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1. -āna-PARTICIPLES IN PASSIVE USAGES:
PRELIMINARY REMARKS

The present paper deals with a group of athematic middle participles with the suffix -āna- which exhibit quite unusual syntactic properties in early Vedic, in the language of the Rgveda (RV). While the finite forms with which these participles are said to belong are employed only transitively, -āna-participles made from the same stem are attested in both transitive and intransitive (passive) constructions. This fact was noted already by Delbrück in his seminal Altindische Syntax. Such asymmetry in the syntactic properties of finite and participial forms requires an explanation. To begin with, I shall focus on two typical examples, the participles hinvānā- and yujānā-.

*I should like to take this opportunity to express my thanks to the audience of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference (University of Helsinki, July 2003), in particular to St. Insler, W. Knobl and C. Watkins for their suggestions and critical remarks. I am also greatly indebted to A. Lubotsky for his criticism and valuable comments on earlier drafts of the paper. I acknowledge my debt to the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) for their financial support, grants no. 220-70-063 (PIONIER project) and 275-70-009 (VENI-project).

1"Verhältnissmäßig häufig ist passiver Gebrauch bei aus der Wurzel gebildeten Particpien auf anā, die man zum Præsens oder Aorist ziehen kann" (Delbrück 1888: 264); see also Delbrück 1888: 379f.; Wackernagel & Debrunner 1954: 270.
hinvaṇā- (root *hi ‘impel’) occurs 18 times in intransitive (passive) constructions (as in (1a)), and 10 times in transitive constructions (as in (1b)) in the Rigveda (see e.g. Kümmel 1996: 141):

(1) a. RV 9.12.8b

śoma hinvaṇā arṣati

‘Soma, being impelled, flows.’

b. RV 2.21.5

dhiyo hinvaṇā uṣijah

‘Usij’s, impelling the (religious) thoughts...’

The syntactic properties of hinvaṇā- are in sharp contrast with those of the finite middle forms made from the nasal present (3pl. med. hinvāte etc.), with which hinvaṇā- is supposed to belong. These forms can only be employed transitively, meaning ‘impel’, as in (2):

(2) RV 9.65.11c

hinve vājeṣu vājīnam

‘I spur on this runner [in the race] for prizes.’

Similarly, the participle yujaṇā- (root *yuj ‘yoke’) occurs 8 times in intransitive (passive) constructions (as in (3b)) and 14 times in transitive constructions (as in (3a)) in the Rigveda (see Kümmel 1996: 90):

(3) a. RV 6.47.19a

yujaṇā harītā rāthe

‘... (Tvaṣṭar,) yoking two fallow [horses] to the chariot.’

b. RV 6.34.2c

rāthe nā mahē śāvase yujaṇāḥ

‘... like a chariot yoked for the great power.’
Vedic grammars treat yujānā- as a middle participle of the root aorist (see, for instance, MacDonell 1910: 370). However, again, as in the case of hinvānā-, the corresponding finite forms (3sg.med. āyukta etc.) can only be employed in transitive usages, as in (4):

(4) RV 7.60.3

āyukta saptā haritah

‘He yoked (now) his seven dun (horses).’

Such remarkable syntactic behaviour of the middle participles requires an explanation: why do these participles show the syntactic features different from those of the corresponding finite forms?

Here it is in order to take a closer look at the syntactic properties of the other forms of the paradigms, where the participles hinvānā- and yujānā- belong. Apparently, in order to find a clue to our problem, we need to look for finite forms which are derived from the same stem as the participles in question (i.e. hin- and yuj-) and can be employed as passives. Such forms indeed exist. In the case of hinvānā-, these are the statives 3sg. hinvé ‘(it) is impelled’, 3pl. hinviré ‘(they) are impelled’. In the case of yujānā-, passive usages are attested for the passive aorist 3sg. āyoji ‘(it) was yoked’, 3pl. āyuṣjran ‘(they) were yoked’.2

To put it in morphological terms, the stem hinu-/hinv- is shared by the nasal present (3sg.act. hinōti, 3pl.med. hinvāte etc.), which never occurs in passive constructions, and the stative (3sg. hinvé), which is employed in passive usages (‘(it) is impelled’). Likewise, the stem yuj- (yōj-) is shared by the root aorist (3sg.med. āyukta etc.), never used in passive constructions (āyukta can only mean ‘(he) yoked’, not ‘was yoked’), and the passive aorist (3sg. āyoji, 3pl. āyuṣjran), always employed as passive (‘it was yoked’, ‘they were yoked’).

---

2 For statives and (medio-)passive aorists (i-aorists), two formations with defective paradigms (3sg. and 3pl. only), which are mainly employed in passive usages, see Kümmel 1996. For statives, see also Gotō 1997.
Thus, the passive syntax of the participles *hinvaṇā-* and *yujāṇā-* can readily be explained on the assumption that they belong with statives (3sg. *hinvē*, 3pl. *hinvire*) or passive aorists (3sg. *āyoji*, 3pl. *āyujran*).

This means that these participles are homonymous, or morphologically (grammatically) ambiguous, but their grammatical characteristics are distinguished by their syntax. *hinvaṇā-* is a middle present participle when employed transitively, meaning 'impelling', and a stative participle when employed intransitively (passively), meaning 'impelled'. Likewise, *yujāṇa-* is a middle root aorist participle when employed transitively ('yoking') and a passive aorist participle when employed in passive constructions ('yoked'):

(i) *hi* 'impel'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Stative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3pl. <em>hinvaṇē</em></td>
<td>3sg. <em>hinvē</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) *yuj ‘yoke’*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root Aorist</th>
<th>Passive Aorist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3sg. <em>ā-yuk-ta</em></td>
<td>3sg. <em>ā-yoj-i</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the fact that participle forms are never listed in the standard Vedic grammars within the paradigms of statives and medio-passive aorists, the assumption that passive -āna-participles should be listed within these paradigms seems quite attractive, since it easily explains their abnormal syntax.

2. MEDIO-PASSIVE AORIST PARTICIPLES VS. MIDDLE ROOT AORIST PARTICIPLES

A similar account is appropriate for some other -āna-participles which display passive syntax. Particularly instructive is the case of the middle participles made from roots which do not have finite
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root aorist forms. Traditionally, such forms are treated as middle root aorist participles, but, assuming that they belong with the (medio-)passive i-aorists, we can more adequately explain the syntax and morphology of these formations. In this section I shall briefly discuss a few such participles.

2.1. srj ‘set free, emit, create': srjānā-
The participle srjānā- is attested exclusively in passive constructions, as in (5):

(5) RV 9.76.1c
hāriḥ srjānō ātyo nā sātvabhīḥ
‘The fallow [Soma], set free, like a horse, by warriors ...’

The only finite formation constructed directly on the root is the passive aorist (3sg. āsarjī, 3pl. āṣṛgran / āṣṛgram; see Insler 1968a: 326f. with fn. 23; Kümmel 1996: 129ff.), as in (6):

(6) RV 1.190.2
sārgo nā yō ... āsarjī
‘... like a discharge (= oblation) which has been discharged (in Agni = in the fire).’ (see Insler 1968b: 5)

Since srj does not form root aorists properly speaking, srjānā- can only belong with this passive aorist.

2.2. drś ‘see': drśānā-
The participle drśānā-3 (RV 1.92.12, 10.45.8) ‘visible’ undoubtedly belongs with the passive aorist (3sg. ādarśī, 3pl. adṛśran/ādṛśram); the middle root aorist first appears in Vedic prose.

---

3 For the hapax drśāna- (RV 2.10.4), with a different accentuation, see Section 5 below.
2.3. ruc ‘shine’: rucānā-
The participle rucānā- ‘shining, bright’ (6x in the RV) must belong with the medio-passive i-aorist ((a)roci, 3x in the RV);\(^4\) the middle root aorist forms properly speaking are unattested.

3. STATIVE PARTICIPLES VS. MIDDLE PRESENT PARTICIPLES

As in the case of hinvānā-, the passive syntax of several middle participles can easily be accounted for on the assumption that they belong with statives made from present stems, not with these middle presents properly speaking.

3.1. su ‘press (out)’: sunvānā-
Unlike the finite middle forms of the nasal present sunutē, which are only employed in transitive usages, the middle participle sunvānā-, next to its transitive attestations, occurs once in a passive construction:

(7) RV 9.101.13
sunvānāsyāndhasah
‘...[speech ...] of the pressed sap.’
(see Gotō 1991: 689 fn. 79; Kümmel 1996: 126)

Most likely, this form belongs with the stative sunvē, sunvirē, employed in passive usages (see Gotō 1991: 689 with fn. 78; Kümmel 1996: 123f.), as in (8):

(8) RV 7.29.1a = 9.88.1a
ayāṁ sóma indra tūbhyaṁ sunve
‘This Soma is pressed for you, O Indra.’

\(^4\) Thus, although hesitantly, Wackernagel & Debrunner 1954: 273 (“rucānā-: 3. Sg. aroci?”).
3.2. *stu* ‘praise, sing’: stāvāna-, stāvānā-, stuvānā-

We find in the RV three athematic middle participles made from the bare root *stu* ‘praise’:\(^5\) stāvāna-, stāvānā- and stuvānā-. Of these three formations, only the first, stāvāna-, is fairly frequent in the RV (18x), while the others two are hapaxes. It occurs in passive constructions, as in (9):

(9) RV 1.130.10cd

\[
\text{divodāsēbhūr indra stāvāno} ' \text{vāydrīthā āhobhir iva dyāuḥ}
\]

‘Praised by the Divodāsas, O Indra, increase, as the heaven [increases] through the days.’

By virtue of its root vocalism, stāvāna- can only belong with the stative stāve (on which see, in particular, Oettinger 1976: 112, 120; Kümmel 1996: 131f.; Gotō 1997: 180ff.), that has apparently generalized the full grade in the root (cf. the class I present stāvati formed from it\(^6\)). By contrast, the participle stuvānā- (RV 7.96.3) is made in accordance with the rules of the derivation of the middle participles of the root aorist and therefore is likely to be a member of the paradigm of the i-aorist āstāvi (on which see Kümmel 1996: 132f.); its non-stative meaning (‘being praised’, rather than ‘praised’)\(^7\) corroborates this assumption:

(10) RV 7.96.3

\[
cetati vājīnīvatī ġṛṇānā jamadagnivāt stuvānā ca vasiṣṭhavāt
\]

‘[Sarasvatī] appears as rich in horses when being praised in the Jamadagni style and sung in the Vasiṣṭha style.’

---


\(^6\) For the secondary character and genesis of this formation, see Narten 1969; Gotō 1987: 331f. with fn. 807.

\(^7\) For the non-stative usage of the participle ġṛṇānā in this passage, see Section 6.
The abnormal accentuation of the form stāvāna- (a hapax in the RV) may result from contamination of the stative and passive aorist participles, i.e. stāvāna- and stuvāna-. The context does not help in determining its paradigmatic status:

(11) RV 6.46.2

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sā tvām} & \text{ nah ... mahā stāvānō ...} \\
\text{gām āśvaṁ} & \text{ rathyāṁ indra sām kira}
\end{align*}
\]

‘You, O Indra, ... bring us a cow and a horse for chariot together, when being praised / praised as the great one.’

3.3. duh ‘milk, give milk’: dú(g)hāna- / duhānā-

As Kümmel (1996: 58) has demonstrated (see also Gotō 1991: 681ff.; 1997: 170ff.), the meaning and syntax of the middle participles dú(g)hāna- and duhānā- depends on their accentuation: forms with the accent on the root give the meaning ‘giving milk, milch(-cow)’, whilst those with the suffix accentuation (2x in the RV) are employed in the sense ‘milking (for oneself)’. This semantic contrast is perfectly parallel to that between the stative 3sg. duhé, 3pl. duhré ‘give milk’ and middle root present (3pl. duhaté) ‘milk (for oneself)’ (discussed at length by Kümmel 1996: 52ff.). Obviously, the difference in accentuation between these formations correlates with their grammatical characteristics: the root-accented participle dú(g)hāna- belongs with the stative 3sg. duhé, 3pl. duhré (‘give milk, be a milch(-cow)’), whilst duhānā- (with suffix accentuation) belongs to the paradigm of the middle root present, together with 3pl. duhaté etc. (‘milk (for oneself)’).

3.4. idh ‘kindle’:indhāna- and evidence from the Atharvaveda

The participle indhāna- occurs 5 times in transitive usages (‘kindling’), as in (12a), and 3 times in passive usages (‘kindled’), as in (12b), in the Ṛgveda:

\[\text{.indhāna- (einmal; in stuvānā- zu verbessern?)}\].
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(12) a. RV 2.25.1a

\[\text{indhāno agnin vanavad vanusyatāḥ}\]

'The one who \textit{kindles} Agni will overpower those who envy [us].'

b. RV 1.143.7

\[\text{indhāno ... vidātheṣu dādyat ... ūd u no yaṁsate dhiyam}\]

'Being \textit{kindled}, shining during the sacrifices, [Agni] will raise our prayer.'

The ratio of the transitive and passive usages is summarized in Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>transitive ('kindling')</th>
<th>intransitive-passive ('kindled')</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RV 2.25.1, 8.102.22, 10.3.4, 10.45.1, 10.128.1</td>
<td>RV 1.143.7, 8.19.31, 8.23.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

The usage of this participle nicely parallels the syntax of the finite forms derived from the stem \textit{indh-}: middle present (3sg. in\textit{d}dhē, 3pl. indhāte/indhatē, etc.) is used transitively, as in (13a); by contrast, the form \textit{indhē}, attested at RV 7.8.1 in a passive construction (13b), must be a stative made from the present stem (see Kümmel 2000: 125f. fn. 80; Kulikov 2001: 46f.):

(13) a. RV 3.13.5c

\[\text{fkvāno agnim indhate}\]

'The singers \textit{kindle} the fire.'

\footnote{With the secondary loss of gemination.}
b. RV 7.8.1ab

\[ \text{indhē rájā sām āryō nāmobhir' yāsyā prátiṣṭam āhutaṁ gṝteṇa} \]

'With reverence the king, the noble [Lord] is kindled, whose face is anointed with ghee.'

Thus, the transitive ('kindling') and intransitive-passive ('kindled') occurrences of \( \text{indhāna-} \) belong with the transitive nasal present \( \text{in(d)dhe} \) and with the stative \( \text{indhē} \), respectively.

Such an analysis of \( \text{indhāna-} \) is further supported by evidence from the Atharvaveda (Śaunakīya). Since the category of stative almost disappears after the RV (see Kümmel 1996: 11), we can expect that the -āna-participles which are grammatically ambiguous in the RV (i.e. belong either to stative or to some other formation with which stative shares the stem) will no longer be ambiguous in the Atharvaveda (AV). This assumption is corroborated by the ratio of usages of \( \text{indhāna-} \) in the AV, summarized in Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \text{indhāna-} ) in AV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| \begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
| \text{transitive ('kindling')} & \text{intransitive-passive ('kindled')} \\
| \hline
| 2x                            & \hline
| AV 19.55.3, 19.55.4           & \hline
| \end{tabular} |

Table 2

4. RECONSTRUCTING STATIVES AND MEDIO-PASSIVE \( \text{i-} \)-AORISTS

On the assumption that several -āna-participles with the 'unexpected' passive syntax belong with statives or \( \text{i-} \)-aorists, we not only are able to account for their 'abnormal' syntax, but also to reconstruct some unattested statives and passive aorists.
4.1. ad ‘eat’: adānā- : *ādi

The middle participle adānā- (hapax in the RV) is employed in the passive usage (‘being eaten’; cf. (14)), whilst finite forms of the root present (3sg.act. ātī etc., middle forms are unattested and probably did not exist in the language of the RV), with which this participle is traditionally connected, never occur in passive constructions:

(14) RV 4.19.9
vamāibhiḥ putrām agrívō adānām ... ājabhartha
‘You [O Indra] have carried out [of a hole] the virgin’s son, being eaten by ants.’

The passive syntax and the non-stative meaning (‘being eaten’, not ‘eaten’) of this RVic hapax are likely to point to the unattested passive aorist *ādi ‘was eaten’.

4.2. hū ‘call’: huvānā- : *āhāvi

The root aorist participle huvānā- (root hū ‘call’) is employed both in transitive (as in (15a)) and intransitive (passive) (as in (15b)) constructions:

(15) a. RV 7.30.3cd
ny āgniḥ sīd āsuro nā hōtā huvāno ātra subhāgāya devān
‘Agni sits down, the Hotar, like the Asura, calling the gods hither for the fortunate [sacrificer].’

b. RV 10.112.3cd
asmabhīr indra sākhībhīr huvānāḥ sadhīcīnō mādayasvā niśādya
‘O Indra, being called by us, [your] friends, be exhilarated, having sat down together [with us].’
By contrast, the finite forms of the root aorist (áhūmahi. RV 6.45.10 and a few other forms) are employed transitively. Thus, passive occurrences of huvānā- must belong with the unattested passive aorist *áhāvi ‘(he) was called’.

4.3. hi ‘impel’: hiyānā- : *áhāyi

The participle hiyānā-, attested 8 times in the RV, is only employed in passive constructions (‘being impelled’) and has no corresponding finite root aorist forms (active root aorists, such as 1pl. ahēma, 3pl. ahyan, are employed transitively). Most likely, this is the participle of the unattested passive aorist *áhāyi ‘was impelled’.

5. SOME FORMAL FEATURES OF THE PASSIVE -āna-PARTICIPLES

In general, the rules of derivation of (passive) -āna-participles do not differ from those for athematic middle participles made from other stems. There are, however, some cases of accent vacillation which have not yet received a satisfactory explanation. The majority of the participles in question have the zero grade in the root and, accordingly, bear the accent on the suffix (-āna-), not on the root. There are, however, a few participles made from the full grade root with root accentuation (sāyānā-, stāvānā-). It seems that the grade of the root depends on its structure: CaR (CaC) roots display the full grade (śī / śay: sāyānā-, stu / stav: stāvānā-), whilst CaRC / CRC roots have a zero grade (cf. dṛś: dṛśānā-, rucē: rucānā-, etc.). Although we find only two examples of the former type (sāyānā-, stāvānā-), active stative participles (see Section 7 below) seem further to corroborate this regularity, cf. járant- ‘old’ (not **jurānt-) and máhant- ‘great’ (made from CaR / CaC roots), as opposed to pṛṣant- ‘speckled’ and bhāhant- ‘high’ (CaRC / CRC roots).

---

10 The morphologically unclear form huvē (RV 1.30.9) ‘(he) called’ cannot represent a stative; see Kümmel 1996: 142 (“[e]s handelt sich um eine Augenblicksbildung nach 1. Sg. huvē in [pāda] b”); Lubotsky 1997: 1659 (“3sg., inf. or pf. w[ith]out red[uplication] (?)”).
Perhaps, under the influence of the two very common stative participles, śāyāna- and stāvāna-, some stative participles with the zero grade in the root have undergone secondary accent shift to the root (cf. indhāna-, citāna-, dū(ɡ)hāna-).11 Thus, there may have been a weak tendency to generalize the root accentuation for all stative participles; cf. especially the root-accented participle dū(ɡ)hāna- (see Section 3.3) opposed to the middle root present participle duḥānā- with suffix accentuation.

6. PARTICIPE OF STATIVES OR i-AORISTS?
The morphological identification of most passive -āna-participles poses no problem, but in some cases we may need additional criteria in order to determine which of these two passive formations (stative, passive aorist, or either of them) the participle in question may belong with. Below I shall briefly discuss the features which can disambiguate some unclear -āna-participles.

(i) Stem
Since passive i-aorists can only be made from root stems, those -āna-participles which are derived from the stems other than the bare root (i.e. from non-root present or intensive stems) can only belong with statives. In cases where a participle is formed directly from the root it may, theoretically, belong either with the medio-passive i-aorist or with the stative made from the root present stem.12 Most often, however, only one of these two formations exists, which rules out the other option. Only in cases where either both or none are attested we are faced with a dilemma: the participle of statives or i-aorists?

11 For the only example of a full grade root participle with suffix accentuation (stavānā-, RVic hapax), see Section 3.2.
12 Statives derived from root aorist stems are almost unknown in Vedic, the only (possible) exception being citē (see Kümmel 1996: 10).
(ii) Accentuation
The accentuation of the passive -āna-participles, briefly discussed in Section 5, may provide an additional clue to the morphological identification of participles made from bare roots. Thus, the root accentuation of the participle citāna- (RV 9.101.11) ‘made perceivable’ may support connecting this formation with the stative citē (RV 10.143.4) (as actually suggested by Kümmel 1996: 39 on semantic grounds), rather than with the passive aorist aceti.

Quite remarkable is the difference in accentuation between two -āna-participles made from the root dṛś ‘see’. While dṛśāna- (RV 1.92.12, 10.45.8) ‘visible’, discussed in Section 2.2, is a regular participial derivative of the passive aorist, the hapax dṛśāna- (RV 2.10.4), judging from its abnormal root accentuation, might belong with the unattested stative *dṛśē ‘is seen’. The context seems to support this analysis; note also the adjacent brhānt- ‘high’, which may represent a stative participle, too (see Section 7 below):

(16) RV 2.10.4
jīgharmy āgnim ... vāyasā bṛhāntam vyāciṣṭham ānnai
rabhasām dṛśānam
‘I besprinkle Agni, … which is high by vital force, most expansive, appearing (lit. seen) as impetuous through food.’

(iii) Temporal/aspectual semantics
The temporal/aspectual meaning of the form in question may also hint at its grammatical characterization. Thus, for the participle adānā- (see Section 4.1), both the non-stative meaning (‘being eaten’, rather than ‘eaten’) and the suffix accentuation (adānā-, not *ādāna-) seem to support the passive aorist analysis.

(iv) Paradigmatic features
There may also be some paradigmatic indications that favour one of the two interpretations. Thus, in the case of the passive participle
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mṛjānā- ‘(being) wiped, (being) cleansed’ (mṛj ‘wipe, cleanse’), we can probably rule out the stative analysis (stative *mṛje?) and reconstruct the passive aorist *āmarji, since this root already has a stative participle, made from the intensive stem (marmṛjānā-).

To conclude this brief discussion of the features of the passive -āna-participles, a general methodological remark is in order. In some cases, evidence for the paradigmatic status (stative or passive aorist?) of -āna-participles is controversial. Thus, the well-attested participle grṇānā- (44x in the RV) can only belong with the stative grṇē ‘is praised’ (and the nasal present grṇe), but some contexts rather point to the non-stative meaning, as in (10), where this form is coordinated with the passive aorist participle stuvānā ‘being praised’. Since the verb gr ‘praise, sing’ forms no aorists at all, one may assume that the participle grṇānā- could supply, where necessary, the participles of the non-existent passive aorist (*āgārī, *girānā-), thus being functionally shared by the two passive formations. This means that, even in cases where formal (morphological) features unambiguously determine the paradigmatic status of a participle, its actual usage can, in a sense, ‘accommodate’ both functional values, those of the passive aorist and stative.13

7. ACTIVE PARTICIPLES OF STATIVES?

Thus far, I have only discussed participles of statives and passive aorists formed with the suffix -āna-, thus presuming that only the middle morphology was possible for such participles (which, in general, meets our expectations with respect to the morphology of the forms employed in passive usages). Yet there seems to be evidence for the assumption that stative -āna-participles may have had active counterparts. It has frequently been noted (Renou 1966: 6 [= Choix I: 22]; Watkins 1969: 142ff.; Schaefer 1994: 45f.) that

13 On the formal and functional overlapping of the stative and passive aorist, see Kümmel 1996: 20f.
the formation stavánt- (active participle?), which occurs three times in the family mañaldas of the RV (at 2.19.5, 2.20.5, 6.24.8, only in the nom. sg. form staván), attests quite an unusual (for an active form) passive syntax, cf.:

(17) RV 2.20.5c

\[muṣnān \ uṣásah \ sūryena \ stavān\]

‘...while (he), the praised one, abducted the dawns with the sun.’

By virtue of its suffix accentuation and active morphology, this form cannot belong to the class I present stávate, which is only attested in the middle (see also section 3.2). On the other hand, its semantics and passive syntax plead for the connection of this formation with the stative stáve, as the active counterpart of the (middle) participle stávāna-.

The assumption of the existence of active stative participles may shed light on the paradigmatic status of some other formations in -ant- (most of which are traditionally taken to be adjectives). Watkins, who first drew attention to these formations (1969: 142ff.; see also Schaefer 1994: 45f.), assumed that they represent active participles with the secondary accent shift marking their passive (intransitive) syntax. These participles include, besides stavánt-:

1. járant- ‘old’ (i.e. ‘(having) grown old’), treated by Gotō (1987: 153 with fn. 238) as an adjective outside the verbal paradigm because of its intransitive syntax (‘(grown) old’, not ‘making old’), different from that of the class I present járati ‘makes old’;

2. pépišat- ‘adorned’ (RV 10.127.7; see Schaefer 1994: 45, 152f.), which may point to the unattested stative *pépiše ‘is adorned’ of the type cékite (on which see Schaefer 1994: 44);

3. pfšant- ‘speckled’ (see Wackernagel & Debrunner 1954: 165; Watkins 1969: 144);
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(4) brhánt- ‘high’ may be the active stative participle of the verb brh ‘be high, strong’ (on which see, in particular, Narten 1959: 45f. [= Kl. Schr. I: 7ff.]; Jamison 1983: 97ff.);

(5) mahánt- ‘great’ [whose parallelism with stavánt- was noted by Watkins (1969: 144)] may belong with the hapax stative mahe ‘is able’ (RV 7.97.2); see Kümmel 1996: 79ff.; Gotô 1997: 179f.

8. PARTICIPLES OF STATIVES AND I-AORISTS:
A SUMMARY

The results of this preliminary sketch of the passive -āna-participles are summarized in tables 3 and 4, which bring together finite (3rd person singular and plural) and non-finite forms (participles) of the medio-passive aorists and statives attested in early Vedic, foremost in the RV:

**Medio-passive i-aorists**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>3sg.</th>
<th>3pl.</th>
<th>participle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ad ‘eat’</td>
<td>*ādi</td>
<td></td>
<td>adāna- RV 4.19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drś ‘see’</td>
<td></td>
<td>ādarśi RV 15x, drśran RV 7x,</td>
<td>drśāna- RV 1.92.12, 10.45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nid ‘revile, blame’</td>
<td>*ānedi</td>
<td></td>
<td>nidāna- RV 4.5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhī ‘fear’</td>
<td>*ābhāyī</td>
<td>bhīyānā- RV 3x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mrj ‘wipe, cleanse’</td>
<td>*āmarji</td>
<td>mrjānā- RV 3x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yuj ‘yoke’</td>
<td>āyōji RV 4x, āyujra RV 2x</td>
<td>yujānā- RV 8x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruc ‘shine’</td>
<td>aroci RV 2x, rocī RV 1.121.6</td>
<td>rucānā- RV 6x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vr ‘cover’</td>
<td>āvārī RV 4.6.7</td>
<td>vrānā- RV 1.61.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>su ‘press (out)’</td>
<td>āsāvī RV 7x</td>
<td>sʿvānā- RV 32x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>srj ‘set free, emit’</td>
<td>āsṛjī RV 12x, āsṛgrān/m RV 19x,</td>
<td>srjānā- RV 11x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stu ‘praise’</td>
<td>āstāvī RV 5x</td>
<td>stuvānā- RV 7.96.3 (stāvānā- RV 6.46.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hi ‘impel’</td>
<td>*āḥāyī</td>
<td>hiyānā- RV 7x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hū ‘call’</td>
<td>*āhāvī</td>
<td>huvānā- RV 10x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
### Statives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>3sg.</th>
<th>3pl.</th>
<th>participle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>idh</em> 'kindle'</td>
<td>indhē</td>
<td>RV 7.8.1</td>
<td><em>indhānā</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gə</em> 'praise'</td>
<td>grnē</td>
<td>RV 5x</td>
<td>grnānā-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>cit</em> 'appear, perceive'</td>
<td>citē</td>
<td>RV 10.143.4</td>
<td>*citānā- RV 9.101.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>duh</em> 'give milk'</td>
<td>duhē</td>
<td>RV (10x)</td>
<td>*dū(gh)ānā-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>drē</em> 'see'</td>
<td><em>drē</em></td>
<td>RV (7x)</td>
<td>*dṛānā- RV 2.10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bru</em> 'say'</td>
<td>bruve</td>
<td>RV 5.61.8</td>
<td>bruvānā-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mṛj</em> 'wipe, cleanse'</td>
<td><em>marmṛjē</em></td>
<td>RV 9.101.13</td>
<td>*marmṛjānā- RV 6x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>śr</em> 'lie'</td>
<td>śaye</td>
<td>RV 11x</td>
<td>śāvānā-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>śubh</em> 'be beautiful'</td>
<td>śōbhe</td>
<td>RV 1.120.5</td>
<td>*śubhānā- RV 2x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>su</em> 'press (out)'</td>
<td>sunvē</td>
<td>RV 3x</td>
<td>sunvānā-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>stu</em> 'praise'</td>
<td>stāve</td>
<td>RV 5x</td>
<td>stāvānā-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>hi</em> 'impel'</td>
<td>hinvē</td>
<td>RV 2x</td>
<td>*hinvānā-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>8x</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>duh</em> 'give milk'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>drē</em> 'see'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bru</em> 'say'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mṛj</em> 'wipe, cleanse'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>śr</em> 'lie'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>su</em> 'press (out)'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>stu</em> 'praise'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>hi</em> 'impel'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### REFERENCES


---


---


---

14 2x in transitive usages ('they milk the cow/udder').

15 1x or 2x in transitive usages ('milking'); see Küimmel 1996: 58.

16 6x in transitive usages.
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