caviṣṭam is another of those derived from superlative adjectives; cf. caniṣṭam and gamiṣṭam.\(^{155}\) It occurs once at 6.67.8d yuvāṁ dāśūye vī caviṣṭam āṁhaḥ ‘you two clear away the troubles of the worshipper’. With the preverb vī, the root often means ‘to clear (a path)’, as in 6.53.4ab vī pathō vājasātaye, cinuhí vī mīḷho jahi ‘clear the paths to the capture of booty, smite away the enemies’ and 4.37.7ab vī no vājā ṛbhukṣanāḥ, pathāś citana vāṣṭave ‘Clear the way to the sacrifice, O Vājas, O Ṛbhukṣan’s’, a theme repeated at 1.90.4b.


\(^{154}\) Q.v. page 99.

\(^{155}\) See pages 99 and 104.
cit ‘perceive’

- **pres. act.** 3rd dual cetātām (10.35.1c)
- **perf. act.** 2nd sing. cikiddhī (7)
- **caus. med.** 2nd dual cetayethām (8.9.10d), 2nd pl. cetāyadhvam (3.53.11a)
- **desid.** cikitsa (2)

The perfect form cikiddhī is by far the most common imperative of this verb, and has transitive meaning ‘to perceive’, as in 4.4.11c tvāṁ no asyā vácsaś cikiddhī ‘you take heed of this word for us’ and 2.43.3b táṣṇám āśinaḥ suṇatīm cikiddhi naḥ ‘sitting quietly, perceive goodwill for us’, as does the present cetatām 10.35.1c mahi dyāvā[p]hrīhī cetatām āpas- ‘may the great heaven and earth perceive our work’. The causative middle stem appears with the meaning ‘pay attention, be attentive’, with no explicit direct object: 3.53.11ab úpa prēta kuśikāś cetāyadhvam, áśvaṇ yāre prā muṇcata śudāsah ‘go to his side, be attentive, let the horse of Sudās go, so he may win property’ and 8.9.10 yād vām kakṣi[v]ān utā yād vyāśva, īṣir yād vām dīrghatamā juh[v] / pṛhiḥ yād vām vai[n]yāḥ śādaṇeśv, evēd āto aśvinā cetayethām ‘When K. and the Ṛṣi V. and D., when P. and V. have called you to the (sacrificial) seats, just then, for that reason, pay attention, O Aśvins.’

For the form cikitsa and the other desiderative impv. see p. 34.

cud ‘impel’

- **pres. act.** 2nd sing. códa (2), 2nd pl. codata (2)
- **pres. med.** 2nd sing. codasva (2)
- **caus. pres.** 2nd sing. codāya (19), 2nd dual codāyatam (10.39.2a), 2nd pl. codāyata (10.101.12b)

Jamison (1983: 153) claims that the causative form has a generally later distribution than the synonymous simple present, and thus was used as a replacement for it. As far as the imperative is concerned, two of the four attestations of the stem coda- occur in the late Book 1. However, one of them (1.48.2d) is a repetition of 7.96.2d. In any case, the causative stem is far more common than the simple present, suggesting that Jamison is correct, whatever the distribution of the forms. While the med. is usually intransitive (‘hurries’), one example of the form codasva is transitive 8.75.6c vṛṣṇe codasva suṣṭitvā ‘drive the good praise (destined) for the bull’.

---

According to Jamison *ibid.*, this is due to the presence of the transitive *namasva* in the previous verse.

**cṛt** ‘bind’
*pres. act.* 2nd sing. *cṛta* (1.25.21b)

**cyu** ‘stir’

**chand** ‘seem’
*aor. -sī impv.* *chantsi* (1.163.4c)

**chid** ‘split, cut’
*pres. act.* 2nd sing. *chindhi* (1.133.2c)

**jani** ‘give birth’
*aor. med.* 2nd sing. *jāniśya* (6.15.18a)
*caus. act.* 2nd sing. *jānāya* (6), 3rd sing. *janayatu* (10.85.43a), 2nd dual *janayatam* (1.185.3c)
*caus. med.* *janayasva* (6.18.15d)

The stem *jāya-* is termed by Kulikov (2001: 242f.) not passive but “anti-causative”, by which he means “the intransitive counterpart of a transitive verb in pairs like *jananta sūryam*” (RV 9.23.2) ‘they generated (gave birth to) the Sūrya’ ~ *sūryo ajāyata* (RV 10.90.13) ‘Sūrya was born’. (p. 16). This analysis is based primarily on the fact that the agent or source of the birth is in the ablative rather than the instrumental.

The -*ya-* stem occurs five times in the imperative, all of them in the late books 1 and 10 e.g. 10.183.1cd *ihā prajām ihā rayin rārāṇah, prā jāyasva praJayā putrakāma* ‘bestowing offspring here, property here, be born with offspring, O desirous of sons’ and 10.43.9a *uj jāyatām parasūr jyotoṣā sahā* ‘let the axe come into being together with light’.

The -*į*- aor. med. forms have a similar meaning to the -*ya-* passives, but occur in earlier books, e.g. 6.15.18a *jāniśvā devāvītaye sarvātātā svastāye* ‘be born to feed the gods with completeness, for well-being’
The active of the causative, the impv. of which once again mostly occurs late, is the transitive counterpart of the intransitive jāyate\textsuperscript{157}, e.g. 9.97.36d vardhāyā vácaṁ jānāyā pūramśhīṁ strengthen our speech, generate wealth!’ while the med. of the caus. is affective, i.e. ‘to create for oneself’\textsuperscript{158}.

\textit{jambh} ‘crush’

\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. jambhāya (2), 2nd dual jambhāyatam (1.182.4a).

\textit{jas} ‘go away, wither’

\textbf{-ya- pres. act.} 2nd pl. jasyata (1.191.7d)

\textbf{perf. act.} 2nd dual jajastám (2)

The transitive perf. only occurs in two instances of a repeated pāda: 4.50.11d and 7.97.9d jajastám aryó vanúsám ārāth ‘make the hostility of the stranger, of the aggressors disappear’. The -ya- forms are intransitive 1.191.7d sārve sākāṁ ní jasyata ‘Let all of you disappear at once’\textsuperscript{159}.

\textit{ji} ‘win’

\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. jáya (6), 3rd sing. jayatu (6.47.26d), 2nd dual jāyatam (2), 2nd pl. jāyata (2), 3rd pl. jayantu (2)

\textbf{pres. med.} 3rd pl. jayantām (10.87.18d)

\textbf{aor. -si impv.} 2nd sing. jési (7)

\textbf{root aor. (?)} 2nd dual. jıtam (9.7.9c)

The active forms of this verb are transitive, meaning ‘to win, capture (something)’, e.g. 8.75.12c samvārgam sām rayin jaya ‘win booty and property’. The middle voice only occurs once, together with the preverb pārā, meaning ‘to lose, gamble away’ at 10.87.18a pārā bhāgām őṣadhināṁ jayantām ‘let them gamble away their share in the plants’.

An extremely interesting example is 8.89.4d hāno vrtrām jāyā svāḥ ‘you will smite Vṛtra, (and) win the sun’. The pāda is almost identical to 1.80.3d hāno vrtrāṁ jāyā

\textsuperscript{157} Jamison (1983: 154).

\textsuperscript{158} Gotō (1987: 146 fn 206).

\textsuperscript{159} Kulikov (2001: 401).
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apāḥ in which jāyā is to be read as a subjunctive jāyāḥ. The syntagma ji- svāḥ is attested elsewhere; once with an impv. – svār jaya – at 8.15.12c, and once with an imperfect – ajayaḥ svāḥ – at 10.167.1d, and, as sāryam jāyat, at 10.43.5b. ji- apāḥ is further attested at 5.30.5d making it the earlier of the two formulas to be attested. Therefore, if ji- apāḥ is the original (despite on the face of it being attested later), then one may assume that apāḥ was substituted with svāḥ, leaving the rest of the pāda undisturbed. It is possible that, as the sandhi of the visarga is unstable before /sl/ + consonant, that it has simply disappeared and we do in fact have a subjunctive. If, however, the sandhi is regular, then this forces us to read the originally subjunctive jāyā as an imperative, because *jāyāḥ svāḥ should yield *jāyāḥ svāḥ.

The former explanation is to my mind more likely, as the subjunctive makes more sense in this context.

While the present stem mostly means ‘to capture’, with direct object denoting the item captured, the aorist -si impv. je/si can also mean ‘to defeat’ in the formulaic syntagma je/si śātrūn. This is an instance of a fixed formula preserving the old aspectual meaning of the aorist imperative.160

The isolated root form jitam occurs only at 9.7.9c [asmdbhyaṃ] śrāvo vāsūni sāṃ jitam *[for us] capture glory and goods*.

jinva ‘impel’
pres. act. 2nd sing. jinva (9), 3rd sing. jinvatu (4), 2nd dual jinvatam (10), jinvata (10.66.12d)

See LIV s. *gÅÄeh3 and Mayrhofer (1986: s. GAY) for the relationship between this stem and jīv. Also see above inoti / invati s. v. i.

jīv ‘live’
pres. act. jīva (10.161.4a), jīvantu (10.18.4c)

160 See p. 86.
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juṣ ‘like’

a-aor. 2nd sing. juṣāsva (58), 3rd sing. juṣātām (10.165.2c), 2nd dual juṣēthām (9), 3rd dual juṣētām (5.72.3b), 2nd pl. juṣādhvam (6), 3rd pl. juṣāntām (3)
aor. si-impv. jóṣi (3)

secondary thematic aor. impv. 2nd sing. jóṣa (10.158.2a)

perf. 2nd pl. jujuṣṭana (2)

thematicised perf. 2nd dual. jujuṣṭatam (1.93.11b)

The extremely common a-aor. med. form juṣāsva means ‘find favour in’ and is transitive e.g. 1.12.12c imāṃ stōman juṣasva naḥ ‘find favour in this our prayer’. The aor. -si impv. jóṣi, which appears three times, appears to mean the same at 4.9.7a asmākam josy adhvaram ‘find favour in our sacrifice’. For the -si impv. see also pages 26 and 47.

This verb is unusual in having no present stem. However, in later texts a pres. juṣate, is derived from the thematic aor.161 There is also a secondarily thematicised aorist impv. jóṣa probably based on the -si impv jóṣi; cf. parṣa from pr and the AV form nesa from ni (see also p. 27). This form only occurs once at 10.158.2ab jóṣa savitar yāsyā te, hāraḥ saṭāṁ savāṁ ārhati ‘find favour, O Savitar, (in those) of whom your zeal is worth a hundred (of their) impulses’, although in this example the direct object is implicit. This form is clearly a later replacement for the -si impv., the latter only occurring in the family books, the former only in Book 10.

jūrv see jṛ

jṛ ‘make old’

pres. act. 2nd dual járatam (2)
va-pres. 2nd sing. jūrva (6.6.6d)
aor. act. 2nd dual jurātam (1.182.3c)

The present stem jára- occurs only in the repeated line 7.67.10c and 7.69.8c dhaṭṭāṁ rāṁāṇi jāratam ca sūrīn ‘give gifts, and allow the patrons to grow old.’ The form jurātam is considered by Gotō (1987: 152) to be an aorist, but is thought to be a

---
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present by Narten (1964: 121) and Joachim (1978: 83). The form is only attested once: 1.182.3c áti kramištatm jurātam pānēr āsūm ‘walk over (him), grind the non-sacrificer’s life,’ with a negative meaning as opposed to the positive meaning (‘allow to grow old’) of the present stem.

The second present stem, jūrva, means ‘to grind’ 163. Cf. Lat. grānum, Goth kaurn. 164 It is only attested once in the imperative, together with the preverb ū with the meaning ‘grind down, crush, exterminate’, as in 6.6.6cd sā bādhasvāpa bhayā sāhobhi, spṛdhvo vanuṣyān vanūsō ni jūrva ‘drive away the dangers with might, attacking the hostile ones, crush our enemies.’

jnā ‘know’

pres. act. 2nd sing. jānīhi (2), 2nd pl. jānīta (1.94.8c)

pres. med. 3rd pl. jānatām (10.191.2b)

The middle voice impv. jānatām occurs only at 10.191.2ab, which is remarkable in that it also contains extremely rare instances of middle voice from both gam and vad: sām gachadhvaṃ sām vadadhvaṃ, sām vo mānānsi jānatām ‘come together, converse, may your minds know each other’. This sentence exemplifies well the reciprocal force of the preverb sām.

For the 2nd pers. sing. present of -na- forms like jānīhi see page 28.

takṣy ‘fashion’

root. pres. act. 2nd sing. tālhi (10.180.2d)

a-aor. 2nd dual. takṣatam (7.104.4c), 2nd pl. takṣata (7), 3rd pl. takṣantu (4.33.8c)

The root takṣy is descended from PIE *tetk, which is a secondary root derived from a reduplicated aorist form of the root *tek ‘to create’ 165. In Vedic, most scholars agree that the root forms are presents, while the thematic forms are aorists, this, despite the presence of two attestations of the forms takṣatha, which looks like a

---

162 See also LIV s. *gerh₂.
163 There is a similar semantic connection between the possibly related roots mtā ("melh") ‘grind’ and mlā ("mleH") ‘wither’. See Thieme (1939) and Mayrhofer (1986: s. MLĀ).
164 See Gotō (1987: 152f.).
165 LIV s. *tetk
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present\textsuperscript{166}. In the impv., however, it is noticeable that while the 2nd pers. sing. is athematic, the rest of the paradigm is thematic, indicating a complimentary distribution or secondary thematicisation.

The form \textit{tālhi} appears to be a regular outcome of the proto-form \textit{*tetā-dhi}, which would have yielded \textit{*tadž-dhi} by assimilation and then \textit{tālhi} with simplification of the cluster and compensatory lengthening.\textsuperscript{167}

There seem to be no other instances of a directly comparable consonant cluster, however, similar outcomes are found in the case of such forms as \textit{bālunderbarhai} (< \textit{ba/munderdoth}) and \textit{s/amacronacute/lunderbarh/runderring} (< \textit{sah}). They descend from \textit{*bažh-tá} and \textit{*sāžh-tr} respectively, with subsequent transfer of the voiced aspiration by Bartholomae’s Law. On the other hand, \textit{*važi-tám (vah)} yields \textit{volhám}, which is shown by Lubotsky (2000\textsuperscript{2}) to be the result of the preceding /v/\textsuperscript{168}.

\textbf{\textit{tan1} ‘stretch’}

\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. \textit{tanu} (1.120.11a), \textit{tanuhi} (5)

\textbf{pres. med.} 2nd sing. \textit{tanušya} (5), 2nd pl. \textit{tanudhvam} (2)

Both \textit{tanuhi} and \textit{tanušya} appear several times with \textit{sthirá-}, which here means ‘bow string’, as their direct object. With the preverb \textit{áva}, the meaning is ‘to slacken one’s bow string’. The differentiation between active and middle is, as expected, dependent on whether the object is one’s own bowstring, or somebody else’s, e.g. 4.4.5c \textit{áva sthirá tanuhi yātuj/umacronacutenā/munderdot} ‘Slacken the bow strings of those driven by sorcerers’. and 2.33.14cd \textit{áva sthirá maghávadbhyas tanušya, mãthvas tokáya tánayāya mṛ́ja ‘Slacken your bow strings [O Rudra] for the sake of the liberal ones, be merciful to our children, O generous one.’ Likewise with a positive meaning, with the preverb \textit{á}: 10.120.4c \textit{ójīyo dh/underbarh/nunderdoto sthirám /amacronacute tanu/sunderdotva ‘(Ever) braver, stretch your bowstring, O daring one.’}

\textbf{\textit{tan2} ‘thunder’, see \textit{stan}}

\textsuperscript{166} Narten (1964: 123ff.), Joachim (1978: 83f.).

\textsuperscript{167} See Wackernagel (1896: 1-175), and also Narten and Joachim (loc. cit) who both also entertain the notion that the long vowel may be due to lengthened grade ablaut.

\textsuperscript{168} Cf. Wackernagel (1896: 1-275).
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**tap** ‘burn’

**pres. act** 2nd sing. tápa (6), 3rd sing. tapatu (3), 2nd dual tápatam (7.104.1a), 2nd pl. tapata (8.89.7c)

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. tapasva (10.16.4a)

Act. may be both transitive, as the first two instances of the following example, and intransitive as – apparently – in the third: 3.18.2abc, tápo śv àgne ántarāḥ amitrān, tápā śāmsam āraruṣah párasya / tápo vaso cikitānā acitān ‘burn our closer enemies, O Agni, burn the word of our further enemy, and burn, O good one, seeing the unseen ones.’ The very rare middle-voice is affective – ‘to heat for oneself’ 169, as in 10.16.4ab ajó bhāgās tápāś tām tapasva, tām te śocīs tapatu tām te arcīḥ ‘The goat is your portion, heat it (for yourself) with your heat. Let your light burn him, your flame.’

**tilvilāy-** ‘be fertile’

**pres. med.** 2nd pl. tilvilāyādhvam (7.78.5c)

**tud** ‘push’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. tuda (6.53.6a)

**tūrv, tur** see tṛ

**tuś** ‘hurry’

**pres. caus.** 2nd sing. tośaya (8.54.8d)

This root is generally intransitive, the stem tośa- always occurring in the middle voice with the meaning ‘hurry’170. The only example of an imperative from this root is also the only example of the causative stem tośaya-, which means ‘to drive,’ or ‘to hurry’ in its transitive sense: 8.54.8cd máhi sthūrá/munderdot śaśayá/munderdot r/amacronacutedho áhrayam, práskaṇvāya ní tośaya ‘drive great, mighty, unbeatable, bold favour to Praskāṇva.’171.

---

169 See also Gotō (1987: 159f.).

170 Gotō (1987: 166ff.).

171 See also Jamison (1983: 128.).
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**trd** ‘pierce, drill’

**pres. act. VII** 2nd sing. trndhi (4)

**trp** ‘be satiated’

**pres. act. VII** 2nd sing. trpnhi (2), 2nd dual trpnām (8.35.10a), 2nd pl. trpnata (1.110.1d)

**pres. VI** 2nd sing. trmpē (8.45.22c), 3rd sing. trmpatu (1.23.7c), 2nd dual trmpatam (2), 3rd dual. trmpatām (3.12.3c)

**caus. pres.** 2nd sing. tarpāya (1.54.9c)

**caus. med.** 2nd dual tarpayēthām (2)

Joachim (1978: 25) sees no semantic difference between the two pres. stems. This seems to be correct; both are intransitive and, if the source of one’s satisfaction is explicitly mentioned, it is in the genitive: 2.16.6d índra sómasya vṛṣabhāsyā trpnhi ‘Indra, be satiated with the bull-like Soma’; 4.46.2c vāyo sutāsyā trmpatam ‘O Vāyu [and Indra] be satiated from the pressed (Soma)’. The active causative tarpāya occurs with an accusative direct object and the genitive again denoting the item with which one is satisfied: 1.54.9c vy āśnuhi tarpāyā kāmam eśām ‘attain, fulfill your desire from them (cups full of Soma)’. In other words, it is a true causative of the intransitive present stem with the basic valency maintained throughout – ‘cause your desire to be satisfied from them’. The med. caus. has the same valency, and appears to mean the same. 1.17.3ab anukāmāṃ tarpayēthām, īndrāvāraṇa rāyā ā ‘satisfy your desire for property’.

**tf** ‘pass’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. tara (2), 2nd pl. tarata (2)

**pres. IV act.** 2nd sing. tīrā (12), 2nd dual tīratam (7.93.4d), 2nd pl. tirata (2), 3rd pl. tirantu (3)

**pres. IV med.** 2nd pl. tiradhvam (7.56.14b)

**va-pres.** 2nd dual tārvatam (6.50.10d)

**ya-pres.** 2nd sing. tūrya (8.99.5d)

**s-aor.** tārīṣtam (2)

[aor. inj. tārīh (4)]

---

172 See also Jamison (1983: 140f.).
The stems *tara*- and *tira*- differ in their meaning. The first means ‘to pass through (a place)’, the object, where explicitly mentioned, appearing in the accusative, e.g. 8.75.15a párasyā adhi saṃvātō ‘varāh abhy ā tara ‘from the further area, pass over to those (who are) nearer’. It can also mean ‘overcome’ 9.59.3b viśvāni duritā tara ‘overcome all dangers’. The second, which only appears with preverbs, has meanings which vary according to the preverb used, but in all cases the verb is transitive with a concrete object. In a large proportion of its occurrences, it appears in the formula prā tira āyuḥ, ‘extend (someone’s) lifespan’.

The stem *tūrva*- , also transitive, means ‘overcome’, and only appears once in the imperative: 6.50.10cd átri/mupāh nā mahās āvāsā ‘mumukta/mupāh, t/umacronacutervata/mupāh narā durit/amacronacuted abh/amacronacuteke. This example is problematic. It could mean ‘as you freed Atri from the great darkness, bring us out of the danger which is in front of us, O Heroes’ 173, but this is not consistent with the meaning of this form in its other occurrences. This has led Gotō (1987: 163 fn. 258) to suggest that this example is parenthetical: ‘überwindet, ihr Männer!’. Grassmann (1872: s. muc) takes the form mumukta/mupāh, which he reads with no augment, to be an imperative, a position supported by Hoffmann (1967: 150). Interpreting (c) as ‘like Atri, free [me] from the great darkness’ would solve the problem of the otherwise seemingly impossible syntax, as nā cannot function as a conjunction.

*tūrya* is a nonce-formation, appearing once at 8.99.5 tvām tūrya tarasyatāh ‘you overcome your adversaries’. Throughout this hymn there is a word-play on various forms containing the syllable -tur-. Gotō (op. cit.: 165 fn. 265) suggests that it may be based on a nominal compound-form °-t/umacronacuterya-, as in śatrut/umacronacuterya- ‘overcoming the enemy’ and vrtrat/umacronacuterya- ‘overcoming V.’.

The single example of the -is- aorist form tāriṣṭam occurs at 1.34.11c and 1.157.4c174, and the form appears in the same formula as does tirā above: prāyus tāriṣṭam ‘extend our lifespan’ 175.

173 Cf. Klein (1985: 1-422) ‘As ye freed Atri from the great darkness, (so) cause (us) to pass out of difficulty, when it confronts us, O heroes’.

174 Narten (1964: 128ff.).
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trā ‘save’

med. pres. 2nd sing. trāyasva (4), 3rd sing. trāyatām (3), 2nd dual trāyethām (5.70.3b), 3rd dual trāyetām (10.35.3b), 2nd pl. trāyadhvam (10.63.11b), 3rd pl. trāyantām (2)

s-aor. med. 2nd sing. trāsva (2), 2nd pl. trādhwam (2)

The forms trāsva and trādhvam must be sigmatic aorists and not root aorists both because of the rest of the paradigm, which is sigmatic, and also because of the parallel Gāthā Avestan form hrāzdām. Both attestations of the form trādhvam occur at 2.29.6cd: trādhvam no devā niyāro vṛkṣya, trādhvam kartād avapādo yajatāh ‘Save us from the crushing (jaws) of the wolf, save us from falling into the pit, O worship-worthy ones’

damši ‘bite’

pres. act. 2nd sing. dasa (6.31.3c)

dakṣ ‘put right’

pres. act. 2nd sing. daksata (2)

For the form dakṣi, which has in the past been connected with the root dakṣ, see page 49.

dad ‘hold’

pres. act. 3rd sing. dadatām (3.53.17c)

This is a secondary root derived from dā ‘give’ 177. Cf. also dadhantu from dhā, in addition to the regular dadhatu, which shows a similar kind of thematic derivation, although in the case of dad the change in the root’s meaning justifies the classification as a separate root. The imperative appears only at 3.53.17c īndraḥ pātalye dadatām sārītor ‘let Indra protect the two wagon-supports (?) from breakage’.

dambh ‘annihilate’

pres. caus. act. 2nd sing. damhaya (2)

---


177 Gotō (1987: 171f.).
This root is to be distinguished from dabh ‘deceive’. See Narten (1968: 131) and Insler (1969).

**daśasy-** ‘be of service’  
**pres. act.** 2nd sing. daśasyá (6), 2nd dual daśasyāt (2), 2nd pl. daśasyata (5.50.3b)
Probably derived from an unattested *daśas- (= Lat. decus) in the same way as canasya- and manasya- are derived from cánas and mánas respectively. See Mayrhofer (1986: ad loc.).

**dah** ‘burn’  
**pres. act.** 2nd sing. dáha (14), dahatāt (3.18.1d), 3rd pl. dahantu (10.87.12d)  
**aor. si-impv.** dhák/sunderdoti (3)
For the form dhak/sunderdoti see page 49. The unclear form daksi, which occurs only at 2.1.10c, has been connected with this verb, but the semantic environment in which it occurs is unsuitable for this to be the case. For further information and examples, see page 49.

**dā1** ‘give’  
**pres. act.** 2nd sing. daddhí (8), dehí (10), dattāt (10.16.2b), 3rd sing. dādātu (17), 2nd dual dattam (1.34.6b), 3rd dual dādāta (10.84.7b), 2nd pl. datta (3), dādāta (7.57.6c), dādātana (10.36.10b)  
**aor. act.** 3rd sing. dātu (2)  
*[aor. inj. dā (17)]*
For a discussion of the forms dehí and daddhí see p.29.  
Another problem with the verb dā is the lack of a 2nd pers. sing. aor. impv., for which see p. 37ff. and 42f.

**dā2** ‘distribute’  
**pres. med.** 2nd sing. dayasva (1.68.6b), 2nd pl. dayadhvam (7.37.2d)

**diś** ‘show’  
**red. pres. act.** 2nd sing. didišṭhi (2), 3rd sing. didiṣṭu (7.40.2c), 2nd pl. didiṣṭana (2)
didistana is a rare example of a -tana form with zero grade of the root, see p. 31. Kümmel (2000: 246f.) states that these forms must be presents rather than perfects, both because of their semantics, and because the 3rd sing. med. inj. form didisha would have ended in -at had it been a perfect.

\[dī1\] ‘shine’

**perf. act.** 2nd sing. didihí (17), didihí (12)

**thematicised perfect.** 2nd dual. didayatam (1.93.10c)

Cf. pìpìhi, pìpaya, pìpayata. This root was originally only perfect, some forms later being ‘transferred’ to the present. Narten (1987) shows that one possible starting point for this is the 2nd sing. imperative didihí, which has the same forms as present impvs. such as piprihi, mimihí, etc. Also brought into consideration is the thematicised perf. impv. didayatam, which is probably constructed on the basis of the subjunctive stem. In the RV there are attested examples of both perf. subj. didáyat and pres. subj. diayat (NB shifted accent), Since the accentuation of didayatam is not attested we cannot, strictly speaking, be certain whether it is not actually a present. The long reduplication vowel is explained by Kümmel (2000: 21f.) as being both characteristic of roots with a long-vowel zero grade, and also of roots whose perfect has present meaning.

\[dī2\] ‘fly’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. diya (3), 2nd dual diyatam (5.74.9d)

\[duvasya\] ‘honour (with gifts)’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. duvasya (3), 2nd pl. duvasyáta (5)

Derived from dūvas- ‘gift’ in the same way as manasy-, daśasy- etc.

---

178 See p. 34.

179 As Kümmel points out, this is first shown indirectly by Delbrück (1874: 133f.), who tentatively classes the perfects of dī, pī etc. with long reduplication as intensives. Also LIV (s. *dejh2).
**duh** ‘milk, give milk’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pres. med.</td>
<td>2nd sing.</td>
<td>dhukṣva (4.57.2b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aor. med.</td>
<td>3rd sing.</td>
<td>duhām (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sa-aor, act.</td>
<td>2nd pl.</td>
<td>dhukṣata (6.48.13a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sa-aor med.</td>
<td>2nd sing.</td>
<td>dhukṣāśva (8.13.25c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This verb is mostly found in the middle voice, meaning ‘to give milk’, e.g. 4.57.2b *dhenūr iva páyo asmāsu dhukṣva* ‘Give us [rain] like a cow [does] milk’. The only active imperative form is that of the -sa- aorist, which is only attested once: 6.48.13 *bharādvājāyāva dhukṣata dvitā, dhenām ca viśvādhasam / īṣaṁ ca viśvābhajasam* ‘For Bharādvāja now milk the cow who gives all milk, and the all-nourishing nourishment.’.

For the form *duhām* see p. 35.

**dr** ‘pierce’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>si-impv.</td>
<td>2nd sing.</td>
<td>dārṣi (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>int.</td>
<td>2nd sing.</td>
<td>dardhi (3)</td>
<td>7.55.4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>2nd sing.</td>
<td>dārdhī (1.133.6a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The intensive is the principle present formation of this verb, although there do exist a few examples of a causative stem *darayā-*. *Dārdhī* is the only form of the perfect of this verb with a long reduplication vowel. The form itself is only attested once, at 1.133.6a *avār mahā indra dārdhī śrudāh naḥ* ‘blast the great ones down, O Indra, hear us’ and cannot be differentiated in function from a pres. impv. Given this, it does seem like that *dārdhī* could be some kind of nonce-variant of the intensive present *dardhī*.

**dhṛ** ‘fasten, be fastened’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pres. act. I</td>
<td>2nd pl.</td>
<td>dṛṇhata (10.101.8d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres IV act.</td>
<td>2nd sing.</td>
<td>dṛhyā (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres. IV med.</td>
<td>2nd sing.</td>
<td>dṛhyasva (8.80.7a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


181 Kümmel loc. cit.
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*dṛphata* is the only attested example of this present stem which has the accentuation on the root, rather than the suffix. The stem *dṛmaḥ-*, which is a thematic stem derived from an old nasal present, is transitive-factive ‘fasten’, e.g. 10.101.8d *mā vah susrocamasó dṛphaṭā tām* ‘let your cup not leak, fasten it!’ while *dṛhya-* is intransitive, meaning ‘be fast, strong’, as in 3.30.15a *indra dṛhya yāmakosā abhūvan* ‘Indra, be strong, the travelling chests are ready’183. The middle voice imperative only occurs once, with apparently very similar meaning to the active: 8.80.7a *indra dṛhyasva pār asi* ‘Indra, be strong, you are a fortress’.

**dṛa**  ‘run’

**root aor. act.** 3rd pl.  *drāntu* (10.85.32d)

This verb has no present stem, being attested as a root aor., a sigmatic aorist (only in the subjunctive form *drāsat*), and as a perfect. This aorist appears to have a suppletive relationship with the present of the verb *dru*184. The forms *dṛahi* and *dṛatu* are attested in the AV.

**dru**  ‘run’


**pres. caus.** 2nd sing. *drāvāya* (8.4.11a)

The causative form occurs once with the meaning ‘let flow’: 8.4.11ab *adhvaryo dhāvāyā tvām, sōmaṁ indraḥ pipāsati* ‘Adhvaryu, let the Soma flow, Indra wants to drink’. The intransitive stem *drava-* occurs several times in Book 8 in the seemingly formulaic sequence *éhi drāva pība*, as for example 8.17.11 *ayāṁ ta indra sōmo, nīpāto ādhi barhiṣi / éhīm asyā drāvā pība* ‘This is your Soma, purified on the altar-grass, come, hurry, drink it’.

**dhanv**  ‘run’


All but one of the attestations of the imperative of this root are in Book 9, and, addressed to Soma, mean ‘run, flow’. Although the present *dhanva-* was originally a

---


-va- stem from the IE root *dhenh₂, by the time of the RV it had become a root in its own right, as shown by forms such as the perfect dadhanvé and the aorist ádhanviṣaḥ.

**dham** ‘blow’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. dhama (10.145.2c)

Appears once, with transitive function: 10.145.2cd sapānīm me pārā dhama, pātīm me kēvalaṁ kura ‘Blow away my co-wife, make my husband mine alone’

**dhā** ‘put, place, give’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. dhehī (64), dhattāt (3.8.1c), 3rd sing. dādhātu (16), 2nd dual dhattām (40), 3rd dual dhattām (10.184.2d), 2nd pl. dhattā (12), dhattāna (5), dādhāta (14), dādhātana (11), dhetana (2), 3rd pl. dadhatu (7.51.1d), dadhantu (7.62.6b)

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. dhatsva (10.87.2d), 3rd pl. dadhatām (10.18.4d)

**aor. act.** 3rd sing. dhātu (4), 2nd dual. dhātām (3), 2nd pl. dhātā (4), dhātana (7.47.4c), 3rd pl. dhāntu (2)

**aor. med.** 2nd sing. dhāṣvā (8)

**perf. med.** 2nd sing. dadhiṣvā (6), 2nd pl. dadhidhvam (3)

**pres. caus.** 2nd sing. dhāpaya (10.151.5d)

**desid.** 3rd pl. didhiṣantu (3.8.6d)

Like some other roots ending in -ā, the verb dhā lacks a 2nd pers. sing. aor. impv. form. The aorist injunctive fills the gap. See p. 37ff. for details. For the form dhehī see p. 29. With the exception of dhehī, the only present form which has no parallel elsewhere is dhetana, which must have been formed analogically to dhehī. dhā is such a well-attested verb that it has a full complement of full- and zero-grade second...

---

185 Hollifield (1978: 180ff.).

186 See also Gotō (1987: 178ff.).

187 For a study of the meaning of the word sapānī, and the history of its interpretation, see Kazzazi, 2001:175f.
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person forms, both with and without the -na suffix. By comparison, the middle voice forms are very sparsely attested.
The present and aorist active forms are extremely common and invariably transitive. There are only two examples of the pres. med., both of them late, e.g.: 10.87.2d kravyádo vrkty àpi dhatsvásán ‘twist the raw-meat eaters around and put them in your mouth’, where the reflexive middle-voice affective meaning is clear. The aorist middle-voice forms are somewhat better represented, The form dhiśva appears twice in Book 6 (18.9c and 22.9c) in the formulaic dhiśva vājram hāste ‘take the Vajra in your hand’, and one further time without hāste at 45.18a. Elsewhere the form occurs with the same affective meaning: 1.91.18d divi śrāvāṃsy uttahāni dhiśva ‘take (for yourself) the highest glories’, and 3.6.6a ghṛtasnāvā rōhitā dhurí dhiśva ‘set (for yourself) the two ruddy (horses) whose backs are covered with ghee at (your own) chariot-pole’.

Kümmel (2000: 274f.) considers the possibility that the forms dadhiśvā and dadhidhvam may actually belong to the reduplicated present. On purely formal grounds he classifies them as perfects, because the dhadhi- stem elsewhere only belongs to the perfect, while the reduplicated present has dadh-. He finds that the perfect and present middle-voice forms are equivalent in meaning, both being affective, e.g. 3.40.5ab dadhiśvā jāṭhāre sutā/m, sómam indra vāreṇyam ‘put into your stomach the choice pressed Soma’.
The causative is only attested in the very late 10.151.5, and is in fact a causative variant of the well-known expression śrád dhā, ‘to believe’: śraddhām prātār havāmahe, śraddhām madhyāmnam pār̥i / śraddhām sāryasya nimirācī, śrāddhe śrád dhāpayehā naḥ ‘We call on Belief in the morning, on Belief in the afternoon, on Belief at the setting of the sun, O Belief, make us believe here’.
The desiderative didhiśantu appears once at 3.8.6cd té devāsah svārvas tāmāvānsah, prajāvad asmē didhiśantu rān̥am ‘these divine posts situated here; let them want to give us a child-rich gift’ 188.

dhāv ‘stream’
pres. act. 2nd sing. dhāva (3), 3rd sing. dhāvatu (4), 2nd pl. dhāvata (2)

---

188 For further desiderative imperatives see p. 34.
The present active is intransitive, meaning ‘to flow’. When it has an accusative object, the meaning is ‘flow through’,\(^{189}\) e.g. 9.49.4a pavītraṃ ḍhāva ḍhārayā ‘flow through the sieve in a stream’.

\(\text{dhāv}_2\) see \(\text{dhū}\)

\(\text{dhunay}-\) ‘rush’

**pres. act.** \(\text{dhunayantām}\) (3.55.16a)

\(\text{dhū}\) ‘shake, mix’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. \(\text{dhūnḥi}\) (3), 2nd pl. \(\text{dhūnuta}\) (1)

**them. pres.** 2nd dual \(\text{dhāvatam}\), 2nd pl. \(\text{dhāvata}\)

The stem \(\text{dhūnu-}\) is transitive, meaning ‘to shake’, 3.45.4cd \(\text{vṛksám pakvám phālam ankēva dhūnḥi-}, -\text{iṅdra sampāraṇam vāsu ‘O Indra, shake down helpful goodness, as [one shakes] a tree, ripe with fruit’}.\)

\(\text{Gotō}\) (1987: 186) shows that the form \(\text{ā dhāva-}\) is a technical term used to describe part of the process of preparing Soma, e.g. 8.1.17ab sōṭā hi sōnam ādribhir ēm enam apsū dhāvata ‘Press it with stones, and ? it in water’. The precise nature of the action, in his opinion, cannot be ascertained, although it may mean ‘shake’ or ‘mix with water’. 1.109.4cd tāv āśvinā bhadrāhastā supāṇī, ā dhāvatam mádhunā pṛktām apsū ‘You two Aśvins, of the blessed hands, having good hands, shake it with honey, mix it in water’\(^{190}\), probably gives an indication that this interpretation is correct, as it is more or less synonymous with \(\text{prc ‘to mix’}\).

\(\text{dhūrv}\) ‘destroy’

**pres. act.** 3rd pl. \(\text{dhūrvanta}\) (6.75.19c)

The IE root of this form is \(\ast\text{dhūr-}\), as shown by the alternative Vedic stem \(\text{dhvāra-}\), which is not attested in the RV. This leads \(\text{Gotō}\) (1987: 191) to suggest that the lengthening of the vowel in the stem \(\text{dhūrva-}\) is due to the influence of the form

\(^{189}\) \(\text{Gotō}\) (1987: 183).

\(^{190}\) Or possibly, ‘shake (it), mix it with honey, in the water’.
tārīya- from ṭṛ (q.v.)¹⁹¹. Lubotsky (1997), on the other hand, finds that the sequence *-urv- is regularly lengthened when accented.

**dhṛ** ‘hold’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. dhārāya (14), 2nd dual dhārayatam (2), 3rd dual dhārayatām (10.173.5d), 3rd pl. dhārayantu (10.18.13c)

**med. pres.** 2nd dual dhārāyethām (6.74.1a), 2nd pl. dhārayadhvam (10.70.5d)

**aor.** 2nd dual didhṛtam (2), 2nd pl. didhṛtā (1.139.8g)

*dhārāya*- is the only present stem from this root, with *dīdhṛ*- being the corresponding reduplicated aorist, in the same manner as the usual connection between reduplicated aorists and -āya- causatives. LIV s. v. *dher*, quoting the unpublished dissertation by J. Bendahan, asserts that these forms are an original reduplicated present, which was reinterpreted as an aorist on this basis. A further factor in the shaping of the forms of this root is undoubtedly its tendency to mimic the forms of the root *gr*, ‘be awake, awaken’ (q.v.). Thus jārāya- : dhārāya, jāgāra : dādhāra, ājīgar : dīdhar, jīgṛtām : didhṛtām and even jāgrvi- : dādhrvi-. Since the lengthening of the reduplicating vowel in forms such as jāgāra and jāgrvi- can be shown to stem from a root-initial laryngeal, and since the root *dhṛ* probably does not have a laryngeal at the beginning, then the original must be *gr*, and *dhṛ* the mimic.

**dhṛṣ** ‘attack, be brave’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. dhṛṣguhī (1.80.3a)

Occurs only once, at 1.80.3ab: praḥy abhiḥi dhṛṣguhī, nā te vājro ni yāmśate ‘Advance, go on, attack, your Vajra will not hold back’. Nowicki (1983: 273f.) is not satisfied with the meaning “be brave” in this context, as occurs, e.g. in Geldner ‘sei mutig’, as the verb appears together with two other verbs of motion. Thus, he concludes, dhṛṣ must here be a verb of motion too, meaning “attack”. He sees the same meaning at 1.183.4a: mā vāṃ vṛko mā vṛkfr ā dadharsīt ‘Neither the he-wolf nor the she-wolf shall attack you two’.

**nakṣ** ‘reach, attain’

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. nakṣasva (8.54.7c)

---

¹⁹¹ See also LIV s. *dhyer.*
This is a secondary root, derived from *nas, probably from an unattested aor. subj. *nāṣati. See p. 49 under nakṣi.

**nabha** 'pierce, burst'
- **pres. med.** 3rd pl. nābhantām (40)

This is the only attested form of this root in the RV, although others occur in later texts. Although it is attested 40 times, it actually only appears in two obviously related formulae: nābhantām anyakē same, ‘let all the others (or foreigners) be destroyed’ which occurs 10 times in 8.39, 11 times in 8.40, 10 times in 8.41 and three times in 8.42, and jyākā . . . nābhantām anyakēśām ‘let the bowstrings of the foreigners be destroyed’, which occurs six times in 10.133.192

**nam** 'bend, bow'
- **pres. act.** nama (2)
- **pres. med.** namasva (8.75.5b), namadhvam (2), namantām (5)

The active forms are generally transitive, while the middle-voice forms are intransitive, e.g. 1.129.5a nī śā namātīmatām kāyasā cīt ‘Bend down anyone’s arrogance’, and 3.33.9c nī śā namādhvam bhāvatā supārāh ‘bend over, become easy to cross’. However, in 10.142.6c ‘c chvānacasa nī nama vārdhamānaḥ ‘bend upwards, bend downwards as you grow’, the active form is intransitive. This is noted by Gotō (1987: 194), who also suggests a possible transitive interpretation: ‘bäume dich auf, beuge nieder [z.B. Brennholz], während du (: Agni) wächst’.

Gonda (1979: 98) on the other hand suggests that it may take its middle meaning from the practically synonymous śvañcasa which precedes it, suggesting that ‘the repetition of the middle ending immediately after ‘c śvañcasva might be regarded as a superfluity and therefore be avoided’.193 Cf. the use of the hapax active pava together with pavasva, under pū, p. 135.

The middle voice with the preverb ā is affective194, i.e. ‘bend for oneself’, e.g. 8.75.5bc ā namasva sāhūtiḥ ṭī nēdyo yajñām angirāḥ ‘bend him nearer to the (your own) sacrifice with invocations, O Aṅgiras.’

---

192 For what little is known about this root see Mayrhofer (1986: s. NABH).
193 The synonymity of the roots nam and śvañc was described by Hoffmann (1960).
194 Gotō loc. cit.
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namasy- ‘worship’

pres. act. 2nd sing. namasyá (5), 2nd pl. namasyáta (3)

Denominative stem derived from námas- ‘homage’, which is of course in turn derived from the root nam. Cf. canasy-, daśasy- etc.

naś1 ‘attain’

pres. act. 2nd sing. aśnuhi (3), 3rd sing. aśnotu (3), 2nd dual aśnutam (2). 3rd pl. aśnuvantu (2)

aor. si-impv. 2nd sing. nakṣi (5.25.2b)

naś2 ‘perish’

pres. act. 2nd sing. nāśya (10.97.13d), 3rd sing. nāśyatu (8.27.18d)

caus. act. nāśāya (1.50.11d)

Both the pres. stem nāśya- and the caus. nāśāya- are restricted to the later books of the RV. However, as Jamison (1983: 141f.) points out, the fact that both have Avestan cognates, and that the causative has a cognate in Lat. nocēre assure the antiquity of these forms. The pres. act. is intransitive, e.g.: 10.97.13d sākāṇa naśya nihākayā ‘disappear together with the snowstorm’, while the causative means ‘make disappear’ 1.50.11cd hrīdrogám māna sûrya, hrāmaṇaḥ ca nāśaya ‘O Sūrya, make my heartbreak, my jaundice, go away’.

nah ‘bind’

pres. act. 2nd pl. nahyatana (10.53.7a).

One of only three forms in the entire RV in which the -tana ending occurs on a thematic stem. See p. 32.

nij ‘clean’

pres. act. ninikta (10.132.6d)

This is the only existing example of the present stem, occurring only once at 10.132.6cd āva priyā didiśṭāna, sāro ninikta rasāṁbhīḥ ‘show kindness, wash [our sins?] away with the suns rays’.
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nī ‘lead’

**Pres. act.** 2nd sing. nāya (12), 3rd sing. nayatu (5), 2nd dual nayatam (2.29.5d), 2nd pl. nāyata (6), 3rd pl. nāyantu (3)

**Pres. med.** 2nd sing. nayasva (3.35.3a), 2nd pl. nayadhvam (2)

-si impv nēśī (10)

The act. forms are transitive, e.g. 1.42.7a dīti nāh saścāto naya ‘lead us past our pursuers’, while the rather scantily attested middle voice is affective\(^{195}\), as in 3.35.3a úpo nayasva vṛṣanā tapuspē- ‘bring (with you) the two bulls (i.e. stallions), protecting them from (over) heat(ing)’\(^{196}\). For the -si impv nēśī see p. 50.

nud ‘push’

**Pres. act.** 2nd pl. nudata (10.165.5a)

**Pres. med.** 2nd sing. nudāsva (7), 2nd dual nudēthām (7.104.1d)

The active form nudata is one of only three active forms attested for this verb, the others being an imperfect anudaḥ and a participle nudān. All of the active forms are limited solely to Book 10. The middle voice forms are transitive and usually occur with words meaning ‘enemies,’ such as mfīdh, amītra etc.

pac ‘cook’

**Pres. act.** 2nd pl. pácata (2), 3rd pl. pacantu (1.162.10d)

pat ‘fly, fall’

**Pres. act.** 2nd sing. pata (2), 2nd dual patatam (3), 3rd pl. patantu (10.134.5b)

**Red. aor.** paptata (1.88.1d)

The reduplicating aorist, which is of the same type as voca-, is thought to have developed from the perfect stem papt-. Kümmel (2000: 295) suggests this development may have occurred in Proto-Indo-Iranian, while other scholars, such as Leumann (1952: 26) suggest a later period. The idea occurs as early as Macdonell (1916: 175).

\(^{195}\) Gotō (1987: 197).

\(^{196}\) Translation based on Klein (1985: 1-369). For the difficult word tapuspē- see Geldner *ad. loc.*
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The present is intransitive, meaning ‘to fly’, e.g. 6.75.16ab ávāśṛṣṭā pārā pata, śāravye ... ‘having been released, fly away, O arrow ...’ or 5.78.1-3c hamsāv iva patatam ā sutāh úpa ‘fly like geese to the pressed (Soma-juices)’, which is the only occurrence of the form patatam. At 10.134.5ab, áva pat means ‘to fall’: áva svēdā ivābhīto, vīṣvak patantu didyāvaḥ ‘May the arrows fall all around like drops of sweat.’ The aorist only occurs once and is undifferentiated in meaning: 1.88.1d váyo ná paptatā sumāyāḥ ‘fly (to us) like birds, O good-powered ones’.

**pad** ‘tread’
**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *padyasva* (6.75.16c)

**pan** ‘worship, praise’
**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *panaya* (5.20.1d), 2nd pl. *panāyata* (6.75.6c)
For a treatment of *panāyata* and other forms in *āya* see Hoffmann (1966: 69), See also Gotō (1987: 206), and for a description of the relationships between the various stems belonging to the root, Jamison (1983: 96f).

**paś** ‘see, look’
**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *pāśya* (7), 2nd pl. *pāśyata* (6)
**pres. med.** *paśyasva* (8.33.19a)
**caus. med.** *spāśāyasva* (1.176.3c)
This root splits neatly between those forms which don’t have the initial /s/ – i.e. the pres. and impf. – and those that do, which are the aorist áspaśa, the perfect paspaśé and the med. caus. spāśāyasva. There is also a ppp. ánu-spāśa. All of the spaś- forms are med., while the majority of those of paś are active. A small number of middle-voice forms from paś are attested including the pres. med. impv. paśyasva, which is only attested once (see below). Altogether, with the exception of two instances of the med. part. pāśyamūna-197, all of the attestations of the pres. med. of paś are late. The active aorist and perfect are supplied by the root drś, which also has perfect and aorist middle-voice forms. Jamison (1983: 167) finds that spaś “appears to be functioning almost as an independent root in Vedic”, and that it differs semantically from paś, in that the latter simply means ‘to see’, while the

---

197 3.31.10a and 7.83.1a.
former means ‘to watch over, spy’. While this semantic difference could easily have originally stemmed from the fact that the spas-forms are always middle-voice (‘to see for oneself’), synchronically there is a suppletive relationship not between paś and spaś but between paś and drś\textsuperscript{198}, with the spaś forms having diverged semantically sufficiently to be considered separate. Thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>See, look</th>
<th>Watch over, spy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pres.</td>
<td>paśyati</td>
<td>paśyate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aor.</td>
<td>ādārśam</td>
<td>ādṛkṣata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>dādārśa</td>
<td>dādṛśe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caus.</td>
<td>spāśāyasva</td>
<td>spāsaśé</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pres. middle-voice impv. of paś means ‘to look’ in its one attestation: 8.33.19a adhāḥ paśyasva mópāri ‘look down not up’, while the active is transitive, as in e.g.: 6.9.4a ayāṁ hōtā prathamāḥ pāśyatemām ‘This is the first hotar, look at him’. The caus. form spāśāyasva is clearly the caus. of the spaś forms, not only by form but by meaning too: 1.176.3cd spāśāyasva yō asmadhṛāg, divyēvāśānir jahi ‘(O Indra) do thou cause (the one) who is our deceiver to be spied out (=discovered). Like a heavenly cudgel, do thou smash him’\textsuperscript{199}

\textbf{pā} \textsuperscript{1} ‘protect’

\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. pāhī (70), 3rd sing. pātu (35), 2nd dual pātām (12), 3rd dual pātām (1.185.10c), 2nd pl. pāta (82), 3rd pl. pāntu (4)

This is an extremely well-attested root. However the huge number of attestations of the 2nd pl. form is misleading, because it only appears in the typical hymn ending of Book 7 yāyām pāta svastibhiḥ sādā naḥ ‘you protect us always with good fortune’.

\textsuperscript{198} See also Kümmel (2000:231ff.) and Mayhofer (1986: s. PAŚ) for further literature concerning the suppletive relationship between paś and drś.

\textsuperscript{199} Translation Jamison (1983: 167).
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\[ pā₂ \text{ ‘drink’} \]

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. \( pība \) (118), 3rd sing. \( pībatu \) (7), 2nd dual \( pībatam \) (43), 2nd pl. \( pībata \) (9), 3rd pl. \( pībantu \) (4)

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. \( pībasa \) (4.35.7c), 2nd pl. \( pibadhvam \) (3)

**root aor.** 2nd sing. \( pāhī \) (25), 2nd dual \( pātām \) (4), 2nd pl. \( pātā \) (3)

**caus. act.** \( pāyāya \) (4)

The pres. impv. of \( pā \) is another hugely attested form, mostly, of course in reference to drinking Soma. It is usually transitive, with an accusative object \( pībā sōmam \) ... (passim) but also commonly occurs with a partitive genitive object, as in e.g. 8.37.1g \( pībā sōmasya vajrivaḥ \) ‘drink (of) the Soma, O Vajra-bearer’, which is also repeated a further five times in the same hymn. By contrast, the middle-voice forms are very rare, a total of six occurrences of all forms (impv. and others) being attested in the entire RV. The middle impv. forms appear three times out of four with the preverb \( sām \), with the meaning ‘drink together’ and no object, as in 4.35.7cd \( sām ṭbhūbhīḥ pībasa vajrāh sākṣīḥr yāḥ indra cakṣye sukṛtyā \) ‘drink together with the Rbhus, who bring gifts, O Indra, whom you made your friends, on account of their good deeds.’ In the same hymn, the form \( pibadhvam \) is also attested: 4.35.9d \( sām mādēbhir indriyēbhīḥ pibadhvam \) ‘(O Rbhus) drink together, with the exhilarations of Indra’. The fourth attestation is with the preverb \( vī \): 3.53.10cd devēbhir viprā ṛṣayo nrcakṣaso, \( vī pibadhvam kuśīkāḥ sōmyām mādhiḥ \) ‘O Poets, O Seers leaders of men, drink together with the gods the sweetness of the Soma, O Kuśikas’, with apparently similar meaning. Possibly \( vī \) is distributive: ‘drink together with the various gods’.

The caus. is unusual in that it is missing the characteristic \( /p/ \) between the root and the suffix. Jamison (1983: 169) remarks that this is most likely avoided because of the \( /p/ \) in the root. The meaning of the caus. is ‘let drink, give to drink’ as in 1.14.7c \( mādhiḥvah svājihva pāyaya \) ‘let them (i.e. the gods) drink of the sweet (Soma), O beautiful-tongued one’.

---

200 For the few occasions where the distinction between the present and aorist of this verb are still upheld, see page 85f.

201 Cf. Grassmann (1872: ad loc.).
The 2nd sing. form *piśa is one of only two imperatives to appear in āmṛedīta, at 2.11.11a: *piśa-pibēd indra śūra sómam ‘Drink, drink the Soma, O Indra, O Hero.’

**pī**

See *piś*.

**piś** ‘carve, paint’

**pres. act.** 3rd sing. *pimśatu* (10.184.1b), 2nd pl. *pimśata* (10.53.7b)

**them. aor.** 2nd sing. *piśā* (7.18.2c)

The thematic stem *pimśa*- is a thematic stem derived from an old nasal stem, cf. *dṛṇ*.

**piś** ‘trample, crush’

**pres. act.** 2nd pl. *pinašṭana* (7.104.18b)

**pī** ‘swell’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *pīva* (4), 2nd dual *pīvatam* (9), 3rd dual *pīvatām* (6.70.6a), 2nd pl. *pīvata* (5.83.6b)

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. *pīvasva* (3.3.7b), 3rd sing. *pīvatām* (10.36.5a), 2nd pl. *pīvadvām* (3.33.12c)

**perf.** 2nd sing. *pīpihi* (2)

**them. red. aor.** 2nd sing. *pīpaya* (3.15.6a), 2nd pl. *pīpayata* (10.64.12c)

**them. perf.** 2nd dual *pīpyatam* (4), 3rd dual *pīpyatām* (6.50.12d), *pīpyata* (2.34.6c)

The thematic present *pīva*- has completely replaced an old -nu- present *pinoti*, which is attested in Avestan as *fra-pinəiti* (V. 3.31). This present stem was subsequently reanalysed as a root *pīv*, from which are attested non-present forms such as perfect *pīpiṇvāthu*.

For a treatment and further bibliography concerning all of the forms of the root *pī*, see Kümmel (2000: 298ff.), whose classification I follow, with the exception of the form *pīpihi*, which he considers to be a reduplicated aorist. There are valid semantic reasons for this; the red. aor. is mostly factitive while the perf. is mostly – but not exclusively – intransitive-stative. However, if this were the case, this would be the

---

202 The other form being *stuhi*, at 8.1.30a.

only example of a reduplicated aor. with the ending -hi. Since the -hi ending is common with perfects, then it is far more likely to be an original perfect form. Since the perfect and reduplicated aorist are in any case outwardly very similar forms, this perfect could easily have been transferred to the aorist paradigm, which would have involved the lengthening of its reduplication syllable, and assumed an aorist meaning. 204
The forms pīpaya and pīpayata are most likely secondarily thematicised aorists, for which see Kümmel (op. cit.: 300 fn. 495), who also admits to the possibility that they could be hybrid forms derived from a subjunctive pīpāyat. See also p. 34.
Semantically, the present active is transitive-factitive: 6.39.5b īśaḥ pīnva vasudevāya pūrvah ‘make much refreshment swell for the giving of goods’, while the middle-voice is intransitive: 3.3.7ab āryā pīnvasva sām īśo dīdhī nah ‘swell with power, illuminate refreshment for us.’ The reduplicated forms are all active, and are mostly undifferentiated in meaning from the active present, while on one occasion it has intransitive meaning: 2.39.6b stānāv iva pīpayat jīvāse nah ‘like two breasts, swell that we may live.’

puṣ ‘flourish’

pres. act. 2nd pl. pusyat (1.94.8c), pusya (10.19.3b)

pū ‘purify’

pres. act. I 2nd sing. pava (9.49.3c)

pres. I med. 2nd sing. pāvasva (127), 3rd sing. pāvatām (2), 2nd pl. pavadhvam (9.21.6c), 3rd pl. pāvantām (2)

pres IX act. 2nd sing. punīhī (8), punītā (10.30.5d), 3rd sing. punītu (9.67.22c), 2nd pl. punītā (9.67.27c), punītāna (4), punīta (9.104.3a), punīantu (3)

With the exception of the one example of the form pava at 9.49.3c, the forms are split neatly between the active-factitive stem punā- and the middle-voice/fientive pava-. The single example of the form pava occurs together with pāvasva at 9.49.3 ghrtaṁ pāvasva dhārayā, yañjēsu devavāmaḥ / asmābhyaṁ vṛṣṭīṁ ā pava. The

204 Kümmel (op. cit.: 310) quotes an example of a form pipīhi, which appears at MS 4.9.9.: 129.7. This form has a characteristically perfect meaning. The parallel passage in the TĀ has pipīhi, explained by Kümmel as having been influenced by the RVic form. Also, cf. the forms didīhi and didīhi, both of which are perfect.
form á pavasva + acc means ‘become pure’ with acc. of content or goal205, and this example is undifferentiated in meaning from the middle voice. As in the case of the single instance of the active nama, which gets its mediality from the juxtaposed verb śvaṅcasva, Gonda (1979: 98) proposes that the middle voice meaning is transferred from the juxtaposed middle form206. Thus we can translate the verse ‘purify yourself as ghee by pouring, .... be pure for us as (with respect to) rain’207. Every single example of the imperative of pū occurs in Book 9, making it the most characteristic Soma keyword of all. Of the 15 examples of the imperative of the factitive stem punā-, eight occur in six consecutive verses (22-27) of 9.27. The form punāna (9.104.3a) is unique, as the only example of a second pers. pl. form of a stem of this kind to show full grade and accentuation of the suffix, cf. gānta etc.

pr ‘bring over’
red. pres. act. 2nd sing. pīprhi (2), 3rd sing. pipartu (3), 2nd dual pipṛtām (5), 3rd dual pipṛtām (1.22.13c), 2nd pl. pipṛtā (2), pipartana (9)
aor. -si impv. pārṣi (16)
sec. thematised aor. impv. pārṣa (1.97.8b)
caus. 2nd sing. pāraya (5), 2nd dual. pārayatam (2.39.4a)
Jamison (1983: 102) considers the caus. form pāraya, which isn’t different in meaning from the reduplicated present, to be the older of the two present stems, because it has an Avestan cognate, while the reduplicating present does not. The latter, she suggests, is formed on the basis of the stem *titarti, from the root tī, which itself is only attested in one participle form titatra-, but which does have an Avestan cognate titaraṭ.

For the -si impv. pārṣi and for the form pārṣa see p. 50. Cf. joṣa, and AV neṣa.

206 See also p. 128.
207 Gondo translates ‘clarify thyself (so as to give) ghee . . . (while) clarify(ing) (thyself) (bring) rain’. Gotō loc. cit ‘als (bzw. zur) Schmelzbutter läutere dich . . . für uns läutere dich zum Regen’.
pṛc ‘mix, pour out abundantly, fill’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. prṇḍhi (2.24.15c), 3rd sing. prṇāktu (1.84.1c), 2nd dual prṇktām (5)

**red. pres. act.** 2nd sing. pipṛgdhi (10.10.11d), 2nd pl. pipṛkta (3.54.21b)

**pres. pass.** 3rd sing. prcyatām (6.28.8b)

Each of the reduplicated forms appears once only, pipṛgdhi at 10.10.11 and pipṛkta at 3.54.21. Joachim, (1978: 109) suggests that the reduplicated forms may have been created by analogy to other forms with similar meaning, such as mīmikṣa-, which occurs in very similar contexts. Also, the reduplicated forms appear in environments containing other reduplicated forms.

The passive form appears once only: 6.28.8ab úpedām upapārcanam, āsā gōśāpa prcyatām ‘let this mixture be added to (i.e. mixed with) the cows (or, more likely, with milk)’.

For an example containing the present of pṛc see above under dhū. 208

pṛj ‘fill’

**pres. act.** prṇṭana (5.5.5c)

**them. pres.** 2nd sing. prṇṭa (8), 2nd pl. prṇṭata (3)

**them. pres. med.** 2nd sing. prṇṭasva (2), 3rd sing. prṇṭām (3.50.1c), 2nd dual prṇṭethām (6.69.7b), 2nd pl. prṇṭādhvam (4)

**red. aor.** pūpurantu (7.62.3d)

**-si impv. prāsi** (2)

For the form prṇṭa see page 28f.

The thematic present, which often appears with the preverb ā, is transitive and usually means ‘fulfil’, often occurring with kāmam ‘desire’, e.g. 1.16.9a sēmām nah kāmam ā pṛṇṭa ‘fulfil this desire of ours’. It can also mean ‘fill’, as in 9.41.5a ā mahī rōḍaṣṭi pṛṇṭa ‘fill the two great worlds’.

Two examples of the athematic present impv. that occur without preverbs both belong to the root pṛj (q.v. below), thus the sole example of the imperative of this

---

208 For the possibility that this root (PIE *pel-k*) may be an alternative form of the root pṛ (pel-h₁) see Mayrhofer (1986: s. PARC, with bibliography), and LIV s. *perk. This is problematic, as it would preclude comparison with forms outside Indo-Iranian, which contain original r.
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stem with the probable meaning ‘fill’ is 5.5.5c prá-pra yajñám prñitana ‘fulfil the sacrifice’.\(^{209}\)

The middle voice present, which is always thematic, means ‘to fill up, become full’, e.g. 3.50.1c óruvyácāh prñatām ebhir ánnaih- ‘having wide reach, let him be filled with this food’. The middle voice may also have affective meaning, as in 10.104.2b nřbhíh sutásya jathāram prñasva ‘fill your (own) stomach with (Soma) pressed by men’.

The red. aor. form púpurantu corresponds to a caus. púrayati, which is attested in the AV, but not the RV. This form, however, which must have been part of the language of the time, as the aor. is dependent on it for its vocalism\(^{210}\). For an example containing the -si impv. prási see under p\(\text{f}^2\).

\(\text{p}\(\text{f}^2\) ‘give’

**pres. act.** 2nd dual prñitám (7.65.4d), 2nd pl. prñitá (1.23.21a)

**root aor.** púrdhí (7)

First differentiated from p\(\text{f}^1\) by Kuiper (1938: 313ff.\(^{211}\)). While the aorist impvs. of these roots are strictly differentiated, the present stems are the same – prñáit.

Historically the two roots are completely different; p\(\text{f}^1\) < *pelh\(_1\) while p\(\text{f}^2\) < *perh\(_3\)

The two attested examples of the pres. stem prñád-/prñí- of which simplex forms occur both belong to this root, a fact recognised by Kuiper (1938: 319). Thus 1.23.21ab āpah prñitā bheṣajām vārūtham tanvē māma ‘O waters, give a potion, protection for my body’ and 7.65.4d prñitām udnó divyāsya cároḥ ‘give (us) of the dear, divine, waters’.

The root aorist form appears, inter alia, in the memorable string of impvs. at 1.42.9ab, where it is clearly differentiated from the -si impv. of p\(\text{f}^1\), and clearly meant to be synonymous with the following prá yaṃsi ‘extend (gifts)’: śagdhí púrdhí prá yaṃsi ca, śiśihi prásy uđāram ‘be powerful, give and extend (gifts),

\(^{209}\) See Kuiper (1938: especially 314-320).

\(^{210}\) Jamison (1983: 149).

\(^{211}\) For further extensive bibliography see Mayrhofer (1986: s. PAR\(^2\)). See also LIV s. *perh\(_3\).*
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sharpen (us), fill our stomachs.’ This ‘absolute’ usage of the transitive is mirrored in 1.125.5b yāḥ prātiḥ sā ha devēṣu gachati ‘he who gives goes to the gods.’

**pyā** ‘swell’
- **pres. med.** 2nd sing. *pyāyasva* (3), 3rd pl. *pyāyantām* (1.93.12b)
  A secondary root derived from *pī* (see above). All attestations – impv. and other forms – are in Books 1, 9 and 10.

**prath** ‘extend, spread’
- **pres. med.** 2nd sing. *prathasva* (5.5.4a), 3rd sing. *prathatām* (10.70.4a), 3rd pl. *prathanītām* (2.3.5c)
  **caus. med.** *prathayasva* (10.140.4a)

**praś** ‘ask’
- **pres. act.** 2nd sing. *prcha* (3), *prchāta* (2)

**prā** see *pṛṛ*

**prī** ‘gratify, be gratified’
- **perf.** *piprīhī* (2)
  **them. perf. med.** *pitrāyasva* (8.11.10c)
  The secondarily thematicised form *pitrāyasva* is probably built on the subjunctive stem *pitrāyat*. Cf. *dīdayatam, pīpaya, pīpayata*. See p. 34.  

**pruth** ‘pant, neigh, snort’
- **pres. act.** *protha* (6.47.30c)
  The usual translations of this root hardly seem suitable in the context in which this one imperative example occurs: 6.47.30 ā krandaṃ bālam Ṽjo na Ṽdhā, ni Ṽṭanīhī durītā bādhamaṇāḥ / āpa protha dundubhe ducchāṇā itā, Ṽndrasya muṣṭīr asi viḷāyasva ‘Cry out, give us strength, might, thunder down, pushing away hardships. Snort away (?) mischief from here, O kettledrum.’ Neither “snort”, “pant” nor “neigh” seem quite right here, the meaning of āpa protha ... ducchāṇā certainly being parallel to that of ni Ṽṭanīhī durītā, for which see Narten (1993: 319), who translates

---

212 Also Kümmel (2000: 322ff.).
Index of attested imperative forms

it as ‘donnere los, die Gefahren bannend’. The only other finite form of this verb (the rest being participles) appears with áśya- ‘horse’ at 7.3.2a.

**bandh** ‘bind’

*pass. pres.* 3rd pl. badhyantām (4.57.4c)
The form badhānā is first attested in the Atharvaveda. Finite forms of this verb are quite sparsely attested in the Rigveda, despite there being many nominal derivatives. The active pres. is not attested at all. Most of the attested forms are passive, such as this one impv.

**bādh** ‘repel, push away, push down’

*pres. med.* 2nd sing. bādhasva (9), 3rd sing. bādhatām (5), 2nd dual bādhetām (6.74.2c), 2nd pl. bādhadhyām (7.56.20c)

**budh** ‘be awake, aware’

*pres. act.* 2nd sing. bodhi (9), bōdha (5), 3rd sing. bōdhatu (2.32.4b), 2nd dual bōdhatam (7), 3rd pl. bōdhatu (1.29.4b)
*caus.* 2nd sing. bodhayā (8), 2nd pl. bodhayāta (8.44.1b)

Hoffmann (1967: 232) and Insler (1972 2, 560ff.) explain the stem bodha- as originating in a root-aorist subjunctive. The form bōdhat is still to be regarded synchronically as such at 4.15.7 bōdhad yān mā hāribhyām kumārāh sāhadevāh, āchā nā hūtā úd aram ‘(I thought that) if Prince Sāhadeva shall take note of me by (giving) two steeds, I shall rise up to (him) like one who has been summoned.’\(^{213}\), which is preferable to the alternative, which is to regard it as a present injunctive. Gotō (1987: 217ff., particularly fn. 451) opposes this, on the grounds that the root aorist of budh is always middle-voice, and that the stem bodha- is always active, and that the active and middle of this root are strictly distinguished in meaning. Insler (*op. cit.*) in fact claims that the synchronically active forms actually have their origin in old “t-less” middle-voice forms, to which were added active endings in the same way as *āśayat, which became áśayat. While in the latter case the rest of the paradigm preserved the identity of the form áśayat as a middle-voice form, in the

---

\(^{213}\) Trans. Insler (*op. cit.*).
The form *bodhā(t) it did not, and the forms were subsequently reinterpreted as being active. Once this had happened, the form bodhi was coined on the basis of the pattern established by the form yódhī and its corresponding subjunctive yodhat.

The form bodhi, if indeed it does have the origin outlined on page 26, is originally active and not middle-voice, since all imperatives of the type CéRCl are active.

The meaning of bódha- and the other synchronically active forms is ‘notice, observe, perceive’. The forms bodhi and bódha have the same meaning, which strengthens the idea that the latter could be derived from the former (p. 27).

Furthermore, bódha only occurs pāda-initially, with lengthened second syllable, while bodhi never does, indicating a metrical complementary distribution. Both may take either a genetive or accusative complement. Examples are: 8.43.27c āgne sā bodhi me vācāḥ, ‘O Agni, take notice of my speech’, 3.14.7c tvām viśvasya surāthasya bodhi, ‘take notice of him who has a good chariot’, 1.147.2a bódhā me asyā vācaso yaviṣṭha, ‘take notice of this my speech, O Youngest One’, and 7.21.1d bódhā na stōmam āndhaso mãdeṣu ‘take notice of our praise in your exhilaration from the (Soma) plant’. The meaning of the middle-voice – of which there are no imperatives – is ‘wake up, be awake’, as in 1.157.1a ābodhy agnír jmā úd eti sūryo ‘Agni has awoken, the sun rises from the earth’.

One notable exception to the above is 1.29.4ab sasāntu tyā árātayo, bódhantu śāra rātīyah ‘Let those enemies sleep, let these heros be awake.’ Gotō (1987: 220) suggests the possibility that ‘Hier hat wahrscheinlich eine akustische Anpassung an sasāntu eine Rolle gespielt.’

The causative bodhaya mean ‘awaken, wake (someone) up’, as in 1.124.10ab pṛá bodhayāsoṣah prajātō mahānyo, ābudhyamānāḥ paṇḍyāḥ sasantu ‘Awaken the givers, O generous Uṣas, let the demons sleep, never awakening’.

*bhr* ‘strengthen’

pres. act. 2nd sing. barhaya (3)

int. 2nd. sing. barhrhī (10.10.10c)

Wackernagel (1896: 251) shows that the -hi ending in barhṛhī is an analogical reconstruction; the form should have been *barhrhjī* (< *barhrj-dhi* < *barhrh-jh-dhi*). If, as was usually the case, the vowel precending the */dj/ cluster had

---

214 The form bodhat is a secondary shortening, according to Insler (op. cit.).
undergone compensatory lengthening, then the form would have been *barbʰrhi. For the possibility that the form barbhrhi may have been derived from the form bárhyhat (see below) on the basis of the relationship between other -i imperatives and subjunctives in -at see footnotes 25, 107.

Mayrhofer (1986: s. BARH) suggests that barbhrhi may stem from the PIE root *bhelUGH ‘swell’, as opposed to the usual derivation from the root *bherUGH ‘be high’. The form appears only once, at 10.10.10cd āpā barbhrhi vṛṣabhāya bāhūṁ, anyāṁ ihasva subhage pātim māt ‘Lay your arm (like a pillow) under a bull (virile man), find some other husband than me, O happy woman’. The root *bhelUGH ‘swell’ does provide some Vedic words whose meaning is ‘cushion, pillow’, e.g. upabārhana-, as well as the word barhís- ‘altar-grass’, so semantically at least this seems possible. The intensive stem appears, with the same meaning, at 5.61.5cd Śyāvāśvastutāya yā, dōr vīrāyopabárhyhat ‘she who shall lay her arms under the man who is praised by Śyāvāśva’.

brū ‘say’

pres. act. 2nd sing. brūhi (4), 3rd sing. bravīt (4), 2nd pl. brūta (10.52.1c), bravītana (2), 3rd pl. bravantu (4)
The second person brūta and bravītana plural forms show characteristic zero-grade vs full-grade; cf. kṛta, kartana. See page 31.

bhaj ‘share’

pres. act. 2nd sing. bhaja (12), 2nd dual. bhajatam (10.106.9d), 2nd pl. bhajatana (7.56.21c)
pres. med. 2nd sing. bhajasva (2)
-si impv. bhaksi (7.41.2d)
caus. bhājayata (10.9.2b)

For the form bhajatana, which is one of only three thematic stems showing the ending -tana, see page 32.
The active impv. almost always appears with the preverb ā, in which case it means ‘let (someone) have a share in (something)’, with acc. and loc. respectively, e.g.

---

215 cf. tāṭhi.

216 See also Schaefer (1994: 39, 157-159).
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1.43.8c ॐ na indo váje bhaja ‘give us, O drop, a share in the prize’. Without ॐ, it means ‘to apportion’ as in 10.106.9d -āmśeva no bhajatam citrām āpnaḥ ‘Like Amśa, give out to us shining wealth’. The impv. of the middle-voice appears to differ little in meaning or valency: 4.32.21a,c bhūridā hy ási śrutāḥ ... á no bhajasva rádhasi ‘because you are the famous plenty-giver, ..., give us a share in your gift.’ The causative stem, which is only attested once in the entire RV, means ‘allow to partake’: 10.9.2ab yá vaḥ śivátyo rásas, táṣya bhájyatehá naḥ ‘That which is your most pleasant sap, allow us to partake of it here’. This meaning, according to Jamison (1983: 129), corresponds to the reflexive meaning of the non-modal middle-voice forms, ‘obtain a share for oneself’.

bhañj ‘break’
pres. act. 2nd sing. bhañdhī (10.87.4d)

bhā ‘shine’
pres. act. 2nd sing. bhāhi (10)

bhid ‘split’
pres. act. 2nd sing. bhindhī (3)

bhīṣajya- ‘heal’
pres. act. 2nd dual bhīṣajyātām (8.22.10d)

bhī ‘fear’
pres.med. 3rd sing. bhayatām (10.42.6c)

bhur ‘move quickly, tremble’
pres. act. 3rd pl. bhurantu (10.76.6a)

---

217 Cf. also Gotō (1987: 221f.).
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**bhū** ‘become’


**perf.** *bhūtātu* (1.127.10c)

[aor. inj. *bhū* (6.15.3a)]

For the form *bodhī* see page 25.

**bhūṣ** ‘exert oneself for smbd.’


A secondary root derived from *bhū*. For literature regarding this root and its relationship with *bhū*, see Mayrhofer (1986: *ad loc.*) For the meaning, see Lubotsky (1995: 225).

**bhr** ‘carry, bring’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *bhāra* (134), 2nd dual *bharatam* (1.109.7a), 3rd dual *bhāratām* (10.59.8c), 2nd pl. *bhārata* (17)

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. *bhārasva* (2), 2nd pl. *bharadhvam* (12)

**red. pres.** 3rd dual. *bibhrātām* (6.75.4b)

The hugely-attested present active forms are typically found with the preverb *ā* and a dative indirect object with the meaning ‘bring something to somebody’, as in e.g. 1.79.8a *ā no agne rayīm bhara* ‘O Agni, bring us property’. The much rarer middle-voice forms are affective or affective-possessive: 1.79.10bc *vāco gotamāgnāyey / bhārasva sumnayūr gīrāḥ* ‘Bring your (own) words to Agni, O Gotama, songs of praise, when you want (his) good will’.

The durative-iterative meaning of the reduplicating present stem *bibhār* - is well demonstrated by the sole example of an imperative derived from it: 6.75.4b *mātēva putrām bibhṛtām upāsthe* ‘let the two [ends of the bow] carry [the arrow] like a mother her son in her lap’. 
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maṃḥ ‘lavish’

them. perf. med. 2nd sing. māmahasva (2), 3rd pl. māmahantām (20)

pres. caus. māmhasya (5.38.1d)
The perfect impv. means ‘to be bountiful’. It can have an accusative object, which denotes the item with respect to which the bounty is being requested, as in 3.52.6ab trīyē dhānāḥ sāvane paruṣṭata, purolāsām āhutam māmahasva naḥ ‘at the third pressing, be bountiful for us with regard to grains, the sacrificed rice cakes’. The third pers. plural form māmahanṭām, while attested a total of 20 times, only occurs in a single formula which comes at the end of most of the hymns between 1.94 and 1.116, and also 9.97: tān no mitrō vāruṇo māmahanṭām, āditīḥ śṛṇḍhuḥ pṛthivī utā dyauḥ ‘In this matter, may Mitra and Varuṇa be bountiful, and also Aditi, Sindhu, Pṛthivi and Dyaus.’ The causative form is semantically problematic, mainly because it is very sparsely attested.218 For the thematicised perfect stems see p.34.

mad ‘exhilarate, intoxicate’

pres. act. 2nd sing. mada (10.63.3d), 3rd dual mādatām (1.121.11b), 2nd pl. mādata (2), 3rd pl. māduṭu (6.75.18d)
sec. pres. act. 2nd sing. manda (6.18.9d), 3rd sing. māndatu (2), 3rd pl. māndantu (8)
sec. pres. med. 2nd sing. 1māndasva (6)
caus. 3rd pl. mādayantu (7.23.5a)
med. caus. 2nd sing. mādayasva (19), 2nd dual mādayethām (5), 2nd pl. mādayadhvam (8), 3rd pl. mādayantām (6)
sec. caus. 2nd sing. mādaya (2)
-si impv. 2nd sing. mātsi (15)
s-aor. med. 2nd sing. mātsva (14)
perf. 2nd sing. mamaddhi (2), 3rd sing. mamāṭtu (12), 2nd pl. mamattāna (10.179.1d)
The root manda is a secondary root derived from mad. Since Bartholomae (1897: 85), it has been accepted that the root manda is actually derived from the weak perfect stem of the root mad. Some scholars (e.g. Renou 1925: 116) have come to recognise

that synchronically these are two roots, whatever their historical origin. Gotō (1987: 235f.), however, considers them to be two stems from the same root, having come about in a similar way to that suggested by Bartholomae. Kümmel (2000: 367) challenges Bartholomae’s basic assumption, suggesting that mand may have originated as a nasal present stem from the root mad, which later became generalised as a secondary root.

Despite Gotō’s assertion (1987: 235) that the stem māda- is intransitive, most of the attestations of the imperative of this stem are clearly transitive, meaning ‘to delight’, e.g.: 10.63.3d tāh ādityāh ānu madā svastāye ‘Joyfully greet these Ādityas for well-being’. Indeed, of the remaining attestations of the imperative of the stem mada-, only one appears to be intransitive – mádatā at 1.182.1b. The transitive examples all have preverbs, (ānu x 3, abhi x 1), while the intransitive example is simplex, leading to the conclusion that the transitivity is inherent in the preverbs rather than the verbal stem.

The stem mānda- differs semantically from māda-, meaning ‘to intoxicate, exhilarate’, usually in the context of Soma, as in 7.22.1a pībā sōmam indra māndatu tvā ‘drink the Soma, O Indra, let it intoxicate you’. The commonly attested -si impv. form mātsi, most of whose attestations are in Book 9, means the same, as can be clearly seen from 9.90.5, which contains the form no fewer than six times: mātsi soma vāruṇam mātsi mītrām, mātsīndram indo pavamāna viṣṇum / mātsi śārdho mārputam mātsi devān, mātsi mahāṃ indram indo mādāya ‘Exhilarate Varuṇa, O Soma, exhilarate Mitra, exhilarate Indra, O purifying drop, (and) Viṣṇu. Exhilarate the Marut horde, exhilarate the gods, exhilarate the great Indra, O drop, for exhilaration’.

The middle-voice variant of this form is its intransitive counterpart ‘be intoxicated, rejoice’: 8.13.14ab ā tu gahi prá tā drava, mātsvā sutāsyā gómataḥ ‘come here, run forth, get intoxicated from the milk-rich pressed (Soma).’

The other most-commonly attested form, the middle-voice of the causative is more akin in meaning to the stem māda-, meaning ‘rejoice’, rather than ‘be intoxicated’ with an accompanying locative or instrumental denoting the cause of the exhilaration, e.g.: 7.29.2c asmīnū ī śū śāvane mādayasva ‘rejoice in this pressing’, or 1.101.9d asmīn yajñē barhiṣi mādayasva ‘rejoice in this sacrifice on the altar-grass’.
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\[ \text{man}_1 \] ‘think’
\[ \text{pres. med.} \] 3rd sing. manutām (6.47.29b)

\[ \text{man}_2 \] ‘wait?, think?’
\[ \text{perf. act.} \] 2nd sing. mamandhi (10.27.20)
Only occurs once, at 10.27.20b: \textit{mó} \textit{sú} \textit{pré} \textit{sedhīr mâhur} \textit{in} \textit{mamandhi}, which is usually translated, e.g. by Grassmann, Geldner and Insler (1972: 555), ‘do not drive (them) forth, just wait a while’. Kūmmel (2000: 365) rejects this interpretation on formal grounds, suggesting as an alternative that this form comes from the IE root *men ‘to think of (an idea)’, whose perfect appears in Greek as μέμονα ‘to have in mind’, in Latin as memini, ‘remember’ and in Germanic as the perfecto-present verb \textit{man}, ‘think’. Thus the meaning of this sentence would be ‘do not drive (them) forth, consider for a while’. This form has anomalous ablaut in the root, for which see p. 25.

\[ \text{manth} \] ‘agitate’
\[ \text{pres. act.} \] 2nd pl. mānthata (3.29.5a)

\[ \text{mand} \] see mad

\[ \text{mahay-} \] ‘exalt’
\[ \text{pres. act.} \] 2nd sing. mahaya (4)

\[ \text{mā́} \] ‘measure’
\[ \text{pres. act.} \] 2nd sing. mimīhi (7), 2nd dual mimītām (2), 3rd dual mimītām (5.51.11a)
\[ \text{pres. med.} \] 2nd dual mīmāthām (2)
\[ \text{aor.} \] 2nd sing. māhi (3)
\[ -\text{si} \text{ impv} \] māśi (5)
\[ \text{aor. med.} \] 2nd sing. māśva (2)
The impv. forms of this verb mostly appear with preverbs – the aorist always with \textit{úpa}, the present either with \textit{úpa}, or \textit{sám} – and generally an accusative object and dative indirect object, with the meaning ‘distribute, measure out’, as in e.g. 3.54.22b\textsuperscript{219} asmadṛyāk sām mimīhi śrāvāṃsi ‘in our direction measure out glories’.

\textsuperscript{219} Repeated at 5.4.2d and 6.19.3b.
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and 7.26.5c sahasrīṇa úpa no māhi vājān ‘give out to us thousandfold prizes’. The middle-voice forms have similar meaning, and the same valency: 9.93.5a ná no rayūm úpa māsva nṛvāntam ‘now distribute to us property, rich in men’. Without preverbs, the meaning and valency may again be the same: 4.44.6ab ná no rayūm puruvīram brhāntam, dāsrā mīmāhām ubhāyeśv asmē ‘Now distribute to us high property, with many heroes, O Wonder-workers, on both sides’. One one occasion, without preverbs and with different valency, it means ‘to measure’, 1.38.14ab mīmīḥi ślokam āsyē, parjānya iva tatah ‘Measure the sound in your mouth, thunder like Parjanya’.

mā2 ‘bellow’

pres. act. 3rd sing. mīmātu (5.59.8a)

mi ‘build’

pres. act. 3rd sing. minotu (10.18.13d)

muc ‘free’

pres. act. 2nd sing. muñca (2), 2nd dual muñcātam (3), 2nd pl. muñcata (4), 3rd pl. muñcāntu (2)
pres. med. 2nd sing. muñcasva (10.38.5c)
a-aor. 2nd sing. muca (4)
aor. med. 2nd pl. mucadhvam (1.171.1d)
perf. 2nd sing. mumugdhī (6), 3rd sing. mumoktu (2), 2nd dual mumukta (2)
theatricised perf. 2nd dual mumócatam (5), 2nd pl. mumócate (8.67.14b)

Kümmel (2000: 382) states that there is no difference in meaning between the present and perfect stems. While this may be true, there is certainly a difference in their characteristic valency. The perfect form mumugdhī almost always occurs – with a variety of preverbs – with an accusative and an ablative in an expression meaning ‘remove [something bad] from us’, as in 1.24.9d kṛtām cid ēnah prá mumugdhī asmāt ‘release the sin we have committed from us’, and 5.2.7c evāsmād agne vī mumugdhī pāśān ‘So remove the bonds from us, O Agni’.

The present, on the other hand, characteristically occurs with reversed valency, as in 6.74.4c prá no muñcātam vāruṇasya pāśād, ‘release us from the bond of Varuṇa’. This is not however a hard and fast rule; while the majority of attestations of perfect forms do have the characteristically perfect valency, there are a couple of instances in
which the present has the characteristically perfect valency: 4.12.6c evó śv āsmán muñcatā vy ámhaḥ ‘thus release the trouble from us’ and 6.74.3cd áva syatam muñcátaṁ yán no āsti, taniṣu buddhān kṛtām ēno asmāt ‘untie, release from us the committed sin which we have, bound to our bodies’.

The aorist muca only occurs with the preverb ví with a single accusative object, e.g. 1.177.4cd stīr/ámbarhīr ā tú śakra prá yāhi, pitā niśādyā vi mucā hārī ihā ‘drive forth to the strewn altar grass, O Mighty One, drink, sitting down, unyoke the two bays here’.

The thematicised perfect forms, presumably derived from the subjunctive *mumócati220 is only attested in Book 8, and, whether or not by chance, is the only impv. form of this verb attested there. It occurs five times in a single, rather difficult formula: 8.86.1-5d mā no ví yauṣṭāṁ sakhyā mumócatam ‘do not reject our friendship, free [us] (?)’. However, given the frequency of the combination ví muc + acc. it is possible that Geldner (ad loc.) is correct that the preverb ví actually belongs with mumócatam (or maybe more likely to both verbs), despite the difficulty posed by the word order. For the thematicised perfect stems see p. 34.

There are only two attestations of middle-voice forms, one of which is reflexive: 10.38.5c prá muñcasva pāri kūtsād ihā gahi ‘free yourself from Kutsa, come here’, while the other is affective-possessive: 1.171.1d nī hélo dhattā ví muctāhavām áśvān ‘lay down your anger, unyoke your (own) horses’.

For the possibility that the form ’mumuktam at 6.50.10c is an impv. see p. 118.

\textit{mud} ‘rejoice’

\textbf{pres. med.} 2nd pl. \textit{modadhvam} (10.97.3a)

\textit{muṣ} ‘steal’

\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. \textit{muṣāyā} (1.175.4a)

\textit{muh} ‘be dazed’

\textbf{pres. act.} 3rd pl. \textit{māhyantu} (10.81.6c)

\textsuperscript{220} For the shift in accent in the attested perf. subj. \textit{mumocati} see Kümmel (\textit{op. cit.} 383).
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\textbf{mrj} ‘clean’

\textbf{sa-aor.} 2nd dual \textit{mrksatam} (2)

\textbf{caus. med. pres.} 2nd pl. \textit{marjayadhvam} (7.2.4d)

\textbf{mṛd} ‘have mercy’


\textbf{caus. act.} 2nd sing. \textit{mṛlāya} (18), 2nd pl. \textit{mṛlāyata} (2.29.2d), 3rd pl. \textit{mṛlāyantu} (4)

Jamison (1983: 102f.) rightly claims that there appears to be no difference in meaning between the simple present and the causative, both taking dative complements. As she also points out, both the simple present and causative can also take an accusative. However there is no need for Jamison’s assertion that the accusative of \textit{āgas ‘sin’} is ellipsed on every occasion where the accusative is absent; the accusative could just as well be considered to be external to the main verbal syntagma rather than as a direct object, and translated e.g. ‘regarding our sin,’; thus 7.93.7c \textit{yāt sīm āgaś ca<\textit{kṛmā tāt sū mṛla ‘the sin which we have committed, regarding this matter please have mercy’.}

\textbf{mrś} ‘touch’

\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. \textit{mrśa} (3)

\textbf{pres. med.} 2nd sing. \textit{mrśasva} (8.70.9b)

\textbf{mṛ́} ‘crush’

\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. \textit{mrṇīhi} (4.4.5d), \textit{mrṇa} (5)

Thieme (1939) suggests that this is the descendant of two separate roots: *\textit{melh₁ ‘to grind’} and *\textit{merh₂ ‘to catch’}. There is no simple way to tell them apart, unlike in the case of the similarly conjugated verbs \textit{pṛ́} ‘fill’ and \textit{ṭṛ́} ‘give’, all of whose thematic forms mean ‘fill’. For one thing, the meanings of the two roots are too similar, and furthermore, from a formal point of view, they are not distinguished either by preverbs – \textit{prā} may be combined with either root, or by form, as both may be thematic or athematic. It is clear that 7.104.22d \textit{ḍṛṣṭādeva prā mrṇa rākṣa indra ‘Crush harm as with a mill-stone’ means ‘crush’, because of the analogy of the mill-stone. Thieme claims that at 6.44.17 \textit{prā mrṇa means ‘catch’: pārāca indra prá mrṇa jahā ca ‘As they (the enemy) turn away, catch them and smite them.’. Klein (1985: 1-85), however, translates the same passage ‘grind up and smash’.}
For the morphology of the imperative forms of this verb see page 28f.

*mṛ*2 ‘hinder’

**int.** 3rd sing. *marmartu* (2.23.6d)

This root only has one imperative form: 2.23.6cd bhṛhaspate yó no abhí hváro dadhé, svá tám marmartu duchúñā hárasvatí. Insler (1972: 92) suggests differentiating this intensive from the previous *mṛ* ‘to crush’, with the meaning ‘hinder’, translating the passage ‘Bṛhaspati, he who poses an obstacle for us, let that own angering221 mischief of his hinder him’. Mayrhofer (1986 s. *MAR*) appears to agree, while Schaefer (1994: 166f.) rejects this, preferring to classify this form under *mṛ* ‘to crush’. One can certainly make a case for Insler’s distinction, both semantically – the idea of the mischievous individual being hindered by his own obstacle does make sense – and historically, by connecting this verb to nouns such as āmúr, ‘hindrance’ (Insler [op. cit]). However, once again, since the phonological evidence is valid for either case, there is no way to be sure that the alternative translation ‘may his own mischief crush him’ is not correct.

**med** ‘be fat’

**pres. act.** 3rd pl. *médyantu* (2.37.3a)

Some scholars, such as Geldner (*ad loc.*), and Joachim (1978: 132) consider the form *medátām*, which occurs at 10.93.11d, to be a 3rd sing. med. impv. form. The text is: 10.93.11cd sádā pāhy abhíṣṭaye, *medátām* vedátā vaso which has been translated either as ‘*(Die Rede) soll an Weisheit fett werden, du Guter’ (Geldner) or ‘Beschütze unser Genossenentswerden (unser fettes Gedeihen?) entsprechend unserem Weisheitwesen, du Guter’ (Oldenberg [1909: *ad. loc.*]), in which case the form *medátām* is seen as an accusative verbal noun.

**myakṣa** ‘be attached’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *myakṣa* (2.28.6a)

**sec. pres. act.** 2nd sing. *mimikṣa* (9.107.6d), 2nd dual *mimikṣatam* (4), 3rd dual *mimikṣatām* (2)

**perf. med.** 2nd sing. *mimikṣa* (1.48.16b)

---

221 I.e. ‘which angers us’.
The impv. form myakṣa is the only extant form of this present stem. It occurs with the preverb ápa, which has the effect of giving it the opposite meaning to that of the simplex, i.e. ‘unattach’, as opposed to ‘attach’: 2.28.6a ápo sú myakṣa varuṇa bhīyāsam mát ‘O Varuṇa, detach fear from me’.

The other reduplicated present forms are considered by Joachim (1978: 132f.) to be secondary derivatives from the perfect. This is rejected by Kümmel (2000: 387f.), who prefers to see them as a thematicised, factitive reduplicated present. It almost always appears in a formulaic expression, as in 9.107.6d mādhyā vajñām mimikṣa naḥ ‘provide our sacrifice with sweetness’, with acc. and instr. The middle-voice form can either be a relic of an athematic reduplicated present or a perfect (Kümmel, loc. cit.). It occurs once at 1.48.16ab sāṁ no ṛāyā hratā viśvāpeṣasā, mimikṣyā sāṁ īṭāhīr ā with a similar meaning to the above reduplicated forms ‘equip us with high property, with every decoration, with refreshment.’

mrad ‘make soft’

pres. act. 2nd sing. m雷达 (6.53.3c)

yaj ‘sacrifice’

pres. act. 2nd sing. yāja (18), 3rd sing. yajatu (3), 2nd pl. yajatu (4.1.1d), 3rd pl. yajantu (10.128.4a)

pres. med. 2nd sing. yajatā (18), 3rd sing. yajatām (6.15.13d), 2nd dual. yajadhvām (10.70.7d), 2nd pl. yajadhvam (8.2.37.a), yajadhvām (6), 3rd pl. yajantām (10.128.3a)

aor. -si impv. 2nd sing. yaksii (33)

-s- aor. 3rd dual yaksatām (3)

-s- aor. med. 2nd sing. yaksya (3)

The active and middle voice forms are usually considered to be differentiated in that the former means ‘worship, offer (as a priest on behalf of someone else), while the middle means ‘sacrifice (on one’s own behalf)’. A close analysis of the data shows that this is basically true in the Rigveda. This is particularly strongly illustrated by the fact that the dative denoting the party on behalf of whom the sacrifice or worship is carried out only occurs with the active. Despite this one rule, however, the situation on the whole is not very consistent and there are many exceptions222.

222 For a full discussion of the valency of the verb yaj see Baum (2006, forthc.).
The agent of the active voice forms is almost always Agni, who is himself often addressed as ‘hotar’. This, and the fact that the abovementioned dative very often does occur with the active, illustrates the meaning ‘worship on behalf of others’.

The middle forms are often reflexive, or possessive-affective. This can be very explicit, there being a reflexive pronoun as direct object, as in the formulaic svayám yajasva tamvāṁ ‘offer your own body’, which occurs several times. However, the middle voice with the preverb á has a special meaning and valency – ‘bring something to someone as a result of their worship’, as in 3.1.22cd prá yamśi hotar bhṛatir iso nō, ‘gnē māhi drāvinam á yajasva ‘Extend to us high refreshment, bring us great wealth, O Agni’.

The -si impv. yākṣi occurs many times in formulaic yākṣi devān, ‘offer to the gods’, mostly at the end of 11-syllable lines, although it does occur elsewhere too, either with accusative object of the god to which of the offering is made, or else without objects, simply meaning ‘make an offering’, as in 1.14.1c devēbhīr yāḥi yākṣi ca ‘come here with the gods and make an offering’. Remarkably, it is once affective-possessive: 1.75.5c ágne yākṣi svāṁ dānam ‘O Agni, sacrifice your own house’. Finally, the 2nd pers. dual form yākṣatām, which is obviously created on the basis of the aor. subj. yākṣat, occurs three times in the same repeated line: 1.13.8c yajhāṁ no yakṣatām imāṁ ‘let these two offer this offering for us’, all of them in Book 1. See also Narten (1964: 47f., 202f.).

yat ‘install, take position’

pres. act. 2nd dual yātatām (8.35.12a)

pres. med. 2nd sing. yatasva (1.69.6b), 3rd pl. yatantām (5.59.8b)

yam ‘extend’

pres. act. 2nd sing. yācha (21), yachatāt (1.48.15c), 3rd sing. yachatu (13), 2nd dual yachatām (17), 3rd dual yachatām (2.41.20c), 2nd pl. yāchata (14), 3rd pl. yāchantu (4)

pres. med. 2nd pl. yachadhvam (7.43.2b)

root. aor. 2nd sing. yandhī (8), 2nd dual yantām (6), 2nd pl. yānta (5), yantana (3)

-si impv. yāmsi (4)

caus. act. 2nd sing. yāṁaya (8.3.2d)

The imperative forms of this verb are entirely active and transitive, with one exception. This verb has two characteristic meanings, in one case occurring with the
noun śārman ‘shelter’, or its synonyms, as its direct object and a dative indirect object, and in the other mainly in expressions concerning the granting of gifts, etc.

The difference is not inherent in the verbal stem, but rather in the choice of preverb, the expression śārma yam occurring with none, while ‘to grant {gifts}’ is expressed by prā yam. In this latter case the aorist is more common than the present, but is by no means exclusively employed in this meaning. Thus prā + yācha- means ‘grant’ in 6.59.9cd á na ihá prā yachatam, rayīṃ viśvāyupasaṃ ‘grant us here property that makes our whole life prosper.’ One exception to this is is the semi-formulaic prā [dat.] yacha- avrkāṃ prthū chardīh ‘extend to (smbd.) your safe, broad shelter’ (1.48.15c, 8.9.1c), although it is worth noting that at 1.48.15d the text continues prā devi gomātīr iṣaḥ ‘O Goddess, (grant us) cow (milk?)-rich refreshment’.

As already mentioned, the aorist forms yandhī and yāsi occur mostly with the preverb prā, with the meaning ‘grant’, as in 4.2.20d mahō rāyāh puruvāra prā yandhī ‘grant us great wealth, O rich one.’ However, on one occasion when there is no preverb, the meaning is once again, ‘extend your shelter’: 7.88.6d yandhī śmā vipra stuvati vārūtham ‘being wise, extend your shelter to your praiser.’

For an explanation of the form yandhī see page 25.

**yas** ‘boil’

**pres. act.** 3rd sing. yayāstu

**yā** ‘travel (in a vehicle)’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. yāhī (142), 3rd sing. yātu (18), 3rd dual yātām (120), 2nd pl. yātā (17), yātāna (3), 3rd pl. yāntu (1.167.2a) -si/aor 2nd dual yāsi/sānta (5)

The aorist form yāsi/sānta occurs only in the formulaic expression yāsi/sānta vartī ‘drive (around) your circuit’, always addressed to the Aśvins. The present can appear in the same formula, as e.g. at 1.34.4a, however usually no such object occurs.

The form yāsi, which occurs once at 1.165.15c, is classified as an impv. by older scholars such as Whitney (1924: §914c), Macdonell (1916: §534) and Grassmann. It is shown by Narten (1964: 209ff.) to be the 3rd sing. med. precative of the verb yā, ‘to ask for’.
**Index of attested imperative forms**

**yāc** ‘ask for’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. yācatā (9.86.41d), 2nd pl. yācata (10.48.5c)

**yu**1 ‘bind’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. yuva (9.108.9c)

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. yuvásva (6)

The active forms of this verb (impv. and others) are only attested twice, both times in late books.223 The single occurrence of the active impv. is transitive, and occurs with the preverb ví, which modifies its meaning to ‘untie, open’ 9.108.9c ví kóśam madhyamáṃ yuva ‘open (or ‘empty’?, cf. Geldner ad. loc.) the middle receptacle’.

The middle-voice form yuvásva is another whose meaning is ‘give’, presumably literally ‘attach to ...’, as in, e.g. 7.5.9ab táṃ no agne maghávadbhyaḥ puruksám, rayín ní vájaṃ śrātyaṃ yuvásva ‘Give this cow-rich property, as fame-worthy booty to our liberal (patrons)’.

**yu**2 ‘keep away’

**red. pres. act.** 2nd sing. yuyodhí (7), 3rd sing. yuyotu (3), 2nd dual yuyotam (2), yuyutám (3), 2nd pl. yuyóta (10), yuyóta (2)

**sk-pres. act.** 3rd pl. yuchantu (8.39.2e)

**caus. pres.** 3rd sing. yaváya (4), 3rd pl. yavayantu (8.48.5d)

**2nd caus. act.** 2nd sing. yaváya (4), 3rd pl. yavayantu (7.44.3d)

**2nd caus. med.** 2nd sing. yavayásva (5.42.9d)

The reduplicated present shows the construction ‘keep something (acc.) away from someone (abl.)’, as in 2.6.4c yuyódy asmád dvéśāṃsi ‘keep hostilities away from us’. It can also have the enclitic personal pronoun naḥ in place of the proclitic asmád in the above example, which in this case would unusually have to be considered an ablative too, as in 6.48.10c āgne hé/lunderbarā/munderdotsi daívyā yuyodhi ná/hunderdot ‘O Agni, keep the heavenly angers away from us’.

The stem yúcha, on the other hand, is intransitive, meaning ‘to stay away from someone (abl.)’, 8.39.2e itô yuchantv āmárah- ‘may the hinderances stay away from here’.

---

223 The other attestation is one occurrence of the present active 3rd pers. sing. yuváti at 10.42.5d.
The transitive/causative stem *yavāya-* occurs only in Books 1, 8 and 10, and this is clearly a late form. *yāvāya-* occurs in Books 3, 5, 6, 7 and 10, making an almost non-overlapping distribution. Both are apparently undifferentiated in meaning from the reduplicated stem *yuyu-*, showing also a similar valency, although with a tendency to drop the ablative.

The single occurrence of the middle-voice caus. is not differentiated in meaning or valency from the active: 5.42.9d *brahmadvīṣaḥ sūryāḥ yāvayasva* ‘keep the enemy of the priest out of the sun’.²²⁴

Jamison (*op. cit*) considers the reduplicated stem *yuyo-* to be a perfect. Gotō (1987: 315f.) disputes Jamison’s accentual grounds for this theory, but Kümmel (2000 401f.), does consider it a possibility. As the forms in question are all modal (except one example of *yuyoti* at 1.92.11), Kümmel considers it typical that the categorial classification of these forms is uncertain, as even in early Vedic they were no longer living forms, the only living perfect forms being the indicative and the participle.

**yuj** ‘yoke’
- **pres. act.** 2nd pl. *yunākta* (2)
- **pres. med.** 2nd dual. *yuṁjāḥām* (7), 2nd pl. *yuṁdīhvām* (3)
- **root aor. med.** 2nd sing. *yuksva* (12)
- **-ya- pass.** 2nd pl. *yujaṁdīhvam* (10.175.1c)

The active forms are transitive, e.g. 10.101.10d *ubhē dhārau práti váñjim yunakta* ‘harness both poles to the beast’, while the middle-voice of all stems is possessive-affective, as in 8.85.7a *yuṁjāḥāṁ rāsābham rāthe* ‘yoke your donkey to your (own) wagon [O Aśvins]’

**yudh** ‘fight’
- **aor.** 2nd sing. *yōḍhi* (5.3.9a)
- **-si impv.** *yóṣi* (1.132.4e)
- **is-aor.** 2nd dual *yodhiṣam* (6.60.2a)
- **caus.** 2nd sing. *yodhāya* (3.46.2d)
- **[aor. inj.]** *yodhiḥ* (10.120.3d)

²²⁴ See also Jamison (1983: 174).
All of the impv. forms of this verb are active, but middle-voice forms are attested elsewhere in the system. The active forms are always transitive, characteristically – both present and aorist – occurring with the preverb abhi either with the meaning ‘fight against’, as in 6.31.3ab tvām kútnaṁ śūṣṇam indra-. -aśūṣwa yudhya kāyavaṁ gāviṣṭau ‘you Indra, fight Śūṣṇa with Kutsa . . . ’ or, ‘to fight for something (acc.)’, as in 6.60.2a tā yodhiṣṭam abhi gā indra nānām ‘You two, Indra (and Agni) fight now for the cows’. Other than that, it is used absolutely, with no object, sometimes with an adverbial locative denoting the place where the fighting is to take place. For the form yodhi, which is attested only at 5.3.9a áva sprdhi pitāraṁ yodhi ... ‘Protect the father, fight (for him)’, see page 26f.

**rakṣ ‘protect’**
- **pres. act.** 2nd sing. rákṣa (25), rákṣatāt (4.50.2d), 3rd sing. rakṣatu (2), 2nd dual rákṣatam (9), 3rd dual rakṣatām (2), 2nd pl. rákṣata (2), 3rd pl. rakṣanta (8.48.5c)
- **pres. med.** 2nd sing. rakṣasva (10.69.4d)

Both the active and middle forms of this verb are always transitive. The middle is in addition possessive-affective. Of the nine occurrences of rákṣatam seven occur at 1.185, in the repeated pāda 1.185.2-8d dyāvā rákṣatam prthivī no ābhvāt ‘Heaven and Earth, protect us from Nothingness’

**rad ‘dig up, scrape’**
- **pres. act.** 2nd sing. ráda (4), 3rd pl. radantu (7.62.3a)
- **-si impv.** rátsi (5.10.1d)

**ran ‘enjoy’**
- **pres. act. I** 2nd sing. rana (5)
- **pres. X act.** 2nd sing. rāṇaya (8.34.1b), 3rd pl. rāṇayantu (6.28.1b)
- **-iṣ- aor.** 2nd pl. rāṇiṣṭana (2.36.3b)
- **perf.** rārandhi (3)

Narten (1964: 217) classes the form rāṇiṣṭana with other -iṣ- aorists which developed from original root-aorists. She claims an ingressive meaning for the aorist, as opposed to the present rana, which she asserts is durative. This appears to

---

225 See also Gotô (1987: 257).
me to be a very far-reaching conclusion to base on just one attested example: 2.36.3ab ...ā hi gāntana, nī barhiṣi sadatanā rāniṣṭana ‘come here, sit on the altar-grass and enjoy yourselves’, especially as the present only occurs in a practically identical context; 5.51.8cd ā yāhy agne atrivāt sutē raṇa226 ‘drive here, Agni, and take pleasure in the pressed (Soma), like Atri.’. All other imperative forms of this verb are likewise intransitive, unless 10.59.5c rārandhī nah sūryasya samdīśi is to be understood transitively, as does Geldner ‘Laß uns des Anblicks der Sonne froh werden’. According to Jamison (1983: 75 and 143), raṇaya is a denominative from the noun raṇa ‘pleasure’.

For the form rārandhī see p. 25.

**randh** ‘cast down’ 227

*pres.act.* 2nd sing. randhi (4.22.9c)
*perf. act.* 2nd sing. rārandhī (6.25.9b)
*caus. act.* 2nd sing. randhaya (9)
*caus. med. 2nd sing.* randhāyasva (3.30.16d)

Insler (1972) suggests that the form randhi is not the original reading of the text, for which he posits *randha*, explaining it as a metrically-motivated abbreviation of randhaya, on the basis of a similar phrase at 7.30.2d. The advantage in suggesting the replacement of one nonce-form by an unattested nonce-form is unclear to me.228 For my suggestion that randhī was created by analogy to the form jōḍhi in the same way as yōḍhi see p. 27. The only other present-forms attested from this root are from the -āya- stem randhaya-. This last is transitive, as is the affective middle-voice form randhāyasva. The single perfect example is undifferentiated in meaning from the present.229

---

226 The expression sutē raṇa is repeated 5 times throughout the RV.

227 The 2nd pl. red. caus. aor. form rīradhatā, classified by Lubotsky as in imperative, is in fact an injunctive.

228 See also Narten (1964: 218) and Kümmel (2000: 416).

229 See also Kümmel (2000: 415f.).
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**rabh** ‘seize’

pres. med. 2nd sing. rabhəsva (3), 2nd pl. rabbhədhwam (2)

**ram** ‘stop’

pres. med. 2nd sing. raməsva (10.34.13b), 2nd pl. rámədhwam (3.33.5a)
caus. act. 2nd sing. raməya (5.52.13d)
caus II act. rámaya (10.42.1d)

The two causative forms, which both mean ‘to bring to a halt’ are explained by Jamison (1983: 103, 131f.). Cf. also Gotō (1987: 262ff.).

**rā1** ‘give, bestow’

pres. act. 2nd sing. rirhi (7)

pres. med. 2nd dual rərəthəm (1.117.23d), 2nd pl. rərədhvam (5.83.6a)
-si impv. rəsì (11)
aor. med. 2nd sing. rəsvə (21), 2nd dual rəsəthəm (1.46.6c), 3rd sing. rəsətəm (10.36.14d), 3rd pl. rəsəntəm (4)

All forms of this verb are middle-voice, except the impv. rirhi, and a number of forms which are either derived from, or implied by the active s-aor. subj. stem rəsə-, such as the -si impv. rəsì. The forms rəsətəm and rəsəntəm are also built on the subjunctive stem, and are the first signs of the development of the thematic stem rəsa-, which is more widely attested in later texts. There appears to be no difference whatsoever in meaning between the active and middle-voice forms, both occurring with the same valency (acc. + dat.) and the same type of direct and indirect objects. See also Narten (1964: 219ff.).

**rā2** ‘bellow’

pres. act. 2nd sing. rəya (7.55.3a)

**rikh** ‘scratch’

pres. act. 2nd sing. rikhə (2)

**ruc** ‘shine’

pres. med. 3rd sing. rocətəm (10.43.9c)
caus. act. 2nd sing. rocəya (2)
The middle-voice forms are intransitive, meaning ‘to shine’, only occurring once in the impv. at 10.43.9c ví rocātām aruśó bhānūnā śācīh ‘The bright red one will shine with light’. The causative is factitive-transitive ‘make shine’, as in 9.36.3ab só no jyōṭīṁsi pūrvya, pāvamāna ví roca ‘Make the lights shine for us, O First Pavamāna’.


ruj ‘smash’
pres. act. 2nd sing. ruja (9)

ruh ‘grow’
pres. act. 2nd sing. roha (4), 3rd sing. rohatu (2), 2nd pl. rohata (10.18.6a), 3rd pl. rohantu (2) a-aor. 2nd dual. ruhātam (8.22.9a) caus. act. 2nd sing. rohaya (8.91.5a)

Gotō (1987: 277ff.) splits this verb into two original roots, one meaning ‘grow’, from an original *h1leuyh, and one meaning ‘ascend’, from an original *reuyh/leuyh. For our purposes, Gotō classes the aorist impv. ruhātam and the causative rohaya ‘makes ascend’, as well any present forms that occur with an accusative of goal as belonging to ruh- ‘ascend’. Thus, while at 10.85.20c á roha sārye amūtasya lokāṁ ‘Ascend to the world of immortality, O Suryā’ has the second meaning, 3.8.11ab vānapaṣte śatāvalśo ví roha, sahāsravalśā ví vayāṁ ruhema ‘Grow with a hundred branches O Tree, with a thousand branches may we grow’, belongs to the first. This example also shows that the aorist forms can in fact also mean ‘grow’ despite what Gotō appears to say (op cit. fn 641). The aor. impv. ruhātam is unusual in meaning ‘ascend’ but being construed with a locative at 8.22.9ab á hi ruhātam aśvinā, rāthe... ‘O Aśvins, get into the chariot.230

rū ‘bellow’
pres. act. 2nd sing. ruva (1.10.4b)

230 See also Joachim (1978: 147f.).
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lī ‘cling, hide’

**pres. med.** 3rd pl. layantām
Occurs once at 10.84.7cd: bhīyaṁ dādhānā ḫḍayeṣu śātravah, pārājitāso ápa ní layantām, ‘the enemies, having fear in their hearts, defeated, shall hide away’. See also Gotō (1987: 279), Mayrhofer (1986, s. LAYI).

**vac** ‘speak’

**red. aor.** 2nd sing. voca (1.32.1e), vocatāt (5.61.18a), 3rd sing. vocatu (3.54.19b), 2nd dual vocatam (7.83.2d), 2nd pl. vocata (15)

[aor. inj. vocaḥ (9)]

vocatāt is the only example of the ending -tāt on an aorist stem. The form occurs once at 5.61.18ab: utā me vocatād īti, sutāsome ráthavītau, ‘And speak for me thus when Rathavīti has pressed the Soma’. vac has a suppletive relationship with brū (q.v.) the latter supplying the missing present stem.

vañc ‘move crookedly, gallop’

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. vacyasva (3), 3rd pl. vacyántām (3.6.2d)

**vat** ‘acquire (spiritually)’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. vātaya (2)

**vad** ‘say’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. vada (10), 2nd pl. vadata (3), 3rd pl. vadantu (10.94.1a)

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. vadasva (1.170.5c), 2nd pl. vadadhvam (10.191.2a)

The middle-voice forms of this verb are mostly attested in Books 1 and 10, although there is one occurrence of sāṁ vade at 7.86.2a. Gotō (1987: 282) says that the middle voice has a reciprocal meaning, strengthened by use of the preverb sāṁ, and this is well demonstrated by both of the impv. examples: 1.170.5c indra tvām marūdbhiḥ sāṁ vadasva- ‘Indra, you talk together with the Maruts’, and 10.191.2ab sāṁ gachadhvaṁ sāṁ vadadhvaṁ, sāṁ vo mānāmsi jānatām ‘come together, converse, may your minds be one’.

The active forms can take a direct object denoting what is said; e.g. 2.43.2de sarvāto nah śakune bhadrāṁ ā vada, viśvāto nah śakune pūnyam ā vada ‘From all sides
announce the blessing to us, O Bird, from every side announce the good (fortune?) to us, O Bird’.

**vadh** ‘strike, kill’

**is-aor.** 2nd dual vadhīṣṭam (4.41.4b)

Used once with the preverb nī, at 4.41.4ab asmīn, ...nī vadhīṣṭam vājram ... ‘strike your Vajra down on him’. This root has a suppletive relationship with han.

**van1** ‘win’

**pres VIII act.** 3rd pl. vanvāntu (2)

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. vanuṣya (1.169.1d)

**s-aor. med.** 2nd sing. vāṁsva (6)

**desid.** 2nd sing. vīvāsa (5), 2nd pl. vīvāsata (2)

The sparsely attested active impv. is transitive, meaning ‘defeat’: 7.21.9cd vanvāntu smā té ‘vasā samīkè, ‘bh/imacrongravetim aryó vanú/sunderdotā/munderdot śāvā/munderdotsi ‘May they with your help defeat in battle the attack of the foreigners, the power of the enemy.’

The single example of the middle-voice form vanu/sunderdotva means ‘win’, but is transitive rather than affective 1.169.1cd sā no vedho marútā/munderdot cikitv/amacronacuten, sumn/amacronacute vanu/sunderdotva táva hí pré/sunderdot/tunderdothā ‘O Master, knowing the Maruts, win for us their goodwill, for they are dearest to you.231’ The aorist form vā/munderdotsva means the same, as in 8.23.27ab vā/munderdotsvā no v/amacronacuteryā purú, vā/munderdotsva rāyā/hunderdot purusp/runderringacute ha/hunderdot ‘Win for us many choice things, win property desirable to many.’ This meaning, ‘win (for us)’, underlies even examples in which the indirect object is not explicitly mentioned: 7.17.5 vā/munderdotsva víśvā v/amacronacuteryā/nunderdoti praceta/hunderdot, saty/amacronacute bhavantv āśī/sunderdoto no adyā ‘win all the choice things, O perceptive one, may all our wishes come true today’. The second half of this verse makes it obvious that Agni is being asked to win the choice things for the worshippers, and not for himself. 232

---

231 Geldner’s translation “Du, Meister der Marut” is impossible, owing to the fact that marútām is accented.

232 For the differentiation of the two roots van and van† see Gotō (1987: 283ff.) For the form vanṣi, which isn’t an imperative, see p. 54. For vīvāsa and other desiderative imperatives, see p. 34.
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van₂ (van₁) ‘love, wish’

-sk- pres. 3rd pl. vañchantu (10.173.1c)
pres./a-aor. 2nd dual vánatam (3), 2nd pl. vanata (8.7.9c)
pres./ a-aor med. 3rd sing. vanatām (1.162.22d)
perf. vāvandhi

The attestation of the form vañchantu at 10.173.1cd is the only time this stem occurs in the RV: víśas tvā sārvā vāñchantu, mā tvād rāștrām ādhi bhraśat ‘May all the tribes want you, may your realm not fall away from you.’

The form vánatam, which could either be a thematic present or aorist, always occurs in the formula ‘X (voc.) vānatam gīra’, ‘want (i.e. gladly accept) our songs’, while the plural vanata occurs in a similar expression, but whose direct object is hāvam ‘call’ (8.7.9c).

The single attestation of the form vāvandhi, which appears to mean exactly the same as the others forms, occurs at 5.31.13cd vāvandhi yājyū/ r ṛtā té/ yē/s yē/s utā téṣu dhehy, ójo jāneṣu yēṣu te syāma ‘Accept those willing to worship, and place strength in them, in those people among whom we wish to be’. For the classification of this form under the root van₁ see Kümmel (2000: 447ff.), and for the full grade in the root see p. 25.

vand ‘pray, praise’
pres. med. 2nd sing. vándasva (6)

vap ‘strew’
pres. act. 2nd sing. vapa (8.96.9d), 2nd pl. vapata (10.101.3b), 3rd pl. vapantu (2.33.11d)

varivasy- ‘make wide space’
pres. act. 2nd sing. varivasyā (2), varivasyantu (4)

vaś ‘wish’
pres. act. 3rd sing. vaṣṭu (1.3.10c)

vas₁ ‘shine, illuminate’
-sk- pres. act. 2nd sing. uchā (14), 3rd sing. uchatu (3), 2nd pl. uchatu (10.35.5c), 3rd pl. uchantu (3)
caus. act. 2nd sing. vāsaya (2)
The present is usually addressed to Uṣas, whose name, of course, is derived from the same root. It is usually intransitive, meaning ‘shine’, often, as here, with the preverb ví, which emphasises the scattered nature of sunrays: 1.113.12d ihádyóśaḥ śréśṭatamā vy īcha ‘shine here today, being the most beautiful Uṣas’. The verb may occasionally take an accusative of goal, as in 7.77.4a ántivāmā dārē amitrām ucha- ‘You who are noble from nearby, illuminate the enemy, (when he is) far away’ i.e. prevent him from hiding. Structurally, amitrām in this example is syntactically identical to ihá in the previous one.

More intriguing, perhaps, are examples where ucha occurs with revát ‘containing riches’, as in 1.92.14c revád asmē vy īcha sūṃtāvati. While this could be adverbial, as suggested e.g. by Grassmann, (ad loc.), I believe it is far more likely that it means ‘riches’ in exactly the same way that gómant and áśvavant (both of which adjectives are attributed to Uṣas in 1.92.14ab) mean cow- and horse-prosperity respectively at e.g. 9.105.4a gómam na indo áśvavat ... dhanva ‘O drop, flow to cow and horse prosperity’. Thus 1.92.14c means ‘shine on riches for us...’

The causative occurs twice, both times at 1.134.3fg: prá cakṣaya ródasī vāsayaśaḥ, śråvase vāsayaśaḥ ‘Reveal the two worlds, let the dawns shine, so you may have glory; let the worlds shine’. See also under caks.

vas 2 ‘wear, clothe’
is-aor. 2nd sing. vāśiśva (2)
caus. act. 2nd sing. vāsaya (2)

Narten (1964: 238f.) raises the possibility that the form vāśiśva may be an innovation based on the root present vaste. However, she decides against this and classifies this form as an iṣ-aorist, both on formal and semantic grounds.

vah ‘drive, carry’
pres. act. 2nd sing. vāha (71), vahatāt (10.24.5d), 3rd sing. vahatu (2), 2nd dual vāhatam (15), 3rd dual vāhatām (4), 2nd pl. vahata (4), 3rd pl. vāhantu (39)
pres. med. 2nd sing. vāhasva (2), 2nd dual vahethām (7.71.3d)
root aor. 2nd dual vōlhum (5), 3rd dual vōlhām (2)
-si impv. vakṣi (24)
All of the active forms are transitive, and seemingly undifferentiated from each other in meaning. The basic meaning is ‘to convey’, most commonly in expressions meaning ‘bring the gods here’, usually addressed to Agni, as in 1.12.3a ágne deváh ihá vaha ‘Agni, convey the gods here’. Another common usage with basically the same meaning is that of horses conveying a god, or pulling a chariot, as in 5.62.4a á vām aśvāsah swayájo vahantu ‘Let the well-harnessed horse bring you (two)’. It may also mean ‘to bring’, as yet another synonym for ‘bring property to us’, as in 1.34.5a trír no rayáṃ vahatam aśvinā yuváṃ ‘Three times convey property to us, O Aśvins.’

The rare middle voice forms are also transitive, and additionally has affective-possessive force. The form váhasva only occurs at 8.26.23: vágyo váhi śivá233 dívá, váhasvā sú svásvyam / váhasva maháḥ prthupákṣasā ráthe ‘Come, O Accommodating Váyu, from heaven. Bring with you the good horse-riches, drive from the great (heaven) your broad-flanked (or winged?) pair (of horses) on the chariot.’ See also Gotó (1987: 295ff.).

The forms volhám and volhám are tentatively consigned by LIV to the root-present, apparently on the grounds that since this root was originally intransitive234, then it can’t have had an original root aorist. In any case, these forms are synchronically undifferentiated in meaning from the thematic present, e.g.: 2.41.9a tá na á volham aśvinā, rayáṃ písáṅgasamárdśam ‘Bring us property of a reddish (gold) appearance, O Aśvins’.

vā₁ ‘blow’

pres. act. 2nd sing. váhi (2), 3rd sing. vátu (7)
The two occurrences of the form váhi both occur at 10.137.3ab: á váta vāhi bheṣaṇáṃ, vi váta vāhi yád rápaḥ ‘O wind, blow medicine here, blow away (that which is) sickness’.

vā₂ ‘extinguish’

caus. act. vápayā (10.16.13b)
Lubotsky (19971: ad loc.) classifies this form as a possible 1st sing. subj., as opposed to Jamison (1983: 145) and Geldner who translate it as an imperative:

---

233 = šiva á.

234 LIV2: s. *yeŋh₂, fn. 1.
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10.16.13ab yāṃ tvām agne samādahās, tām u nīr vāpayā pānah ‘O Agni, the one whom you burnt, extinguish him again’.

vājay- ‘incite’
pres. act. 2nd sing. vājāya (10.68.2d)

vid1 ‘find’
pres. act. 2nd sing. vinda (2)
a-aor 2nd sing. vidá (10.113.10d)
[aor. inj. vida (4)]
For the question as to whether the injunctive vidas can also have modal value, see page 41, and also Hoffmann (1967: 263). The form vidá is attested at 10.113.10d vidó /sunderdotú /nunderdota urviy/amacronacute gādhám adyá ‘Find us a ford today’. The form vidó in this example is without doubt *vidá u, and must be distinguished from examples of vidas which become vidó by sandhi, e.g. 5.30.4d vidó gāvām ārvām usṛyānām ‘you found the pit of the reddish cows’.

vid2 ‘know’
perf. act. 2nd sing. viddhí (8), vitāt (5.60.6d), 2nd dual vittám (2)
Kümmel (2000: 495ff.) assigns no special perfect meaning to the modal forms, but rather considers them undifferentiated from a present stem meaning ‘to know’.

viś ‘enter, settle (down)’
pres. act. 2nd sing. viśa (18), 3rd pl. viśantu (7)
pres. med. 2nd sing. viśasva (10.56.1b), 3rd pl. viśatām (10.34.14c)
pres. caus 2nd sing. veśaya (1.176.2a)
A verb of motion, the well-attested present occurs with either an acc. or a loc., meaning ‘to enter’. The usual addressee is Soma, and thus the singular occurs 14 times out of 18 in Book 9. Thus, e.g. 9.25.2c dhármanā vāyām ā viśa ‘go, according to your nature, into Vāyu’, and 9.97.36c īndram ā viśa bhātā rāvēṇa ‘go into Indra with a great roar.’
The middle-voice forms, both impv. and non-impv., are uniformly late, the earliest occurrence being in Book 8. The impv. only occurs twice, and its meaning differs according to the preverb used: 10.56.1b tṛṭīyena jyōtiṣā sāṃ viśasva ‘unite with the
third light’, and 10.34.14c ní vo nú manyár viṣatām ārātir ‘may your wrath abate, (and) your disfavour’.

viṣ ‘be active’

pres. act. 2nd sing. vividhī (2)
See Narten (1964: 244ff.), Joachim (1978: 156), Mayrhofer (1986 s. Veṣ) for the differentiation of this root from another viṣ meaning “flow”.

vī ‘seek, pursue’

pres. act. 2nd sing. viḥī (11), vihī (3), viḥāt (10.11.8d), 3rd sing. vētu (7), 2nd dual viḥām (6), 2nd pl. viṭā (7.59.6a), 3rd pl. vyāntu (7)
-si impv. vēṣ (5)
For the possible existence of a form viṭā, see p. 93. The length variation in the root, seen in viḥī and vihī could be due to analogy with the doublets dīdīhī/didihī and pipiḥī/pipiḥī. Thus the form viṭā, if in fact Narten identified it correctly, is formed by analogy to the form viḥī. The -si impv. vēṣ is actually the 2nd pers. sing. pres. form of this verb. However it undoubtedy is used as an impv. See p. 55.

vīḍ ‘strengthen, become firm’

med. pres. viḍāyasva (2.37.3b)

vīray- ‘act like a hero’

pres. med. 2nd pl. vīrayadhvam (2)

vṛfi ‘cover’

pres. act. 2nd sing. āṛṇu (9.96.11c), āṛṇuhī (4), 2nd pl. āṛṇuta (2.14.3d)
pres. med. 2nd sing. āṛṇusva (10.16.7b)
aor. act. 2nd sing. vṛdhī (8), 2nd dual vartam (6.62.11d)
The active is transitive, mostly occurring with the preverb ápa, meaning ‘open’. From the single occurrence of the middle voice, it is clear that it is reflexive: 10.16.7b sām prōrnusva pīvasā mēdāsa ca ‘cover yourself with fat and melted butter’. According to LIV, this verb is a conglomerate of (at least) three PIE verbs: *uvel ‘einschließen, verhüllen’, *yer ‘aufhalten, abwehren’ and *Hyer, ‘stecken’, the latter to explain such forms as the aor. āvar, and compounds such as pārī-vṛṭa (op.
The long ā in the pres. stem does not, according to LIV, indicate an original laryngeal (**ylH-nēu, as suggested by Rasmussen [1983: 22]) but rather a variant *ulnéu with different syllabification. (op. cit.: fn.4.). Lubotsky (20001) dispenses with the multiple roots, making do with a single anī, laryngeal-initial root *Hār, and explains the stem ārnu- as having been formed by laryngeal metathesis. For extensive further bibliography see Mayrhofer (1986: s. VAR2).

**vṛ** ‘wish, choose’

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. vṛṇīvā (2), vṛṇādhvām (5.28.6c)

This is a set root with some aṇī forms apparently by analogy to the root vṛ ‘to cover’. See Hoffmann (1968), Lubotsky (20001).

**vṛj** ‘twist’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. vṛṇḍhi (2), 3rd sing. vṛṇaktu (4), 2nd pl. vṛṇkta (1.172.3b)

**vṛt** ‘turn’

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. vartasva (10.95.17d), 3rd sing. vartatām (4), 2nd pl. vartadhvam (10.19.1a), 3rd pl. vartantām (2)

**root aor.** 2nd pl. vartta (1.165.14c)

**perf. act.** 2nd pl. vavṛtytana (5.61.16c)

**perf. med.** 2nd sing. vavṛtytva (9), 2nd pl. vavṛtydhvam (8.20.18d)

**caus. act.** 2nd sing. vartāya (11), 2nd dual. vartāyatam (2), 2nd pl. vartāyata (2.34.9c), 3rd pl. vartāyantu (2)

While the present stem of this verb is always middle-voice, and intransitive, meaning ‘turn round’, or ‘return’, the aorist and perfect stems may also be active. The active forms are also intransitive, hardly differing in meaning from the middle-voice presents: 1.165.14c ó sū vartta maruto vīpram ācha ‘please turn to the seer, O Maruts’. An exception is the active perfect with the preverb /a/ , which is transitive, as in 5.61.16 tē no vāsūni kāmyā, ... /a/ yajjīyāso vavṛtytana ‘Turn desirable goods to us (in our direction), O sacrifice-worthy ones’. 235

The causative forms, obviously, are always transitive, as in 2.23.7c bhṛṣpate āpa tām vartāyā pathāh ‘Brhaspati, turn (divert) him (the wolf) from the path’.

---

235 See also Kümmel (2000: 465).
The stem *vavṛ-* has been variously described in the past as a perfect, a reduplicated present (e.g. by Whitney [1924: §643c and 1885: 164]), and an aorist (Hoffmann [1976]). In any case the modal forms of this stem must be perfects. This is confirmed by the optative form *vavṛtyāt*. The ending -yāt in the RV is attested only on present and perfect stems, while the aorists have the ending -yās. The main obstacle to classifying all of the forms as perfects is the presence of the medio-passive aorist forms *avavṛtī* and *avavṛtran*. These must, however, be artificial forms, since the medio-passive is formed from the root and not from the aorist stem.

**vṛdh** ‘grow’


**them. perf.** 2nd sing. *vāvṛṛhāsva* (4)

**caus. act.** 2nd sing. *vardhāya* (13), 2nd dual *vardhāyatam* (2), 3rd pl. *vardhayantu* (2.11.11c)

**caus. med.** 2nd sing. *vardhayāsva* (10.59.5d)

The caus. and pres. act. are both transitive, meaning ‘increase’ or ‘magnify’, and are apparently undifferentiated in meaning, sometimes occurring in identical contexts, as in 9.61.23c *punānō vardha no giraḥ* ‘as you are purified, enhance our songs’, and 3.29.10d *-āhā no vardhayā giraḥ* ‘then magnify our songs’.

The middle-voice forms are either intransitive, meaning ‘grow’, as in 8.13.25ab *vārdhasvā sā puruṣatūta, īśiṣṭatābhīr ūṭībhīḥ* ‘grow, O much-praised one, with aid praised by seers’, or transitive-affective, as 7.8.5d *svayām vardhaśasva tanvām sujāta* ‘enhance your own body, O well-born’. The single example of the middle-voice causative falls into this latter category: 10.59.5d *ghṛtēna tvām tanvām vardhayasva* ‘enhance your (own) body with fat’.

---

236 See also footnote 15.

237 For a very comprehensive study of all of these forms see Kümmel (2000: 462ff.). For the medio-passive forms, see also Kümmel (1996: 107f.).

The thematic perfect form, in which the voiced, aspirated final consonant of the root is preserved, is explained by Kümmel (2000: 471) as being used because the regular athematic form would have been *vāvṛtsva, which could have been confused with forms from the verb vṛt.

**vrśc** ‘cut up’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. vrścā (9)

**perf (?. act.** 2nd dual vavrktam (6.62.10d)

Classification of the form vavrktam under this verb following Kümmel (2000: 509).

**vrṣṭ** ‘take courage’

**a-aor. med.** 2nd sing. vrṣasva (10), 2nd dual vrṣethām (2)

**them. perf.** 2nd sing. vavrṣasva (8.61.7c)


**vrṣṭ** ‘rain’

**pres. caus.** 2nd sing. vrṣāya (10.98.1d), 2nd dual varṣayatam (5.63.6d)

**vrh** ‘tear out’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. vrhā (5), vrhatāt (1.174.5c), 2nd dual vrhatam (6.74.2a), 2nd pl. vrhata (8.67.21c)

**vyath** ‘waver’

**caus. act.** 2nd sing. vyathaya (6.25.2b)

**vyadh** ‘pierce’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. vidhya (9), 2nd dual vidhyatam (2), 3rd dual vidhyatām (6.75.4c), 2nd pl. vidhyata (1.86.9c)

**vyā** ‘enfold, swathe’

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. vyayasva (2)
śaṃsa 'proclaim, recite'
  pres. act. 2nd sing. śaṃs (6), 2nd pl. śaṃsata (5)
  pres. caus. śaṃsaya (7)
The causative occurs only in the repeated pāda ā tā na indra śaṃsaya gōśv āśveṣu
‘O Indra, give us hope for cows and horses’, which occurs seven times at 1.29.1-7c239.

śak ‘be powerful, be able’
  aor. act. 2nd sing. śaṅdhi (15), 2nd dual śaṅt (4)
  desid. act. 2nd sing. śakṣa (26), 3rd sing. śaṅsatu (1.81.6c), 2nd dual śaṅsatam (6)
For an example of the form śaṅdhi see under pṛ, page 138.
For an account of the desiderative forms, see page 34.

śardha 'challenge, defy'
  pres. act. 2nd sing. śaṅdha (5.28.3a)

śas 'kill, slaughter'
  pres. act. 2nd pl. śaṣta (2)

śā ‘sharpen’
  pres. act. 2nd sing. śiśihi (12), śiśādhi (4), 3rd sing. śiśātu (1.111.5a), 2nd dual
śiśātām (1.122.3a), 3rd dual śiśātām (10.12.4d), 2nd pl. śiśāta (2)
The form śiśādhi has anomalous full-grade in the root. This form occurs four times,
at 6.15.19d, 7.104.19b, 8.42.3b, and 10.84.4b. It always occurs in the syntagma sām
śiśādhi at the end of the second pāda of a triṣṭubh line, an environment in which
the form śiśihi does not occur. This suggests a formulaic or phraseological reason for
the preservation/coinage of this form; conceivably could have been modeled on the
form (ā) śaśādhi (from śās, q.v.), which is morphologically regular, metrically
identical, occurs only in the same position in triṣṭubh lines, and also isn’t too far
away in meaning. For the structure of the root see Rasmussen (1989: 53), and LIV s.
*keḥ3(j).

239 For the meaning see Jamison (1983: 134).
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śās ‘command’
pres. act. 2nd sing. śādhi (2.28.9d), 2nd pl. śāstāna (10.52.1a)
perf. 2nd sing. śaśādhi (2)

śuc ‘burn, shine’
pres. act. 2nd sing. śōca (6), 3rd sing. śocatu (6.52.2d)
pres. med. 2nd sing. śócasva (2)
perf. act. 2nd sing. śuśugdhí (1.97.1b)
caus. act. 2nd sing. śocaya (6.22.8d)
The valency of this verb is extremely similar to that of vas (q.v.). The active forms are intransitive, but may sometimes take an accusative of goal, meaning “shine on something”. It even occurs once with revāt (10.69.3c) in the same way as vas does, again leaving open the question whether revāt is adverbial or nominal.
The causative only occurs once in the RV, at 6.22.8d: brahmadvīṣe śocaya kṣām apās ca ‘for the hater of Brahma make the earth and waters burn’.
The form śuśugdhí appears once in the RV, at 1.97.1, together with two attestations of the part. of the int., and is undoubtedly used to achieve a poetical effect rather than for any perfect meaning: ápa naḥ śōśucad aghām, ágne śuśugdhy á rayím / ápa naḥ śōśucad aghām.

śudh ‘cleanse’
caus. act. 3rd pl. śundhayantu (10.17.10a)

śubh ‘be beautiful, shine’
pres. act. 2nd sing. śumbha (8.70.2a), śumbhata (1.21.2b)

śus ‘dry out’
pres. act. 3rd sing. śusyatu (7.104.11c)

śṛ ‘smash’
pres. act. śṛṇihi (8), śṛṇītam (7.104.1c), śṛṇantu (10.87.15a)
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śnath ‘push, pierce’
root aor. 2nd sing. śnathihi (2)
is-aor. 2nd pl. śnathiṣṭana (9.101.1c)
For the mechanism which led to the formation of productive -iṣ- aor. forms from old set root aorists see Narten (1964: 53).

śrath ‘become loose’
pres. act. 2nd sing. śrathāya (2)
red. aor. 3rd pl. śiśrathantu (7.93.7d)

śrī ‘lean, incline, turn’
pres. med 2nd sing. śrayasva (2), 3rd dual. śrayetām (7.2.6d)240, 2nd pl. śrayadhvam (2), 3rd pl. śráyantām (6)

śrī ‘perfect, make shine’
pres. act. 2ng. sing. śrī/nunderdotihi (8.2.11b), 2nd pl. śrī/nunderdoti (9.46.4c), śrī/nunderdotana (9.11.6c)
For the meaning see Narten (1987).

śru ‘hear’
pres. act. 2nd sing. śṛṇu (4), śṛṇuhī (7), śṛṇudhī (5), 3rd sing. śṛṇōtu (25), 2nd dual śṛṇutām (22), 2nd pl. śṛṇutā (5), śṛṇota (1), śṛṇotana (2), 3rd pl. śṛṇvāntu (12) pres. med. 2nd sing. śṛṇusvā (1.131.7c)
aor. 2nd sing. śṛudhi (39), 3rd sing. śṛōtu (2), 2nd dual śṛutām (40), 2nd pl. śṛuta (3), śṛōta (4), 3rd pl. śṛuvantu (2)
-si impv. śrōṣi (6.4.7b)
caus. act. 2nd sing. śrāvāya (3), 2nd dual śravayatam (7.62.5c)
An extremely common verb which has been extensively discussed elsewhere. For the aor. form śrudhī, the formula śrudhī hávam and the form śṛṇudhī see p. 23 and p.82. For the full- and zero-grade variants śṛṇutā, śṛṇota and śṛṇotana see p.31. For the -si impv. form śrōṣi see p. 56.

240 The form śrayethē is wrongly classified by Lubotsky (1997) as an imperative.
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śruṣ ‘obey’

**pres. act.** 3rd sing. śroṣantu (1.86.5a)

This is a secondary root from śru. See p. 56, LIV s. kleśus and further bibliography in Mayrhofer (1986: s. ŚROṢ).

śvaṅc ‘bow’

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. śvaṅcasva (2)

The uniformly late present stem only appears with the preverb ud, meaning ‘rear up’.\(^{241}\)

śvas ‘snort, rumble’

**caus. act.** 2nd sing. śvāsaya (6.47.29a)

sac ‘follow’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. sacata (10.75.5b)

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. sācasva (3), 3rd sing. sacatām (1.183.2c), 3rd dual sacetām (1.185.9b), 3rd pl. sacantām (7)

**pres. III. act.** 3rd sing. sīdatām (2), 2nd pl. sīdatām (5), 3rd dual sīdatām (2), 2nd pl. sīdatām (11), 3rd pl. sīdayantu (1)

The hapax legomenon sacata (10.75.5) is the only attested active form of this stem. Gotō (1987: 319) calls it “ganz abnorm”, and Lubotsky (1997 1: ad loc.) classifies it as a nonce form. Despite the reduplicated stem often being active, while the thematic stem saca- is always middle-voice (apart from the single example above), Gotō (1987: 319f.) correctly finds no difference in meaning between them, while suggesting that the reduplicated stem may originally have been iterative.\(^{242}\)

sad ‘sit’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. sīda (16), 3rd sing. sīdatu (2), 2nd dual sīdatam (5), 3rd dual sīdatām (2), 2nd pl. sīdata (11), 3rd pl. sīdentu (1)

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. sīdasva (1.36.9a)

---

\(^{241}\) For the semantics of this verb see Hoffmann (1960). See also under nam, p. 128.

\(^{242}\) See also Joachim (1978: 163f.). For the form sākva (1.42.1c), which could belong here, see under sah.
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**a-aor.** 2nd sing. sāda (5), 3rd sing. sadatu (7.97.4a), 2nd dual sādatam (4), 3rd dual sadatām (4), 2nd pl. sādata (3), sadatana (2.36.3b), 3rd pl. sadantu (7)

-si impv. sātsi (12)

**caus. act.** 2nd sing. sādāya (6), 2nd pl. sādāyata (10.30.14b)

**caus. med.** 2nd pl. sādayadhvam (5.43.12b)

[aor. inj. sadaḥ (6)]

An intransitive verb, most of whose forms are active. It behaves, when used with the preverb ā, rather like a verb of motion, in that the seat (etc.) that is to be sat on is in the accusative: 3.53.3c ēdām barhīr yājamānasya sīda- ‘sit on this altar-grass of the sacrificer’. The other most common preverb with which this verb is used is nī, in which case it means ‘sit down’: 7.11.1d ny āgne hōtā prathamāh sadehā ‘O Agni, sit down here as the first hōr’. The middle voice impv. only occurs once, and, once again like verbs of motion, is reciprocal, meaning ‘sit together’, and is strengthened by the preverb sām (cf. sām gachasva etc.): 1.36.9ab sām sīdasva mahāh asi, śōcasva devavītanah ‘Sit together (with us), you are great, burn brightly . . .’. For the causative forms see Jamison (1983: 169f.).

The lack of retroflexion in the present stem sīda- (> *si-sde-*) is explained by Klingenschmitt (1982: 129) as being due to dissimilation of the internal -s- of the root from the s- of the reduplicating syllable. This is the opposite phenomenon to the assimilation of the root-initial s- with the -d-, as seen in e.g. the word nīḍā- < *ni-sdō-. The long -ī- is the result of compensatory lengthening, as in other cases of consonant loss by dissimilation. For further literature on this problem see Mayrhofer (1986: s. SAD).

**san** ‘attain’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. sanuhi (8.81.8c), 3rd sing. sanotu (6.54.5c), 3rd pl. sanvantu (2)

**a-aor.** 2nd sing. sāna (5.75.2b)

**saparya-** ‘worship’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. saparya (10.98.4d), 2nd pl. saparyata (7)

sas ‘sleep’

**pres. act.** 3rd sing. sástu (5), 3rd dual sastān (1.29.3b), 3rd pl. sasántu (4)

All five occurrences of the form sástu occur at 7.55.5, as does one instance of sasántu: sástu mātā sástu pitā, sástu svā sástu viśpātiḥ / sasántu sārve jñātāyaḥ, sástv ayāṁ abhīto jānaḥ ‘Let mother sleep, let father sleep, let the dog sleep, let the chieftain sleep, let all the relatives sleep, the these people hereabout sleep’.

sah ‘conquer’

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. sāhasva (4), 2nd pl. sahadhvam (10.103.2c)

**-si impv.** sakṣi (5.33.2d)

**s-aor. med.** sākṣya (1.42.1c), sākṣya (3.37.7c)

The form sākṣya only occurs at RV 1.42.1c: sākṣyā deva prá̄ pas purāḥ. This form has been assigned both to sah and sac. The latter option is to be found in Grassmann, Geldner (“Geh uns als Geleitsmann voran, o Gott!”) and Macdonell (1916: 426). The former viewpoint is represented by Narten (1964: 265), who also quotes Böhtlingk-Roth (1855-1875), Whitney (1885), and Ludwig (1876-1888), where it is translated as (in his spelling) “sige, gott, vor uns einher”.

Morphologically, both possibilities seem impeccable, as both verbs have identical sigmatic aorist forms sākṣat. The root sah also has a form sākṣya, with the same lengthening seen in some of its other sigmatic aorist forms, such as āsākṣi, etc. This form, however, could also be classified as a perfect (< *se-sgh₂-*), and the other lengthened sigmatic aorist forms, which are all late, derived from it by analogy.²⁴⁴

In favour of the sah derivation is that there is no other attestation of sac with the preverb prá. However, the semantics could be more compatible with sac, as the hymn is addressed to the god Pūṣan, who looks after travellers on the roads, and thus the meaning ‘accompany us (or possibly ‘lead us’) ahead, O god’ works very well.

If we accept the sah derivation, then purāḥ would have to be understood as a postposition, and the line would mean ‘conquer forth, O God, in front of us’.

---

²⁴⁴ See also p. 30.
sā ‘bind’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. sya (5), 3rd sing. syatu (2), 2nd dual syatam (2), 3rd dual syatām (2.40.4d)

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. syasva (3), 2nd pl. syadhvam (10.30.11c)

**root aor.** 2nd sing. sāhi (4.11.2a), 2nd dual sitam (8.5.9c)

The present stem is thematic: *šh₂-jé-. All impv. forms of this verb appear either with the preverb áva or ví, both combinations having the meaning ‘untie’, ‘release’, as seen clearly in 6.40.1b -áva sya hárī ví mucā sákhāyā ‘unhitch the horses, release the two friends’

245 The uncommon middle-voice forms appear to have exactly the same meaning: 3.4.9ab tán nas turīpam ādha poṣayitnā, déva tva/sunderdot/tunderdotar ví rarā/nunderdotá/hunderdot syasva ‘And, O god Tva/sunderdot/tunderdot/runderring, giving, release our property-bringing seed’

sādh ‘bring to one’s goal, succeed’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. sādha (8)

**pres. med.** 3rd pl. sādhatām (6.53.4c)

**caus. act.** 2nd sing. sādhāya (4), 2nd dual sādhāyatam (7.66.3c)

Of the eight examples of the active form sādha, seven occur in the repeated verse īlām aṣṇe purudāṃsah sanīṃ, gōh saśvattamāṃ hāvamāṇāya sādha246 ‘Make refreshment, the many-wondered, recurring, attainment of a cow possible for the caller’. The middle voice means ‘to succeed’, as in 6.53.4c sādhatām ugra no dhīyāh ‘may our thoughts come to fruition’. The causative has a similar meaning to that of the active: 1.94.4c jīv/ātave pratarām sādhayā dhīyāh ‘make our thoughts come to fruition, that we live longer’. As can be seen from this example, there is a true causative/intransitive relationship between the active and middle-voice forms.

246 Unlike Geldner: “Halte die Falben an, spanne die beiden Kameraden aus’.

247 Or, as Klein (1985: 2-99): ‘And, giving us that property-giving seed, release us’.

248 See also Jamison (1983: 159).

247 3.1.23ab, 3.5-7.11ab, 3.15.7ab, 3.22-23.5ab.
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**sic** ‘pour’


**pres. med.** 2nd sing. *siṅcasva* (3.47.1c), 2nd pl. *siṅcádhvam* (7.16.11c)

The active is transitive, while the middle-voice is poorly attested, but is probably possessive-affective, as in 3.47.1c ā *siṅcasva jathāre mādhva ūrmim* ‘Pour the wave (drink) into (your own) stomach’.

**sidh** ‘drive away’


**sīv** ‘sew’

**pres. act.** 3rd sing. *sīvyatu* (2.32.4c)

**pres. med.** 2nd pl. *sīvyadhvam* (10.101.8b)

**su** ‘press’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *sunú* (1.28.6d), 3rd sing. *sunotu* (8.33.12a), 2nd pl. *sunóta* (4), *sunótana* (5.34.1c), *sunutá* (3)

**pres. med.** 2nd pl. *sunudhvam* (4.35.4c)

**root aor.** 3rd sing. *sótu* (10.76.6a), 2nd dual *sutám* (2), 2nd pl. *sóta* (3), *sotana* (8.4.13b)

The single attestation of the middle-voice of this verb is obviously affective: 4.35.4cd áthā *sunudhvam sávanam mādāya, pātá rūnderring bhavo mādhuna hunderringbhus somyásya* ‘Press (for yourselves) the pressing for exhilaration, drink, O Rūnderringbhus, (of) the sweet Soma.’

**sū** ‘impel’


[aor. inj. *sāvih* (3)]
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sūd ‘prepare’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. sūdaya (2), 3rd pl. sūdayantu (2)

Mayrhofer (1986: s. SŪD and SVAD) and Gotō (1987: 342f. and 1988: 310) cast doubt on the traditional derivation of these forms from the root svad ‘sweeten’ (as appears e.g. in Jamison [1983:99]) both on semantic and morphological grounds. LIV² (s. *syeh₂d), however, reunites them, reconstructing sūdaya- as *suh₂d-ej and s(u)vada- as a relic of an old nasal present *suḥ₂nd. Further bibliography may be found at all of the above quoted references.

st ‘run’

**them. aor.** 2nd sing. sāra (9.41.6c)

stj ‘release’

**pres act.** 2nd sing. srjá (27), 2nd dual srjātām (3), 2nd pl. srjāta (4), 3rd pl. srjantu (3)

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. srjasva (2), 2nd, pl. srjādhvam (6.48.11c)

srt ‘creep’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. sarpa (10.18.10a), sarpatu (8.17.7c), sarpata (10.14.9a)

A verb of uniformly late distribution, the earliest example of any form occurring in Book 8.

skambh ‘fasten, strengthen’

**pres. act.** 2nd pl. skabhāyāta (10.76.4b)

For bibliography covering the forms in -āya- see under grh.

stan ‘thunder’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. stanāya (5.83.7a)

**root aor.** stanihi (6.47.30b)

[**red. aor. inj.** tatanah (1.38.14b)]

For the form of the root aor. from set roots see p. 94. For the etymology and meaning of the root, see Narten (1993). For the sole example of the form stanihi see p. 139. For the identification of the form tatanah as a reduplicated aor. see Hoffmann (1976²). For the sole attestation of this form see p. 148.
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**stu** ‘praise’
- **pres. act.** 2nd sing. *stuhí* (20), 2nd dual *stutam* (8.35.11a), 2nd pl. *stota* (2)
- **si-impv stoshi** (10.22.4d)

**stuh** ‘rejoice’
- **pres. act.** 2nd pl. *stobhata* (1.80.9b), *stobhantu* (8.92.19b)

**stř** ‘strew’
- **pres. act.** 2nd dual *strñītam* (8.73.3a), *strñīta* (3)
- **pres. med.** 3rd sing. *strñītām* (7.17.1b)
The single example of the middle voice is passive, or ‘fientive’: 7.17.1ab *āgne bhāva suṣamidhā sāmiddha, utā barhīr urviyā ví strñītām* ‘O Agni, may you be lit with good kindling, and may the altar-grass be spread widely’

**sthā** ‘stand’
- **pres. med.** 2nd pl. *tiṣṭhadhvam* (7.104.18a), 3rd pl. *tiṣṭhantām* (3.18.2d)
- **[aor. inj. sthāḥ (6.24.9c)]**
The active forms of this verb are intransitive. With the preverb *ā* it takes an accusative of goal and means ‘to get into (a chariot)’, as in 3.44.1d *ā tiṣṭha hāritaṁ rātham* ‘get into the gold-coloured chariot’. The middle voice only occurs with *vī*, and is reflexive and reciprocal, meaning ‘to spread apart’ 3.18.2d *vī te tiṣṭhantām ajārā ayāsah* ‘your (flames) will spread apart, ageless and restless’.

**spaś** see *paś*

**spr** ‘win’
- **pres. act.** 2nd sing. *sprṇahi* (10.87.7a)
- **root aor.** 2nd sing. *sprdhi* (2), *sprtam* (10.39.6d)

It is suggested by Wackernagel (1942: 176) that this is actually two roots with identical morphology, one meaning ‘win’, the other meaning ‘release’. The formal difference, as shown by Joachim (1978: 172f.) is in the valency; the former takes an accusative object, while the latter takes an ablative. Thus to the latter root belongs
e.g. 10.87.7ab utālabdhām sprṣuḥi jātaveda, ālebhānād ṛṣṭibhir yātudhānāt ‘Free the seized one from the magician who has seized him with your spears, O Jātavedas.’, while to the former belongs 5.3.9a āva sprdhi pitāram yōdhi ... ‘Protect the father, fight (for him)’.

sprṣ ‘touch’

pres. act. 2nd sing. sprṣa (5), 2nd pl. sprṣata (10.70.5a)
caus. med. 2nd sing. sparśayasva (10.112.3b)
The middle voice causative is passive, meaning ‘let (it) be touched’: 10.112.3ab hāritvatā vārcasā sūryasya, śrēṣṭhaī rūpāis tanvāms sparśayasva ‘Let your body be touched by the gold-coloured shine of the sun, by the most beautiful forms(?).’

sphṛ ‘kick away’

pres. act. 2nd sing. sphura (4.3.14c)

smṛ ‘remember’

pres. med. 2nd dual smarethām (7.104.7a)

syand ‘move quickly’

pres. med. 2nd sing. syandasva (9.67.28a), 3rd pl. syándantām (5.83.8b)

sru ‘flow’

pres. act. 2nd sing. srava (34), sravantu (10.9.4c)

svaj ‘embrace’

pres. act. 2nd pl. svajadhvam (10.101.10c)

svad ‘make tasty/be tasty’

pres. act. 2nd sing. svada (3.14.7d), 3rd pl. svádantu (10.110.10d)
pres. med. 2nd sing. svádasva (3)
pres. caus. 2nd sing. svadayā (10.110.2b)

svap ‘sleep’

pres. act. 2nd sing. svapa (3)
pres. caus. svápayā (1.29.3a)
svār 'sound'
pres. act. 2nd sing. svār (3), 3rd pl. svārantu (8.13.28a)

hāṇ 'slay'
pres. act. 2nd sing. jaḥī (50), 3rd sing. hantu (3), 3rd dual hatām (16), 2nd pl. hatā (3), 2nd pl. hantana (2), 3rd pl. ghantu (7.104.17d)

hā₁ 'move'
pres. med. 2nd sing. jihīṣva (5.78.5a), 3rd sing. jihītām (4), 3rd dual jihātām (7.34.24a), 3rd pl. jihatām (2)
The form jihatām only occurs in 10.59.1-4d.

hā₂ 'leave'
pres. act. 3rd sing. jaḥātu (3.53.21d)
pass. 3rd sing. hiyatām (2)
Mayrhofer (1986: ad loc), considers this and hā₁ to ultimately have the same origin. LIV (s. *ghēH and *ghēH₁), while pointing out that all that differentiates between the two roots is the active and middle voice, is hesitant to consider them one root, on the grounds that “eine Vereinigung beider Wurzeln bedürfte genauerer semantischer Untermauerung.”

hi 'launch, drive'
pres. act. 2nd sing. hinu (2), hinuhi (2), hinutāt (10.16.1d), 2nd dual hinotam (1.184.4b), 2nd pl. hinōta (10), hinotana (10.30.7d), 3rd pl. hinvantu (4)
them. pres. 2nd sing. hinva (10.156.2c), 3rd sing. hinvatu (1.27.11c)
root aor. 2nd pl. heta (10.30.9b)

hu 'sacrifice, pour'
pres. act. 2nd pl. juhōta (7), juhōtana (6), juhuta (2)
-si impv. hoṣi (6.44.14c)

hū 'call'
pres. act. 2nd sing. hvaya (5.53.16c)
Index of attested imperative forms

$hṛ₁$ ‘take’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *hara* (2)

$hṛ₂$ ‘like’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *harya* (7), 2nd dual *hāryatam* (2), 2nd pl. *haryata* (5.54.15c)

$hṛṣ$ ‘be excited’

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. *hārṣarva* (2)

**pres. caus.** 2nd sing. *hārṣaya* (3)

*hvā* see *hū*
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<td>9.36.3ab</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.41.5a</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.52.3</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.59.3b</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.61.23c</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.63.12</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.85.4c</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.90.5</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.93.5a</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.97.33ab</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.97.33a</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.97.36c</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.97.36d</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.97.51ab</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.105.4a</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.107.6d</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.108.9c</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.9.2ab</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.10.10cd</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.10.12c</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.14.8</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.16.1cd</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.16.2ab</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.16.2cd</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.16.4ab</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.16.11a</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.16.13ab</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.18.5cd</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.18.8a</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.19.2b</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.22.4d</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.24.5d</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30.5d</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.34.14a</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.34.14c</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.35.1c</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.38.2d</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.38.5c</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.42.11cd</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.43.9c</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.56.1b</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.59.5c</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.63.3d</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.69.3cd</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.71.11b</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.84.7cd</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.85.20c</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.85.27a</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.87.2d</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.87.7ab</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.87.18a</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.97.13d</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.101.8d</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Index

10.101.10d ................. 156
10.101.12a ................. 103
10.104.2b ................. 138
10.106.3b ................. 104
10.106.4d ................. 104
10.106.9d ................. 143
10.112.3ab ................. 181
10.113.10d ................. 166
10.120.4e ................. 115
10.130.1d ................. 97
10.132.6cd ................. 129
10.134.5ab ................. 131
10.137.3ab ................. 165
10.142.6e ................. 128
10.145.2cd ................. 124
10.145.2d ................. 100
10.151.5 ................. 125
10.158.2ab ................. 113
10.164.1ab ................. 102
10.164.5de ................. 99
10.173.1cd ................. 163
10.175.2 ................. 15
10.183.1cd ................. 110
10.191.2ab ................. 114, 161