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**List of abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>Atharvaveda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVP</td>
<td>Atharvaveda Paippalāda recension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AĀ</td>
<td>Aitareya-Āraṇyaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JB</td>
<td>Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KB</td>
<td>Kauśītaki-Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Mantra-Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Maitrāyaṇī-Śaṃhitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV</td>
<td>Rigveda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Sađviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŚBK</td>
<td>Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa Kāṇva recension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŚBM</td>
<td>Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa Mādhyandina recension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>Sāmaveda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TĀ</td>
<td>Taittiriya-Āraṇyaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB</td>
<td>Taittiriya-Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Taittiriya-Śaṃhitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YV</td>
<td>Yajur-Veda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>act.</td>
<td>active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aor.</td>
<td>aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caus.</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desid.</td>
<td>desiderative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impv.</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inj.</td>
<td>injunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>int.</td>
<td>intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>med.</td>
<td>middle-voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opt.</td>
<td>optative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part.</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pass.</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ppp.</td>
<td>perfect passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres.</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red.</td>
<td>reduplicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subj.</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voc.</td>
<td>vocative</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 kr, śru, bhū, av, gam, dā, dhā and other, mostly common verbs have fully attested present and aorist systems with reasonably numerous examples of each, other, equally common verbs, such as as and i, have no aorist system. Many other common verbs, such as bhr, 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 – -dhí for root-aorists, -si for sigmatic aorists\(^1\), and -a for thematic aorists, while the -iś\(^2\), -siś\(^2\), 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, Ḟā\(^1\) and Ḟā, cannot differentiate the injunctive and imperative in the 2nd person singular but can in the 3rd: the forms Ḟas and Ḟas function as both injunctive and imperative, while in the 3rd person we have both Ḟat, Ḟat and Ḟatu, Ḟahu.\(^4\)

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 asmābhyaṃ māhi vārīvaḥ sugām kah, and 1.102.4c asmābhyaṃ indra vārīvaḥ sugām kṛdhi ‘For us, O Indra, make space, wide and

---

\(^1\) See page 43ff.

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

\(^3\) See page 37ff.

\(^4\) The verbs sthā and gā have the same limitations. See pages 37ff and especially 42ff.
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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 41ff.

⁶ Skinner (1957: 35ff.).
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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
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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 mitráṁ kṛṇadhvaṁ khālu mlātā no ‘Grant us your friendship8, have mercy on us . . .’.

The Soma-stones also appear as the addressees of an imperative: 10.175.2 grāvaṇo āpa duchānām, āpa sedhata durmatīm / usrāḥ 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 īndraḥ purāstād uta madhyatō nah, sākhā sākhībhya 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 urūṁ no gātū/munderdot soma mīdunderdothva/hunderdot ‘Make us a wide road, O generous Soma’ as is 8.80.4c purāstād enam [rātham] me kṛdhi ‘Put it (my chariot) in front for me’ with 8.45.9ab asmākāṁ sū rātham purā, īndraḥ kṛṇotu sātāye ‘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 arvācīṇaṁ sū te máno, grāva kṛṇotu vagnūnā ‘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 “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.”.

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.
In 6.69.2cd prā vāṃ gīrāḥ śasyāmānā avantu, prā stómāso gīyāmānāso arkaṅh
‘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.\footnote{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.}

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 mahitvām astu vajrīṇe ‘May there be greatness for the Vajra-bearer’ or
1.24.9b urvī gabhīrā sumatiṣṭe astu ‘may your compassion be profound and broad’.
An interesting example is: 1.30.12 tāthā tād astu somapāḥ, sākhe vajrin tāthā
kṛnu / yāthā ta uśmāṣṭāye ‘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 somapāḥ (V.) and sākhe vajrin and are on exactly the same level. kṛnu
here could be seen semantically (but obviously not morhpologically) as a causative
of 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\footnote{These terms date back to Damourette and Pichon (1952).},
cannot, by
deinition, 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.
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 īṃ stavat kāḥ prṇāt kō yajāte, yād ugrām in 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...asmē sā [rayī] indrāvarunāv āpi svāt ... utā naḥ ... sūribhya indrāvarunā rayīḥ svāt ‘[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 asmē 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 syāt naḥ sūnūs tānayo vijāvā, āgne sā te sūmatīr bhūtv asmē ‘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 stómo agriyō, ḫrdsprīg astu sāmtamaḥ ‘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 idām dyāvāpythvī satyām astu, pītar mātar yād ihōpabrūvē 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 yāmaḥ ‘May your path be bright’ and 1.140.11ab idām agne sūdhitām dūrdhitād ādhi,
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priyād u cin māmmanaḥ préyo 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 ná me stotāmatīvā ná dārhitāḥ, syād aye ná 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 dhā 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 than 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, krīṇīta 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 vārvṛtyāt, which can also be interpreted as a perfect form – and just a few in -yās, the ending -yāt 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.\textsuperscript{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>249</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhū</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śru</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṁru</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dā</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>* 45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>** 0</td>
<td>2</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>*** 175</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>** 1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>1593</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>1669</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
* dā 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\textsuperscript{1}).

\textsuperscript{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/-dh/-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></td>
<td>-antu</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>-ātām</td>
<td>-atām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 thematic</td>
<td></td>
<td>-etām</td>
<td>-antām</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:

act.

<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.
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 explaining. 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 (pa). There are, however, a number of cases where -dhi occurs after a vowel:

1) Root forms containing an original *-zdherent or *-źdh- cluster: edhí (as), šádhi, šaśādhi (śás), tālhi (taks).

2) Disyllabic root aorists from roots ending in -r: kṛdhí (kr), vṛdhí (vr), spṛdhí (spr).

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

4) The form śrudhí (śru), which is explained by Lubotsky (1995) as being due to the prevalence of the form in the interior of the pāda, and the high proportion of its occurrences in formulae, especially, śrudhí hávam. Likewise the form śrṇudhí. As will be shown below, this latter form was coined especially to enable the use of the formula śrudhí hávam in certain metrical environments, we may actually entertain the notion that the form śrudhí 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 yódhi (yudh) and bodhí (budh), which may not have the -dhi ending at all, and for which see p. 26.

6) The form bodhí (bhū), for which see p. 25, and yuyodhí (yu2).

Stem-final consonants have regular sandhi before the -dhi ending, e.g. mumugdhí (muc), šagdhí (šak), etc., while stem-final consonant clusters are simplified so that *-nddhi > -ndhi and *-ṅd-dhi > *-ṅgdhi > -ṅdhi. The examples of this development, most of which are derived from -n-infix presents, are anđhí (aṅc), undhí (ud), chindhí (chid), trndhí (trd), prṇdhí (prc), bhaṇdhi (bhaṅj), bhindhí (bhid) and vṛndhí (vrj). The root aṅc is exceptional in also having a form angdhi.18

17 See also Lubotsky (1995).
18 See also Insler (1972: fn 9).
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The ending is always accented where the accent is preserved: *aṇḍhī (aṇ), aḍḍhī (ad), iḥ, inuḥ (i), ṭṛṇuḥi, ṭṛṇhī (kr), jāgrhī (gr), gṛṇhī (gf), cinuḥi (ci), cikiddhī (cit), chindhī (chid), daddhī, dehī (dā), diḍihī, diḍhī (ḍī), dāḍhī (ḍr), dhehī (dhā), dhṛṇuḥi (dhrṣ), pāhī (pā₁ and pā₂), pīṭhī (pī), punḍhī (pū), pūrdhī (pū₂), pīṛṭhī (prī), bhindhī (bhīd), bodhī (bhū), mamaddhī (mad), mīṃḍhī (mā), munugdhī (muc), yandhī (yan), yāḥī (yā), yuyodhī (yu₂), rārandhī (ran), rārandhī (randh), vāvandhī (van₂), vidhī (vid), vīhi (vī), āṛṇuhi (vṛ₁), sāḍhī (ṣak), ssuṇḍhī (ṣuc), ssṛṇuḥi, ssṛṇdūhī, ssṛnḥhī (ṣru), sīśīhī (sā), sṛṇīhī (ṣīr), stūhī (stu), jaḥī (han), with the single exception of the form yōḍhī (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 (ad), edhī (as), cākandhī (kan), tālḥī (takṣi), pāhī (pā₁ and pā₂), bodhī (budhī), bhāhī (bhā), bodhī (bhū), mamaddhī (mad), mamandhī (man₂), māhī (mā₁), yandhī (yan), yāḥī (yā), yuyodhī (yu₂), yōḍhī (yudhī), rārandhī (ran), randhī, rārandhī (randh), vāvandhī (van₂), vāhī (vā), sāḍhī (ṣak), sāḍhī, sāḍhī (sā), snathīhī (ṣnath), sāhī (sā), stanihī (stan).

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: *h₁ṣdhi would have yielded *ṣdhi (a form which is attested in Avestan zḍi), and *h₂y-dhī would likely have yielded *dhi. To this group must also be added mamaddhī, sāḍhī and tālḥī, whose roots cannot form zero-grades.

2) pāhī, vāhī, sāhī, yāḥī, 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 rirṭhī from rā, mimiṭhī from mā, sīśīhī from sā and jihiṣva from hā₁. 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 sāhīṣītam from the root sā shows that it is most likely an innovation.

¹⁹ For the possible existence of an archaic form ēhi 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 avidādhi may originally have belonged to this group. See page 94.

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

5) cākandhi, mamandhi, yuyodhī, rārandhī (from ran) and vāvandhī show that reduplicated perfects from set and anīt 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 Cer have zero grade in the same forms: jāgrhī, dādṛhī, pipṛhī. Insler (1972:554ff.), and later Kümmel (2001: 414) ascribe these forms to an analogy with unattested but very probable 3rd pl. forms such as *rāraṇūr, 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 *-ṛH-ur. If this is the case, then this process must of course have begun with set roots and spread to anīt roots later.

6) yandhī and bodhī (bhā) are genuinely problematic. Insler (1972: 551ff.) explains the former as being patterned after the 3rd pl. ind. aor. form āyamur, in the same way as both 2nd pers. sing. impv. gahī and 3rd pers. ind. aor. āgmān have zero grade. However, the problem is not only yandhī; 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 Cer have zero grade in the second person singular imperative was one – there were many forms ending in -andhī and almost none ending in -ahi. Likewise, bodhī could have come under the same influence from forms like yuyodhī, 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 pāṃṣi, which also all have full-grade of the root.

As for bodhī, since Wackernagel (1896: 1-274) it has been accepted that the form bodhī is unoriginal. It is considered to be a redactional replacement for *būdhi. 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 bodhī 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 *bheuH-, thus allowing bodhi to be explained as an original, full-grade root aorist impv. *bheH₂u-dhi, of the same type as yandhī.

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 sās – sāsti – sādhi, 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 jániṣṭha.

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 *jeudh-dhi to *jeu-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 *ē : *ē 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 *jēudh-dhi rather than the more conventional *jūdh-dhi, since the only actual example of a “Narten” present which has a imperative is stūuti, whose imperative is stūhi. Jasanoff then goes on to suggest that the form yódhi and bodhi were formed by analogy to the -si impv. jōsi citing parallel forms throughout the conjugations of the two verbs. jōsi, he claims, was reanalysed by speakers as jōṣ-i, and this i-imperative was extended to the parallel roots yudh and

---

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

22 For more details see also p. 140.

23 This form is considered secondary by Insler (1972: 557), who posits original *stōḍhi. It is unclear to me why Jasanoff rejects Insler’s example of the verb sās.
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*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 *hāni* ‘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).

It is clear to me that the crux of any discussion of these forms must be the unique accentuation of the form *yōdhi*. 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 *jōši*, by which impvs can be formed of the type *CēRC*-i. The hitherto unexplained form *ghōši* is constructed in exactly the same way, as is *cākṣi*, 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 *jōši*. Furthermore, there is at least one other form of precisely this type: *randhī*, from the root *randh*. Unfortunately, the accentuation of this form has not been preserved.

Not least among the parallel forms in the conjugations of *yōdhi* and *jōši* are the aorist subjunctives *yodhat* and *jōsat*, which alongside the imperative forms exhibit the ubiquitous -*i/-at* pattern seen throughout the examples of the -*si* imperative.

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 *jōši* : *jōsa*, *pārṣi* : *parṣa*, *bodhī* : *bōdha*, and *nēši* : *neša*. 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 bodhat, 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 aviddhī, which is an is-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 krṇu and krṇuhi, śṛṇu and śṛṇuhi 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 – aśāna, grhānā. Since, as has been known since de Saussure, puṇāti is constructed in the same way as yunakti, then the form puṇīhī is constructed in the same way as bhandhi (< *bhugdhi ) i.e. *punHdhi. This is also, of course, exactly analogous to the form śṛṇuhi. The forms such as grḥānā are likewise probably analogous to forms such as śṛṇu. Gotō (1987: 331) claims that it is “universally accepted” that these forms arose through dissimilation from an original *grḥānā, 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 *grbh < *ghrb hH, to which the above mentioned particle was added. While this explains the forms aśāna and grhānā, it does not explain two other forms, puṇā 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 mṛṇīhi (*puṇīhi is not attested in the

26 See page 94.

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

28 The attested forms of this type are: grṇīhi, from gr, “to praise, welcome”, jānīhi, from jānā, “to know”, mṛṇīhi, from mṛṇ, “to crush”, puṇīhi, from pū, “to purify”, śṛṇīhi, from śṛ, “to crush”, and śṛṇīhi, from śṛ, “to prepare”.

29 For the possible conditions under which zero-grade laryngeals produced i in Indic see Jamison (1988).
The morphology of the imperative RV), related in the same way as śṛṇu and śṛṇuḥi.30 As to their construction, we lack both internal and comparative evidence. The most likely explanation is that it is a full-grade form *plnehi of the same type as other PIE endingless imperatives from laryngeal-final stems.31 If this is true, then Gotó’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 *(h)adzdhi, via intermediate forms *(h)azdhi and *hedhī. A further dissimilation of the two /dh/ sounds would have achieved the final forms, as noted by Lubotsky (1995: 34). This explanation is accepted by Mayrhofer (1986: 111). According to this theory, it is the presence of the three /dh/ sounds in the word that caused a different treatment to similar forms such as viddhī.

The situation is complicated by the fact that the verb dāḥ also has a form daddhī. Thus, we need to suppose that 1) either this form was reconstructed on the basis of forms such as viddhī, 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 *dhaddhī 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 īrṣva, ārṇuṣva, kṛṇuṣvā, kṛṣvā, jihīṣva, tanuṣva, dhatuṣva, dhiṣvā, dadhiṣvā, dhuṣtva, mimikṣvā, vanuṣva, vavṛtṣva, vṛṇīṣvā, śṛṇuṣvā and yakṣvā. However, unlike the ending -dhī, on those occasions where the stem is full-grade, the stem is accented (where preserved) and not the ending: īṣva, jāniṣva,

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

31 See page 42.
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mātśva, māśva, rāśva, sākṣva, sākṣva, trāśva, vāṃśva, vāśiśva, yākṣva.

The forms īśva, jāniśva and vāśiśva 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 jāniśva 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 seṭ roots. It is also possible the usual zero-grade second person sing. form *jāśva would have been replaced by levelling with the rest of the paradigm - jāniṣṭa etc.32 On the other hand, vāśiśva is usually considered33 to be an -iṣ-aorist form. The root vas is anīṃ, thus precluding any possibility that this is a root-form.

īśva is more problematic. Narten (1964: 238) considers it to be an innovation constructed on the basis of the root present īte. Since a form *īśva is apparently phonetically impossible in Vedic, this explanation is probably correct. The stem is a reduplicated present < *h₂ī-h₂śd̐-, 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. mimikṣvā is one, which has the accent on the suffix, but the closest comparison may be the form sākṣva, which could go back to *sē-sg̃h-, 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, grnātu, cinotu, jīgātu, ḍāḍātu, ḍātu, dardartu, ḍāḍhātu, bravītu, vētu, hantu, etc. The only exceptions to this are the zero grade bhātu and babhātu.

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

33 E.g. by Narten (1964: 238f.).
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 gānta and kārtā. A full list of full-grade second person plural forms, and full-grade/zero-grade second person plural variants is: iyarta (ṛ₁), unātta (ud), kṛṇutā/kṛṇota, kṛta/kārtta (kṛ), gata/gānta/gantā (gaṃ), jīgāta, gāta (ga₂), datta/dādhāta, dāhāta (dhā), pāta (pā₁), pādā (pā₂), punītā/punīta (pū), yānta (yam), yātā (yā), yuvāta (yu₂), yuvākta (yu), vartta (vrṭ), śṛṇutā/śṛṇota, śṛuta/śṛóta (šru), sunūta/sunōta, sōta (su), stota (stu), hinōta, hetā (hi), juhuta/juhōta (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 gānta and gantā. The forms pātā and yātā 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 (aṅhi), aviṣṭāna (av), itana, ētana (ī), kārtana, kṛṇotana (kṛ), gāntana (gaṃ), gātana, jīgātana (ga₁), citana (ci), jujuśṭana (juṣ), dadātana (dā₁), didiśṭana (diś), dādhātana, dhātana, dhetana (dhā), nahyatana (nah), pīnaśṭana (piś), pūntāna (pū), pipartana (pr), pṛṇītana (pṛ₁), braviṭana (bru), bhajatana (bhaj), bhūtana (bhū), mamattāna (maḍ), yantana (yam), yātāna (yā), yuvātana (yu₂), rāniśṭana (ran), vavrītana (vrṭ), śāśṭīna (śāṣ), śnāṭiśṭana (śnāṭ), ṣrīṇītana (ṣṛī), śṛṇotana (šru), sadatana (sad), sunūtana, sotana (su), hantana (han), hinotana (hi), juhōtana (hu).

The -tana ending is generally attached to the full-grade stem, the exceptions being itana, citana, jujuśṭana, didiśṭana, dhātana, punītana, pṛṇītana, vavrītana and śrīṇītana. 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 kṛnu-, the resulting *kṛnutana 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’, nhayatana in 10.53.7a aksānāho nhayatanotá somyāh ‘Bind fast the ties (straps) to the wagon shaft, O Soma-worshippers’34 and sadatana, the aor. impv. of sad, at 2.36.3ab amēva naḥ suhavā ā hí gāntana, nū barhiśi sadaṇā rāṇiṣṭana, ‘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 rāṇiṣṭana. In the second example the poet’s intention seems to be to use the form nhayatana to gain another -na- syllable to enhance this line’s consonance: aksānāho nhayatanotā somyāh. 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 āḍhī stotrasya sakhyāsyā gātā and 5.55.9c āḍhī stotrasya sakhyāsyā 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. kr̥tām, 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), dhātām (dhā), pātām (pā₁ and pā₂), yantām (yam), yātām (yā), yayaṭām/yayaṭotām (yaya₂), voḥām (vah), vartām (vṛ₁), hinotām (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: sāntu (as), yāntu (i), kṛṇvantu (kṛ), ciyántu (ci), punántu (pū), vanvántu (van₁), vyántu (vī), śṛṇvantu (śru).

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 dhatt/amacronacutem (dhā), pāt/amacronacutem (pā), pip/runderringt/amacronacutem (p/runderring), and sast/amacronacutem (sas), while the 3rd sing. med. form occurs only in kṛṇutām (kṛ). 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 śrāthām (ś), mānāthām (mā), yuṇjāthām (yu), rārāthām 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 (idh), īratām (rı), 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: krṇudhvām (kṛ), yungdhvām (yu), vṛṇādhvām (vṛ₂), which are accented on the ending, and the sigmatic aorist form trādhvam, 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 indhvam (idh) < *indh-dhvam, and vavrdhvam (vṛ) < *vavrd-dhvam, however the form yungdhvām preserves the /g/, which is most often lost before -dhi.35

---

35 See p. 23.
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), vàvṛdhásva\(^{36}\) (vṛdh) and vàvṛśasva (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 śak has to all intents and purposes become a separate root in its own right. Other attested forms are cikītsa, from cit, vivāsa and vivāsata, from van\(^1\) ‘to win’\(^{37}\) and didhi/sunderdotantu from dhā ‘put’.\(^{38}\)

The desiderative cikītsa appears at 6.47.20cd bṛhaspatye prā cikītsa gāviṣṭāv, itthā satē jārita indrā pāṃthām ‘Bṛhaspati, 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 -aḥbhyebhyah prā cikītsa 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 vivāsa nāmasā, ‘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 sīṣāsati, the desid. of sanṛ. 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 *uī-ṛṇ-Hse- as

\(^{36}\) This form may have been created to disambiguate the regular form *vāyṛtsva, which could have been misinterpreted as belonging to the root vṛt. See also p. 170.

\(^{37}\) For the distinction between the roots van\(^1\) ‘win’ and van\(^2\) (vanṛ) ‘love’, see p. 162.

\(^{38}\) See page 125.
shown also by such forms as cikīrṣati from kr (*kṣi-kṛ-Hse-), yāyāṣa-*ja-He-Hse-*) from yu ‘bind’ and cikīṣa-*kvi-He-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,\(^{40}\) corresponding to the third pers. sing. and pl. present med. forms duhē and duhrē. A unique imperfect form āduha is attested in the MS. The form duhām is attested twice at 4.57.7c sā naḥ pāyasватī duhām ‘Let the milk-laden one give us milk’ and 1.164.27c duhām aśvibhyāṃ pāyo aghnyēyāṃ ‘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\(^{41}\), 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.\(^{42}\) It is in all cases singular, except for 10.24.5cd, nāsatayēv abruvan dev/āḥ, 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), kṛṣatāt (2.30.5d), carkṛtāt (1.104.5c), gachatāt (10.154.1-4d. 10.154.5d), dattāt (10.16.2b), dhahatāt (3.18.1d), dhātāt (3.8.1c), punītāt (10.30.5d), bhavatāt (3.23.2d), yachatāt (1.48.15c), yācatāt (9.86.41d), rakṣatāt (4.50.2d), vahatāt (10.24.5d), vocatāt (5.61.18a), vittāt (5.60.6d), vitāt (10.11.8d), vrhatāt (1.174.5c, 4.16.12d, in identical pādas), hinutāt (10.16.1d).

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

The -táṭ ending is generally attached to the present stem, however it occurs once with an aorist – vocatáṭ – and once with a perfect stem – vittáṭ. 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 -táṭ forms are considered by most scholars to be a ‘future imperative’, although this tendency is most pronounced in the Brāhmaṇaś. Thus Macdonell (1916: 348) says: ‘The form in -tád 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 Brāhmaṇaś, 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 -táṭ 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 -táṭ impv. to appear in the apodosis of conditional or temporal clauses; eight of the attested examples appear thus, e.g.: 10.30.5d yād āśīrvac āśadhibhiḥ punítāṭ ‘when you pour them in, purify with grass’, or 10.16.1cd-10.16.2ab yadā śṛtāṃ krṇāvo jātavedō, āthem enam prá hinūtā pitṛbhyaḥ / śṛtāṃ yadā kārasi jātavedō, āthem enam pāri dattāḥ pitṛbhyaḥ ‘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 gāchāty āsuniḥtām etām, āthā devánāṁ vaśanībhavāti ‘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 uśmāsi tād vaso kṛdhi, ‘as we wish, that you (will) do’, or 4.16.17cd ghorāḥ yād aṁṛtyuṁ bhātvāty, ādha smā naṁ 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'.

The rest of the examples of the -tāt imperative appear to show no special semantic features to differentiate them from other imperative forms: e.g. 3.23.2cd āgne vi paśya brhatābhi rāyā, īśāṃ no netā bhavatād anu 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 pā1 ‘protect’), yāhi (yā), sāhi (sā), vāhi (vā), māhi (mā1 ‘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 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 *sthāhi. 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 sām yād viśā ‘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’.

Translation Klein (1985: 2-105).

Most certainly not **dhīhi, **dīhi 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; sā (of the type known as sā-figē), sū, and tú. While the status of the former is somewhat controversial, it is apparent that it occurs practically exclusively with imperatives and imperative-like forms. Likewise sū is confined virtually always to modal formations, while tú mostly is.

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 dāḥ, 17 could be considered to be positive modals, the rest being either negative modal or else belong to Hoffmann’s historical or mythological class of injunctives. Of these 17, five are verb initial, and are not marked by either sū or tú (as sā-figē always occurs at the beginning of a pāda it cannot occur here). Of the remaining 12, one occurs with tú: 1.169.4a tvām tā na indra tām rayīṃ dāḥ ‘You give us that property, O Indra’, one with sū: 6.33.1a yā ājīṣṭha indra tām sā no dāḥ ‘That (exhilaration) which is mightiest, O Indra, give that to us’, and two have sā-figē: 5.33.6cd sā na ēnīṃ vasāvāno rayīṃ dāḥ ‘Give us colourful property . . . ’ and 9.97.25cd sā naḥ sahāsrā bṛhatīr iṣo dāḥ bhāvā soma druṇītavā punānāḥ ‘Give us . . . ’

47 Jamison (1992) finds that of 180 occurrences of sā-figē, approx. 160 are associated with imperatives and other modals. A further ten examples occur as correlatives for yā- 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 sū, 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.
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 sóvishṭam na ā bhara śāra śāva, ājīṣṭham ējo abhibhūta ugrām / viśvā dyumā viśnyā mānuṣaṇām, asmābhyaṁ 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 ántama utā triātā, śivō bhavā varātyahā / vāsūr angrīr vāsūravāvā cāhā nakṣi, dyumāttamaṁ rayṁ dáḥ ‘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 dáśiśe rayṁ, virāvantam pärinasam / śiśīhī naḥ sūnumāth ‘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.

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, 4.6.11.b, 4.17.18b, 4.32.12c, 5.7.9.d, 5.36.5d, 5.83.7a, 6.4.4c, 6.10.6a, 6.13.5b, 6.40.1d, 6.47.9a, 6.47.50a, 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 dhāh and dáḥ occasionally seem to be subjunctive forms, e.g.: 3.28.5 āgne trīye sāvane hī kānīṣāḥ, puroṣṭaṁ sahasah śūnaḥ dūtām / āthā devēyāv adhvarīṁ vipānyāyā, dhā rāṇavantam amṛteṣu jāgṛvīṁ ‘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, among the immortals, with approval, full of gifts, awake. 4.6.11ab ākāri brāhma samāthāna tābhyaṁ, sāṁsāty uktāṁ yādite u u 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 dáḥ which could possibly be subjunctive is: 6.35.1ab kaḍā bhuvan rāṭhakṣayāṁ brāhma, kaḍā stotre sahasrapoṣyāṁ dhāḥ ‘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.
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Interestingly, the negative modal syntagma *mā dhāḥ never occurs.

Of the modal examples, nine appear with sā-figē, 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 *sā revāc choca sā gīro juṣasva, sā vāyaṇa darṣi 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 prēṣō yandhi sutapāvan vājān / sthā ā śā ārdhvā āṭā āriṣanyann ‘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-figē: 7.62.2a *sā sūrya prāti purō na āud 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), yodhīḥ 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 u here is a sentence connector. For the combination ā 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-figē is enough to classify the example as modal.
The morphology of the imperative

\(tābhīrūṣāvṛtrahātye\) ‘with that help us in the slaying of obstacles’ and 10.120.3d \(adāḥsūmādhūmādhunābhīyodhiḥ\) ‘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 \(pīpihi\) as such. An example of such usage is the form \(tatanah\), from the root \(stan\) ‘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 \(sadaḥ\) (6x) / \(sada\) (5x), \(vocaḥ\) (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 \(kr\), which has the very widely attested aor. impv. \(krdhī\), the most commonly attested of all of the aorist imperatives with 100 attestations. The aorist injunctive form \(kaḥ\) is attested 28 times, of which only two examples are modal. It never occurs with \(sū\) or with \(sā-figē\). Conversely, the imperative form \(krdhī\) occurs with these two modality-markers numerous times. As Hoffmann correctly points out, one of the occurrences of modal \(kaḥ\) is a metrical variation of an otherwise almost identical line which contains the form \(krdhī\):

\[\text{tristubhr} 6.44.18b \text{asmābhyaṃ māhi vārivaḥ sugāṃ kaḥ}\]

\[\text{jagatī 1.102.4c asmābhyaṃ indra vārivaḥ sugāṃ kṛdhī}\]

64 See p. 134.
The other modal example is 1.164.49d sārasvatī tām ihā dhātave 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 kṛdhi arvāṅc- 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 bhūh, which Hoffmann says has no certain modal examples, does nevertheless occur once with sā-figē (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 dhaḥ, dāḥ, sthāḥ, and gāḥ, 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 ιστόη, 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; sthāḥ and dāḥ. It is likewise noteworthy that the verbs corresponding to dhā and dā in Greek lack the -θ imperative, instead exhibiting the unusual forms Θές and δός. On the other hand, both have genuine third person imperatives, Θετω and δότω, corresponding to the attested Vedic forms dātū and dhātū. The Vedic evidence would seem to indicate 2nd pers. *dhā, 3rd pers. dātū, etc. While the two paradigms are not directly comparable they do at least indicate that the second person imperative did not end in -dhi, 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 (1972: 559). Such forms are also discussed by Dunkel (1985), on which see further discussion on page 95.

66 Quoted in Dunkel (1985).
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 kāḥ 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 Vedie, there is also one example in Avestan, dōiṣṭī, at Y.33.13a, from the verb dis (Ved. diṣ), ‘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 ni, which have thematic presents and sigmatic aorists, e.g. yaja-/yakṣ-. 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 imperative form yodhiś, used modally at 10.120.3ed is in fact formed on the basis of the anomalous imperative form yodhi.
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sigmatic aorists, e.g. *prṇātī/prās-. His third group consists of *dr, *yam, *mā, *ksi, vī, juś, 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 – *darṣasi. 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 -σον, as in, e.g. Homeric λέξον, δεῖξον, etc., noting that the Greek sigmatic aorist, like its Vedic counterpart, cannot take the 2nd sing. aor. impv. ending -dhi/-θ.

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.

See footnote 98, below.
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 jóši. 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
śroši, jóši and nakši, 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 homophonic 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

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

72 I am omitting consideration of the form vāṃsi, 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
purūrāṇā ci dhy āṣty, āvo nānām vai vāruna / mitra vāṃsi vai vāṃ sumatin ‘Because it exists
so widely, I would win your grace now, O Varuṇa, your goodwill, O Mitra.’
**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 śaṣmaś, citró ná súraḥ práti cakṣi bhānūm,* ‘Your hissing comes like thunder from heaven, show your brilliance, being bright like the sun,’ and 9.97.33ab *divyāḥ suparnò ’va cakṣi soma, pīvan dhārūḥ kārmanā devāvītau,* ‘Look (down) like the heavenly eagle, O Soma, fattening your streams with a sacrificial act at the divine feast’.

**ghōṣi** ‘listen’

Root: *ghuṣ;* pres. *ghoṣati;* 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 *ārcāmi te sumāti/munderdot ghōṣi arvāk* ‘I sing to your goodwill, listen here’ and 6.5.6d *tāj jušasva jaritūr 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 ‘lauttönend’. The small number of occurrences of this form and the large number of possibilities 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 vāruṇaḥ 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.\(^\text{73}\)

**jéśi** ‘win’

Root: ji; pres. jāyat; aor. ajāśam, jeh ; no. of occurrences: 7

This form is clearly derived from the sigmatic aorist stem jaiśa. As usual, it bears a strong resemblance to the subj. aorist jéṣat. 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 jéśi ca púvamāna máhi śrávaḥ, ‘Win and conquer great fame (for us), O purified Soma’.\(^\text{74}\) where it is clearly an imperative.

**jóśi** ‘like’

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

All the forms of this verb appear to be aorist,\(^\text{75}\) with the addition of some perfect forms. A present stem juṣa- was later built on the basis of the aorist.\(^\text{76}\)

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 jóśi is derived from jósat, 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 juṣa-. 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 jósat as being derived from jóśi. Furthermore, it is possible that this form was created analogically on the basis of jéṣat/jéśi.

---


\(^{74}\) Translation Klein (1985: 2-72).

\(^{75}\) As well as the common root aorist forms of this verb, one -iṣ aorist form exists, jóśiṣat, 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 *togōss* with loss of final *i*. See also *nakṣi* and *śroṣi*.

Another imperative form from the same stem, *joṣā*, is attested once, for which see p. 27 and p. 113.77

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

*dārṣi* ‘pierce’

Root: *dr* / *dṛ*; Pres. –;

The root *dr* has several s-aorist forms, including *dārṣat* and *dārṣasi*, and also has what are classified as root aorist injunctive forms, *dar*, and *dart*.79 The existence of these forms would seem to undermine the assertion of Cardona (1965: 8) that the possible classification of *yakṣi*, *parṣi*, *satsi*, *yamṣi* 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 injunctions, 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*80 are to be classified as imperatives, e.g. 8.24.4 ā nirekāṁ utā priyām, īndra dārṣi jānānām / dhrṣatā dhṛṣṭa 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-śi and ā-bhara is obvious.

---

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

78 Werba (1997: §414), gives *dṛnāti*, 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 *daḥ* (cf. *kāḥ* from *kar-s* and *kar-t*), so the latter form must have been rebuilt in a similar way to *āprāt* (see *prāsi*).

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.
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The one exception is 6.26.5ab, where the form darṣi occurs in a relative clause. See p. 59.

dhākṣi ‘burn’

Root: dah; pres. dahati; 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 sū viśvān rakṣāso dhāksy agne, bhāvā yajñānām abhiṣastipāvā, ‘Burn up all the Rakṣasas, O Agni, become the defender of the sacrifices from curses’, 4.4.4 úd agne tiṣṭha práty á tanuṣva, ny āmītrāh oṣatāt tigmahete / yó no árātīm samidhāna cakrē, nīcā tām dhakṣy atasām nā śuśkam, ‘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 śuśkam vānam indra heti, rākṣo ni dhakṣy aśānir nā bhūmā, ‘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 daksī: tvāṁ vi bhāsy ánu daksī dāvāne, ‘you shine out, ... to give’. Geldner thinks this is the -si form from daks, 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. anat (root aorist); no. of occurrences: 1

This form appears once, at 5.24.2b áchā nakṣi dyumāttamaṃ rayīm dāḥ ‘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 Wurzelerweiterung 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 yākṣat/yākṣi.

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

néṣi ‘lead’
Root: nī; pres. nayati; aor. anaiṣṭa, nesā ; 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 jēṣijēṣat from ji, shows the pair nēṣi/nēṣat. 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 āṇītām, which have not been satisfactorily explained, although perhaps they should be classed together with the similarly difficult form jītam, from ji.

The form nēṣi appears 10 times, e.g.: 3.15.3c vāso nēṣi ca pārśi cāty āṇhaḥ ‘Lead us, O good one, and pass us over troubles’, in which also note the presence of another -si imperative, pārṣi.

An imperative form nēṣa, similar to jōṣa and parṣa, is attested at Atharvaveda 7.97.2.

pārṣi ‘pass, bring’
Root: pr; pres. piparti; aor. prāṣat; 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(ṣ) for a similar example.
82 1.31.18; 1.91.1; 1.129.5; 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 (pārṣat) and reduplicated aorist forms (apāparan). 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.
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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; parṣi/parṣat.

Another imperative is also attested, parṣā, at 1.97.8ab sā naḥ śindhum iva nāvāyā-. -ātī 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+impv. construction, leave little doubt that this is an imperative.85

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

prāsi ‘fill’

Root: pr; pres. prāti; aor. āprās (3rd sing. sigmatic) ; no. of occurrences: 2

This form is attested twice, 1.42.9 and 8.1.23, both times in the expression prāsy 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: bha; pres. bhajati/-te; aor. bhakṣ-; no. of occurrences: 1
The only occurrence of this form is at 7.41.2d:

prātarjītam bhāgam ugrāṃ havema
vayām putrām āditer yō vidhartā |
ādhrāś cid yām mānyamānas turāś cid
rājā cid yām bhāgam bhakṣīty 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 matsat/mátsi. 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.

*māsi* ‘measure’

Root: mā; pres. mimite; aor. māhi, māsi, māsva; no. of occurrences: 5

This form occurs 5 times.87 The only attested aorist forms of this verb are the imperatives māhi88 and māsva, and the form māsi.

An example of māsi is 1.92.7cd prajáváto nṛváto áśvabudhyān, úśo góagrāh úpa māsi vájān ‘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 māhi, 4.22.10b asmābhyaṃ cittān úpa māhi vájān ‘to us, measure out shining booty.’

Māsi can occur among other imperatives, e.g. 2.17.7cd kṛdhí praketām úpa māsy ā bhara, daddhi bhāgāṃ tanvā vēna māmāh ‘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 māsi.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).
yáksı ‘sacrifice, worship’

Root: yaj ; pres. yajati/he ; aor. ayāh (2nd sing. ind.), yakṣat; no. of occurrences: 33

Yakṣi is the most common -si imperative form, and like vakṣi, the second-most common, presents few problems.91 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. dyāṃsam, yamsat, yamat; no. of occurrences: 4

This verb is well attested both in root and sigmatic aorists, and the form yāṃsi 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.

yōtsi ‘fight’

Root: yudh ; pres. yūdhyati ; aor. yōdhat, ayodhīt; 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 yotsi as a lone, obviously analogically derived, oddity. The form appears at 1.132.4e asmābhya/munderdotsi yōtsi ca ‘for us win and fight’, together with the form je/sunderdoti, on the basis of which it was probably derived ad hoc.

rātsi ‘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-Samhitā 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 á bhara in (a).

rāsi ‘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.94

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 asmē
rāsi sārdha indra mārutaṁ 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. vahāti/te; aor. ávā; vakṣat; no. of occurrences: 24

Narten (1964: 240), cites Lat. vēksi, and Cypriot Greek ἐὑέξε to show that this is a very ancient sigmatic formation. To this LIV$^2$ adds Old Church Slavonic otn-vēsta. Nearer to hand we also have Avestan (uz-)wuažat, which corresponds exactly to Vedic (ud-)vakṣat.

Virtually all of the existing aorist forms of this verb are sigmatic, 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 á vakṣi devāň ihā vipra vakṣi ca, which account for approx. half of the total occurrences of this form, and also the common proximity of other -si imperatives satsi and vakṣi, other actions associated with Agni in his sacrificial role.

véṣi ‘pursue’

Root: vī; pres. vetti; aor. vēṣat; no. of occurrences: 5

Veṣi, strictly speaking, is the 2nd sing. pres. of the verb vī ‘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 (1997) 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 vaś, 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 (1997) are: 1.188.3; 2.3.11; 2.26.4; 3.4.1; 3.7.9; 3.13.5; 3.15.5; 5.1.11; 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: volḥām and volḥām. 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. LIV$^2$ 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 (1997) 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.
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Examples include 6.4.8a-c nā no agne 'vrkēbihiś svastī, vēśi rāyāh pathibhiḥ pārsy ānpaḥ / tā sūṛbhīyō ḍṛṇatē rāśi sunnām '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 vēśi in the same sentence as two other -si imperatives would make it hard to interpret it any other way. Likewise 7.16.5d yākṣi vēśi ca vāryam 'Make an offering, and seek desirable things’ is hardly mistakable as being an imperative.98

śrōṣi ‘hear’

Root: śru; pres. śṛṇoti; 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, aśrausīs, 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 (pā)klyauṣ, which he compares directly with Vedic śroṣi.

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 LIV2 include, with varying levels of certainty, the unclear Avestan form sraoṣānē, 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 kṛṣēṣi, which is not a -si imperative. However, it also has a subjunctive form kṛṣeṣat. Whether this means that the imperative usage is simply unattested, or that the subjunctive form was derived by analogy, e.g. to veṣat, 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 ṣrājasana ṣrījam dhā, rājeva jera vrvkē kṛṣeṣy antōh, 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 kṛṣēṣi 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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klausīti, Tocharian B klyausān, Old Church Slavic slyša, Old High German (h)losēn, etc.

The form šrośi is attested once at 6.4.7ab tvām hí mandra�am arkašokaír, vavrmāhe máhi nah šrósy agne ‘For we have chosen you, the most delightful, with bright flames (or ‘song-flames?’), hear our great (song), O Agni’.

sātsi ‘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 yaksī / 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 devāir ā satsi barhiṣi ‘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 barhiṣi occurs in seven out of the ten occurrences of this form. In two of the remaining three, satsi occurs together with the form vakṣī, e.g. 3.14.2cd vidvāh ā vakṣi vidāṣo ni satsi, mādhya ā barhiṣūṭāye 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. sahate; aor. asakṣi, 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 sakṣ- originate from the -si imperative form sakṣi. These are (predictably) sakṣat and sakṣiva,100 The verb also has root aorist forms, e.g. optative sahyāh, and -iṣ- aorist forms, such as ásahiriṣṭa.

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 sakṣiva may be derived from the root sac.
The sole appearance of the form sakṣi is at the unfortunately very unclear 5.3.3.2cd yā itthā mañhavann ānu jósam, vākso abhī práryāh sakṣi jānān, translated by Geldner as ‘Komm hierher, du Freigebiger, 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 pra- 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. stumāsi, stuvánti; aor.astoṣī, stosoṣat; 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, of a root present and sigmatic aorist.

The form stoṣī occurs once in a difficult passage at 10.22.4d sejānā styoṣy 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.

---

101 For a summing up of the difficulties of this passage see Oldenberg (1909: ad loc.). The problem is the difficulty in identifying the form yā(h). Oldenberg considers the possibility that it could either be a neuter or feminine plural relative pronoun, or a form of the verb yā. In the first case the sandhi would most likely have resulted in yētthā. If the last option is true, as Oldenberg admits, the difficulties are solved. This solution is also adopted by Geldner. If this were the case, then the form would have to be yās, the 2nd sing. pres. subj., which would correspond well with the subj. form vakṣas which follows, and also would give some backing to the ultimate classifying of the -si forms as subjunctives. If this were a subjunctive, it could even be scanned as disyllabic (<*yaHaś*), which would solve the problem of this pāda having only ten syllables. Another problem with this passage, also recognised by Oldenberg, is the apparent need to supply an omitted direct object for the form vakṣas, since the verb vah is always transitive (see page 164). This passage is not covered in Thieme (1938).

102 The forms stuuni, stauti are attested in the Atharvaveda.

103 Narten (1964: 276).
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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 tāṃ u prā hoṣi mādhūmantam asmai, sōma/sunderdoti . . . ‘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 RV104 of forms ending in -si which occur in relative clauses. The attested examples are:

parṣi occurs in a subordinate clause at 1.174.9cd prā yāt samudrām āti śūra pārṣi, pārīvāy turvāṣaṃ yāduṃ svasti ‘When you cross the sea, O hero, then take T. and Y. across to well-being’.

satsi – at 3.30.18bc sāṃ yān mahīr īṣa āsātsi pūrvīḥ / rāyó vantāro bhṛhatāḥ syāma ‘when you gain the great, abundant refreshments, may we be the winners of great wealth’.

yāṃsi – at 1.63.8 tvām tvām na indra deva citrāṃ, īṣam āpo nā pīpayāḥ pārījanā / yāyā śūra prāty asmābhyaṃ yāṃsi, tmānam ārjam nā viśvādha ksāradhyat ‘You, O god Indra, will swell that shining refreshment like water all around for us, with which, O hero, you will bestow upon us our life’s breath, so it will flow always like a strengthening drink’.

And finally darṣi at 6.26.5ab tvām tād ukthāṃ indra barhāṃ akaḥ, prā yuc chatā sahāsṛā śūra dārsi ‘O Indra, you make this word powerful, when you destroy hundreds, thousands, O hero.’

Of these four forms, darṣi can, I believe, be disregarded, if it is indeed a root present105. It is also different semantically from the other examples, in that it

104 As well as one example of yāksī in a relative clause at TS 2.6.12.5: yād agne kavyāvāhanaḥ piṭṭhī yāksī rāvīḍhaḥ ‘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 agnih kravyāvāhanaḥ piṭṭhī yāksad rāvīḍhaḥ. ‘Agni, who shall sacrifice to the Fathers . . .’

105 See p. 48.
denotes a habitual or inherent act (corresponding to the aorist injunctive *kah*), 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 *darsi* to be a subjunctive, following Szemerényi (1966), and translates the passage: ‘Du Indra, machst das Wort (*tād ukthām*) machtvoll (*barhānā kah* Inj. Aor.), damit (*yād*) du Hunderte, Tausende herausschlagest (*darsi*). 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 -*s-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, āchāntsu etc.; chantsi : chantsat.
- ji — ajaiṣam, ājaiḥ; jēṣi : jēṣat.
- dāh — dhāk; dhāksi : dhākṣat
- nī — naiṣṭa; nēṣi : nēṣat
- pṛ — aprāḥ; prāṣi. *prāṣat is unattested.
- bhaṣ — bhāk; bhāksi : bhākṣat
- mad — amatsu etc.; mātsi : mātsat
- yāj — ayāḥ, yāṭ; yāksi : yākṣat
- yam — ayāmsam, ayān; yāmsi : yāmsat
- vah — āvāṭ; vāksi : vākṣat

The following verbs have other sigmatic aorist forms, but only the -si and -sat forms are active:

- rā — ārādhvam, ārāsata etc.; rāsi, rāsata
- stu — astoṣi, āstoḍhvam 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:

- jūṣ — jōṣi : jōṣat
- dṛ — dārṣi : dārṣat
- pr — pārṣi : pārṣat
- vī — vēṣi : vēṣat
- śru — śrōṣi : śrōṣan
- sad — sāṭsi : sāṭsat

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 bōdhṭ (see also p. 26). Furthermore we may bring into consideration the unquestionably analogical form barbhī and its probably subjunctive counterpart bārbhīt.
sah – sakṣi : sāksat. Other aorist forms from the stem sāks- probably originate in a reduplicated stem.

The following have other no sigmatic aorist forms:
- mā – only māhi, māsi and māsva.
- yudh – only yōtsi
- rad – only rātsi
- 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 Jasanoft have suggested a much earlier derivation, and a much more widespread occurrence of these forms than was originally assumed. Jasanoft’s theories concerning the antiquity of these forms have already been mentioned under the forms śroṣi, joṣi 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 τερψιμβροτος, versipellis and flexanimus. Furthermore, he compares πλησιστιος with präsi, Κλευσιππος with śroṣi, Ἀναβησινεως with Vedic gāsi, Ἀνεξικόμη with sakṣi, Γεωσιστρότη with joṣi, and Ἡσιόδος with Vedic yāsi.
other aorist stems, in cases such as *klēu-si (śroṣi) 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 — rāsa-, nakṣa-, śroṣa-...

Formation of neṣa, paraṣa 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 avida/dunderdot/dunderdothi) and thus use other modal forms instead.
Aorist versus present imperative

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 γονεῖς τιμᾶ (Isocrates 1.16) means ‘honour thy parents’ (now and forever more), while βλέψον πρὸς τὰ ὄρη (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 ἄλλοις ἔχετε οἴστισιν ἂν δοίητε αὐτούς [τοὺς ἵππους] . . . ἐκείνοις δίδοτε· εἰ μέντοι ἡμᾶς βούλεσθε . . . ἡμῖν αὐτούς 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-Edgerton109 and Whitney110.

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 Brāhmana 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


110 Whitney (1924: 220).
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 ṛūḥiḥ \ rtupāḥ pahi sōmam\textsuperscript{111} and 2.37.1d hotrād sōmām \ dravinodāḥ pīha ṛūḥiḥ. This example is significant because the adverb ṛūḥiḥ 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 yāvām pāta svastībhīḥ sādā nah, 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.
Aorist versus present imperative

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 1

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
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>

Table 3

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>ṛṣa</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 Wüst (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 of 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 Śatapathabrāhmaṇa 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,\(^{118}\) and one is a prose passage (ŚBM 1.1.4.12 and ŚBK 2.1.3.16): tānī vā etānī catvārī vāca ehiḥ brāhmaṇasyāgahi ādraveti vaśyasya ca rājanyābhandheścādhaṃvēti śūdrasya, ‘These then are the four types of speech. ehi belongs to the brahmin, āgahi and ādrama 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 suputrām subhāgām kṛdhi whereas RV 10.85.45 has suputrām subhāgām kṛnu(!). 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 śāntātāmam? ‘quietest, gentlest’. A look at the attestations of the form āgahi in the RV.
passage bears a strong affinity to RV 8.13.14a: अ तु गahi प्रा तु द्राव, 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: āsra gharman śiṃṣa / āsra gharman 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 -ου / -οιο, -εω / -ηο, -σι / -εσσι and variant forms such as ἤμες and Ὠμμες – are variants of the type which is also abundant in Rigvedic, examples being 1st pers. sing. subj. -ά, -άνι, 3rd pers. sing. aor. subj. forms such as gamat, gamati, and 1st pers. plural active endings -μας and -ματι, the locatives with and without -ι 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 गahi is considered so harsh that it is reserved for the third-ranked vaiśya caste.

For the accentuation of the form ehi 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).
second plural ending -\textit{ta} and -\textit{tana}. This kind of variant can be shown to be metrically motivated, as in the case of the formulaic \textit{paramé vyôman}, which appears in triśṭubh cadences, and its metrical variant \textit{paramé vyômani}, which appears in jagatī cadences. Likewise, the phrases 10.78.8c \textit{ādhi stotrásya sakhyásya gāta} and 5.55.9c \textit{ādhi stotrásya sakhyásya gātana} are differentiated only by the variant verbal endings -\textit{ta} and -\textit{tana}, the former being suited to the cadence of a triśṭubh pāda and the latter to that of a jagatī pāda.\textsuperscript{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 -\textit{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.\textsuperscript{124}

\textbf{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.

\textsuperscript{123} See also Korn (1998: 171ff.).

\textsuperscript{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 – \textit{asmābhyaṃ māhi vārīvah sugāṃ kah} and 1.102.4c – \textit{asmābhyaṃ indra vārīvah sugāṃ kr długi}, where an aorist injunctive stands at the end of a triśṭubh pāda, and an aorist imperative at the end of a jagatī pāda. Renou (1925: 45ff.) suggests that the perfect and imperfect act as metrical variants in pseudo-narratives such as RV 1.32.
For the purposes of this study, the placement of \( \overline{U} \overline{U} \) and \( \overline{U} \overline{U} \overline{U} \) 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** \( \overline{U} \overline{U} \)

**In hendecasyllables**

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:

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

\[10.116.1a \quad \text{pibā sōmam} \backslash \text{mahatā indriyāya, pibā}^{125} \text{vṛtrāya} \backslash \text{hántave sāviṣṭha} \]

\[10.116.1c \quad \text{pība rāyē} \backslash \text{sāvase hāyāmānaḥ, pība mádhvas} \backslash \text{trpād indrā vrṣasva} \]

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

\[3.35.9d \quad \text{agnēḥ pība} \backslash \text{jīhvāyā sōmam indra} \]

\[2.30.10b \quad \text{vīryā kṛdhī} \backslash \text{yāni te kāṛtyāvāni} \]

\[6.5.6a \quad \text{sā tāt kṛdhī} \backslash \text{iśīṣās tūyam agne} \]

\[6.23.7d \quad \text{urūṃ kṛdhī} \backslash \text{vāyatā ulokām} \]

\[7.25.5c \quad \text{satrā kṛdhī} \backslash \text{suhānā śūra vṛtrā} \]

---

125 The purpose of the vowel lengthening is not always immediately obvious. It is highly likely that some syllables are lengthened regularly even when not marked as such. See the 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 tāj jasasva $krḍhī mā$ devāvantam
8.96.8c úpa tvēmaḥ $krḍhī no$ bhāgadhēyaṁ
10.104.1d dadhamirā $indra$ pibā sutāṣya

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 $krḍhī$ sahasrasāṁ īśim
9.61.28b $krḍhī no$ yaśāso jāne
1.44.13a śrudhī śrutkarṇa vāṁ nibhir

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 mā no āti khya ā $gahi$
6.2.10c samṛdho viśpate $ṛṇu$
6.53.7a ā rikha kikrā $ṛṇu$ (also 6.53.8d)
10.85.45b suputrāṁ subhāgāṁ $ṛṇu$
1.14.7b -āgne pāṁivatas $krḍhi$
1.42.6c dhānāni suṣāṇā $krḍhi$
1.127.11d māhi śaviṣṭha nas $krḍhi$
5.51.14d svastī no adite $krḍhi$

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: śrudhī hávam – Aside from 9.104.6a sānemi kṛdhī asmād á, most of the examples in which the verb is not either at the beginning or the end of the pāda contain the syntagm śrudhī (...) hávam.

8.66.12d śāviṣṭha śrudhī me hávam
8.82.6a īndra śrudhī sā me hávam
8.6.18c māmēd ugra śrudhī hávam
8.74.11c sā pāvaka śrudhī hávam

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 pāri bhūsa pība r tūnā
4.46.1a ágram pībā mádhunāṁ
8.17.1b īndra sōmam pībā imām
8.32.19c īndra pība sutānāṁ

In dodeca-syllables
Behave as in octosyllables:

Pāda-initial
2.17.7c kṛdhī praketám \ āpa māśy á bhara
7.16.6a kṛdhī rátnam \ yājamānāya sukrato

Pāda-final
2.23.7d sugām no asyai \ devāvītaye kṛdhī
8.66.8c sēmām na stōmām \ yujuṣṭaṇā á gahi

Two exceptions:
6.51.13c davīṣṭhām asya \ satpate kṛdhī sugām
9.85.4d uruṁ no gātāṁ \ kṛṇu soma mūḍhavah
Disyllabic forms — ∪

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 pāhi vajrivo \ duritād abhike
1.129.9f pāhi no \ durād ārād abhiṣṭihīh

Immediately after the caesura

2.11.15b tṛpát sōmam \ pāhi drahyād indra (10 sylls)
2.11.17b trikadrakeṣa \ pāhi sōmam indra

Pāda-final

3.35.6b śaśvattamām \ sumānā asyā pāhi
3.35.8c tāsyāgāryāa \ sumānā ṭṣva pāhi

Immediately before the caesura

3.36.3d evā pāhi \ pānyo adyā nāvyān
4.34.7b sajōsāh pāhi \ girvano marādbhiḥ

Third and fourth syllable before end

3.47.3a utā rtūbhir \ rtu[pāḥ pāhi sōmam
3.51.7a īndra marutva \ ihā pāhi sōmaṃ
5.43.3c hoṭeva naḥ \ prathamāḥ pāhiṣya asyā

Trisyllabic words ∪ ∪ ∪

In hendecasyllables

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

1.31.8b yaśāsaṃ kārāṃ \ krṣuhi stāvānaḥ
Aorist versus present imperative

3.30.6d víśvam satyāṁ \krṇuhi vīṣṭāṁ astu
1.100.1d marūtvāṁ no \bhavatvā indra ātē
4.1.20d sumṛṭikō \bhavatu jātāvedāḥ

Only one exception to this has been found in the test corpus:
3.58.7d sómam pibatam \asrīḍhā sudānū

In octosyllables

Pāda-initial
1.18.1b \krṇuhi brahmaṇas pate
8.13.7b śṛṇudhī jaritūr āhavam

Middle of pāda

At 3rd syllable
1.13.2c \krṇuhi vītāye
6.53.10c \krṇuhi vītāye
10.60.11d nīyag bhavatu te rápaḥ

At 4th syllable
8.84.3b nṛiḥḥ pāhi \śṛṇudhī gīraḥ
4.9.7c \śṛṇudhī hávam
8.74.8b cāniṣṭhā \bhavatu priyā

In dodecasyllables

In this case the behaviour is the same as in hendecasyllables.
6.48.4c arvācaḥ sīṁ \krṇahy agnē avase
9.82.4b pājṛyāga garbaḥ \śṛṇuhi brāvāmi te
1.94.8a pārvo devā \bhavatu suvatō rátho

Trisyllabic words \U — \U

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 brāhmaṇy ātrer \āva tāṁ srjantu, ninditāro \nindēyāso bhavantu
Aorist versus present imperative

7.35.5c śām na ṭaśadhīḥ \vanīno bhavantu

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

Pāda-initial
6.51.11d bhāvantu naḥ \ sutrātrāḥ sugopāḥ
1.114.11b śṛṇūtu no \ hávaṇ rudrō marūtvān

One exception
One example is completely unlike the others:
10.67.11c paścā mṛdho \ āpo 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 kṛdhi \ maghavaṇ chagdhi 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 kṛdhi. 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 triṣṭubḥ pādas, and so the only choice the poet had here, if he wished to use any form of the verb kṛ, is the form kṛdhi. Even if the caesura were after the fifth rather than the fourth syllable, the
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 triśūbh 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 group, 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 triśūbh 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 consonantal 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 krdhi, 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.
Aorist versus present imperative

assume the second syllables of these forms are always long whether marked or not, or that this syllable is also anceps, ∪ ? 128

Another piece of evidence which brings into doubt the length of the final syllable of the ∪∪ 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 kṛḍhi 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 triṣṭubh 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 triṣṭubh is a catalectic variant, as ∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪ for the late-caesura variant and ∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪ for the early-caesura one. By his reasoning the scheme of the triṣṭubh would be the same, but minus the last syllable, and the new last syllable would then become anceps, thus: ∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪∪. As far as the final syllable of the forms kṛḍhi and kṛṇuḥ 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 kṛḍhi occurs in the cadence, as in 7.27.5a nā indra rāyē \ vāritis kṛḍhi nāḥ, 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 (∪ — ∪ ∪)\textsuperscript{129} is the same as that of the jagatī and thus can accommodate the ∪ ∪ forms such as krḍhī. 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 śrudhī 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 śrudhī 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 śrudhī 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 imám me varuṇa śrudhī, hávam adyā ca mr̥laya
```

\textsuperscript{129} Except for the trochaic gāyatrī. The anuśṭubh has no such variant.
The other method used to regularise this formula was to use the form śṛudhī to replace the verb śrudhī. It has already been noticed by Lubotsky (1995) that this form is typically (in fact only) used in the same formulae as śrudhī (p. 135) and that the ending -dhi is ‘probably due to the influence of śrudhī.’ 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 śrudhī hāvam allows. I believe that the form śṛudhī was specially coined to allow easier accommodation of the formula śrudhī hāvam 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 āk/sunderdotitam was replaced by the later āk/sunderdotiti śrāvas because it fits better into the cadence of the Rigvedic octosyllable (1974: 153ff.).

Thus, the fact that śrudhī hāvam 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 sugām, 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 sugām is the same as that in śrudhī hāvam, 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 sutāsya, sutānām or mádhūnām 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.\textsuperscript{130}

\textsuperscript{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.
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 κλαθή is used exclusively in prayers. A selection of examples is:

Iliad
1.37 – κλαθή μεν, ἄργυρότοξ’, ὧς Χρύσην ἁμφιβέβηκας
“hear me, you of the silver bow, who have under your protection Chryse . . .”

5.115 – κλαθή μεν, αἰγιόχοιο Δίως τέκος, Ὄτρυτώνη
Hear me, child of Zeus who bears the aegis, Atrytone!

10.278 – κλαθή μεν, αἰγιόχοιο Δίως τέκος, . . .
Hear me, child of Zeus who bears the aegis, . . .

Odyssey
5.445 – κλαθή, ὁνοξ, ὃς ἐστὶν πολύλλιστον δὲ σ’ ἵκανο
Hear me, O king, whosoever thou art, as to one greatly longed for do I come to thee

9.528 – κλαθή, Ποσείδαον γαίηχε κυνοχαίτα
Hear me, Poseidon, earth-enfolder, thou dark haired god

3.55 – κλαθή, Ποσείδαον γαίηχε, μηδὲ μεγήρης
Hear me, Poseidon, earth-enfolder, and grudge not in answer . . .

4.762 – κλαθή μεν, αἰγιόχοιο Δίως τέκος, Ὄτρυτώνη
Hear me, child of Zeus who bears the aegis, unwearied one
4.767 – ὃς εἰπώσοι ὀλόλυξε, θεό δὲ οί ἐκλυεν ἀρῆς

---

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

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.
Aorist versus present imperative

So saying she raised the sacred cry, and the goddess heard her prayer.

Schmitt (§§ 400-405) considers the formula *kludhi moj (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 κλοῦθ Μεµε occurs only in prayers in the Iliad. When humans spoke to each other, they used a different expression for “hear me”. The Vedic phrase śṛudhi me (and śṛudhi 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 śṛṇudhi – 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 hāvam, for which there are basically no exceptions. The poets may have been aware of the great antiquity and inviolability of this formula. Another is pība sōmam. This formula is of lesser antiquity than śrudhi hāvam, 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 sōmam pāhi to fit the cadence of 11-syllable lines. A noteworthy fact in this case is that the form pāhi, when meaning ‘drink’ rather than ‘protect’, almost never occurs pādā-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 pība sōmam 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 hāvam clearly has perfective and resultative aspect; i.e. it means ‘hear our call now and do as we ask’, or even ‘obey our call’. pība sōmam, 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 pāhi 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 sajóṣāsā uṣ sā sūryeṇa ca, īṣaṁ no volham aśvinā

7cd sajóṣāsā uṣ sā sūryeṇa ca, trīr vartīr yātam aśvinā

10cd sajóṣasā uṣ sā sūryeṇa ca, ārjaṁ no dhattam aśvinā

13cd sajóṣasā uṣ sā sūryeṇa ca, ādityair yātam aśvinā

While 7-15d contain disyllabic present imperatives, 4-6d contain the rare form volham, the aorist imperative of voh. 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 d yātam aśvinā gatam, avasyūr vām ahāṁ huve, dhattāṁ rāṁāṇi dāśūse, it seems clear that gatam was chosen because it sounds similar to yātam and dhattam, and also because it fits into the characteristic ū ū 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 sām astu and sām bhavatu. The following is the text in full:
1 śāṃ na āndrāgniḥ bhavatāṁ ávobhiḥ, śāṃ na āndrāvāruṇā rātāhavyā śāṃ āndrāsómā sūvātāya śāṃ yōḥ, śāṃ na āndrāpūṣāṇā vājasātāu

2 śāṃ no bhāgaḥ śāṃ u naḥ śāṃso astu, śāṃ naḥ pāramdhīḥ śāṃ u santu ráyah śāṃ naḥ satyāsya suyāmasya śāṃsah, śāṃ no aṛyamā puruṣātō astu

3 śāṃ no dhātaḥ śāṃ u dhartā no astu, śāṃ na urūcī bhavatu svadhābhīḥ śāṃ rōdastī bhataḥ śāṃ no aḍāriḥ, śāṃ no devānāṃ suhāvāni santu

4 śāṃ no agnīr jyōtirānīko astu, śāṃ no mitrāvaraṇāv aśvānā śāṃ śāṃ naḥ sukṛāṃ sukrāṇi santu, śāṃ na isīrō abhi vātā vātāḥ

5 śāṃ no dyāvāpythivī pūrvāhūtāu, śāṃ antārikṣaṃ drṣāye no astu śāṃ naḥ oṣadhīr vanīno bhavantu, śāṃ no rājasā pātīr astu jīṣṇuḥ

6 śāṃ na āndro vāsahīr devā astu, śāṃ ādityēbhīr vāruṇāḥ susāmsah śāṃ no rudrō rudrēbhīr jālāṣaḥ, śāṃ nas tvāṣṭā gnābhīr ihā śṛṇotu

7 śāṃ naḥ sōmaḥ bhavatu brāhma śāṃ naḥ, śāṃ no grāvāṇāḥ śāṃ u santu yajñāḥ śāṃ naḥ svārīṇāmā mitāyo bhavantu, śāṃ naḥ prasvāḥ śāṃ v astu vēdiḥ

8 śāṃ naḥ śuryā urucākṣā ūḍ ētu, śāṃ naś cātāsraḥ pradīpā bhavantu śāṃ naḥ pārvatā dhruvāyo bhavantu, śāṃ naḥ sindhavaḥ śāṃ u santā āpāḥ

9 śāṃ no ādītir bhavatu vratēbhīḥ, śāṃ no bhavatāḥ marūtaḥ svarkāḥ śāṃ no viṣṇuḥ śāṃ u pāsā no astu, śāṃ no bhavitṛmaḥ śāṃ v astu vāyāḥ

10 śāṃ no devāḥ savitā trāyamāṇāḥ, śāṃ no bhavantāśāso vibhāṭaḥ śāṃ naḥ parjānyo bhavatu prajābhīḥ, śāṃ naḥ kṣetrasya pātīr astu śambhāḥ

11 śāṃ no devāḥ viśvādevā bhavantu, śāṃ sārasvatī sahā dhībhīr astu śāṃ abhiśīcaḥ śāṃ u rātiśācaḥ, śāṃ no divyāḥ pārthivāḥ śāṃ no āpyāḥ

12 śāṃ naḥ satyāsya pātāyō bhavantu, śāṃ no ārvantaḥ śāṃ u santu gāvāḥ
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.

\textit{aj}  ‘drive’
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. \textit{ája} (6), 3rd sing. \textit{ajatu} (2), 2nd dual \textit{ajutam} (2.39.7b)
  \item \textbf{pres. med.} 2nd pl. \textit{ajadhvam} (6.48.11b)
\end{itemize}

\textit{aṅc₁}  ‘bend’
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. \textit{aca} (9.97.54d)
\end{itemize}

\textit{aṅc₂}  ‘draw (water)’
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. \textit{aca} (5.83.8a)
\end{itemize}
For the meaning of this verb see Hoffmann (1965). Though Hoffmann considers this meaning to be a semantic development from the meaning ‘bend’ of aṅc₁, Mayrhofer (1986: s.v.) suggests this is a separate root.

**aṅj** ‘anoint’

- **pres. act.** 2nd sing. andaḥ (9.5.10b), andhī (10.156.3c), 3rd sing. anaktu (6), 2nd pl. anaktana (10.76.1b), 3rd pl. aṅjantu (2)

**ad** ‘eat’

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

With the exception of the form adhī, 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 havimśi ‘oblation’. Since the oblation consisted of ghee, this corresponds with the description of ghee as ‘food’ (anu-) of the gods, as in e.g. 2.35.11c hintyavarrṣam gṛhtram ṣṭanam 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 asmābhyaṃ tād vaso dānāya rādhah, sām arthayasva bahū te vasavāyam, “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. ārṣantu (2)

The second person singular of this Soma key-word is entirely restricted to Book 9. This verb characteristically appears – usually with the preverb abhī – in expressions such as 9.20.4 abhy ārṣa bhṛhād yāsō, maṅgāvadhiyo dhṛvaṃ rayīṃ / iṣāṃ stotṛbhya 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 ārśa sahasrīṇaṃ, rayiṃ gōmantam aśvīnam / abhī vājam utā śrāvah ‘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-arśa + acc. + dat. and ā-bhara + acc. + dat. are in effect synonymous. In other words, abhī-arśa yāsas (acc.) maghāvadbhyas (dat.) is exactly parallel to ā bhara īṣaṃ 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 arśa divyā vāsāny, abhī viśvā pārthivā pāyāmānaḥ ‘Flow heavenly goods to us, and all things on earth as you are purified’ 137.

aivi ‘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. aviḍḍhī (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. āvīh (6.25.1c)]

For a discussion of the form avitā, which appears at 7.59.6 ā ca no barhiḥ sādatāvitā 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 vitā 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 (< *h₁eH-tē, 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 pātā 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).
classified as root-aorists, such as inj. ávīt (*h₁e₂yH-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. śnathihi, stanihi, etc.), the original zero-grade root aorist form would probably have been *ūh₁ < *h₁uH-dh₁, 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.

**aś₁** ‘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. zdi; Gk. ισθέ.

**aś₂** ‘throw’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. asya (6), 3rd sing. asyatū (1.114.4c), 2nd dual asyatam (7.104.25c)

**pres. med.** 2nd pl. asyadhvam (10.30.2d)

**ās** ‘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 āditih suputrā ‘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. act. 2nd sing. ihí (64), 3rd sing. etu (51), 2nd dual itam (8.101.8c), 3rd dual itām (2), 2nd pl. itā (17), ētana (2), itana (3), 3rd pl. yántu (30)
pres V. (caus.) 2nd sing. inū (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 vί dvēsāṃsūnūhī vardhāyēlām ‘scatter the enemies, enhance the refreshment’. Another example of a similar causative stem formation is jinv-/jīva-.

It would be tempting to describe hinu- as the causative of hā, but Mayrhofer (1986: s. HAY) specifically rejects this, with ample justification.

Dunkel (1985) suggests that the form ētā which appears in such expressions as 5.45.5a ēto nv ādyā sudhāyō bhāvāma ‘come let us have good thoughts today’ and 8.24.19a ēto nv īndraṃ stāvāma ‘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 ētī in such Greek examples as ētī ... ᾠκόουον ‘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 pība ‘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+īhi. 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 ēti 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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**i$_2$, inv** see *i*

**iṅg** ‘set in motion’
**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *iṅgaya* (4.57.4d)

**idh** ‘kindle’
**pres.med.** 2nd pl. *indhvam* (10.101.1b), 3rd pl. *indhatām* (1.170.4b)

**il** ‘come to rest’
**pres. act.** 2nd pl. *iláyata* (1.191.6d)

**iṣ$_1$** ‘send’
**pres. act.** 2nd pl. *iṣyata* (1.15.9c)

**iṣ$_2$** ‘seek’
**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *ichá* (4), *ichatu* (7.102.1c), *icháta* (7.104.18a)
**pres. med.** 2nd sing. *ichasva* (10.10.10d)

**iṣaṇya-** ‘drive’
**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *iṣaṇya* (3.50.3d), 2nd pl. *iṣaṇyata* (5.52.14d)
For a discussion and bibliography on the connection of this stem to *iṣ$_1$ ‘send’* see Mayrhofer (1986: s. E/Sunderdot).

**īṅkhaya-** ‘to swing, rock’
**pres act.** 2nd sing. *īṅkhaya* (3)
All three attestations of this form are in 9.52.3: *carūr ná yás tám īṅkhaya-, īndo ná dānam īṅkhaya / vadhair vadhasnav īṅkhaya* ‘that which is like a pot, rock it, O drop, rock the gift, rock with weapons, O weapons bearer’.

**ūḍ** ‘praise’
**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *ūḷṣvya* (8.23.1a)

**īr** see *r$_1$*
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**u** ‘weave’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *vaya* (10.130.1d 2x), *vayata* (10.53.6c)
Originally an -áya- form built on the *ani* root *u*, < *h₂y-ēfe-*. From this present stem were later on secondarily derived such forms as the future *vayiyánt*.

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

**ukṣ** ‘sprinkle’

**pres. act.** 2nd dual *ukṣatam* (6), 2nd pl. *ukṣata* (1.87.2d)
**pres. med.** 2nd dual *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 *ghṛtā-*, and one with the accusative. The other example shows *páyas* instead. There are thus two basic valencies attested: either + acc. + instr. as in e.g. 7.62.5b *ā no gávyātim ukṣatam ghṛtēna* ‘sprinkle our pastures with ghee’, or + acc. + dat. as in 1.87.2d *ā ghṛtáṁ ukṣatā mādhuvānram ārcate* ‘sprinkle honey-coloured ghee for the singer’.

**ud** ‘wet’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *undhi* (5.83.8c), 2nd pl. *unáta* (5.42.3b)

Appears in exactly the same environment as the impv. forms of *ukṣ* – with the instr. of *ghṛtā-*: 5.83.8c *ghṛtēna dyāvāprthivī vy undhi* ‘moisten the heavens and the earth with ghee’ apparently addressed to the rain, and 5.42.3ab *ūd īraya kavītām, unáttainam abhi mádhvā ghṛtēna* ‘enliven the wisest of the wise, moisten him with honey and ghee.’

**ubj** ‘subdue’

**pres. act.** 2nd dual *ubjátam* (2), 3rd pl. *ubjántu* (6.52.1c)

This is a secondary root, originally the -sk- present of the root *vabh*. First suggested by Osthoff (1884). Osthoff’s position is confirmed by Lubotsky (2001: 39).

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Paradigm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>uruṣ-</strong></td>
<td>‘protect’</td>
<td><strong>pres. act.</strong> 2nd sing. uruṣyā (8), 3rd sing. uruṣyatu (8.47.9a), 2nd dual. uruṣyātām (6), 3rd dual. uruṣyātām (3), 2nd pl. uruṣyata (3), 3rd pl. uruṣyāntu (8.25.10c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>uoṣ</strong></td>
<td>‘burn’</td>
<td><strong>pres. act.</strong> 2nd sing. oṣa (2), oṣatāt (4.4.4b), 2nd dual oṣatam (7.104.1c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ṛ1</strong></td>
<td>‘go, move, rise’</td>
<td><strong>pres. act. III</strong> 2nd pl. īyarta (8.7.13c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>pres. med.</strong> 2nd sing. īṛṣva (3), 2nd dual. īṛāthām (8.73.1a), 2nd pl. īṛdhvam (1.113.16a), 3rd pl. īṛatām (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>pres. caus.</strong> 2nd sing. arpayat (3.3.3.4c), 2nd dual arpayatām (7.104.1b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>pres. X</strong> 2nd sing. īraya (12), 2nd dual. īrayatam (10.39.2b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>pres. X. med.</strong> 2nd sing. īrayasva (2), 2nd pl. īrayadhvam (4.34.2d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The single attestation of the transitive reduplicated present impv. īyarta (&lt;*h3er-*h2er-te) is 8.7.13 ā no rayām . . . īyartā 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 ād īṛṣva nāry abhī jīvalokām ‘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 rayām 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 īṛ. Jamison (1983: 124) derives arpayati from the root *h2er ‘to fit’, whence also e.g. Greek ὀφρόφικός. Mayrhofer (1986: s. āram) appears to agree with this (despite treating all the finite forms together under AR1), however synchronically speaking the two roots *h2er and *h3er have merged into a single root r143.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ṛ2</strong></td>
<td>‘arrive, hit’</td>
<td><strong>pres. act.</strong> 3rd sing. rchatu (2), 3rd pl. rchantu (10.87.15c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

143 See Mayrhofer (1986: s. AR1), LIV under 1.*h2er.
This verb is unattested outside of Book 10. The two examples of the form /runderringchatu/ both occur in the same verse, 10.164.5de: yám dvíṣmás tám sá /runderringchatu/, yó no dvéṣṭi tám /runderringchatu/ ‘he whom we hate, may it hit him, he who hates us, may it hit him’.

/runderringc/ ‘sing’

pres. act. 2nd sing. /runderringarca/ (25), 3rd sing. /runderringarcatu/ (10.36.5b), 2nd pl. /runderringarcanta/ (24), 3rd pl. /runderringarcatu/ (2)

/runderringd/ ‘agitate, slay’

pres. act. /runderringdantu/ (7.104.24c), caus. pres. /runderringardaya/ (2)

/runderringdh/ ‘attain, thrive’

-ya- pres. /runderringdhyatām/ (10.85.27a)
Only occurs once at 10.85.27a ihá priyám prajáyā te sám /runderringdhyatām/. 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 prajáyā refers to the scope of prosperity, as in the case of other verbs of similar meaning, such as /runderringpā/sunderdotya-.
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, /runderringdrnnoti/, as well as a -na- infix present /runderringrdhat/, for which no imperatives are attested.

/ej/ ‘move’

pres. act. 3rd sing. /runderringejatu/ (5.78.7c)

/kan/ ‘enjoy’

is-aor./runderringcaniṣṭām/ (7.70.4a)

perf. act. /runderringcākandhi/ (10.147.3a), /runderringcākantu/ (1.122.14d)

caniṣṭām is probably a nonce-form built on the basis of the superlative caniṣṭha-.
See Narten (1964: 111f.), and Hoffmann (1952). For the long reduplication vowel of /runderringcākandhi/ 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. med.** 2nd sing. *kṛṇusvā* (14), 3rd sing. *kṛṇutām* (2.5.7b), 2nd pl. *kṛṇadhvām* (27)


**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. *kaḥ* (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 *bhadrām mānaḥ kṛṇusva vrtratūrye / havīś kṛṇusva subhāgo yāthāsāvi ‘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 *āvīś kṛṇusva daiyāṇy agne ‘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 *prō aśvīnāv āvase kṛṇvdvam, prā pū/svānta svātavaso hi sānti ‘make the Aśvins well-disposed towards you, so they will help, (make) Pūṣan (well-disposed), because they are powerful in themselves’.

The form *kuru* occurs twice in the RV, at 10.19.2b *pūnar enā nyā kuru ‘make them [the cows] go back’ and 10.145.2d *pātim me kévala/m kuru ‘make my husband mine alone’. This, and the form *kurma/hunderdot* have a metrically complementary distribution: whereas the former – with one exception – usually appears at the end of eight-syllable lines, *kṛṇuhī* generally occurs in eleven-syllable lines immediately after the caesura. *kṛṇuhī* also appears twice in eight-syllable lines at the third, fourth and fifth syllable.

---

144 For the formation of the *kar-/kura* stem see Hoffmann (1976^2^)
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**krṣ** 'pull'
- **pres. act. I** karṣa (5.83.7c)
- **pres. IV.** krṣatu (4.57.4b), krṣantu (4.57.8a)
- **pres. med.** krṣasva (10.34.13a)

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

**kṝ₁** 'scatter'
- **pres. act.** 2nd sing. kira (2)

**kṝ₂** 'praise'
- **int. pres.** 2nd sing. carkṛtāt (1.104.5c)

**kḷp** ‘put in order, fit together’
- **pres. med.** 2nd sing. kalpasva (1.170.2d)
- **caus. act. pres.** 2nd sing. kalpayā (10.18.5d), 3rd sing. kalpayatu (10.184.1a)
- **caus. med. pres.** 2nd sing. kalpayasva (2)

Kalpasva, in its single attestation means ‘to be tolerant’, or ‘to be in accord with’: 1.170.2cd tēbhīḥ kalpasva sādhuvā, mā naḥ samāraṇe vadhīḥ ‘Be in real harmony with them [the Maruts], do not kill us in battle’. The causative means ‘to arrange’, as in 10.18.5cd yāthā nā pūrvam āparo jāhāty, evā dhātar  ēyūṃṣi 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 anyēṇa māt pramūdāḥ kalpayasva ‘Arrange lustful pleasures (for yourself) with some else than me’.

With the exception of the present form kalpasva, this verb is only attested in Book 10. kalpasva occurs at 1.170.2d, making this a verb of uniformly late distribution.145

**krṇḍ** ‘cry out’
- **pres. act.** 2nd sing. krṇḍa (2), 3rd sing. krṇḍatu (5.58.6)
- **pres. caus.** 2nd sing. krṇḍaya (6.47.30a)

145 See also Jamison (1983: 124.).
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kram ‘stride’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pres. act.</td>
<td>2nd sing.</td>
<td>krāma □</td>
<td>10.164.1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres. med.</td>
<td>2nd sing.</td>
<td>kramasva □</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aor. act.</td>
<td>2nd dual.</td>
<td>krami/sunderdot/tunderdotam □</td>
<td>(1.182.3c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 vitarām 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’ 146

kṣam ‘pardon, be favourable’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pres. med.</td>
<td>2nd pl.</td>
<td>kṣāmadhvam □</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both examples of the imperative of kṣam occur in consecutive hymns in Book 2: 2.29.2cd abhiṣattāro abhī ca kṣāmadhvam, adyā ca no mṛjayatāparām ca ‘as distributors (of goods), pardon us and have mercy on us today and later’147 and 2.28.3d abhī kṣāmadhvam yājya devāh ‘(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’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pres. act.</td>
<td>2nd sing.</td>
<td>ksāra □</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the imperative forms, and many of the other occurrences of this characteristic Soma-keyword are restricted to Book 9. With the preverb abhī the valency of this verb is highly reminiscent semantically of that of the verb ārṣ (see p. 92) as in 9.35.3c ksārā no abhī 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”.

**kṣi** ‘dwell’

**pres. caus.** 2nd sing. *kṣayāya* (3.46.2d)

**kṣip** ‘throw, launch’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *kṣipa* (2.30.5a)

**khud** ‘insert (penis)’

**pres. act.** 2nd pl. *khudāta* (10.101.12b)

This is the only appearance of this verb in the RV. 10.101.12ab *kāprīn naraḥ kapṛthām ūd dadhātana codāyata khudāta vōjasātaye* ‘The penis, O Men, erect the penis, thrust it, insert it for the winning of booty!’

**gam** ‘go, come’


**pres. med.** 2nd sing. *gachasva* (2), 2nd pl. *gachadhvam* (10.191.2a)


**-iś- aor.** 2nd dual *gamiṣṭam* (2)

**caus. pres.** 2nd sing. *gāmaya* (10.152.4d), *gāmaya* (5.5.10c)

With the exception of the forms *gachatam* and *gachātām*, the pres. impv. of the verb *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 *sām*, occur in books 9 and 10. The form (*sam)*gachasva occurs twice, but in the same verse of the same hymn – 10.14.8a and d: *sāṃ gachasvā pitṛbhīḥ sāṃ yamēna- ... sāṃ gachasva tānvā suvārcāḥ* ‘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.\(^{148}\)

The -\(i\)- aorist form *gami\(\dot{s}\)tam* occurs twice in the same hymn in Book 10 at 10.106.3b *pa\(\dot{s}\)v\(\dot{e}\)va citr\(\acute{\text{a}}\) y\(\acute{\text{a}}\)jur \(\dot{\text{a}}\) gami\(\dot{s}\)tam* ‘like two bright animals, come to the sacrifice’ and 10.106.4d. *sr\(\acute{\text{u}}\)\(\acute{\text{s}}\)tv\(\acute{\text{a}}\)neva \(\dot{\text{a}}\) h\(\acute{\text{a}}\)v\(\acute{\text{a}}\)m \(\dot{\text{a}}\) gami\(\dot{s}\)tam* ‘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 -\(i\)- aorist forms which are based on superlatives, such as *cani\(\dot{s}\)tam* (see p. 99). The basis for this derivation is the form *\(\acute{\text{a}}\)gami\(\dot{s}\)tha\(-\)*, an epithet associated elsewhere with the Aśvins.

For the ablaut variants *gata, g\(\acute{\text{a}}\)nta* and *gant\(\acute{\text{a}}\)* see page 31.

For the form *gachat\(\acute{\text{a}}\)t\(\acute{\text{a}}\)* see page 35.

\(\textbf{g\(\acute{\text{u}}\)1 ‘go’}\)

\textbf{pres. act.} 3rd sing. *jig\(\acute{\text{a}}\)tu* (2), 2nd dual *jig\(\acute{\text{a}}\)tam* (2.24.12d), 2nd pl. *jig\(\acute{\text{a}}\)ta* (2), *jig\(\acute{\text{a}}\)t\(\acute{\text{a}}\)na* (5.59.6c)

\textbf{aor. act.} 2nd pl. *g\(\acute{\text{a}}\)ta* (3), *g\(\acute{\text{a}}\)t\(\acute{\text{a}}\)na* (5.55.9c)

\textbf{[aor. inj. g\(\dot{\text{a}}\)h (4)]}

This verb is actually entirely missing a second-person singular imperative. The aorist injunctive form *g\(\dot{\text{a}}\)h* fills the gap. It is attested four times in its modal function, making it the most common “imperative” form of the verb *g\(\text{\(a\)}* See page 40.

\(\textbf{g\(\acute{\text{u}}\)2 ‘sing’}\)

\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. *g\(\acute{\text{a}}\)ya* (7), 2nd pl. *g\(\acute{\text{a}}\)y\(\acute{\text{a}}\)ta* (28)

\textbf{aor. act.?} 2nd pl. *g\(\acute{\text{a}}\)t\(\acute{\text{a}}\)* (8.2.38)

The form *g\(\acute{\text{a}}\)t\(\acute{\text{a}}\)* appears only at 8.2.38 *g\(\acute{\text{a}}\)th\(\dot{\text{a}}\)\(\acute{\text{s}}\)rava\(\acute{\text{s}}\)\(\acute{\text{a}}\)m \(\dot{\text{a}}\) \(\dot{\text{p}}\)\(\acute{\text{a}}\)ti\(\acute{\text{n}}\), \(\dot{\text{r}}\)\(\acute{\text{a}}\)v\(\acute{\text{k}}\)\(\acute{\text{a}}\)\(\acute{\text{a}}\)m\(\acute{\text{a}}\)m\(\acute{\text{a}}\) puru\(\acute{\text{m}}\)\(\acute{\text{n}}\)\(\acute{\text{a}}\)m / k\(\acute{\text{a}}\)n\(\acute{\text{v}}\)\(\acute{\text{a}}\)so g\(\acute{\text{a}}\)t\(\acute{\text{a}}\) \(\acute{\text{v}}\)\(\acute{\text{j}}\)\(\acute{\text{n}}\)\(\acute{\text{a}}\)m* ‘The famous-in-song, the true-leader, the desirous-of-fame, the great-souled; K\(\acute{\text{a}}\)n\(\acute{\text{v}}\)\(\acute{\text{a}}\)s, sing to (or of?) the prize-winner!’ This translation, in which I agree with Geldner, makes far more sense, considering the context (*g\(\acute{\text{a}}\)th\(\dot{\text{a}}\)\(\acute{\text{s}}\)rava\(\acute{\text{s}}\)\(\acute{\text{a}}\)m* etc.) than translating *g\(\dot{\text{a}}\)ta* as ‘go!’ However, it is problematic, as the verb *g\(\dot{\text{a}}\)* has a sigmatic aorist, and no other root forms at all. Grassmann classes this form under *g\(\text{\(a\)}* to go’, but translates it “jemand angehen (mit

\(^{148}\) See Lubotsky (1995:\ 133ff.).
Index of attested imperative forms

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 udgātēva sakune sāma gāyasi ‘O bird, you sing like an udgāt singing a sāman’or 10.71.11b gāyatrām two gāyati śākvarīśu ‘the one sings a song in Śākvarī stanzas’, it can also mean “to sing of, praise” as in 1.21.2 tā yañēśu prā śaṁsata-, indrāgni śumbhatā naraḥ / tā gāyatrēśu 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. gātuyā (8.16.12b).

**guh** ‘hide’

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

The form gūhatām, which Lubotsky (1997: 491) classifies as an imperative, is in fact a 3rd person dual active injunctive: 2.40.2ab imaū devaū jāyamānaū juṣanto-, imaū tāmāṃsi gūhatām āju/sunderdot/tunderdotā ‘(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 Gotô (1987: 296 fn. 704).

**gūrdhay-** ‘praise’

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

Appears only at 8.19.1ab tām gūrdhayā svārnāram, devāso devām aratīm 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. jārasva (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 śrudhīya to śrudhī. Jamison herself has severe doubts as to the plausibility of this theory.
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perf. act. 2nd sing. jägrhi (4), 2nd dual jäghtam (2)
aor. act. 2nd dual jigrtáam (5), 2nd pl. jigrtá (7.57.6d)
The long vowel in jägrhi is a result of a laryngeal at the beginning of the root, *h₁ger₁⁴½.

The aor. impv. examples of this verb are all transitive, the reduplicated stem ájígar-being the aorist of the pres. caus. stem jāraya-, which is attested three times in the RV¹⁵²; e.g. 1.158.2c jígrtám asmé revátiḥ púráṇḍhíḥ, ‘make rich wealth awaken for us’.

The aorist occurs twice with púráṇḍhíḥ ‘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 impsv. are intransitive. jarasva means ‘wake up’, while jägrhi means ‘be watchful, awake’.

The aor. impv. forms have a short reduplicating syllable, cf. didhtam (q.v. under dhr).

grbhī/grhī ‘seize’

pres. act. 2nd sing. grbhāyā (13), 2nd pl. grbhāyāta (2)
pres. IX act. 2nd sing. grhāṇā (10.103.12b), 3rd sing. grhṇātu (4.57.7a)
For ‘deverbative’ grbhāya- besides grbhntā see LIV s. grebh₂ and bibliography in Gotō (1988: fn. 5), Mayrhofer (1986: s. GRABH). For class IX impsv. in -āna, see p. 28.

gī ‘praise, welcome’

pres. IX act. 2nd sing. grṇīhi (9), 3rd sing. grṇītu (2), 3rd dual. grṇītām (10.47.8c),
2nd pl. grṇītā (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: puroldśam pacatyām, juśāsvendrā gurasvaca ‘Enjoy the cooked rice-cake, and welcome it, Indra’. For its classification as an


¹⁵² Jamison (1983: 126f.).
aorist imperative, constructed from *gūṛṣva on the basis of the form juṣāsva, see Gotô (1987: 154, fn. 242). Joachim (1978: 75f.) suggests the forms could be derived from gṛ’s2 ‘to swallow’. For the possibility that the root *gārdh 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. ghōṣi (2)
See discussion of this controversial form on page 46.

cakṣ ‘look’
aor. -si impv. 2nd sing. cakṣi (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 cakṣa-vi cakṣva-, -indraś ca soma jāgṛtām ‘Look here, look around, O Indra and Soma, be aware’.
The active -si-impv. cakṣi means, on one occasion, with the preverb práti ‘to show’ 7.3.6cd divô nā te tanyatār eti śūṣmaś, citrô nā sūraḥ práti cakṣi bhāṇum ‘Your crash comes like thunder from heaven, show your brilliance, bright like the sun’, while the other instance of this form, with the preverb āva, means ‘to look down’: 9.97.33a divyāḥ supārṇo ‘va cakṣi 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 pāraṃdhiṃ, jārā ā sasatīṃ iva / prá cakaṣaya rōdasī vāsayaśaśaḥ ‘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 vi caṣṭe ‘appear’. No such transitive use with vi occurs in the imperative form.
cat ‘hide’
caus. med. 2nd sing. catayásva (3)
The form catayásva + acc. + abl. means ‘to make X hide from Y’ i.e. to drive away’: 2.33.2ed vy àsmađ dvéṣo vitaráṃ vy āṁho, vy āṁvāś catayásvā visúciḥ ‘drive all hostilities, all trouble far away from us, all distress in all directions’.

canasy- ‘take pleasure in’
pres. act. 2nd dual canasyáta (1.3.1c)
A “tertiary derivation” denominative verb from the noun cánas-, which in turn is from the verbal root kan154; cf. manasya- < mánas- < man-.

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

cí ‘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 dáśăše ví caviṣṭam āṁhaḥ ‘you two clear away the troubles of the worshipper’. With the preverb ví, the root often means ‘to clear (a path)’, as in 6.53.4ab ví pathá vājasātaye, cinuhí ví mfidho jahi ‘clear the paths to the capture of booty, smite away the enemies’ and 4.37.7ab ví no vājā rbhukṣanah, pathāś citana yāśtave ‘Clear the way to the sacrifice, O Vājas, O Rbhukṣaṇs’, a theme repeated at 1.90.4b.

154 Q.v. page 99.
155 See pages 99 and 104.
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**cit** ‘perceive’
- **pres. act.** 3rd dual *cetatām* (10.35.1c)
- **perf. act.** 2nd sing. *cikiddhī* (7)
- **caus. med.** 2nd dual *cetayethām* (8.9.10d), 2nd pl. *cetāyadhvam* (3.53.11a)
- **desid.** *cikītsa* (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 vācasaś cikiddhī* ‘you take heed of this word for us’ and 2.43.3b *tūṣṇīṁ āśinaḥ sumatiṁ cikiddhī naḥ* ‘sitting quietly, perceive goodwill for us’, as does the present *cetatām* 10.35.1c *mahī dyāvāpyṛthivī 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 *ūpa prīta kuśikāś cetāyadhvam, āśvaṁ rāyé prā muñcatā sudāsah* ‘go to his side, be attentive, let the horse of Sudās go, so he may win property’ and 8.9.10 *yād vāṁ kaśśīvāḥ utā yād vyāśva, ḫir yād vāṁ dirghātāmā juhāva / pṛhiḥ yād vāṁ vainyāḥ śādanēṣv, evēd āto aśvinā cetayethām* ‘When K. and the Rṣi 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 impvs. see p. 34.

**cud** ‘impel’
- **pres. act.** 2nd sing. *códa* (2), 2nd pl. *codata* (2)
- **pres. med.** 2nd sing. *codasva* (2)

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 suṣṭūtīṁ ‘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’
- pres. act. caus. 2nd sing. *cyāvaya* (2), 3rd sing. *cyāvayatu* (10.17.3a)

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

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

**jani** ‘give birth’
- aor. med. 2nd sing. *jāniśva* (6.15.18a)
- caus. act. 2nd sing. *janāya* (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 rayīṁ rāraṇaḥ, prā jāyasva prajāyā putrikāma* ‘bestowing offspring here, property here, be born with offspring, O desirous of sons’ and 10.43.9a *ūj jāyatām parasūr jyotiśā sahā* ‘let the axe come into being together with light’.

The *-iś-* 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\(^{157}\), e.g. 9.97.36d vardhāyā vācaṁ janāyā pūraṇḍhīṁ strengthen our speech, generate wealth!’ while the med. of the caus. is affective, i.e. ‘to create for oneself’\(^{158}\).

\textit{jambh} ‘crush’
\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. \textit{jambhāya} (2), 2nd dual \textit{jambhāyatam} (1.182.4a).
\end{itemize}

\textit{jas} ‘go away, wither’
\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{-ya- pres. act.} 2nd pl. \textit{jasyata} (1.191.7d)
\item \textbf{perf. act.} 2nd dual \textit{jajastám} (2)
\end{itemize}

The transitive perf. only occurs in two instances of a repeated pāda: 4.50.11d and 7.97.9d \textit{jajastám aroyo vaṇiśāṁ ārātip ‘make the hostility of the stranger disappear’}. The -ya- forms are intransitive 1.191.7d sārve sākāṁ nī \textit{jasyata} ‘Let all of you disappear at once’ \(^{159}\).

\textit{ji} ‘win’
\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. \textit{jáya} (6), 3rd sing. \textit{jayatu} (6.47.26d), 2nd dual \textit{jáyatam} (2), 2nd pl. \textit{jáyata} (2), 3rd pl. \textit{jayantu} (2)
\item \textbf{pres. med.} 3rd pl. \textit{jayantām} (10.87.18d)
\item \textbf{aor. -si impv.} 2nd sing. \textit{jéśi} (7)
\item \textbf{root aor.} (7) 2nd dual. \textit{jitam} (9.7.9c)
\end{itemize}

The active forms of this verb are transitive, meaning ‘to win, capture (something)’, e.g. 8.75.12c \textit{samvārgam sāṁ rayāṁ 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 \textit{pārā bhāgāṁ ośadhīnāṁ jayantām ‘let them gamble away their share in the plants’}. An extremely interesting example is 8.89.4d \textit{háno vyātām jáyā svāḥ ‘you will smite Vṛtra, (and) win the sun’}. The pāda is almost identical to 1.80.3d \textit{háno vyātām jáyā}


\(^{159}\) Kulikov (2001: 401).
apāḥ in which jāyā is to be read as a subjunctive jāyāḥ. The syntagma ji- svaḥ is attested elsewhere; once with an impv. – svār jaya – at 8.15.12c, and once with an imperfect – ajayaḥ svaḥ – 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 svaḥ, leaving the rest of the pāda undisturbed. It is possible that, as the sandhi of the visarga is unstable before /s/ + 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 *jāyāś svaḥ should yield *jāyāḥ svaḥ, 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. jeśi can also mean ‘to defeat’ in the formulaic syntagma jeśi śatrūn. This is an instance of a fixed formula preserving the old aspectual meaning of the aorist imperative. The isolated root form jitam occurs only at 9.7.9c [asmāhyyam] śrávo vāsūni sāṃ jitam ‘[for us] capture glory and goods’.

jīnv ‘impel’

 pres. act. 2nd sing. jīva (9), 3rd sing. jīvatu (4), 2nd dual jīvatam (10), jīvata (10.66.12d)

See LIV s. *gājeh2 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)
Index of attested imperative forms

juṣ ‘like’
a-aor. 2nd sing. juṣásva (58), 3rd sing. juṣátām (10.165.2c), 2nd dual juṣéthām (9), 3rd dual juṣétām (5.72.3b), 2nd pl. juṣādvam (6), 3rd pl. juṣāntām (3)
aor. si-impv. jōṣi (3)

secondary thematic aor. impv. 2nd sing. jōṣa (10.158.2a)
perf. 2nd pl. jujusṭana (2)

The extremely common a-aor. med. form juṣásva means ‘find favour in’ and is transitive e.g. 1.12.12c imām stōmaṃ juṣasva naḥ ‘find favour in this our prayer’. The aor. -si impv. jōṣi, which appears three times, appears to mean the same at 4.9.7a asmākam jősasy adhvarām ‘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. jōṣa probably based on the -si impv jōṣi; cf. parṣa from pr and the AV form neṣa from nī (see also p. 27). This form only occurs once at 10.158.2ab jōṣaḥ savitar yāsyate te, háraḥ śatām 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 jāratam (2)
va-pres. 2nd sing. jṛva (6.6.6d)
aor. act. 2nd dual jurātām (1.182.3c)
The present stem jāra- occurs only in the repeated line 7.67.10c and 7.69.8c dhattām rātnāni jurātām ca sūrīn ‘give gifts, and allow the patrons to grow old.’ The form jurātām is considered by Gotō (1987: 152) to be an aorist, but is thought to be a

The form is only attested once: 1.182.3c *dī kramištām jurātam paṇēr āsūn* ‘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 *nī* with the meaning ‘grind down, crush, exterminate’, as in 6.6.6cd *sā bādhasvāpa bhayā sāhobhi, spṛdhō vanusvān vanūso nī jūrva* ‘drive away the dangers with might, attacking the hostile ones, crush our enemies.’

**jīnā** ‘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 gachadhvam sām vadadhvam, sām vo mānāmsi 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.

**takṣ** ‘fashion’

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

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

The root *takṣ* 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 *mfj* (< *melh₁*) ‘grind’ and *mlā* (*mleH*) ‘wither’. See Thieme (1939) and Mayrhofer (1986: s. MLĀ).

\(^{164}\) See Gotō (1987: 152f.).

\(^{165}\) LIV s. *tetk*. 
present. 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 tālhi appears to be a regular outcome of the proto-form *tetk-dhi, which would have yielded *tadz-dhi by assimilation and then tālhi with simplification of the cluster and compensatory lengthening.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 bālunderbarhá-□ (< ba/munderdoth) and s/amacronacute/lunderbarh/runderring- (< □sah). They descend from *baźh-tá and *sáźh-yr respectively, with subsequent transfer of the voiced aspiration by Bartholomae’s Law. On the other hand, *vaźh-tám (vah) yields volhám, which is shown by Lubotsky (2000) to be the result of the preceding /v/168.

\( \textit{tan}_1 \) ‘stretch’

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

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

Both tanuhi and tanusva appear several times with sthirá-, which here means ‘bow string’, as their direct object. With the preverb 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 áva sthirá tanuhi yātujānām ‘Slacken the bow strings of those driven by sorcerers’. and 2.33.14cd áva sthirá maghāvadvhyas tanusva, mīdhvas tokāya tánayāya mṛṭa ‘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 ā: 10.120.4c ājīyo dhṛṣṇo sthirām ā tanusva ‘(Ever) braver, stretch your bowstring, O daring one.’

\( \textit{tan}_2 \) ‘thunder’, see \textit{stan}

---

166 Narten (1964: 123f.), Joachim (1978: 83f.).

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.

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 àntarāṁ amitrān, tápā śāṁsam áraraśāh pārasya / tápo vaso cikitānó aciṭān ‘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 bhāgas tápasā tám tapasva, tám te şocis tapatu tám te arcīh ‘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 tf

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 māhi sthūrāṁ śaśayāṁ rádho āhrayam, prāśkapāya ní tośaya ‘drive great, mighty, unbeatable, bold favour to Praskapāya.’\(^{171}\).

---

\(^{169}\) 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. ʻtr\( ndhi \) (4)

\( trp \) ‘be satiated’

**pres. act. VII** 2nd sing. ʻtr\( ṭhhi \) (2), 2nd dual ʻtr\( ṭhitam \) (8.35.10a), 2nd pl. ʻtr\( ṭhuta \) (1.110.1d)

**pres. VI** 2nd sing. ʻtr\( ṭpa \) (8.45.22c), 3rd sing. ʻtr\( ṭpatu \) (1.23.7c), 2nd dual ʻtr\( ṭpatam \) (2), 3rd dual. ʻtr\( ṭpatām \) (3.12.3c)

**caus. pres.** 2nd sing. ʻtar\( p\( āya \) (1.54.9c)

**caus. med.** 2nd dual ʻtar\( p\( ayē\( thām \) (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 ʻindra s\( ō\( massya ṛ\( ṭ\( ṭ̄vaḥ\) \( ṭ\( ṭ\( ṭhitam \) ‘Indra, be satiated with the bull-like Soma’.

4.46.2c v\( ā\( yo sut\( asya ʻtr\( ṭpatam ʻO V\( ā\( yu [and Indra] be satiated from the pressed (Soma)’.

The active causative ʻtar\( p\( āya occurs with an accusative direct object and the genitive again denoting the item with which one is satisfied: 1.54.9c v\( y\( ut\( ṭ\( ṭ\( ṭhī t\( ō\( r\( p\( ayē\( k\( ō\( man \) e\( s\( ām ʻattain, 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 anukāmām ʻtar\( p\( ayē\( thām, ṭ\( in\( ṭ\( r\( ā\( vanu ī\( r\( ō\( yā ā ʻsatisfy your desire for property’.

\( t\( ṭ\) ‘pass’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. ʻtara \) (2), 2nd pl. ʻtar\( at\( a \) (2)

**pres. IV act.** 2nd sing. ʻt\( ī\( r\( ā \) (12), 2nd dual ʻt\( ir\( at\( am \) (7.93.4d), 2nd pl. ʻt\( ir\( at\( a \) (2), 3rd pl. ʻt\( ir\( ant\( u \) (3)

**pres. IV med.** 2nd pl. ʻt\( ir\( dhvam \) (7.56.14b)

**va-pres.** 2nd dual ʻt\( ā\( rvat\( am \) (6.50.10d)

**ya-pres.** 2nd sing. ʻt\( ā\( r\( ya \) (8.99.5d)

**s-aor.** ʻt\( ā\( ri\( št\( am \) (2)

[**aor. inj.** ʻt\( ā\( ri\( ṭh \) (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 *pārasyā ādhi saṃvātā ‘varāh abhy ā tara ‘from the further area, pass over to those (who are) nearer’. It can also mean ‘overcome’ 9.59.3b *viśvānī 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 tīrā dyuḥ *, ‘extend (someone’s) lifespan’.

The stem *tūrva-* is transitive, means ‘overcome’, and only appears once in the imperative: 6.50.10cd *ātri māhās tāmaso ‘mumukta tārya tārata narā duritāb abhike*. 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’

Gotō (1987: 163 fn. 258) to suggest that this example is parenthetical: ‘überwindet, ihr Männer!’ Grassmann (1872: s. *muc*) takes the form *mumukta-, tārya-tārata-*, 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 tarusyatāḥ ‘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 °-*tumya-, as in *śatrutumya- ‘overcoming the enemy’ and *vṛatrya- ‘overcoming V.*.

The single example of the -*iš-* aorist form *tārištam* occurs at 1.34.11e and 1.157.4c, and the form appears in the same formula as does *tirā* above: *prāyus tārištam ‘extend our lifespan’*

---

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 trādhwam 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 Brāzdām. Both attestations of the form trādhwam occur at 2.29.6cd: trādhwam no devā niñūro vṛkasya, trādhwam kartād avapādo yajatrāh ‘Save us from the crushing (jaws) of the wolf, save us from falling into the pit, O worship-worthy ones’

**daṃś** ‘bite’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. daśa (6.31.3c)

**dakṣ** ‘put right’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. dākṣata (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 pātalyē dadatām śārītōr ‘let Indra protect the two wagon-supports (?) from breakage’.

**dambh** ‘annihilate’

**pres. caus. act.** 2nd sing. dambhaya (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 daśasyátam (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 cânas and mónas 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 dak/s, 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.

da1 ‘give’
pres. act. 2nd sing. daddhí (8), dehí (10), dattá (10.16.2b), 3rd sing. dādātu (17), 2nd dual dattam (1.34.6b), 3rd dual dattām (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.

da2 ‘distribute’
pres. med. 2nd sing. dayasva (1.68.6b), 2nd pl. dayadhvam (7.37.2d)

diś ‘show’
red. pres. act. 2nd sing. didiśdhi (2), 3rd sing. dideśtu (7.40.2c), 2nd pl. didiśtana (2)
didiṣṭana 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 didiṣṭa would have ended in -at had it been a perfect.

**dī** ‘shine’

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

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

Cf. pīpihi, pīpaya, pīpayata. 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 didihī, which has the same forms as present impv.s. such as pīpihī, mimihī, 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. didāyat and pres. subj. didayat (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.

**dī**2 ‘fly’

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

**duvasy** ‘honour (with gifts)’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. duvasya (3), 2nd pl. duvasyāta (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. *deįḥ₂).
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**duh** ‘milk, give milk’
- **pres. med.** 2nd sing. *dhukṣva* (4.57.2b)
- **aor. med.** 3rd sing. *duhām* (2)
- **sa-aor, act.** 2nd pl. *dhukṣata* (6.48.13a)
- **sa-aor med.** 2nd sing. *dhukṣāsva* (8.13.25c)

This verb is mostly found in the middle voice, meaning ‘to give milk’, e.g. 4.57.2b *dhenār iva pāyo asm/āmacrūcāṃ duhūtva* ‘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 *bharādvājāy/āmacrūcāṃ dhukṣata dvitā, dhenām ca viśvādhasam / ī/āmacrūcāṃ ca viśvābhahasam* ‘For Bharādvāja now milk the cow who gives all milk, and the all-nourishing nourishment.’.

For the form *duhām* see p. 35.

**dr** ‘pierce’
- **si-impv.** 2nd sing. *dārśi* (10)
- **int.** 2nd sing. *dardrhi* (3), 3rd sing. *dardartu* (7.55.4b)
- **perf.** 2nd sing. *dādhrhi* (1.133.6a)

The intensive is the principle present formation of this verb, although there do exist a few examples of a causative stem *daraya-*. *dādhrhi* is the only form of the perfect of this verb with a long reduplication vowel180. The form itself is only attested once, at 1.133.6a *avār mahā indra dādhrhi śrudhā naḥ* ‘blast the great ones down, O Indra, hear us’ and cannot be differentiated in function from a pres. impv.181 Given this, it does seem like that *dādhrhi* could be some kind of nonce-variant of the intensive present *dardrhi*182.

**dṛ** ‘fasten, be fastened’
- **pres. act.** 2nd pl. *dṛmbhata* (10.101.8d)
- **pres IV act.** 2nd sing. *dṛhyā* (3)
- **pres. IV med.** 2nd sing. *dṛhyāsva* (8.80.7a)

---


181 Kümmel loc. cit.
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*dṛṇhata* is the only attested example of this present stem which has the accentuation on the root, rather than the suffix. The stem *dṛṇhā-*, which is a thematic stem derived from an old nasal present, is transitive-factitive ‘fasten’, e.g. 10.101.8d *mā vah susroc camasō dṛṇhatā tām* ‘let your cup not leak, fasten it!’ while *dṛhya-* is intransitive, meaning ‘be fast, strong’, as in 3.30.15a *īndra dṛhya yāmakośā 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 *īndra dṛhyasva pār asi* ‘Indra, be strong, you are a fortress’.

**dṛā** ‘run’

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

This verb has no present stem, being attested as a root aor., a sigmatic aorist (only in the subjunctive form *dṛāsat*), and as a perfect. This aorist appears to have a suppletive relationship with the present of the verb *dru*\(^{184}\). The forms *dṛāhi* and *dṛātu* 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 *ādhvaryo drāvāyā tvāṁ, sōمام īndraḥ 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 *ēhi drāva pība*, as for example 8.17.11 *āyāṁ ta īndra sōmo, nipūto ādhi barhiśi / ēhīm asyā dravā 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\(^{185}\), 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 ádhanviṣur\(^{186}\).

**dham** ‘blow’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. dhama (10.145.2c)
Appears once, with transitive function: 10.145.2cd sapátīm me pārā dhama, pātīm me kēvala/sunderdot kuru ‘Blow away my co-wife\(^{187}\), make my husband mine alone’

**dhā** ‘put, place, give’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. dhehī (64), dhattā (3.8.1c), 3rd sing. dádhātu (16), 2nd dual dhattām (40), 3rd dual dhattām (10.184.2d), 2nd pl. dhattā (12), dhattana (5), dádhāta (14), dádhätana (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. dhátu (4), 2nd dual. dhātam (3), 2nd pl. dhāta (4), dhātana (7.47.4e), 3rd pl. dhāntu (2)

**aor. med.** 2nd sing. dhīsvā (8)

**perf. med.** 2nd sing. dadhīsvā (6), 2nd pl. dadhidhvām (3)

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

**desid.** 3rd pl. didhīsvat (3.8.6d)

[aor. inj. dhāḥ (40)]

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 sapátī, and the history of its interpretation, see Kazzazi, 2001:175f.
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 kravyādo vṛkyā āpi dhatsvāsan ‘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 dhīṣva appears twice in Book 6 (18.9c and 22.9c) in the formulaic dhīṣva 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 divī śrāvāṇsy uttamāni dhīṣva ‘take (for yourself) the highest glories’, and 3.6.6a ghṛtāsnāvā rōhitā dhūri dhīṣva ‘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 dadhīṣvā 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 dadhīṣvā jaṭhāre sutā/m unā, sōnam indra vāreṇyām ‘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 śrād dhā, ‘to believe’: śraddhām prātār havāmahe, śraddhām madhyāḥdinam pārī / śraddhāṃ sūryasya nimirāci, śraddhe śrād dhāpayehā nan ‘ 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 didhīṣantu appears once at 3.8.6cd té devāśaḥ svāravas tathivāṃsaḥ, prajāvad asmē didhīṣantu rānam ‘these divine posts situated here; let them want to give us a child-rich gift’ 188.

**dhāv1** ‘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’,\textsuperscript{189} e.g. 9.49.4a *pavitraṃ dharma dharmaṇyā ‘flow through the sieve in a stream’.

\textit{dhāv}_2 \text{ see } dhū

\textit{dhunay}- ‘rush’

\textbf{pres. act.} dhunayantām (3.55.16a)

\textit{dhū} ‘shake, mix’

\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. dhūnui (3), 2nd pl. dhūnuta (1)

\textbf{them. pres.} 2nd dual dhūvatam, 2nd pl. dhūvata

The stem dhūnu- is transitive, meaning ‘to shake’, 3.45.4cd *vrksāṃ pakvāṃ phālam ankhāヴァ dhuṇui-, -īndrā sampāraṇam vāṣu ‘O Indra, shake down helpful goodness, as [one shakes] a tree, ripe with fruit’. \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Gotō (1987: 186)} shows that the form dharma- is a technical term used to describe part of the process of preparing Soma, e.g. 8.1.17ab sótā hi sónam ādribhir ēṃ enam apsā dharma ‘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 táv aśvinā bhadrahkanā supāṇi, dharmavatam mādhunā pṛṅktām apsā ‘You two Aśvins, of the blessed hands, having good hands, shake it with honey, mix it in water\textsuperscript{190}, probably gives an indication that this interpretation is correct, as it is more or less synonymous with prc ‘to mix’.

\textit{dhūrv} ‘destroy’

\textbf{pres. act.} 3rd pl. dhūrvantu (6.75.19c)

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

\textsuperscript{189} Gotō (1987: 183).

\textsuperscript{190} Or possibly, ‘shake (it), mix it with honey, in the water’.
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túrva- from ṭp (q.v.)191. Lubotsky (19972), 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 didhṛyathām (2), 2nd pl. didhṛtā (1.139.8g)

dhārāya- is the only present stem from this root, with didhṛ- being the
corresponding reduplicated aorist, in the same manner as the usual connection
between reduplicated aorists and -āya- causatives. LIV s. v. dhēr, quoting the
unpublished dissertation by J. Bendahman, 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 :
dādhrāra, djīgar : didhār, 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. dhṛṣṇuh (1.80.3a)
Occurs only once, at 1.80.3ab préhy abhîhi dhṛṣṇuhí, nā te vájro ní yaṁsate
‘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: má váṁ vīko má vṛkār ā dadhṛṣṭ ‘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. *dhēr.
This is a secondary root, derived from *naś, probably from an unattested aor. subj. *náksati. See p. 49 under nakṣī.

**nabh** ‘pierce, burst’

**pres. med.** 3rd pl. nábhantām (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: nábhantām 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 . . . nábhantām anyakēśuṁ ‘let the bowstrings of the foreigners be destroyed’, which occurs six times in 10.133.

**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 ní sū namātatiṃ kāyasya cīt ‘Bend down anyone’s arrogance’, and 3.33.9c ní sū namadhvam bhāvatā supārāh ‘bend over, become easy to cross’. However, in 10.142.6c úc chvañcasva ní nama vārdhamānah ‘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 śvañcasva which precedes it, suggesting that ‘the repetition of the middle ending immediately after úc śvañcasva might be regarded as a superfluity and therefore be avoided’. Cf. the use of the *hapax* active pava together with pavasva, under pā, p. 135.

The middle voice with the preverb á is affective, i.e. ‘bend for oneself’, e.g. 8.75.5bc á namasva sāhūtibhiḥ / nēdiyo yajñāṃ angiraḥ ‘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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**namsa-y-** ‘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.

**naśi** ‘attain’

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

**naś₂** ‘perish’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *naśya* (10.97.13d), 3rd sing. *naśyatu* (8.27.18d)
**caus. act.** *nāśaya* (1.50.11d)
Both the pres. stem *nāśya-* and the caus. *nāśáya-* 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. *nōcēre* assure the antiquity of these forms. The pres. act. is intransitive, e.g.: 10.97.13d *sākā munderdot naśya nihākayā* ‘disappear together with the snowstorm’, while the causative means ‘make disappear’ 1.50.11cd *ḥṛdrogam máma sūrya, harimāṇam ca naśaya* ‘O Sūrya, make my heartbeat, 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 didiṣṭana, sāro ninikta raśmībhīḥ* ‘show kindness, wash [our sins?] away with the suns rays’. 
ni ‘lead’
- **pres. act.**  2nd sing. náya (12), 3rd sing. nayatu (5), 2nd dual nayatam (2.29.5d), 2nd pl. náyata (6), 3rd pl. náyantu (3)
- **pres. med.**  2nd sing. nayasva (3.35.3a), 2nd pl. nayadhvam (2)
  - **-si impv néši** (10)

The act. forms are transitive, e.g. 1.42.7a áti naḥ saścāto naya ‘lead us past our pursuers’, while the rather scantily attested middle voice is affective195, as in 3.35.3a úpo nayasva vēšanā tapuspā- ‘bring (with you) the two bulls (i.e. stallions), protecting them from (over) heat(ing)’196. For the -si impv néši see p. 50.

nud ‘push’
- **pres. act.**  2nd pl. nudata (10.165.5a)
- **pres. med.**  2nd sing. nudásva (7), 2nd dual nudéthām (7.104.1d)

The active form nudata is one of only three active forms attested for this verb, the others being an imperfect anuda and a participle nudán. 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 mfīḥ, 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).

196 Translation based on Klein (1985: 1-369). For the difficult word tapuspā- see Geldner ad. loc.
The present is intransitive, meaning ‘to fly’, e.g. 6.75.16ab ávasrṣṭā pārā pata, śāravye ... ‘having been released, fly away, O arrow ...’ or 5.78.1-3c haṁsāviva patatam ā sutāṁ úpa ‘fly like geese to the pressed (Soma-juices)’, which is the only occurrence of the form patatam. At 10.134.5ab, áva pâ means ‘to fall’: áva svēdā ivābhīta, viṣvāk patantu didyavāh ‘May the arrows fall all around like drops of sweat.’ The aorist only occurs once and is undifferentiated in meaning: 1.88.1d váyo nā pâpâtaś 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 áspaśta, the perfect paspaśé and the med. caus. spāśāyasva. There is also a ppp. ánu-spāṣṭa. 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. paśyamāna-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 spaś-forms are always middle-voice (‘to see for oneself’), synchronically there is a suppletive relationship not between paś and spaś but between paś and dṛś\(^{198}\), with the spaś forms having diverged semantically sufficiently to be considered separate. Thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>See, look</strong></th>
<th><strong>Watch over, spy</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pres.</td>
<td>paśyati</td>
<td>paśyate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aor.</td>
<td>ádaṛśam</td>
<td>ádṛkṣata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ádaṃṛśa</td>
<td>ádaṃṛṣe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caus.</td>
<td>spāśāyasva</td>
<td>spāśāyasva</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pres. middle-voice impv. of paś means ‘to look’ in its one attestation: 8.33.19a adhāh paśyasva mōpāri ‘look down not up’, while the active is transitive, as in e.g.: 6.9.4a ayām hōtā prathamāh pāśyatemāṁ ‘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 asmadhrūg, 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’\(^{199}\)

pāḥ ‘protect’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. pāhi (70), 3rd sing. pātu (35), 2nd dual pātām (12), 3rd dual pātāṃ (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 yūyām pāta svastībhīḥ sādā naḥ ‘you protect us always with good fortune’.

---

\(^{198}\) See also Kümmel (2000:231ff.) and Mayhofer (1986: s. PAŚ) for further literature concerning the suppletive relationship between paś and dṛś.

\(^{199}\) Translation Jamison (1983: 167).
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*pā2 ‘drink’


pres. med. 2nd sing. *pībavsya (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 *pība sōmam ...

(passim) but also commonly occurs with a partitive genitive object, as in e.g. 8.37.1g *pība sōmasya vajrīvaḥ ‘drink (of) the Soma, O Vajra-bearer’, which is also repeated a further five times in the same hymn 200. 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 *sám, with the meaning ‘drink together’ and no object, as in 4.35.7cd *sám rūbhābhīḥ pībavsya rātmahēbhīḥ, sākāṭrīḥr yāḥ indra cakṛṣye 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 *sám mádebhir indrīyēbhīḥ pibadhvam ‘(O Rbhus) drink together, with the exhilarations of Indra’. The fourth attestation is with the preverb *vī: 3.53.10cd devebhēr viprāḥ rṣavaḥ nycaṣṣasō, *vī pibadhvam kuśikāḥ somyāṁ mādhu ‘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’201.

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 mādhvaḥ suṣīhva 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 *āmreṭita*, at 2.11.11a: *piśa-pibēd indra śūra sómam* ‘Drink, drink the Soma, O Indra, O Hero.’

**pinv** see *pī*

*piś* ‘carve, paint’

- **pres. act.** 3rd sing. *piṃśatu* (10.184.1b), 2nd pl. *piṃśata* (10.53.7b)
- **them. aor.** 2nd sing. *piśā* (7.18.2c)

*piṃśa*- is a thematic stem derived from an old nasal stem, cf. *drh*.

*piś* ‘trample, crush’

- **pres. act.** 2nd pl. *piṇāṭana* (7.104.18b)

*pī* ‘swell’

- **pres. act.** 2nd sing. *piṇva* (4), 2nd dual *piṇvatam* (9), 3rd dual *piṇvatām* (6.70.6a), 2nd pl. *piṇvata* (5.83.6b)
- **pres. med.** 2nd sing. *piṇvasva* (3.3.7b), 3rd sing. *piṇvatām* (10.36.5a), 2nd pl. *piṇvadhvam* (3.33.12c)
- **perf.** 2nd sing. *piṇhi* (2)

- **them. red. aor.** 2nd sing. *piṇpaya* (3.15.6a), 2nd pl. *piṇpayata* (10.64.12c)
- **them. perf.** 2nd dual *piṇpata* (4), 3rd dual *piṇpata* (6.50.12d), *piṇpata* (2.34.6c)

The thematic present *piṇva-* has completely replaced an old -nu- present *piṇoti*, which is attested in Avestan as *fra-pinaotita* (V. 3.31). This present stem was subsequently reanalysed as a root *pinv*, from which are attested non-present forms such as perfect *pipinvaṭhuḥ*.

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 *piṇhi*, 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-statative. 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.

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 iṣaḥ pinva vasudéyāya pārvīḥ ‘make much refreshment swell for the giving of goods’, while the middle-voice is intransitive: 3.3.7ab ārjā pinvasva sām tō so dīdīḥi 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 pipyatam jīvāse nah ‘like two breasts, swell that we may live.’

puṣ ‘flourish’
pres. act. 2nd pl. puṣyata (1.94.8c), puṣyantu (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), punītāt (10.30.5d), 3rd sing. punātu (9.67.22c), 2nd pl. punītā (9.67.27e), punītāna (4), punāta (9.104.3a), punāntu (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 pavasva at 9.49.3 ghṛtām pavasva dhārayā, yajñēṣu devavāmaḥ / asmābhyaṃ vṛṣṭīm 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 pipiḥi, explained by Kümmel as having been influenced by the RVic form. Also, cf. the forms didīḥi and didīhī, both of which are perfect.
form á pavasva + acc means ‘become pure’ with acc. of content or goal\textsuperscript{205}, 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 śvañcasva, Gonda (1979: 98) proposes that the middle voice meaning is transferred from the juxtaposed middle form\textsuperscript{206}. Thus we can translate the verse ‘purify yourself as ghee by pouring, .... be pure for us as (with respect to) rain’\textsuperscript{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 punâ-, eight occur in six consecutive verses (22-27) of 9.27. The form punāta (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.

\textbf{pū ‘bring over’}

\textbf{red. pres. act.} 2nd sing. piprhi (2), 3rd sing. pipartu (3), 2nd dual piprtám (5), 3rd dual piprtám (1.22.13c), 2nd pl. piprtá (2), pippartana (9)

\textbf{aor. -si impv. pāršī} (16)

\textbf{sec. thematised aor. impv. parṣa} (1.97.8b)

\textbf{caus.} 2nd sing. pārāya (5), 2nd dual. pārayatam (2.39.4a)

Jamison (1983: 102) considers the caus. form pārāya, 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 tṛ, which itself is only attested in one participle form titrat-, but which does have an Avestan cognate titrāt. For the -si impv. paršī and for the form parṣa see p. 50. Cf. joṣa, and AV neṣa.

---

\textsuperscript{205} Gotō (1987: 207).

\textsuperscript{206} See also p. 128.

\textsuperscript{207} Gonda 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’.
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pṛc 'mix, pour out abundantly, fill'
pres. act. 2nd sing. prīḍhi (2.24.15c), 3rd sing. pṛṇāktu (1.84.1c), 2nd dual pṛṇktām (5)
red. pres. act. 2nd sing. pipṛgdhi (10.10.11d), 2nd pl. pipṛkta (3.54.21b)
pres. pass. 3rd sing. pṛcyatām (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 āpedám upapārcanam, āṣū gōṣūpa pṛcyatām ‘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.

pṛi ‘fill’
pres. act. prṇītana (5.5.5c)
them. pres. 2nd sing. prṇa (8), 2nd pl. prṇata (3)
them. pres. med. 2nd sing. prṇasva (2), 3rd sing. prṇatām (3.50.1c), 2nd dual prṇethām (6.69.7b), 2nd pl. prṇādhvam (4)
red. aor. pāpurantu (7.62.3d)
-sī impv. prāsi (2)

For the form prṇa 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 sēmāṁ naḥ kāmam ā prṇa ‘fulfil this desire of ours’. It can also mean ‘fill’, as in 9.41.5a ā mahī rōdasī prṇa ‘fill the two great worlds’.

Two examples of the athematic present impv. that occur without preverbs both belong to the root pṛṭ2 (q.v. below), thus the sole example of the imperative of this

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.
stem with the probable meaning ‘fill’ is 5.5.5c prā-pra yajñām pṛṇātana ‘fulfil the sacrifice’.\footnote{See Kuiper (1938: especially 314-320).}

The middle voice present, which is always thematic, means ‘to fill up, become full’, e.g. 3.50.1c ērvuvaścāh pṛṇātām ebhir ānaih- ‘having wide reach, let him be filled with this food’. The middle voice may also have affective meaning, as in 10.104.2b nībhīh sutāsya jathāram pṛṇasva ‘fill your (own) stomach with (Soma) pressed by men’.

The red. aor. form pāpurantu corresponds to a caus. pūrayati, 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\footnote{Jamison (1983: 149).}. For an example containing the -si impv. prāśi see under pṛf₂.

\textbf{pṛf₂ ‘give’}

\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd dual pṛṇātām (7.65.4d), 2nd pl. pṛṇātā (1.23.21a)

\textbf{root aor.} pūrdhī (7)

First differentiated from pṛf₁ by Kuiper (1938: 313ff.)\footnote{For further extensive bibliography see Mayrhofer (1986: PAR²). See also LIV s. *perh₃.}. While the aorist impvs. of these roots are strictly differentiated, the present stems are the same – pṛṇāti. Historically the two roots are completely different; pṛf₁ < *pelh₁ while pṛf₂ < *perh₃.

The two attested examples of the pres. stem pṛṇā/-pṛṇ- of which simplex forms occur both belong to this root, a fact recognised by Kuiper (1938: 319). Thus 1.23.21ab āpaḥ pṛṇātā bheṣajām vārūthaḥ tanvē māma ‘O waters, give a potion, protection for my body’ and 7.65.4d pṛṇātām udnā divyāsya cāroḥ ‘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 pṛf₁, and clearly meant to be synonymous with the following prā yaṃsi ‘extend (gifts)’: sāgadhā pūrdhī prā yaṃsi ca, śiśhiḥ prāśy udāram ‘be powerful, give and extend (gifts),
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sharpen (us), fill our stomachs.’ This ‘absolute’ usage of the transitive is mirrored in 1.125.5b yāh prayāti sā ha devēṣu gachati ‘he who 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. prathantām (2.3.5c)

**caus. med.** prathayasva (10.140.4a)

**praś** ‘ask’

**pres.act.** 2nd sing. prcha (3), prchāta (2)

**prā** see pī₁

**prī** ‘gratify, be gratified’

**perf.** piprīhī (2)

**them. perf. med.** piprāyasva (8.11.10c)

The secondarily thematicised form piprāyasva is probably built on the subjunctive stem piprāyat. Cf. didayatam, 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 á kraṇḍaya bālam ōjo na á ḍhā, nī ṣṭāniḥi duritā bādhamānah / āpa protha dundubhe duchānā itā, īndrasya muṣṭir 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 ... duchānā certainly being parallel to that of nī ṣṭāniḥi duritā, for which see Narten (1993: 319), who translates

---

212 Also Kümmel (2000: 322ff.).
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it as ‘donnere los, die Gefahren bannend’. The only other finite form of this verb (the rest being participles) appears with áśva- ‘horse’ at 7.3.2a.

**bandh** ‘bind’

**pass. pres.** 3rd pl. badhyantām (4.57.4c)
The form bandhānā 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. bádhasva (9), 3rd sing. bádhatām (5), 2nd dual bādhetām (6.74.2c). 2nd pl. bādhadhvam (7.56.20c)

**budh** ‘be awake, aware’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. bodhi (9), bódha (5), 3rd sing. bódhatu (2.32.4b), 2nd dual bódhatam (7), 3rd pl. bódhantu (1.29.4b)

**caus.** 2nd sing. bodhaya (8), 2nd pl. bodhayata (8.44.1b)

Hoffmann (1967: 232) and Insler (1972, 560ff.) explain the stem bodha- as originating in a root-aorist subjunctive. The form bódhat is still to be regarded synchronically as such at 4.15.7 bódhad yām mā hāribhyāṃ kumārāḥ sāhadevāḥ, 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 *āśaya, which became āśayat. While in the latter case the rest of the paradigm preserved the identity of the form āśayat as a middle-voice form, in the

---

213 Trans. Insler (*op. cit.*)
case of *bodhā(t)\textsuperscript{214} 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 yōdhi 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 ČēRCi are active.

The meaning of bōdha- and the other synchronically active forms is ‘notice, observe, perceive’. The forms bodhi and bōdha have the same meaning, which strengthens the idea that the latter could be derived from the former (p. 27).

Furthermore, bōdha 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 vācaḥ, ‘O Agni, take notice of my speech’, 3.14.7c tvām viśvasya suvāthasya bodhi, ‘take notice of him who has a good chariot’, 1.147.2a bōdha me asyā vācaso yaviṣṭha, ‘take notice of this my speech, O Youngest One’, and 7.21.1d bōdha na stómam āndhaso mādeṣu ‘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 āgnir jmā ēti sūryo ‘Agni has awoken, the sun rises from the earth’. One notable exception to the above is 1.29.4ab sasāntu tyā ārātayo, bōdhanthu sūra rātāyaḥ ‘Let those enemies sleep, let these heroes be awake.’ Gotō (1987: 220) suggests the possibility that ‘Hier hat wahrscheinlich eine akustische Anpassung an sasāntu eine Rolle gespielt.’

The causative bodhayā mean ‘awaken, wake (someone) up’, as in 1.124.10ab pra bōdhayoṣaḥ prāṇatō mahāny, ābodhyamānāḥ pāṇāyaḥ sasantu ‘Awaken the givers, O generous Usas, let the demons sleep, never awakening’.

\textit{bṛh} ‘strengthen’

\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. bhraya (3)

\textbf{int.} 2nd sing. bṛhrhi (10.10.10c)

Wackernagel (1896: 251) shows that the -hi ending in bṛhrhi is an analogical reconstruction; the form should have been *bṛṛrhī (< *bṛṛr̥-dhi < *bṛṛṛh-\textit{dhi}). If, as was usually the case, the vowel preceding the */zdhi/ cluster had

\textsuperscript{214} The form bōdhat is a secondary shortening, according to Insler (\textit{op. cit.}).
undergone compensatory lengthening, then the form would have been *barbrhi215. For the possibility that the form barbrhi may have been derived from the form bárbrhat (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 barbrhi may stem from the PIE root *bhelgh ‘swell’, as opposed to the usual derivation from the root *bhergh ‘be high’. The form appears only once, at 10.10.10cd úpa barbrhi vrṣabhāya bāhūm, anyām iḥasva 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 *bhelgh ‘swell’ does provide some Vedic words whose meaning is ‘cushion, pillow’, e.g. upabárha-, 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 vṛdhyopabárbrhat ‘she who shall lay her arms under the man who is praised by Śyāvāśva’.216

brū ‘say’

pres. act. 2nd sing. brūhi (4), 3rd sing. bravītu (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)
-sī impv. bhakṣi (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 á, in which case it means ‘let (someone) have a share in (something)’, with acc. and loc. respectively, e.g.

215 cf. tālhi.

216 See also Schaefer (1994: 39, 157-159).
1.43.8c ā na indo vāje bhaja ‘give us, O drop, a share in the prize’. Without ā, 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 bhūrid/āmedhāḥ hy āsi śrutāḥ ... ā no bhajasva rādhāsi ‘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 yó vāḥ śivātamo rāsas, tāsya bhājayateḥa 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’.

bhañ ‘break’
pres. act. 2nd sing. bhañddhi (10.87.4d)

bhā ‘shine’
pres. act. 2nd sing. bhāhi (10)

bhid ‘split’
pres. act. 2nd sing. bhindhi (3)

bhiṣajya- ‘heal’
pres. act. 2nd dual bhiṣajyātām (8.22.10d)

bhī ‘fear’
pres.med. 3rd sing. bhayatām (10.42.6c)

bhur ‘move quickly, tremble’
pres. act. 3rd pl. bhurāntu (10.76.6a)

217 Cf. also Gotō (1987: 221f.).
**bhū** ‘become’


**perf.** *bhāvatu* (1.127.10c)

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 *bháratām* (10.59.8c), 2nd pl. *bharata* (17)

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. *bhárasva* (2), 2nd pl. *bharadhvam* (12)

**red. pres.** 3rd dual. *bibhṛtām* (6.75.4b)

The hugely-attested present active forms are typically found with the preverb /macronacute and a dative indirect object with the meaning ‘bring something to somebody’, as in e.g. 1.79.8a /macronacute no agne rayím bhara ‘O Agni, bring us property’. The much rarer middle-voice forms are affective or affective-possessive: 1.79.10bc vāco gotamāgnáye /bhárasva summayār gíra/hunderdot ‘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 *bibhṛ-* 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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**manḥh** ‘lavish’
**them. perf. med.** 2nd sing. māmahasva (2), 3rd pl. māmahantām (20)
**pres. caus. maṇḍhaya** (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 ṭṛṣṭye dhānāḥ sāvane puṇṇaḥ, puṇṇāṣayām āhu tam māmahasva naḥ ‘at the third pressing, be bountiful for us with regard to grains, the sacrificed rice cakes’. The third pers. plural form māmahatām, 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 mītrō vāruṇo māmahatām, ādhīḥ sīndhuḥ pṛthivī utā dyaūḥ ‘In this matter, may Mitra and Varuṇa be bountiful, and also Aditi, Sindhu, Pṛthivī and Dyaus.’ The causative form is semantically problematic, mainly because it is very sparsely attested. For the thematicised perfect stems see p.34.

**mad** ‘exhilarate, intoxicate’
**pres. act.** 2nd sing. mada (10.63.3d), 3rd dual madatām (1.121.11b), 2nd pl. mādata (2), 3rd pl. mādata (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. mandaya (2)
**-si impv.** 2nd sing. mātis (15)
**s-aor. med.** 2nd sing. mātisva (14)
**perf.** 2nd sing. mamaddhi (2), 3rd sing. mamāttu (12), 2nd pl. mamattāna (10.179.1d)
The root mand is a secondary root derived from mad. Since Bartholomae (1897: 85), it has been accepted that the root mand 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 ṝṇā ṭārdhā ānu mādā svastāye ‘Joyfully greet these Ādityas for well-being’. Indeed, of the remaining attestations of the imperative of the stem *māda*-, only one appears to be intransitive – *mādatā* at 1.182.1b. The transitive examples all have preverbs, (ānu x 3, abhī 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 ṝṇā 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: mátsi soma vārṇam mátsi mītrām, mátsiṁdram indo pavamāṇa viṣṇum / mátsi śārdho mārastam mátsi devān, mátsi mahām 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 tú gahi prā tú drava, mátsvā sutāsyā gōmaṭaḥ ‘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 asmīṁn ū śu sāvane mādāyasva ‘rejoice in this pressing’, or 1.101.9d asmīṁ yajñē barhiṣi mādāyasva ‘rejoice in this sacrifice on the altar-grass’.
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**man**

1. ‘think’
   - pres. med. 3rd sing. *manutām* (6.47.29b)

2. ‘wait?, think?’
   - perf. act. 2nd sing. *mamandhi* (10.27.20)
   Only occurs once, at 10.27.20b: mó śā prā sedhīr māhur īn mamandhi, which is usually translated, e.g. by Grassmann, Geldner and Insler (1972: 555), ‘do not drive (them) forth, just wait a while’. Kümmel (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 μέμνοντα ‘to have in mind’, in Latin as *memini*, ‘remember’ and in Germanic as the perfecto-present verb 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.

**manth**

‘agitate’
   - pres. act. 2nd pl. *mānthata* (3.29.5a)

**mand**

see *mad*

**mahay**

‘exalt’
   - pres. act. 2nd sing. *mahaya* (4)

**mā**

1. ‘measure’
   - pres. act. 2nd sing. *mimīhi* (7), 2nd dual *mimītām* (2), 3rd dual *mimītām* (5.51.11a)
   - pres. med. 2nd dual *mimātheta* (2)
   - aor. 2nd sing. *māhi* (3)
   - -si impv *māsi* (5)
   - aor. med. 2nd sing. *māsva* (2)

The impv. forms of this verb mostly appear with preverbs – the aorist always with úpa, the present either with úpa, or sām – and generally an accusative object and dative indirect object, with the meaning ‘distribute, measure out’, as in e.g. 3.54.22b219 *asmadryāk sām mimīhi śrāvāṃsi* ‘in our direction measure out glories’.

---

219 Repeated at 5.4.2d and 6.19.3b.
and 7.26.5c sahasräña úpa no māhi vājān ‘give out to us thousandfold prizes’. The middle-voice forms have similar meaning, and the same valency: 9.93.5a nū no rayīn 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 nū no rayīm puruvīram bhāntām, dāsrā mīmāṁhāṁ ubhāyesv 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 mīmīḥ ślokam āṣyē, parjānya iva tataṁ ‘Measure the sound in your mouth, thunder like Parjanya’.

**mā2** ‘bellow’
**pres. act.** 3rd sing. mīmātu (5.59.8a)

**mī** ‘build’
**pres. act.** 3rd sing. minotu (10.18.13d)

**muc** ‘free’
**pres. act.** 2nd sing. muṁca (2), 2nd dual muṁcātām (3), 2nd pl. muṁcata (4), 3rd pl. muṁcāntu (2)
**pres. med.** 2nd sing. muṁcasva (10.38.5c)
**a-aor.** 2nd sing. muca (4)
**aor. med.** 2nd pl. mucadhvam (1.171.1d)
**perf.** 2nd sing. mumugdhi (6), 3rd sing. mumoktu (2), 2nd dual mumuktam (2)
**thematicised perf.** 2nd dual mumócatām (5), 2nd pl. mumócata (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 mumugdhi 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 mumugdhy asmāt ‘release the sin we have committed from us’, and 5.2.7c evāsmād agne vī mumugdhi 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 muṁcataṁ vārṇasya 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 āṣmān muṇcata vy āṁhah ‘thus release the trouble from us’ and 6.74.3cd āva syatam muṇcātaṁ yān no āstī, tanāṣu baddhāṁ kṛtāṁ ēno asmāt ‘untie, release from us the committed sin which we have, bound to our bodies’.

The aorist muca only occurs with the preverb vi with a single accusative object, e.g. 1.177.4cd stīrṇāṁ barhīr ā tu śakra prā yāhi, ādāṇā νiṣāḍaya vi muca hāri 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 *mumócati 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 vi yauṣṭaṁ sakhyā mumócatam ‘do not reject our friendship, free [us] (?)’. However, given the frequency of the combination vi muc + acc. it is possible that Geldner (ad loc.) is correct that the preverb vi 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 prā muṇcasva pári kātsād ihā gahi ‘free yourself from Kutsa, come here’, while the other is affective-possessive: 1.171.1d ni hēlo dhattā vi mucadhvam āśvān ‘lay down your anger, unyoke your (own) horses’.

For the possibility that the form ’mumuktāṁ at 6.50.10c is an impv. see p. 118.

mud ‘rejoice’

**pres. med.** 2nd pl. modadhvam (10.97.3a)

muṣ ‘steal’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. muṣāyā (1.175.4a)

muh ‘be dazed’

**pres. act.** 3rd pl. māhyantu (10.81.6c)

---

220 For the shift in accent in the attested perf. subj. mumócati see Kümmel (op. cit: 383).
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**mṛj** ‘clean’
- sa-aor. 2nd dual mṛṣatam (2)
- caus. med. pres. 2nd pl. marjayadhvam (7.2.4d)

**mṛd** ‘have mercy’
- pres. act. 2nd sing. mṛḷā (19), 3rd sing. mṛḷatu (1.179.5c), 2nd dual. mṛḷatām (6.74.4b), 3rd dual mṛḷatām (10.93.7a), 2nd pl. mṛḷātā (11), 3rd pl. mṛḷantu (2)
- caus. act. 2nd sing. mṛḷāya (18), 2nd pl. mṛḷāyata (2.29.2d), 3rd pl. mṛḷayantu (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 than the accusative of 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 yāt sīm āgaś cakṛmā tāt sū mṛḷa ‘the sin which we have committed, regarding this matter please have mercy’.

**mrś** ‘touch’
- pres. act. 2nd sing. mrśa (3)
- pres. med. 2nd sing. mrśasva (8.70.9b)

**mfś** ‘crush’
- pres. act. 2nd sing. mfśihi (4.4.5d), mfśa (5)

Thieme (1939) suggests that this is the descendant of two separate roots: *melh₁ ‘to grind’ and *merh₂ ‘to catch’. There is no simple way to tell them apart, unlike in the case of the similarly conjugated verbs pfś₁ ‘fill’ and pfś₂ ‘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 – pra may be combined with either root, or by form, as both may be thematic or athematic. It is clear that 7.104.22d dṛṣādeva pra mfśa rákṣa 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 pra mfśa means ‘catch’: pārāca indra pra mfśa jahī 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.

**mṛ₂** ‘hinder’

**int.** 3rd sing. marmartu (2.23.6d)

This root only has one imperative form: 2.23.6cd bṛhaspate yo no abhi hvāro dadhē, svā tām marmartu duchūnā hārasvatī. Insler (1972: 92) suggests differentiating this intensive from the previous mṛj “to crush”, with the meaning ‘hinder’, translating the passage ‘Bṛhaspati, he who poses an obstacle for us, let that own angering mischief of his hinder him’. Mayrhofer (1986 s. MAR13) 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 āmūr, ‘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 médatām, which occurs at 10.93.11d, to be a 3rd sing. med. impv. form. The text is: 10.93.11cd sādā pāhy abhīṣtaye, médātām vedaṭā vaso which has been translated either as ‘(Die Rede) soll an Weisheit fett werden, du Guter’ (Geldner) or ‘Beschütze unser Genosseninsentwerden (unsers fettes Gedeihen?) entsprechend unserem Weisheitwesen, du Guter’ (Oldenberg [1909: *ad. loc.*]), in which case the form médatām is seen as an accusative verbal noun.

**myakṣy** ‘be attached’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. myakṣa (2.28.6a)

**sec. pres. act.** 2nd sing. mimikṣa (9.107.6d), 2nd dual mimikṣatām (4), 3rd dual mimikṣatām (2)

**perf. med.** 2nd sing. mimikṣva (1.48.16b)

---

221 I.e. ‘which angers us’.
The impv. form *myak/sunderdota* 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 myak/sunderdota bhiyásam 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 *mádhvā yajñáam mimíksa nah* ‘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 *sám no rāyá bṛhatā viśvápeśasā, mimíksvā sám ūḷabhir 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. *mrada* (6.53.3c)

*yaj* ‘sacrifice’


**aor. -si impv.** 2nd sing. *yák/sunderdoti* (33)

-s- **aor.** 3rd dual *yakṣatām* (3)

-s- **aor. med.** 2nd sing. *yáksva* (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 exceptions.²²²

²²² For a full discussion of the valency of the verb *yaj* see Baum (2006, forthc.).
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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 ā na ihā prā yachatam, rayīṃ viśvāyupōsam ‘grant us here property that makes our whole life prosper.’ One exception to this is the semi-formulaic prā [dat.] yach- avṛkām prthā chardīḥ ‘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 gōmatīr īṣah ‘O Goddess, (grant us) cow (milk?)-rich refreshment’.

As already mentioned, the aorist forms yandhī and yāmsi occur mostly with the preverb prā, with the meaning ‘grant’, as in 4.2.20d mahō rāyāḥ puruvāra prā yandhi ‘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 śnā vīpra stuvatē 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. yayastu

**yū** ‘travel (in a vehicle)’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. yāhi (142), 3rd sing. yātu (18), 3rd dual yātām (120), 2nd pl. yātā (17), yātāna (3), 3rd pl. yāntu (1.167.2a)

-**sī-** -aor 2nd dual yāsīstām (5)

The aorist form yāsīstām occurs only in the formulaic expression yāsīstām varīth ‘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 yāsīṣṭa, 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. preceptive of the verb yā, ‘to ask for’.
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yāc ‘ask for’

pres. act. 2nd sing. yācatāt (9.86.41d), 2nd pl. yācata (10.48.5c)

yu1 ‘bind’

pres. act. 2nd sing. yuva (9.108.9c)
pres. med. 2nd sing. yuvāsva (6)
The active forms of this verb (impv. and others) are only attested twice, both times in late books. 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 kőśam madhyamām yuva ‘open (or ‘empty’?, cf. Geldner ad. loc.) the middle receptacle’. The middle-voice form yuvāsva is another whose meaning is ‘give’, presumably literally ‘attach to ...’, as in, e.g. 7.5.9ab tām no agne maghāvadbhyah purukṣūm, rayin ví vājam śrūyaṃ yuvāsva ‘Give this cow-rich property, as fame-worthy booty to our liberal (patrons)’.

yu2 ‘keep away’

red. pres. act. 2nd sing. yuyodhī (7), 3rd sing. yuyotu (3), 2nd dual yuyotam (2), yuyutām (3), 2nd pl. yuyota (10), yuyotana (2)
sk-pres. act. 3rd pl. yuchantu (8.39.2e)
caus. pres. 3nd. sing. yavāya (4), 3rd pl. yavayantu (8.48.5d)
2nd caus. act. 2nd sing. yāvāya (4), 3rd pl. yāvayantu (7.44.3d)
2nd caus. med. 2nd sing. yāvayasva (5.42.9d)
The reduplicated present shows the construction ‘keep something (acc.) away from someone (abl.)’, as in 2.6.4c yuyodhy āsmād dvēśāṃsi ‘keep hostilities away from us’. It can also have the enclitic personal pronoun naḥ in place of the proclitic āsmād in the above example, which in this case would unusually have to be considered an ablative too, as in 6.48.10c āgne hēlāṃsi daivyā yuyodhi nāḥ ‘O Agni, keep the heavenly angers away from us’.
The stem yūcha, on the other hand, is intransitive, meaning ‘to stay away from someone (abl.)’, 8.39.2e itō yuchantv āmūraḥ ‘may the hinderances stay away from here’.

---

223 The other attestation is one occurrence of the present active 3rd pers. sing. yuvāti at 10.42.5d.
The transitive/causative stem *yaváya-* occurs only in Books 1, 8 and 10, and this is clearly a late form. *yaváya-* 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 *brahmadvíṣaḥ súryád yávayasya* ‘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: 315ff.) disputes Jamison’s accentual grounds for this theory, but Kümmel (2000 401ff.), 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.

**yuṭi** ‘yoke’

**pres. act.** 2nd pl. *yunákt (2)
**pres. med.** 2nd dual. *yuŋjáhām (7), 2nd pl. yungdhvám (3)
**root aor. med.** 2nd sing. *yuṅśvá (12)
**-ya- pass.** 2nd pl. *yuṣjadhvam (10.175.1c)

The active forms are transitive, e.g. 10.101.10d *ubhē dhúrau práti váhni/munderdot yunakta* ‘harness both poles to the beast’, while the middle-voice of all stems is possessive-affective, as in 8.85.7a *yuŋjáhām rásabhām rāthe* ‘yoke your donkey to your (own) wagon [O Aśvins]’

**yuḍh** ‘fight’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *yuḍhya (2), 2nd pl. yuḍhyata (8.96.14d)
**aor.** 2nd sing. *yódhā (5.3.9a)
**-si impv.** *yóṣi (1.132.4e)
**is-aor.** 2nd dual *yodhīṣtam (6.60.2a)
**caus.** 2nd sing. *yodháya (3.46.2d)

[**aor. inj.** *yodhī (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 abhí either with the meaning ‘fight against’, as in 6.31.3ab tváṁ kútsevenabhí śásñam indra-. -aśaṁ yudhya kāya vaṃ gāviṣaṁ ‘you Indra, fight Śūṣṇa with Kutsa . . .’ or, ‘to fight for something (acc.)’, as in 6.60.2a tó yodhiṣṭam abhí gā indra nīnām ‘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 yódhi, which is attested only at 5.3.9a áva sprdhī pitāraṁ yódhi ... ‘Protect the father, fight (for him)’, see page 26f.

**rakṣy** ‘protect’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. rákṣa (25), rákṣatāt (4.50.2d), 3rd sing. rakṣatu (2), 2nd dual rakṣatām (9), 3rd dual rakṣatām (2), 2nd pl. rákṣata (2), 3rd pl. rakṣantu (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 rakṣatām seven occur at 1.185, in the repeated pāda 1.185.2-8d dyávā rakṣatām prthivī no ábhvā ‘Heaven and Earth, protect us from Nothingness’.

**rad** ‘dig up, scrape’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. ráda (4), 3rd pl. radantu (7.62.3a)

**-sí impv.** ráṣi (5.10.1d)

**ran** ‘enjoy’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. raña (5)

**pres. X act.** 2nd sing. ranaya (8.34.1b), 3rd pl. ranyañantu (6.28.1b)

**-iṣ- aor.** 2nd pl. rāniṣṭana (2.36.3b)

**perf.** rāndhī (3)

Narten (1964: 217) classes the form rāniṣṭana with other -iṣ- aorists which developed from original root-aorists. She claims an ingressive meaning for the aorist, as opposed to the present raña, which she asserts is durative. This appears to

---

225 See also Gotō (1987: 257).
me to be a very far-reaching conclusion to base on just one attested example: 2.36.3ab ...ā hi gántana, nī barhiśi sadatanā rāṇištana ‘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 suté 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 naḥ sūryasya saṃḍāśi 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 rāṇa ‘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 (19722) 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 randhi was created by analogy to the form jó/sunderdota in the same way as yódhi see p. 27. The only other present-forms attested from this root are from the -áya- 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 suté raṇa is repeated 5 times throughout the RV.

227 The 2nd pl. red. caus. aor. form rāradhatā, 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. rabhasva (3), 2nd pl. rabhadhvam (2)

ram 'stop'

pres. med. 2nd sing. ramasva (10.34.13b), 2nd pl. rámadhvam (3.33.5a)
caus. act. 2nd sing. ramáya (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 Gotô (1987: 262ff.).

rā1 'give, bestow'

pres. act. 2nd sing. riríhi (7)
pres. med. 2nd dual rarāthām (1.117.23d), 2nd pl. rarīdhvam (5.83.6a)
-si impv. rási (11)
aor. med. 2nd sing. rásva (21), 2nd dual rāsāthām (1.46.6c), 3rd sing. rāsatām (10.36.14d), 3rd pl. rāsantām (4)
All forms of this verb are middle-voice, except the impv. riríhi, and a number of forms which are either derived from, or implied by the active s-aor. subj. stem rāsa-, such as the -si impv. rási. The forms rāsatām and rāsantām are also built on the subjunctive stem, and are the first signs of the development of the thematic stem rāsa-, 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. rāya (7.55.3a)

rikh 'scratch'

pres. act. 2nd sing. rikhā (2)

ruc 'shine'

pres. med. 3rd sing. rocatām (10.43.9c)
caus. act. 2nd sing. rocaya (2)
The middle-voice forms are intransitive, meaning 'to shine', only occurring once in the impv. at 10.43.9c ví rōcatām aruśō bhāmūnā śūciṁ 'The bright red one will shine with light'. The causative is factitive-transitive 'make shine', as in 9.36.3ab sā no jyōtīniśi pārvya, pāvamāna ví rocaya 'Make the lights shine for us, O First Pavamāna'.


ruj 'smash'

pres. act. 2nd sing. rujā (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 *h₁leyd₁, and one meaning ‘ascend’, from an original *reuy₁/leuy₁. 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 ā roha sūrye am saṃsāra lokāṁ ‘Ascend to the world of immortality, O Suryā’ has the second meaning, 3.8.11ab vānaspate śatāvalśo ví roha, sahāsravalśā ví vayām rūhma ‘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 ā 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: 147ff.).
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lī ‘cling, hide’

pres. med. 3rd pl. layantām

Occurs once at 10.84.7cd: bhīyaṃ dādhānā hṛdayeṣu śātraṇaḥ, pārājītāḥ āpa nī layantām, ‘the enemies, having fear in their hearts, defeated, shall hide away’. See also Gotō (1987: 279), Mayrhofer (1986, s. LAY).

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 rāthavītau, ‘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.avadhvam (10.191.2a)

The middle-voice forms of this verb are mostly attested in Books 1 and 10, although there is one occurrence of sāṃ vade at 7.86.2a. Gotō (1987: 282) says that the middle voice has a reciprocal meaning, strengthened by use of the preverb sám, and this is well demonstrated by both of the impv. examples: 1.170.5c  śrotra tvām marādhiḥ sāṃ vadavasva- ‘Indra, you talk together with the Maruts’, and 10.191.2ab sāṃ gachadhvam sāṃ vadadhvam, sāṃ 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 naḥ śakune bhadrāṁ ā vada, viśvāto naḥ śakune pūṇyām 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 *ní*, at 4.41.4ab *asmīn, ...ní vadhīṣṭam vājram ... ‘strike
your Vajra down on him*. This root has a suppletive relationship with *han*.

**van** ‘win’

*pres VIII act.* 3rd pl. *vanvāntu* (2)

*pres. med.* 2nd sing. *vanuṣṭa* (1.169.1d)

*s-aor. med.* 2nd sing. *vāṃṣva* (6)

*desid.* 2nd sing. *vīvāsa* (5), 2nd pl. *vīvāsata* (2)

The sparsely attested active impv. is transitive, meaning ‘defeat’: 7.21.9cd *vanvāntu
smā tē ‘vasā samīkē, ‘bhītīm aryō vanuṣṭām śāvām ‘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 *vanuṣṭa* means ‘win’, but is transitive
rather than affective 1.169.1cd *sā no vedho maruṭām cikītvān, sumnā vanuṣṭa tāva
hil prēṣṭā ‘O Master, knowing the Maruts, win for us their goodwill, for they are
deepest to you.’ 231 The aorist form *vāṃṣva* means the same, as in 8.23.27ab
*vāṃṣvā no vāryā purā, vāṃṣva rāyāḥ purusprīhaḥ ‘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 *vāṃṣva vīsvā vāryāṃ
pracetaḥ, satyā bhavantv āśīno 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
maruṭām is accented.

232 For the differentiation of the two roots *van* and *vare* see Gotō (1987: 283ff.) For the form
*vamsi*, which isn’t an imperative, see p. 54. For *vīvāsa* and other desiderative imperatives,
see p. 34.
van (vanī) ‘love, wish’
-sk- pres. 3rd pl. vañchantu (10.173.1c)
pres./a-aor. 2nd dual vānata (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 vañchantu, má tvād rāṣṭram ādhi bhraṣat ‘May all the
tribes want you, may your realm not fall away from you.’
The form vānata, which could either be a thematic present or aorist, always occurs
in the formula ‘X (voc.) vānataṁ gīrāḥ’, ‘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 vāvandhī, which appears to mean exactly the same
as the others forms, occurs at 5.31.13cd vāvandhī yājyūḥ 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 van see Kümmel (2000: 447ff.), and for the full grade in the root see p. 25.

vand ‘pray, praise’
pres. med. 2nd sing. vārndasva (6)

vap ‘strew’
pres. act. 2nd sing. vapā (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)

vas ‘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. vāsāya (2)
The present is usually addressed to Uśas, whose name, of course, is derived from the same root. It is usually intransitive, meaning ‘shine’, often, as here, with the preverb vī, which emphasises the scattered nature of sunrays: 1.113.12d ihādyōsāh śrēṣṭhatamā vy īcha ‘shine here today, being the most beautiful Uśas’. The verb may occasionally take an accusative of goal, as in 7.77.4a āntivāmā dārē amītram ucha: ‘You who are noble from nearby, illuminate the enemy, (when he is) far away’ i.e. prevent him from hiding. Structurally, amītram in this example is syntactically identical to ihā in the previous one.

More intriguing, perhaps, are examples where uchā occurs with revāt ‘containing riches’, as in 1.92.14c revād asmē vy īcha sūntāvati. 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 gōman and āśvavant (both of which adjectives are attributed to Uśas in 1.92.14ab) mean cow- and horse-prosperity respectively at e.g. 9.105.4a gōman na indo āśvavat ... 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: přā cakṣaya rōdasī vāsāyōsāsāh, śrāvase vāsāyōsāsāh ‘Reveal the two worlds, let the dawns shine, so you may have glory; let the worlds shine’. See also under cakṣ.

vāṣ, vāṣa ‘wear, clothe’
is-aor. 2nd sing. vāsi/sunderdotva□ (2)
caus. act. 2nd sing. vāsaya□ (2)
Narten (1964: 238f.) raises the possibility that the form vāsi/sunderdotva□ may be an innovation based on the root present vaste. However, she decides against this and classifies this form as an i/i-s-aorist, both on formal and semantic grounds.

vah ‘drive, carry’
pres. act. 2nd sing. vāha (71), vahatīt (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 vāhethām□ (7.71.3d)
root aor. 2nd dual vohām (5), 3rd dual vohām (2)
-si impv. vaksi (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 āgne devāḥ ihā 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 ā vām āśvāsaḥ sūyājo 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 tṛīḥ no rāyīṃ vahatam āśvinā yuvāṃ 'Three times convey property to us, O Āśvins.'

The rare middle voice forms are also transitive, and additionally has affective-possessive force. The form vāhasva only occurs at 8.26.23: vāyo yāhi śīvā233 divō, vāhasvā sū svāsvyam | vāhasva mahāḥ pyṭhupākṣasā rāthe ‘Come, O Accommodating Vāyu, 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 Gotō (1987: 295ff.).

The forms volhām and volhām are tentatively consigned by LIV2 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 tā na ā volhām āśvinā, rāyīm piśāṅgasamdrśam ‘Bring us property of a reddish (gold) appearance, O Āśvins’.

vā₁ ‘blow’

pres. act. 2nd sing. vāhi (2), 3rd sing. vātu (7)

The two occurrences of the form vāhi both occur at 10.137.3ab: ā vāta vāhi bhṛṣajāṃ, vi vāta vāhi yād rāpah ‘O wind, blow medicine here, blow away (that which is) sickness’.

vā₂ ‘extinguish’

caus. act. vāpayā (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 = śiva ā.

234 LIV2: s. *uegba, fn. 1.
10.16.13ab yāṁ tvāṁ agne samādahās, tāṁ u nīr vāpayā pūnah ‘O Agni, the one whom you burnt, extinguish him again’.

**vāj**- ‘incite’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. vā́jya (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 śu na urviyā gādhām adyā ‘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 ūrvām usrīyānām ‘you found the pit of the reddish cows’.

**vid₂** ‘know’

**perf. act.** 2nd sing. viddhi (8), vitt (5.60.6d), 2nd dual vittām (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. vīśa (18), 3rd pl. viśantu (7)

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. vīśasva (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 dhārmanā vāyām ā viśa ‘go, according to your nature, into Vāyu’, and 9.97.36c indram ā viśa brhatā rávēna ‘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 trīyena jyōtiśā sāṁ vīśasva ‘unite with the
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third light’, and 10.34.14c ní vo ná manyúr viśatām árātir ‘may your wrath abate, (and) your disfavour’.

**vīy** ‘be active’
**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *vīvidhi* (2)
See Narten (1964: 244ff.), Joachim (1978: 156), Mayrhofer (1986 s. VEŚ) for the differentiation of this root from another viś meaning “flow”.

**vī** ‘seek, pursue’
-**si impv. vēsi** (5)
For the possible existence of a form *vītā*, see p. 93. The length variation in the root, seen in *vihí* and *vihí* could be due to analogy with the doublets *dīdihí/dīdihí* and *pipihí/pipihí*. Thus the form *vītā*, if in fact Narten identified it correctly, is formed by analogy to the form *vihí*. The -**si impv. vēsi** is actually the 2nd pers. sing. pres. pres. form of this verb. However it undoubtedly is used as an impv. See p. 55.

**vīd** ‘strengthen, become firm’
**med. pres.** 2nd sing. *vīdayasva* (2.37.3b)

**vīray**- ‘act like a hero’
**pres. med.** 2nd pl. *vīrayadhvam* (2)

**vṛf** ‘cover’
**pres. med.** 2nd sing. *āṛnusva* (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 sám prōrṇusva pīvasā médasā ca ‘cover yourself with fat and melted butter’.
According to LIV, this verb is a conglomerate of (at least) three PIE verbs: *yel ‘einschließen, verhüllen’, yer ‘aufhalten, abwehren’ and Hyer, ‘stecken’, the latter to explain such forms as the aor. āvar, and compounds such as pārī-vṛta (op.
The long ā in the pres. stem does not, according to LIV, indicate an original laryngeal (**yIH-nḗ, as suggested by Rasmussen [1983: 22]) but rather a variant *uHnḗ with different syllabification. (op. cit.: fn.4.). Lubotsky (2001) dispenses with the multiple roots, making do with a single aH, laryngeal-initial root *Hyār, and explains the stem āṛṇu- as having been formed by laryngeal metathesis. For extensive further bibliography see Mayrhofer (1986: s. VAR).

**vr** ‘wish, choose’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense/Person</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pres. med. 2nd sing.</td>
<td>vr̥̣ṣ (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres. med. 3rd sing.</td>
<td>vr̥̣ṣhm (5.28.6c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a set root with some anit forms apparently by analogy to the root vr ‘to cover’. See Hoffmann (1968), Lubotsky (2000).

**vṛj** ‘twist’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense/Person</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pres. act. 2nd sing.</td>
<td>vṛ̥dhi (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres. act. 3rd sing.</td>
<td>vṛ̥aktu (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres. act. 2nd pl.</td>
<td>vṛ̥kta (1.172.3b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**vṛt** ‘turn’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense/Person</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pres. med. 2nd sing.</td>
<td>vart̥sva (10.95.17d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres. med. 3rd sing.</td>
<td>vartatām (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres. med. 2nd pl.</td>
<td>vartadhvam (10.19.1a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>root aor. 2nd pl.</td>
<td>vartta (1.165.14c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perf. act. 2nd pl.</td>
<td>vavṛttana (5.61.16c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perf. med. 2nd sing.</td>
<td>vavṛtśva (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caus. act. 2nd sing.</td>
<td>vartāya (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caus. act. 2nd dual.</td>
<td>vartāyam (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caus. act. 2nd pl.</td>
<td>vartāyata (2.34.9c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caus. act. 3rd pl.</td>
<td>vartayantu (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 ṝu vartta maruto vipram ácha ‘please turn to the seer, O Maruts’. An exception is the active perfect with the preverb á, which is transitive, as in 5.61.16 té no vāsāṇi kāmyā, ... / ā yajñiyāso vavṛttana ‘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 bṛhaspate ápa tāṁ vartayā pathāḥ ‘Bṛhaspati, turn (divert) him (the wolf) from the path’.

---

235 See also Kümmel (2000: 465).
The stem *vavr*- 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 *vavrtyāt*. The ending -yāt in the RV is attested only on present and perfect stems, while the aorists have the ending -yās.236 The main obstacle to classifying all of the forms as perfects is the presence of the medio-passive aorist forms *āvavarti* and *āvavrtran*. These must, however, be artificial forms, since the medio-passive is formed from the root and not from the aorist stem.237

**vṛdh** ‘grow’


**them. perf.** 2nd sing. *vārṇāsva* (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 vardhā no girāh* ‘as you are purified, enhance our songs’, and 3.29.10d *-āhā no vardhayā girāh* ‘then magnify our songs’.

The middle-voice forms are either intransitive, meaning ‘grow’, as in 8.13.25ab *vārdhāsvā sū puruṣātuta, āśiṣṭatābhīṁ ātiṣṭhiṁ* ‘grow, O much-praised one, with aid praised by seers’, or transitive-affective, as 7.8.5d *svayāṁ vardhāsva tānvaṁ sūjakā* ‘enhance your own body, O well-born’. The single example of the middle-voice causative falls into this latter category: 10.59.5d *ghṛtēṇa tvaṁ tvaṁ tvarṇā tvarṇā vardhayāsva* ‘enhance your (own) body with fat’.238

---

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: 107ff.).

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 *\(v\text{āvṛṛtsva}\), which could have been confused with forms from the verb \(vṛt\).

\(vṛśc\) ‘cut up’

\begin{align*}
\text{pres. act. } & 2\text{nd sing. } vṛścā (9) \\
\text{perf (\textbullet\textcopyright), act. } & 2\text{nd dual } vavṛktam (6.62.10d)
\end{align*}

Classification of the form \(vavṛktam\) under this verb following Kümmel (2000: 509).

\(vṛṣā\) ‘take courage’

\begin{align*}
\text{a-aor. med. } & 2\text{nd sing. } vṛṣasva (10), 2\text{nd dual } vṛṣethām (2) \\
\text{them. perf. } & 2\text{nd sing. } vavṛṣasva (8.61.7c)
\end{align*}


\(vṛṣ\) ‘rain’

\begin{align*}
\text{pres. caus. } & 2\text{nd sing. } vṛṣāya (10.98.1d), 2\text{nd dual } varṣayatam (5.63.6d)
\end{align*}

\(vṛh\) ‘tear out’

\begin{align*}
\text{pres. act. } & 2\text{nd sing. } vṛhā (5), vṛhatāt (1.174.5c), 2\text{nd dual } vṛhatam (6.74.2a), 2\text{nd pl. } vṛhata (8.67.21c)
\end{align*}

\(vyāth\) ‘waver’

\begin{align*}
\text{caus. act. } & 2\text{nd sing. } vyāthaya (6.25.2b)
\end{align*}

\(vyadh\) ‘pierce’

\begin{align*}
\text{pres. act. } & 2\text{nd sing. } viḍhyā (9), 2\text{nd dual } viḍhyatam (2), 3\text{rd dual } viḍhyatām (6.75.4c), 2\text{nd pl. } viḍhyata (1.86.9c)
\end{align*}

\(vyā\) ‘enfold, swathe’

\begin{align*}
\text{pres. med. } & 2\text{nd sing. } vyāyasva (2)
\end{align*}
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śaṁs ‘proclaim, recite’

pres. act. 2nd sing. śaṁsya (6), 2nd pl. śaṁsata (5)

pres. caus. śaṁsaya (7)

The causative occurs only in the repeated pāda ā tū na indra śaṁsaya gōśv āśveṣu ‘O Indra, give us hope for cows and horses’, which occurs seven times at 1.29.1-7c.

śak ‘be powerful, be able’

aor. act. 2nd sing. šagdhī (15), 2nd dual šaktam (4)

desid. act. 2nd sing. šikṣa (26), 3rd sing. šikṣatu (1.81.6c), 2nd dual šikṣatam (6)

For an example of the form šagdhī see under p/runderringmacron239, page 138.

For an account of the desiderative forms, see page 34.

śardh ‘challenge, defy’

pres. act. 2nd sing. śārdha (5.28.3a)

śas ‘kill, slaughter’

pres. act. 2nd pl. śasta (2)

śā ‘sharpen’

pres. act. 2nd sing. śiśīhī (12), śiśādhi (4), 3rd sing. śiśātu (1.111.5a), 2nd dual śiśītām (1.122.3a), 3rd dual śiśātām (10.12.4d), 2nd pl. śiśīta (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 sāṁ śiśādhi at the end of the second pāda of a triśūbhi line, an environment in which the form śiśīhī does not occur. This suggests a formulaic or phraseological reason for the preservation/coinning of this form; conceivably could have been modeled on the form (ūt) śaśādhi (from śas, q.v.), which is morphologically regular, metrically identical, occurs only in the same position in triśūbhi lines, and also isn’t too far away in meaning. For the structure of the root see Rasmussen (1989: 53), and LIV s. *kēh₂j₁.

239 For the meaning see Jamison (1983: 134).
śās ‘command’

- pres. act. 2nd sing. śādhi (2.28.9d), 2nd pl. śāstāna (10.52.1a)
- perf. 2nd sing. śāśādhi (2)

śuc ‘burn, shine’

- pres. act. 2nd sing. śōca (6), 3rd sing. śocatu (6.52.2d)
- pres. med. 2nd sing. śōcasva (2)
- perf. act. 2nd sing. śuśugdhī (1.97.1b)
- caus. act. 2nd sing. śocaya (6.22.8d)

The valency of this verb is extremely similar to that of vas₁ (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 vas₁ does, again leaving open the question whether revāt is adverbial or nominal.

The causative only occurs once in the RV, at 6.22.8d: brahmadvīśe śocaya ksām āpāś ca ‘for the hater of Brahma make the earth and waters burn’.

The form śuśugdhī 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: āpa naḥ śośucad aghām, āgne śuśugdhy ā rayim / āpa naḥ śośucad 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)

śṛṅ ‘smash’

- pres. act. śṛṅhitī (8), śṛṅtam (7.104.1c), śṛṇantu (10.87.15a)
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 seṭ root aorists see Narten (1964: 53).

śrath ‘become loose’
pres. act. 2nd sing. śrathāya (2)
red. aor. 3rd pl. sīśrathantu (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. 2nd sing. śrīṇīhi (8.2.11b), 2nd pl. śrīṇīta (9.46.4c), śrīṇītana (9.11.6c)
For the meaning see Narten (1987).

śru ‘hear’
med. 2nd sing. śṛṇusvā (1.131.7e)
aor. 2nd sing. śṛṇdhī (39), 3rd sing. śṛṇōtu (2), 2nd dual śṛṇtām (40), 2nd pl. śṛṇta (3), śṛṇota (4), 3rd pl. śṛṇvantu (2)
-si impv. śrōśi (6.4.7b)
caus. act. 2nd sing. śrāvāya (3), 2nd dual śravatam (7.62.5c)
An extremely common verb which has been extensively discussed elsewhere. For the aor. form śṛṇadhī, the formula śṛṇadhī 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 śrōśi see p. 56.

240 The form śrayethe is wrongly classified by Lubotsky (19971) as an imperative.
śruṣya ‘obey’
**pres. act.** 3rd sing. śroṣantu (1.86.5a)
This is a secondary root from śru. See p. 56, LIV s. kleyus and further bibliography in Mayrhofer (1986: s. ŚROŚ).

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. sīṣaktu (6), 2nd pl. sīṣakta (10.19.1b)
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 (19971: 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. sīḍa (16), 3rd sing. sīḍatu (2), 2nd dual sīḍatam (5), 3rd dual sīḍatām (2), 2nd pl. sīḍata (11), 3rd pl. sīḍantu (1)
**pres. med.** 2nd sing. sīḍasva (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 sāṅsya (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 sādatām (4), 2nd pl. sādata (3), sadatana (2.36.3b), 3rd pl. sadantu (7)

-sī 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 á, rather like a verb of motion, in that the seat (etc.) that is to be sat on is in the accusative: 3.53.3c édám barhír yájamānasya 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 hótā prathamāh sadehā ‘O Agni, sit down here as the first hótp’. 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 sám (cf. sám gachasva etc.): 1.36.9ab sám sīdasva mah/amacronacute/mcandrabindu asi, śócasa deva/amacronacutetama/hunderdot ‘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 nīdā- < *ni-sdō-. The long -i- 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 sastám (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 śvā sástu viśpāthā / sasántu sārve jñātāyāḥ, sāstv ayām 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. sáhasva (4), 2nd pl. sahadhvam (10.103.2c)

-śi impv. sakṣi (5.33.2d)

**s-aor. med.** sākṣya (1.42.1c), sākṣva (3.37.7c)

The form sākṣva only occurs at RV 1.42.1c: sākṣvā deva práḥ prāṣ 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 sākṣva, with the same lengthening seen in some of its other sigmatic aorist forms, such as ásākṣi, etc. This form, however, could also be classified as a perfect (< *se-sgh-<), 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 prā. 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: *sh2-i-ě-. 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 hārī ví mucā sākhāyā ‘unhitch the horses, release the two friends’. The uncommon middle-voice forms appear to have exactly the same meaning: 3.4.9ab tān nas turīpaṁ ādha posavīnū, déva tvāśṭaraś ví rarāṇāḥ syasva ‘And, O god Tvaśṭa, giving, release our property-bringing seed’.

sādh ‘bring to one’s goal, succeed’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. sādha (8)

**pres. med.** 3rd pl. sādhantām (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 agne purudāṁsām sanīṁ, gōh śaśvattāṁm hávamānāṁ yā sādha247 ‘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 sādhantām ugra no dhiyāḥ ‘may our thoughts come to fruition’. The causative has a similar meaning to that of the active: 1.94.4c jīvetave pratarāṁ sādhayaḥ dhiyāḥ ‘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.248

---

245 Unlike Geldner: “Halte die Falben an, spanne die beiden Kameraden aus’.

246 Or, as Klein (1985: 2-99): ‘And, giving us that property-giving seed, release us’.

247 3.1.23ab, 3.5-7.11ab, 3.15.7ab, 3.22-23.5ab.

248 See also Jamison (1983: 159).
sic ‘pour’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. siñcá (5), 3rd sing. siñcatu (2), 2nd dual siñcatam (2), 2nd pl. siñcata (9), 3rd pl. siñcantu (8.53.3b)

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. siñcasva (3.47.1c), 2nd pl. siñcádhvam (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 siñcasva jathāre mádhva ārmīṇ ‘Pour the wave of the sweet (drink) into (your own) stomach’.

sidh ‘drive away’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. sédha (6), 3rd sing. sedhatu (10.36.4a), 2nd dual sédhatam (5), 2nd pl. sédhata (3), 3rd pl. sedhantu (10.100.8b)

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), sunóta (5.34.1c), sunutá (3)

**pres. med.** 2nd pl. sunudhvam (4.35.4c)

root aor. 3rd sing. sótu (10.76.6a), 2nd dual su tám (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 āthā sunudhvam sávanam mádāya, pátá ṇbhavo mádhunāḥ somyásya ‘Press (for yourselves) the pressing for exhilaration, drink, O Rbhus, (of) the sweet Soma.’

sū ‘impel’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. suva (9), suvatát (4.54.3d), 3rd sing. suvatu (3), 3rd pl. suvantu (7.50.3c)

[aor. inj. sāvīh (3)
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sūḍ ‘prepare’

pres. act. 2nd sing. sūḍaya (2), 3rd pl. sūḍayantu (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. *sueh₂d), however, reunites them, reconstructing sūḍaya- as *suh₂d-ēje and s(u)vada- as a relic of an old nasal present *suh₂nd. Further bibliography may be found at all of the above quoted references.

ṣṛ ‘run’

them. aor. 2nd sing. sāra (9.41.6c)

ṣṛj ‘release’

pres. act. 2nd sing. sṛjā (27), 2nd dual sṛjātam (3), 2nd pl. sṛjāta (4), 3rd pl. sṛjantu (3)

pres. med. 2nd sing. sṛjasva (2), 2nd, pl. sṛjādhvam (6.48.11c)

ṣṛp ‘creep’

pres. act. 2nd sing. sarpa (10.18.10a), sarpata (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. stanyāya (5.83.7a)

root aor. stanihi (6.47.30b)

[red. aor. inj. tataṇah (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 tataṇah as a reduplicated aor. see Hoffmann (1976³). 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)

stubh ‘rejoice’
pres. act. 2nd pl. stobhata (1.80.9b), stobhantu (8.92.19b)

stf ‘strew’
pres. act. 2nd dual stṛṇṭam (8.73.3a), stṛṇṭā (3)
pres. med. 3rd sing. stṛṇṭām (7.17.1b)
The single example of the middle voice is passive, or ‘fientive’: 7.17.1ab ágne bháva suṣamidhā sámiddha, utá bahrír urviyá ví stṛṇṭām ‘O Agni, may you be lit with good kindling, and may the altar-grass be spread widely’

sthā ‘stand’
pres. act. 2nd sing. tisṭha (34), 3rd sing. tisṭhatu (3), 2nd dual tisṭhatam (1.183.3a), 2nd pl. tisṭhata (5), 3rd pl. tisṭhantu (2)
pres. med. 2nd pl. tisṭhadhvam (7.104.18a), 3rd pl. tisṭhantām (3.18.2d)
aor. inj. sthāḥ (6.24.9c)]
The active forms of this verb are intransitive. With the preverb á it takes an accusative of goal and means ‘to get into (a chariot)’, as in 3.44.1d á tisṭha háritam rátham ‘get into the gold-coloured chariot’. The middle voice only occurs with ví, and is reflexive and reciprocal, meaning ‘to spread apart’ 3.18.2d ví te tisṭhantām ajārā ayásah ‘your (flames) will spread apart, ageless and restless’.

spaś see paś

spr ‘win’
pres. act. 2nd sing. sprmuhi (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
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e.g. 10.87.7ab utálabdhāṃ sprṇuhi 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 áva spr̥diḥ pitāraḥ yóḍhi ’... ’Protect the father, fight (for him)’.

sprś ‘touch’
pres. act. 2nd sing. spr̥ṣa (5), 2nd pl. spr̥ṣata (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 hārītvatā vārcasā sāryasya, śrēṣṭhaī rāpaīś tuvāṃ 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 smaretām (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. svādantu (10.110.10d)
pres. med. 2nd sing. svādasva (3)
pres. caus. 2nd sing. svadaya (10.110.2b)

svap ‘sleep’
pres. act. 2nd sing. svapa (3)
pres. caus. svāpaya (1.29.3a)
Index of attested imperative forms

svaˈr ‘sound’
pres. act. 2nd sing. svara (3), 3rd pl. svarantu (8.13.28a)

hɑn ‘slay’
pres. act. 2nd sing. jahí (50), 3rd sing. hantu (3), 3rd dual hatám (16), 2nd pl. hatá (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 jihītām only occurs in 10.59.1-4d.

hā₂ ‘leave’
pres. act. 3rd sing. jahātu (3.53.21d)
pass. 3rd sing. hīyatām (2)
Mayrhofer (1986: ad loc), considers this and hā₁ to ultimately have the same origin.
LIV (s. *gʰeH and *gʰeh₁), 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. hinóta (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. juhóta (7), juhótana (6), juhuta (2)
-si impv. hoši (6.44.14c)

hū ‘call’
pres. act. 2nd sing. hvaya (5.53.16c)
Index of attested imperative forms

$hṛ_1$ ‘take’

pres. act. 2nd sing. *hara* (2)

$hṛ_2$ ‘like’

pres. act. 2nd sing. *harya* (7), 2nd dual *hāryatam* (2), 2nd pl. *haryata* (5.54.15c)

$hṛṣ$ ‘be excited’

pres. med. 2nd sing. *hāṛasva* (2)

pres. caus. 2nd sing. *hṛṣaya* (3)

$hvā$ see *hā*
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.137.3ab</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.142.6c</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.145.2cd</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.145.2d</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.151.5</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.158.2ab</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.164.1ab</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.164.5de</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.173.1cd</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.175.2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.183.1cd</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.191.2ab</td>
<td>114, 161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>