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The emphasis of the book under review lies on the semantics of the Vedic intensive. The author conclusively shows that the Vedic intensive has no demonstrable intensive or affective meaning at all and that in the majority of instances it displays an iterative or repetitive function. The morphological analysis, however, can be refined in several aspects. This review essay takes up a few morphological and etymological points where the author's treatment seems insufficient or where some further progress can be achieved.

THIS BOOK, WHICH REPRESENTS a revised version of Christiane Schaefer's 1989 doctoral dissertation, addresses various problems of the intensive, a fascinating, but rather neglected category of the Vedic verb. It consists of two parts of more or less equal length: the general part (I. "Vorbemerkungen," pp. 11-14; II. "Morphologie," pp. 15-71; III. "Semantik," pp. 72-100) and the discussion of the forms arranged in accordance with the verbal root (IV. "Monographischer Teil," pp. 101-208). The book is concluded by indices and a bibliography.

The emphasis of the book lies on the semantics of the intensive. Not only in chapter III, which is dedicated to this subject, but also in the discussion of the separate intensive formations, S. primarily deals with meaning. She conclusively shows that the Vedic intensive has no demonstrable intensive or affective meaning at all and that in the majority of instances it displays an iterative or repetitive function. This result is very important and is one of the major achievements of the book.

Whereas the semantics of the intensive is treated fully and adequately in S.'s book, the morphological analysis can be refined in several aspects. In the following, I shall take up a few morphological and etymological points where I disagree with S.'s position or where, in my opinion, we can reach a little farther.

MORPHOLOGY

The Subjunctive

S. convincingly shows that the intensive subjunctive had zero grade in the root in Indo-Iranian (cf. also GAv. vōīuvidāti/ē Y 30.8). The only serious exception to this rule in Vedic is the subjunctive of vhan- 'to slay', viz., jāṅghanan, jāṅghanat, etc. S. explains these forms by Sievers' Law, but I do not think that Sievers' Law was ever operative with the nasals. In order to understand properly the origin of jāṅghanat, it should be borne in mind that the first n of *nCn clusters was regularly lost already in Indo-Iranian times. The Avestan intensive to this root is (ni-)jāyante, (aua-)jāyaj, etc., with the expected loss of the first -n-. The Vedic speakers presumably considered the heavy reduplication essential to the formation, so that this n was reintroduced into the reduplication syllable. Since the cluster -gnh- was still awkward, the zero grade of the root ghn- was replaced by -ghan- (note that -ghan- may also be a reflex of the zero grade, e.g., in the pf. ptc. jaghanvān, with *n > an before a resonant).

---

1 sanisvanat, which, incidentally, S. forgot to include in her "Monographischer Teil," may be due to the fact that śvan- has no zero grade. Moreover, it is a set- root, so that *śyvanH-a would regularly yield śvan-. parparat is an artificial formation.
2 Cf. for this rule Hoffman 1952: 130f. = 1976: 366, who points to forms like RV yujmahe < *yujjmahe, AV ruddmoha < *rundmoh, RV agasmahi < *agasmahī, GAv māhmaidī next to māṅghī.
3 In the active participle, however, -ghan- in the function of zero grade was probably less acceptable, cf. also subj. ādrārata vs. ptc. ādrārat from the root dr- with a comparable syllabification pattern. The descriptive full grade in the ptc. is further only attested in nāmānati (8.43.8), where the cluster -mm- was evidently impossible, and the nonce form pāṇiphanat. The intensive active participle from vhan- shows a remarkable variety of forms: next to the "normal" nom. sg. apa-jāṅghanat (9.49.5) and jāṅghanat (9.66.24c), we find gen. sg. jāṅghnathās with a unique cluster (in the next verse, 25a!), and further nom. sg. ghnīngkhanat (9.90.6), dat. sg. ni-ghnīngkhanate (1.55.5) with...
The fact that the subjunctive has zero grade in the root is of considerable importance. First of all, we get rid of the "thematic" intensives, which can now be explained as subjunctives. Secondly, it becomes clear that lsg. dedisam (RV 8.74.15) is a subjunctive and consequently, that -am can function as a lsg. subjunctive ending, which was already proposed by Insler (1966: 228). As indicated by S., zero grade subjunctives are very rare in Vedic, but they point to the great antiquity of the formation. Apart from the intensive, zero grade in the subjunctive is only regular with roots in -ā in the reduplicated present (dādāh, dādah, dādat, dādhan, dādhave, dādhate, Av. dadat). We find several zero grade subjunctives in the perfect (jājyvat, śāsavat vs. śasāvāna, vāyṛdhathe, vāyṛddhāti, jujyusān vs. jujōsah), but these forms are incidental and are hardly old.

The Reduplication

S. treats the reduplication on pp. 22–35 (synchronic analysis) and pp. 52–71 (the historical development). She correctly remarks that, historically speaking, the "heavy" reduplication of the intensive involves repetition of the second consonant of the root. In a synchronic analysis, she distinguishes four types which largely depend on the structure of the root:

Type I Kā-: root structure K̄1(R)ā̄K̄2 (K̄1 = any consonant, K̄2 = an obstruent), e.g., nānād-: śnād-; śāsva-: śīvas-.

In this category there is some overlapping with the perfect formations which sometimes show long reduplication. In order to distinguish between the two, we can use the accent, since the intensive normally has initial accentuation, in contradistinction to the perfect where we find final accentuation. This is not an absolute criterion, however. On the one hand, we find initially accented perfect forms, and intensives with final accentuation, on the other. For instance, śasadāna-, which seems to belong to the system of the perfect (śasadāhi, śasadāre), has initial accentuation. This word has probably exerted influence on śāsujāna- (book x, twice) used in the same context (tanvā śāsujāna- at the end of the line vs. tanvā śāsādāna- in the same position in RV 1.123.10a, 124.6c). Two more perfect medial participles have initial accentuation, viz., śāsvāna- and tūtujāna- (next to tūtujānā-).

Forms with unambiguous intensive reduplication, but with final accentuation, must be considered intensive perfects, e.g., badbadhe, sarsre, badbadhānā-, marmṛjānā-.

S.'s attitude towards these forms is ambivalent. For instance, badbadhe is called 3sg. pf. middle in the table on p. 18, but on p. 156 it appears as 3sg. present, although in the discussion she says that these forms are "ihrer Funktion nach Perfekta." On the contrary, badbadhānā- on p. 156 is labeled "ptc. pf." but on p. 18 "ptc. pres." As to marmṛjānā-, S. calls it a present ptc. both on p. 18 and on p. 167f., where the root mṛj- is treated, in spite of the fact that this is no doubt a participle of the intensive perfect, not only because of its accentuation, but also because of its passive meaning 'cleaned'—cf. the perfect middle māṃjah, which always displays this meaning when used without preverbs.

In a similar fashion, vāvasānā- and vāvasre can belong to the medial perfects of the intensive (as opposed to the plain perfect vāvasire). See further below.

It is clear that for some isolated formations the choice between the perfect and intensive perfect is difficult. A case in point is rārakṣānā- (vṛaks- 'to protect'). It is unclear to me how S. interprets this form. On p. 18, rārakṣānā- appears in the table among the intensives, but it is not treated in the "Monographischer Teil," and in the discussion of the reduplication (p. 27ff.) rāraks- is mentioned a few times without a clear statement on the matter. Considering the fact that rārakṣānā- (4.3.14b) is used in the same stanza with vāväbdhānā- (4.3.14d), which is a perfect participle, we can safely assume the same interpretation for rārakṣānā-.

Yet another ambiguous case is āvāvacit, which can be taken as an intensive or as a pluperfect of ṭvrc-. S. opts for an intensive, which is a possible choice, but forgets to mention the form in the discussion of the ambiguous formations (note that Macdonell [1910: 364] and Leumann [1952: 24], for instance, take āvāvacit to be a pluperfect).

Type II Ke/-o-: root structure (s)K̄1(R)i/u(K), e.g., cekit-: cēcit, rōruc-: vruc-.

Two roots in final -ā vacillate between type II and type IV, viz., nōnavit, nonumās, anonavur vs. navinot, and dodhavīti, dodhuvat vs. davidhvāra, dāvidhvā. S. admits that she is unable to account for the distribution of nōnavitī, etc., vs. navinot (p. 69). The diasyllabic reduplication of navinot is most probably due to the fact that the expected *nonot (older *nānaget) was considered awkward by the Vedic speakers and had to be avoided, the first -g- being prone to dissimilation.4 In the 3sg. imperfect, the normal way to repair the form was to add

---

4 It is well known that Vedic shows many examples of labial dissimilation, and, incidentally, S. points to a fine example of such dissimilation in the intensive (p. 143f.), viz., nānānāvā, nānānām (< *nam-nam-) vs. nāmāte, ānānāta.
the ending -it (cf. áyoyavit, ároravit, ájohavit), but in the   

injunctive this ending was inappropriate,5 so that there   

was no other choice than to introduce the disyllabic   

reduplication.   

The interchange of do- and davi-is of a different order.   
The locus of the disyllabic reduplication is the participle,   
where we find the following distribution: nom. sg. dōdhuvat   
(books II, IX, and X), dāvidhvat (book IV), dāvidhvat (metr   
cally dāvidhvat) (book VIII), gen sg. dāvidhvatas6   
(book X), nom. pl. dāvidhvatas (books II, IV [twice]).   

These forms seem to point to an original paradigm nom.   
sg. dōdhuvat, gen. sg., nom. pl. dāvidhvatas. The only   
deviation from this pattern in the family books is 4.13.2b   
dāvidhvat, which occurs in the same hymn as 4.13.4c   
dāvidhvatas. This paradigm is obviously the result of   
Sievers‘ Law, which was only operative in the final syll   
able (Schindler 1977: 62), so that *dālayyat, dālayyatats   
yielded *dālayyat, dālayyatats. The form *dālayyatats   
had an impossible cluster and was replaced by dāvidh   
vatas, which at the same time explains why we here find   
d- and not dh- (as opposed to bhādhriti vs. jādhbhṛ-,   
ghāṁghṛit vs. jāṁghan- the recent complete restructuring   
of the reduplication). The int. pl. dāvidhāvata (śrīṅgā   
dāvidhāvata 1.140.6) is most probably an artificial   
form based on 8.60.13b (śrīṅgas dāvidhvat). 1.140 is   
a hymn playing with reduplication and intensives, and it is   
only to be expected that some of the forms are nonce.   

In some of the participles, the analogy went in the   
opposite direction, cf. nom. pl. nāṇuvatats (8.92.33),   
jōhuvatas (7.93.3).   

Type III KaR-: root structure (s)K(R)aR(K), e.g.,   
dārdar-/dārd(i)r- : vṛ-, cankram- : vṛkram-.   

Also this type had to complete with type IV. We have   
already seen the interaction of jāṁghan- and ghāṁghṛn-   
(see note 3). In a similar fashion, the ptc. to tārtatī is   
tārtatrāt-. It is peculiar that in old and frequently attested   
intensives dar-dr-. (cf. Av. nīḍārā: nāriṇiāta) and sar-sr-,   
the cluster rCr does not seem to present problems, ptc.   
dārdrat- (book VI) vs. younger 3sg. dārdrat (book   
VIII), 3pl. impf. adārdar (book X); 3du. med. sarsrāt   
(book III), 3sg. pf. med. sarsrē (books II, VI), ptc.   
sārsrān- (book V [twice]). On the other hand, in more   
“recent” intensives this cluster is avoided, and type IV   
reduplication has been introduced instead (kārikr-, tārtr-,   
bhārībhṛr-).   

Type IV KaŘː: root structure (s)K(R)aR(K), e.g.,   
kārikr- : vṛ-, vārtrīr- : vṛj-.   

Type IV reduplication has become productive in those   
formations where the root began with two consonants   
because it helped to avoid difficult clusters. The late   
expansion of this type explains the forms like ghāṁghṛn-,   
bhārī-bhṛ- without Grassmann’s dissimilation and with   
out palatalization of the initial consonant. Non-palatal   
offset is further found in kārikrān, gāṁghṛt-śānanti,   
kānikesa(n)-, and kāṁikān (śānand-), which is attested in   
the late “Anhang”-hymn 7.103 and seems to be younger   
than canaṅkādān (8.69.9). For dāvidhvat, see above. gāṁghṛt-   
(p. 56, n. 123) mentions an additional   
formation where the root began with two consonants   
and other evidently secondary formations discussed above   
(i.e., gāṁghṛt- without palatalization, nāvinot, etc.), there   
remains a very small group of forms where we can look   
for the origin of disyllabic reduplication: vārtrīr-   
(vārtrīr- plus a few other forms from vṛj-), and three   
nominal formations, viz., plus yāvīyudh-, vānivān-, sārṣrpā-.   

S. follows Beekes’ explanation (1981) of this peculiar   
reduplication as being original in roots with an initial la   
ryngeal: *HCR-HCR- > Skt. CaRi-CaR-. Beekes was   
unable to find a root of this structure among type IV   
intensives, but as S. points out (p. 63), the intensive stem   
vārtrīr- to the root vṛj- “to bend”, PIE *h2/3rge-,   
provides the model Beekes was looking for. I would suggest   

5 As was pointed out by Leumann 1952: 23ff., the second   
ary endings -is, -it belong with 3pl. -ar. Since the latter   
d ending does not occur in the intensive injunctive (see below), it is   
understandable that -it is limited to the intensive imperf ect. A   
similar distribution is found in the plepurer, where we find   
aucyavit, ájagrabhīt, ariiject, ávāvacit, ávāvartī, but rātān.   
An exception is dādharṣīt, which is a hybrid aorist formation,   
cf. Hoffmann 1967: 89.   
6 This form is analyzed by S. as 3du. pres. (after Grassmann),   
which is impossible because of the thematic ending and the   
transitive construction (cf. Geldner ad 10.96.9). On p. 138 S.   
herself writes that the dual sīpṛe is the object of dāvidhvatas.   

7 The distribution between the short and long vowels has been   
established by Kuryłowicz (1939-1949: the long vowel appears   
before a single consonant, the short one before a cluster. The   
same distribution is found in the reduplication syllable of the   
reduplicated aorist. S. (p. 56, n. 123) mentions an additional   
condition suggested to her by E. Tichy, viz., that a short vowel   
also appears before a long vowel in the root. The evidence   
consists of the intensive perfect dāvidhāvata and red. aor.   
dīdipah. Both forms are clearly secondary (to the ptc.   
dāvidhvat and the caus. dīpayah, respectively), however, and there are counter   
examples like nāvinot (the rule claiming that a long vowel here   
behaves differently from a diphthong cannot be phonetically   
justified).
yarivāyudh- as another possible candidate, in view of the lengthening in compounds amitṛitāyudh- 'fighting with the enemies', Av. aspaṭātayo- 'horse-fighter', frātātayo- n.pr., which provides an indication that the root yudh- began with a laryngeal (cf. Mayrhofer, EWAiA, s.v. YODH).

S. presents an attractive (at least, at first sight) scenario for the fact that some of the roots with an initial laryngeal (like mrj- < *Hmrj-<) do not have disyllabic reduplication (pp. 63ff.). She assumes that the so-called Saussure-Hirt's Law, according to which a laryngeal is dropped in the neighborhood of IE o-vocalism, has affected the forms of the intensive singular, e.g., 3sg. *HceR-HcoR-ti > *HceR-CoR-ti, but 1pl. *HceR-Hcr-me > *HceR-Hcr-me with disyllabic reduplication. Unfortunately, we cannot demonstrate this on the basis of the attested forms. The only root in the above-mentioned group of unambiguous formations which shows alternation in the reduplication syllable is yvṛt-, and we find the following forms:

Type III: 3sg. vārvarītī, 3pl. vāṛvyatī, ptc. act. āvāṛvyatī-, ptc. med. vāṛvyatā.

Type IV: 3sg. varivarītī, 3sg. impf. avarivar, 3pl. avarivur (analogical).

Especially puzzling is the co-occurrence of vārvarītī and varivarītī in one and the same hymn, 1.164 (verses 11 and 31, respectively).

The Endings

The intensive shows a very archaic pattern of the 3pl. endings, which has escaped S.'s attention. In the 3pl. imperfect active we find -ur, which is a regular replacement of -*at < *-nt (ādārdarēr, anonavur, djohavur, analogical d-avarivar from the root vr-, and AV acarkrṣur), whereas the 3pl. injunctive has the ending -an (carkrān, pāpatan, dāvidyutan, sōṣucan). The pattern of *-nt in the imperfect vs. *-ent in the injunctive has been postulated for the Indo-European verb by Kortlandt 1987: 219ff., 1988: 63ff., but this is the first time that we have the real attestation of this system. For the endings -is, -it, -itām, which are only found in the imperfect, but not in the injunctive, see note 5.

In the middle voice, the situation is less transparent. For 3pl. injunctive, S. gives the following forms (p. 16): cāṅkramata, marmṛjata, sanisnata with the ending -ata vs. nonuvanta, vāvāsanta, johuvanta,10 jāṅghananta with the ending -anta. Some of the latter forms may represent subjunctives.11 For instance, jāṅghananta (RV 1.88.2d) is likely to be a subjunctive (cf. Jamison 1983: 49). The first stanza of this Marut hymn is an invitation to the Maruts to come to the worshippers, while stanzas 2 and 3 describe the Maruts' appearance. In this description, jāṅghananta stands between the present vāntī in 2b and the subj. kṛṇavante in 3b.

In a similar fashion, johuvanta (7.21.7d) may be a subjunctive (pace S., p. 206, n. 619). The pāda (-indriam vājasya johuvanta sātāu 'they will invoke Indra again and again in the struggle for booty') seems to be used in parallel to 6d (nā śādur āntam vividdha yuddha te 'an adversary will not experience the end of your [power] in a fight'). The contexts of the other occurrence of jāṅghananta (2.31.2) and nonuvanta (4.22.4) are ambiguous, but a subjunctive cannot be excluded (cf. already Jamison 1983: 49 for jāṅghananta).12

The status of vāvaśanta is not easy to determine. We find two types of reduplicated formations with the root vāś- 'to bellow'; vavāśire (2.2.2), on the one hand, and the long reduplication vāvaś-, on the other. The former must be a regular perfect middle, but for the forms with vāvaś- we have the choice between the intensive and the intensive perfect.13 It seems to me that 3pl. med. vāvaśire (9.94.2) with its perfect ending and the ptc. vāvaśānā- (14 times) with the final accentuation typical of the speakers of Vedic because of its two rs, which substituted for the ending -ur, -an in this word.

10 The accented johuvanta, given by S. on p. 16, is a mistake.
11 The subjunctives always have the 3pl. ending -anta (marmṛjanta, sōṣucanta, jarḥṣanta). S.'s account on p. 45 is confused: jarḥṣanta and marmṛjanta (incidentally, given by S. with an accent mark) are first called injunctives, and then, in the same sentence, marmṛjanta is called subjunctive.
12 Hoffmann 1967: 187 takes nonuvanta as injunctive, but it stands against the present bharati, and its connection with the preceding injunctives is broken. I think that a subjunctive interpretation is conceivable.
13 There are no instances of perfects from the long vowel roots with long reduplication and shortening of the root syllable.
of a perfect, clearly point to the fact that the stem vāvasī was associated with intensive perfect in Vedic. This has as a consequence that avāvasātin is 3du. int. pff. act., āvāvasānta 3pl. int. pff. middle, and, finally, vāvasānta 3pl. int. pf. injunctive middle. This accounts for the ending -anta, which is the only attested ending of the 3pl. middle in the pluperfect, cf. dūtīsvānta, ādārdṛhōnta, inj. cakṛpānta. The only exceptional form is the active ptc. vāvasati (4.50.5), which can be compared to the secondary ptc. jāgāra.  

We may conclude that the regular 3pl. medial ending of the intensive injunctive is -ata, whereas -anta belongs either to the subjunctive, or to the perfect injunctive.

**ETYMOLOGY**

Finally, I would like to offer a short comment on the etymology of two roots, vs. vākās- and yājñḥ-.

Root kās- (pp. 102-4)

S. convincingly argues that the intensive cākāsīti means 'beschauen, betrachten', so that we have to postulate the original meaning 'to see, to cast a look' for the root. My only criticism concerns S.'s remark that the intensive is "im Rigveda die einzige Verbalbildung zur Wurzel" (p. 102). In the older literature, the present cāṣe, 3pl. cāṣate 'to see, cast a look' was considered a reduplicated present to vākās- (i.e. < *kēkēk-), and I believe that this view is correct. The present cāṣe exhibits exactly the same range of meanings proposed by S. for vākās-.14 is used with the same preverbs and in similar contexts. Nowadays, however, the derivation of cāṣat from *kēkēk- is considered untenable15 because Vedic cāṣ- and Iranian *cāš- show the same reflexes as if they represented PIE *kēkēs-. This is correct, but it does not mean that Skt. ks, Ir. š cannot reflect *kēk-. We now know that Skt. ks, Ir. š can go back to PIE *tk (cf. Skt. takṣ-, Ir. *taš- 'to fashion by cutting' < PIE *tek-, Gr. τέκτων), in spite of the fact that the exact details of the phonetic development are not entirely clear. It therefore seems probable that *kēk- developed in a similar fashion (possibly, *kēkēk- > *cāšti- > *cāšti- > Plur. *cāš-, yielding Ir. *cāš-, Skt. *cāṭr- > cāky-, cf. Burrow 1959: 88). Also cākṣur- n. 'eye', which is best analyzed as an original perfect participle (Leumann 1952: 105), points to the development *kēk > Skt. kṣ, Ir. š.

Root yājñḥ- (pp. 122-25)

S.'s notation of the root as yājñḥ- is unfortunate. Its only attestation is int. jāṅgahe, found in RV 1.126.6, AVS 5.19.4 (= AVP 9.19.1) and AVP 19.34.7, which points to the root ga(m)h-. The meaning of the verb is disputed. In the difficult RV passage with its many hapaxes, it is said about a wanton girl:

\[ \text{āgadhitā pārigadhitā yā kaśikēvā jāṅgahe dādāitī māhyām yādurī yāsānām bhujyāt satā} \]

Geldner translates: "Die angebückt, umarmt wie das Ichneumonweibchen sich abzappelt, die wöllüstige gewährt mir hundert Liebesgenüsse." S. suggested that the verb here means 'kümüt sich wiederholt, biegt sich immer wieder hoch', with references to the description of the copulation of ichneumons in the zoological literature. This meaning does not seem to fit AVS 5.19.4, however:

brahmagāvī pacīyāmānā yāvat śābhi vijāṅgahe tējo rāṣṛāsa nī hanti nā vīro jāyate vṛṣā

"The Brahman's cow being cooked, as far as she penetrates (?), smites out the brightness of the kingdom; no virile hero is born [there]." (Whitney)

S. interprets pādas ab 'solange die Brahmanenkuhm beim Braten sich zu seinen Schaden [Stück für Stück] auseinander biegt ...' (p. 125), which, to my mind, does not produce a satisfactory sense. I believe that the best explanation for vijāṅgahe is given in WVC (s.v.), where this form is connected with gandhā-'smell'. The AV passage thus gets a perfectly plausible interpretation: as far as the smell of the cooking of the brahman's cow reaches, it destroys the splendor of the kingdom, and no valiant sons are born there. We may find some support for this analysis in AVP (Kashmir) 19.34.7, which S. unfortunately left out of consideration, since, in her opinion, it provides "keinen brauchbaren Kontext zur Bedeutungsbestimmung" (p. 123). The passage is corrupt, indeed, but it does supply us with important information. It reads:

tvam atvamam surabhiṣiṣam māhyānam hāvator ami tāyā vidūr dhi jāṅgahe davā vārcasā dade. Reading uttamam for the evidently corrupt atvamam, we get tvam uttamam

---

14 S.'s assertion that the latter form belongs to the intensive because it is accented on the reduplication syllable (p. 180) is due to a mistake: on the same page she mistakenly accents the form on the reduplication syllable in the 1.62.3 passage.

15 All alleged examples of the meaning 'erschienen, sich zeigen', given by Grassmann, must be translated 'sehen, beschauen'; see Geldner's translation ad loc.

surabhisām 'you are the highest of the fragrant ones', which is a strong indication that jāṅgahe in pāda c means 'smells'. Admittedly, for a definitive conclusion we have to wait for the edition of the Oriissa version of the AVP.

We may therefore assume that (vi)jāṅgahe is an intensive to the root gandh- 'to smell'. As I have tried to show elsewhere (Lubotsky 1995), one of the typical positions where -dh - > -h- is exactly VdhW. The advantage of this analysis is further that (vi)jāṅgahe can be explained as a derivative of the root attested elsewhere in Vedic.

Let us now return to the RV passage. It is well known that ichneumons are famous for their smell. When squeezed at their back, they emit a strong musky odor. The only problem is that this concerns males, whereas the form kaśikā (a hapax!) seems to indicate a female. I do not think that this is a decisive counter-argument, however, because kaśikā-, in spite of its gender, may be a generic name for the species and not specifically refer to a female, cf. godhā- f. 'big lizard, alligator', etc. An additional argument in favor of the interpretation of jāṅgahe as an intensive to gandh- is the fact that the poet of 1.126 obviously plays with two different meanings of this root (dgaḥhitā pārīgaḥhitā vā kaśīkēva jāṅgahe 'squeezed, embraced, she smells like an ichneumon').

CORRIGENDA

Let me repeat that S.'s book is an important and useful contribution to the study of the Vedic intensive, which offers new insights and sharp analyses of many difficult problems. It is only a pity that the value of the book is strongly diminished by many mistakes, omissions, and inaccuracies on the part of the author. There are scores of wrong accents, omitted length marks and other omitted or wrong diacritics, inaccurately cited and translated text passages, wrong alphabetic order in the text passages, wrong alphabetic order in the index (passim), preverbs indiscriminately written together with the verbal form or separately or with a dash, wrong numbers of the passages cited, erroneously repeated headings (e.g., on pp. 18, 33–34, 135, 203), etc. In addition to what has been mentioned above, I here give a list of the most disturbing errors.

P. 15, l. 25: Delete vāvacīti.
P. 16, l. 9: vevyāte belongs to the forms cited in the next line.

P. 18, l. 12: Read: sēṣiḥat.
P. 18, ll. 30–31: Delete rāraksānas. Note that bad-badhāna- and marmjāna- are int. pf. participles and must be removed from this list.
P. 19, l. 23: Read: jāgāti.
P. 27, n. 29: vānivānas (S. gives vānivānas in the text and in the index) is nom. pl. of an adjective and not an intensive participle. Since S. does not include this form in her "Monographischer Teil," this must also be her opinion. Nevertheless, this unattested verbal stem appears further at p. 34, l. 26.
P. 35, 1. 8: Add sarisṛpī-, which is found in the RV.
P. 46, n. 80: S. cites Gotō 1987: 153 and n. 238, who argues that jārānt- 'old' cannot be an original participle to the present jārāti because of fem. jārattr-, which points to an athematic formation. Gotō therefore suggests considering jārānt- an independent adjective. In fact, this fem. is only attested in a late hymn, 9. 112 ("Anhang"), and merely shows that at some period jārānt- was indeed felt to be an adjective, to which the fem. was built in accordance with the pattern brhānt-: brhāt-, but this is by no means the original situation.
P. 70, l. 5: Delete bōbhuvati (=AV).
P. 70, l. 21: Read 3. du. med. sarṣrāte for 3. pl. med. sarṣrate.
P. 106, l. 3: Read "VIII 20, 19" for "VIII 22, 6."
P. 109, l. 14: Read: (abhi-)kāṅkaṇradat 1, 11, 15, IV, V2, IX33, X3.
P. 112, l. 9: Add voc. cekitaṇa II 33, 15.
P. 114, l. 8: Read: prātī jōguve I 127, 10 = V 64, 2.
P. 114, l. 9: Read: āpa jōguvānas.
P. 135, l. 21: Add ā-dardrā- (VIII 100, 4; X 78, 6).
P. 138, l. 10: Add VII 21, 4.
P. 141, l. 22: Read: III 2, 11.
P. 151, n. 448: apāvṛtā-, ānapāvṛt- do not contain two preverbs, āpa and ā, but only āpa with a regular lengthening before the root vr-.

P. 152, n. 449: (lines 4–5) read "Perfekt des Intensivs" for "Perfekt des Partizips." The rule proposed in Lubotsky 1981 is cited incorrectly. Read "VHD > VD,

---

17 Barret's reconstruction (1940: 53), tvam uttamam surādhasaṁ, is probably wrong.
when followed by a consonant (D = any voiced unaspirated stop)."

P. 154, l. 2: Read: 1 30, 16.

P. 175, l. 23: Read: (= X 8, 1).

P. 175, l. 28: Add IX 71, 2.

P. 192, l. 9: Read: I 164, 31 = X 177, 3.


P. 203, l. 9: Read: IX 66, 24.

P. 203, l. 20: Read “zwei” for “drei.”
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