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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>Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KB</td>
<td>Kauśitaki-Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Mantra-Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Maitrāyaṇi-Ṣaṃhitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV</td>
<td>Rigveda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Saḍviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŠBK</td>
<td>Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa Kāṇva recension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŠBM</td>
<td>Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa Mādhyandina recension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>Sāmaveda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TĀ</td>
<td>Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB</td>
<td>Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Taittirīya-Ṣaṃhitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YV</td>
<td>Yajur-Veda</td>
</tr>
<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>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subj.</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voc.</td>
<td>vocative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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, dāj, 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 bhṛ, 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, and -a for thematic aorists, while the -iṣ-, -siṣ-, and reduplicated aorists are prevented by a morphological limitation from forming an imperative that is differentiated from the injunctive – and the imperative is, after all, differentiated from the injunctive only in the second person singular, third person singular and third person plural – and thus uses the injunctive instead.

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

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

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

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 asmābhyam māhi váriṣaḥ sugām kah, and 1.102.4c asmābhyam indra váriṣaḥ sugām kṛdhī 'For us, O Indra, make space, wide and

---

1 See page 43ff.
2 Except for the unique form aviddhī. Some roots have 2nd pers. sing. root aor. impvs. ending in -iṣ while the rest of the paradigm has -iṣ- 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.
The place of the imperative in the Rigvedic verbal system easily passable⁵. Furthermore, there is no possible distinction between the imperative and the injunctive in the negative, as the injunctive with the particle mā functions as the negative of the imperative.

**The third person imperative**

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

⁵ See also page 41f.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

7 Any categorical statement to the effect that “the imperative expresses mands” would therefore need to vary the definition of the mand accordingly. This would of course make the definition somewhat circular, as the answer to the question “what is a mand” would be
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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 mitrāṃ kṛṇadhvam khālu mṛḍātā no ‘Grant us your friendship⁸, have mercy on us . . .’.

The Soma-stones also appear as the addressees of an imperative: 10.175.2 grāvāṇo āpa duchānām, āpa sedhata durmatim / uṣrāḥ kartana breeṣajām ‘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 ēṃdraḥ purāstād utā madhyatō naḥ, sākhā sākhībhyo 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 urūṃ no gātāṃ kṛṇu soma mīḍhvaḥ ‘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 asmākam sū rātham purā, ēṃdraḥ kṛṇotu sāṭāye ‘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 arvācīnaṃ sū te móno, grāvā 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).

“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.”.

⁸ or “make us into your friend”.

⁹ This is the usual translation of this passage, as it appears, e.g., in Geldner. However, as the plural of words meaning ‘cows’ often means ‘milk’, such an interpretation for this passage would make far more sense.
In 6.69.2cd *prā vāṁ gīraḥ śasyāmānā avantu, prā stōmāso gīyāmānāso arkatīḥ* ‘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.\(^\text{10}\)

In addition to these, there are a great many examples of subjects which are inanimate objects or even abstracts, for which there is no 2nd person parallel, e.g. 1.8.5b *mahitvāṁ astu vajrīṇe* ‘May there be greatness for the Vajra-bearer’ or 1.24.9b *urvi gahārhā sumatī įe astu* ‘may your compassion be profound and broad’.

An interesting example is: 1.30.12 *tāṭhā tāṭd astu somapāḥ, sākhe vajrin tāṭhā kṛmu / yāṭhā ta uśmāśtāyē* ‘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. *kṛmu* here could be seen semantically (but obviously not morphologically) 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\(^\text{11}\), cannot, by definition, have a one-to-one paradigmatic correspondence; each in many ways has its own grammar and language.

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

---

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

\(^{11}\) These terms date back to Damourette and Pichon (1952).
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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 viśvāhāvāt ‘Who would (will) praise him, who would give abundantly, who would worship him, if the generous one always were only to help the powerful?’

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

---

12 op. cit.: 360.

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

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

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

Occasionally one may feel that optative sentences have more emotional content, to be more pleading: 3.1.23cd syān naḥ sūnás tānayo vijāvā, āgne sā te sumatīr bhūtv asmé ‘May we have a son of our own, to carry on the clan. Agni, let us have your goodwill’. However, note the imperative in the same sentence. Furthermore, very often imperatives are not lacking emotion either: 1.16.7ab ayām te stómo agriyō, ḫrīṣṭhīg astu sāṃtamah ‘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 śyāt 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 dyāvāpythīvī satyām astu, pītar mátar yād ihōpabrūvé 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 yāmāś ‘May your path be bright’ and 1.140.11ab idām agne sūdhitaṃ dārhitād ādhi,
priyād u cin mānmanah prēyo astu te ‘O Agni, may this well-formed (hymn) be better than the ill-formed hymn, and even dearer to thee than a dear hymn’.\textsuperscript{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 stotāmativā ná dúrhitaḥ, syād aṣṇe 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, kṛṇvīta and dādhīta.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{14} Translation from Klein (1978: 143).

\textsuperscript{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 vauṛtyāt, 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.
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Forms which appear in grammar books, such as bhavet, bhūyāt and gamyāt are in fact completely unattested in the Rigveda.\(^\text{16}\)

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kr</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>av</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhū</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śru</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dā ṛ</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>**2</td>
<td>0</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>***</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>**9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

* dā ṛ 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).\(^1\)

---

\(^{16}\) 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.
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.
The morphology of the imperative

**active**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>sing.</th>
<th>dual</th>
<th>pl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 athematic</td>
<td>Ø/-dhí/-hi/-tam</td>
<td>-ta / -tana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 thematic</td>
<td>Ø/-tāt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 athematic</td>
<td>-tū</td>
<td>-tām</td>
<td>-a(n)tū</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>-svā</td>
<td>-āthām</td>
<td>-dhvām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 thematic</td>
<td></td>
<td>-ēthām</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>-ētām</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>bhāva</td>
<td>bhavatām</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>bhavadhvām</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 -dhí, while -hí normally appears after a vowel, e.g. *addhí (ad), but *pāhí (pā). There are, however, a number of cases where -dhí occurs after a vowel:

1) Root forms containing an original *-zdhdh- or *-zdhdh- cluster: edhí (as), šādhi, šaśādhi (śās), tālhi (takṣ)

2) Disyllabic root aorists from roots ending in -r: kṛdhí (kṛ), vṛdhí (vṛ), sprdhí (spṛ).

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 hāvam. Likewise the form śṛṇudhí. As will be shown below, this latter form was coined especially to enable the use of the formula śrudhí hāvam 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 yōdhí (yudh) and bodhí (budh), which may not have the -dhí 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 -dhí ending, e.g. mumugdhí (muc), šagdhí (śak), etc., while stem-final consonant clusters are simplified so that *-nddhí > -ndhi and *-ṅg-dhí and *-ṅk-dhí > *-ṅgdhí > -ṅdhí. The examples of this development, most of which are derived from -n-infix presents, are añc (aṅc), undhí (ud), chindhí (chid), trndhí (trd), prṇdhi (prc), bhaṃdhi (bhaṅj), bhindhí (bhid) and vṛṇdhi (vṛj). The root añc is exceptional in also having a form angdhí.

17 See also Lubotsky (1995).

18 See also Insler (1972: fn 9).
The ending is always accented where the accent is preserved: āndhī (aṅj), addhī (ad), iḥī, inuhī (i), kṛnūhī, kṛdhi (kṛ), jāgrhī (gr), gṛnūhī (gṛ), cinuhī (ci), cikiddhī (cit), chindhī (chid), daddhī, dehi (dā), didhī, didhī (dī), dādyhī (dṛ), dhehī (dhā), dhrṇūhī (dhrṣ), pāhī (pā₁ and pā₂), pīpīhī (pī), punthī (pū), pārthī (pṛ), pīpṛtī (prī), bhindhī (bhīd), bodhī (bhū), mamaddhī (mad), mimīhī (mā), mumugdhī (muc), zhndhī (yam), yāhī (yā), yuyodhī (yu₂), rārandhī (ran), rārandhī (randh), vāvandhī (van₂), viddhī (vid), vihī, vihī (vī), ūrṇūhī (vṛ₁), šagdhī (šak), sūṣugdhī (šuc), šṛnūhī, šṛṇudhī, šṛudhī (šru), śiśīhī (śā), śṛṇīhī (śṛ), stuhī (stu), jāhī (han), with the single exception of the form yōdhi (see below). ¹⁹

24
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The 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 (es), cākandhī (kan), tāḷhī (takṣ), pāhī (pā₁ and pā₂), bodhī (budh), bhāhī (bhā), bodhī (bhū), mamaddhī (mad), mamandhī (man₂), māhī (mā₁), yādhī (yam), yāhī (yā), yuyodhī (yu₂), yōdhi (yudh), rārandhī (ran), randhī, rārandhī (randh), vāvandhī (van₂), vāhi (vā), šagdhī (šak), sādhi, šaśādhi (šās), śādhi, śādhihī (śānath), sāhī (sā), stānithī (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: *h₁sdhī would have yielded *sdhī (a form which is attested in Avestan zdī), and *h₂d-hī would likely have yielded *dhi. To this group must also be added mamaddhī, šagdhī and tāḷhī, whose roots cannot form zero-grades.

2) pāhī, vāhī, sāhī, yāhī, bhāhī and māhī show the generalisation of full-grade in root-stems of the type CeH. There are no exceptions to this in the second person singular root present and aorist, although there are zero-grade reduplicated-present forms like rirīhī from rā, mimīhī from mā, sīśīhī from sā²⁰ and jihīṣva 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 sāḥīsitam from the root sā shows that it is most likely an innovation.

¹⁹ For the possible existence of an archaic form éhi see footnote 141.
²⁰ Which also has a full-grade variant šāśādhi. For another possible explanation of this form see p.171.
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3) śnathihi and stanihi have -iś- aorist forms in the rest of their paradigm. The form avīḍḍhi 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 vāvandhi show that reduplicated perfects from seṭ and anīṭ 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, dādrhī, pipīrhi. Insler (1972: 554ff.), and later Kümmel (2001: 414) ascribe these forms to an analogy with unattested but very probable 3rd pl. forms such as *rāranūr, 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 *-rṇH-ur. If this is the case, then this process must of course have begun with seṭ roots and spread to anīṭ 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. āgman 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 Cen(H) always have full 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 yāṃsi, 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 *buddhi. This theory is often accepted unquestioningly, e.g. by Insler (1972: 559).

Jamison (1997) accepts that the form is unoriginal, but considers that original bhava would have been weakened in unemphatic position to *bho, and then the impv. ending -dhi added, finally Grassmann’s Law working to replace the initial aspiration. Thus she places 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 \textit{edhi} from \textit{as}. He calls Wackernagel’s idea “unconvincing”.

Lubotsky (1995: 224ff.), however, suggests another solution. Following Kortlandt, he reconstructs \textit{bhū} as \textit{*bbeH\text{\textsubscript{2}}u} rather than \textit{*bheuH\text{\textsubscript{2}}}, thus allowing \textit{bodhi} to be explained as an original, full-grade root aorist impv. \textit{*bbeH\text{\textsubscript{2}}u-dhi}, of the same type as \textit{yandhí}.

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

Insler (1972) explains \textit{yódhi} as an acrostatic (“Narten”) aorist. In the present he quotes the example of the root \textit{sās} – \textit{sāsti} – \textit{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 \textit{jāniṣṭva}.\footnote{On page 30 I suggest that the form \textit{jāniṣṭva} is the exact middle-voice equivalent of the forms of the type \textit{stāhi}.}

Insler explains \textit{bodhi} as an analogical formation on the basis of \textit{yódhi}.\footnote{For more details see also p. 140.}

Mayrhofer (1986: 111ff.) suggests that the form \textit{yódhi} is the result of a resyllabification of \textit{*jeudh-dhi} to \textit{*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 \textit{*ē : *ē} ablaut. Secondly, he states that even if it were to be shown that the root \textit{yudh} did have such an aorist, it could not be shown that it would have an aorist imperative of the type \textit{*jeudh-dhi} rather than the more conventional \textit{*juddh-dhi}, since the only actual example of a “Narten” present which has a imperative is \textit{stāuti}, whose imperative is \textit{stuhí}.\footnote{This form is considered secondary by Insler (1972: 557), who posits original \textit{*stādhi}. It is unclear to me why Jasanoff rejects Insler’s example of the verb \textit{sās}.} Jasanoff then goes on to suggest that the form \textit{yódhi} and \textit{bodhi} were formed by analogy to the -\textit{si} impv. \textit{jōsi} citing parallel forms throughout the conjugations of the two verbs. \textit{jōsi}, he claims, was reanalysed by speakers as \textit{jōs-i}, and this \textit{i}-imperative was extended to the parallel roots \textit{yudh} and
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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 ḫāni ‘draw water’.

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

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

Whatever the historical explanation, we have a pattern created on the basis of the form jóṣi, by which impvs can be formed of the type *CēRC-i. The hitherto unexplained form ghóṣi 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 jóṣi. Furthermore, there is at least one other form of precisely this type: randhi, from the root randh. Unfortunately, the accentuation of this form has not been preserved.

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

There is one further attested step in the story of the analogically created -i imperative; some of them were at a later date replaced by forms in -a. Thus we have jóṣi : jósā, pāṛṣi : parṣa, bodhi : bódha, and néṣi : neṣa. 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 barbḥhi, which is plainly analogical, could have been derived from the subjunctive form barbḥhat.
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140), such as bódhat, were reanalysed as thematic presents, and thus would have developed thematic imperatives. Thereafter the other aorist forms of the same type followed suit.

The ending -dhi/-hi only occurs with athematic present stems, root aorists, with the exception of the unique form aviḍḍhi, 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 kṛṇu and kṛṇuhi, 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, punāti is constructed in the same way as yunakti, then the form punīhi is constructed in the same way as bhandhi (< *bhangdhi) i.e. *punHdhi. This is also, of course, exactly analogous to the form śṛṇuhi. The forms such as grhānā 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 *grhānā, 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 *grbhā < *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, prṇā and mṛṇā.

These are usually explained as secondary thematisations, e.g. by Strunk 1967: 40, LIV 435 fn. 8, and Kellens 1984: 181. Rather, these too are most probably -dhi-less variants of the corresponding forms such as mṛṇīhi (*prṇīhi 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 gṛ, “to praise, welcome”, jāṇīhi, from jña, “to know”, mṛṇīhi, from mṛṇ, “to crush”, punīhi, from pū, “to purify”, śṛṇīhi, from śṛṇ, “to crush”, and śṛṇīhi, from śṛṇ, “to prepare”.

29 For the possible conditions under which zero-grade laryngeals produced ī in Indic see Jamison (1988).
RV), related in the same way as śṛṇu and śṛṇuhi. As to their construction, we lack both internal and comparative evidence. The most likely explanation is that it is a full-grade form *pīneh₁ of the same type as other PIE endingless imperatives from laryngeal-final stems. If this is true, then Gotó’s version of the reconstruction of the forms aśāna and grhānā must be correct – the form *grbhnaH-na was simplified to grhānā by dissimilation.

**dehī and dhehī**

These are two more highly problematic forms. Hoffmann (1956: 21) suggests that they are the result of dissimilation of an original *d(h)adzdhi, via intermediate forms *d(h)azdhi and *dhedhi. A further dissimilation of the two /dh/ sounds would have achieved the final forms, as noted by Lubotsky (19951: 34). This explanation is accepted by Mayrhofer (19862: 111). According to this theory, it is the presence of the three /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 dā₁ also has a form daddhī. Thus, we need to suppose that 1) either this form was reconstructed on the basis of forms such as 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, āṛṇavā, kṛṇavā, kṛṣvā, jīhīvā, tanuṣva, dhatva, dhīvā, dadhiṣvā, dhūkṣva, mimikṣvā, vanuṣva, vavṛtva, vṛṇīvā, śṛṇavā and yuṅavā. However, unlike the ending -dhī, on those occasions where the stem is full-grade, the stem is accented (where preserved) and not the ending: īlīṣva, jāṇīṣva,

---

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

31 See page 42.
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mātsva, māsva, rásva, sākṣva, sākṣva, trāsva, vāṃsva, vāsīṣya, yākṣya.

The forms īḷīsya, jāṇīṣya and vāsīṣya 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 jāṇīṣya 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 *jāṣva would have been replaced by levelling with the rest of the paradigm - jāṇiṣṭa etc. On the other hand, vāsīṣya is usually considered to be an -iṣ-aorist form. The root vas is aniṣ, thus precluding any possibility that this is a root-form.

īḷīsya is more problematic. Narten (1964: 238) considers it to be an innovation constructed on the basis of the root present īṭe. Since a form *īḷīsya is apparently phonetically impossible in Vedic, this explanation is probably correct. The stem is a reduplicated present < *h₂ī-h₂īsd-, 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. mimikṣyā is one, which has the accent on the suffix, but the closest comparison may be the form sākṣya, which could go back to *śe-

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, dādātu, dātu, dardartu, dādāṭu, bravītua, 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 kārta. A full list of full-grade second person plural forms, and full-grade/zero-grade second person plural variants is: iyarta (ṛ₁), unāttā (ud), kṛṣṇātkṛṣṇā, kṛṭa/kārta (kṛ), gata/gānta/gantā (gam), jīgātā, gāta (gā₁), gāta (gā₂), datta/dādhāta, dāhdāta (dhā), pāta (pā₁), pātā (pā₂), punītā/punītā (pū), yānta (yam), yātā (yā), yuyōta (yu₂), yunākta (yu), vartta (vṛt), śṛupatha/śṛupā, śrūta/śrūta (śra), sunubha/sunāta, sōta (su), stota (stu), hinōta, heta (hi), juhūta/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), anuktana (aṇiḥ), aviṣṭāna (av), itana, étana (i), kārtana, kṛṣṇāna (kṛ), gāntana (gam), gātana, jīgātana (gā₁), cītana (cī), jījuṣṭana (juṣ), dadātana (dā₁), didiṣṭana (diṣ), dādhātana, dhattana, dātana, dhētana (dhā), nahyatana (nah), pinaṣṭana (piṣ), punītāna (pū), pipartana (pr), prṛṇītana (prṛ₁), braśiṣṭa (bru), bhajatana (bhaj), bhūtana (bhūa), mamattāna (mad), yantana (yam), yātāna (yā), yuyōtana (yu₂), rániṣṭana (ran), vavṛttana (vṛt), śāstāna (śās), snātiṣṭana (snāth), śṛṇītana (śṛṇī), śṛṇotana (śṛṇ), sadatana (sad), sunōtana, sotana (su), hantana (han), hinotana (hi), juhōtana (hu).

The -tana ending is generally attached to the full-grade stem, the exceptions being itana, cītana, jiṣṭana, diṣṭana, dhātana, punītna, prṛṇīta, vavṛttana and śṛṇītana. As can be seen all of these belong to one of three types: 1) those with the -nā/-nī- suffix, 2) reduplicated perfects of roots ending in a consonant, and 3) forms which have three syllables. Thus, in four-syllable forms, even in cases where the ending is attached to the zero-grade stem, the syllable preceding the ending is long. The reason for this, as noted by Renou (1952: 264) and Lubotsky (2004) is metrical. If the ending were attached to a zero-grade stem like kṛṣu-, the resulting *kṛṣnutana would have four consecutive short syllables and would be metrically awkward. Obviously the forms which have only three syllables are immune to this problem.
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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 spärhë bhajatanā vasavỳe ‘give us a share in the desirable riches’, nayhatana in 10.53.7a aksānāho nayhatanotā somyāḥ ‘Bind fast the ties (straps) to the wagon shaft, O Soma-worshippers’ and sadatana, the aor. impv. of sad, at 2.36.3ab amēva naḥ suhavā ā hī gāntana, nī barhiṣi sadatanā 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 nayhatana to gain another -na- syllable to enhance this line’s consonance: aksānāho nayhatanotā somyāḥ. In all cases the last syllable of the suffix is lengthened, thus solving the metrical problem.

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

The second person dual

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

A full list of full-grade dual forms, and stems which have both full and zero-grade forms in the dual are: gantām (gam), dhātam (dhā), pātām (pā₁ and pā₂), yantām (yam), yātām (yā), yāyatām/yuyotam (yu₂), voṭhām (vah), vartām (vr₁), 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).
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Of the attested forms which preserve accentuation, almost all have the accent on the ending and a zero-grade stem: sántu (as), yántu (ī), kṛṇvántu (kṛ), cíyántu (cī), punántu (pū) , vanvántu (vanī) , vyántu (vī), śṛṇvántu (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 gámát.

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 dháttām (dhā), pāttām (pā), pipřatām (pṛ) and sástām (sas), while the 3rd sing. med. form occurs only in kṛṇútām (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 jiháttām (hā), while the 2nd dual med. ending -áthām occurs in the forms tráthām (ṛ), mínáthām (mā), yuṇjáthām (yu), raráthām and rásáthām (raudh). 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 (ṛ), jānatām (jñā), dadhatām (dhā) and jihatām (hā).

The 2nd pl. ending -dhvam, while not uncommon, does not occur often in forms which preserve their accent. The attested examples are: kṛṇudhvám (kṛ), yuṇgdhvám (yu), vṛṇdhvám (vr), which are accented on the ending, and the sigmatic aorist form trádhvam, 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 indhám (idh) < *indi-dhvam, and vavrdhvam (vṛ) < *vavr-dhvaṃ, however the form yuṇgdhvám 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: didayatam (di), pipaya, pipayata (pī), piprāyasva (prī), māmahasva (maṃh), mumócatam, mumócata (muc), vávṛdhása\(^{36}\) (vṛdh) and vávṛśasva (vrṣ).

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 cikitā, from cit, vivāsa and vivāsata, from van₁ ‘to win’\(^ {37}\) and didhi/sunderdotantu from dhā ‘put’.\(^ {38}\)

The desiderative cikitā appears at 6.47.20cd bhāspate prá cikitā gāvītāv, itthā satē jaritā indra pānthām ‘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 -abhāyebhyāḥ prá cikitā gāvīṣtau ‘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 sgāsati, the desid. of san₁. 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 *ṭi-ṛn-ḥse- as

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

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

\(^ {38}\) See page 125.
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shown also by such forms as cikīʂatī from kṛ (*kṣi-kṛ-Hse-), yāyāṣa-(*ĵu-ĵu-Hse-) from yu ‘bind’ and cikīʂa-*kwi-Hse-) from ci ‘consider’.

The stative (‘t-less’) middle-voice

The form duḥām, from the root duḥ ‘to (give) milk’ is the only imperative form attested in the RV derived from the IE stative (t-less) middle conjugation, corresponding to the third pers. sing. and pl. present med. forms duḥē and duḥṛē. A unique imperfect form āduha is attested in the MS. The form duḥām is attested twice at 4.57.7c sā naḥ pāyasvatā duḥām ‘Let the milk-laden one give us milk’ and 1.164.27c duḥām aśvāḥbhāṃ pāyo aghneḥyāṃ ‘may this milk-cow give milk for the Aśvins.’

The -tāt imperative

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

Semantically, it is something of a wildcard. It is always 2nd person, except in the late funeral hymn 10.154, in which the form gachatāt appears several times, all of which are apparently 3rd person. It is in all cases singular, except for 10.24.5cd, nāsatyāv abruvan devaḥ, pīnar ā vahatāt īti, ‘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 śāyāṃ 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), dhatatāt (3.18.1d), bhatatāt (3.8.1c), punītāt (10.30.5d), bhavatāt (3.23.2d), yacatāt (1.48.15c), yavatāt (9.86.41d), rakṣatāt (4.50.2d), vahatāt (10.24.5d), vocatāt (5.61.18a), viṭṭāt (5.61.6d), viṭāt (10.11.8d), vrhatatāt (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.
The morphology of the imperative make it plural: áto no rudrā utá vā na áṣya / ágne vittād dhavīṣo yād yājāma ‘From there, O Rudrās or Agni, take note now of this oblation of ours, which we will sacrifice.’

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

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

It is true that there is a tendency for the -tāt impv. to appear in the apodosis of conditional or temporal clauses; eight of the attested examples appear thus, e.g.: 10.30.5d yād āṣīcā āṣadhībhiḥ punītāt ‘when you pour them in, purify with grass’, or 10.16.1cd-10.16.2ab yadā śṛtām kṛṇāvā jātavedō, āthēm enam prá hinutāt piṭbhyāḥ / śṛtām yadā kārasi jātavedō, āthēm enam pāri dattāt piṭbhyāḥ ‘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 gachāty āsunītēm etām, śtha devānēm vaśānībhavāti ‘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 ghorā yād arya sāmyrīr bhāvyāty, ādha sma nas tanvō bodhī gopāh ‘when

---

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

The rest of the examples of the -tāt imperative appear to show no special semantic features to differentiate them from other imperative forms: e.g. 3.23.2cd āgne ví paśya brhatābhī rāyā, isām no netā bhavatād ānu dyān ‘O Agni, look here with great wealth, be our leader to refreshment daily’, or the previously quoted example at 10.24.5d.

\section*{The modal aorist injunctive}

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

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

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

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

\textsuperscript{46} Most certainly not **dhihi, **dhi as suggested, e.g. by Jamison (1997).
Ideally, it should be possible to find some kind of formal sign as to whether a form is modal or not. Often there is none. However, there are three particles which do seem to be associated with modality and which occur often with the aorist injunctives in examples of this kind; sá (of the type known as sá-ígé), sú, and tú. While the status of the former is somewhat controversial, it is apparent that it occurs practically exclusively with imperatives and imperative-like forms. Likewise sú 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 (which of course are always unambiguous) 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 sú or tú (as sá-ígé 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 sú: 6.33.1a yā ojīṣṭha indra tām sū no dāḥ ‘That (exhilaration) which is mightiest, O Indra, give that to us’, and two have sá-ígé: 5.33.6cd sā na ēṇīṃ vasavāno rayīṃ dāḥ ‘Give us colourful property . . . ’ and 9.97.25cd sā nāḥ sahāsrā bṛhatīr īṣo dāḥ bhāvā soma draviṇopit punāṅāḥ ‘Give us . . .’

---

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

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

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

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

51 1.121.4a, 6.20.7d. 6.351b is possibly a subjunctive.
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 

śāviṣṭhaṁ na ā bhara śāra śāva, ājiṣṭhaṁ ājo abhibhūta ugrām / viśvā dyumnā viśnyā mānuṣaṇām, asmābhyaṁ dā harivo mādayādyai ‘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 tvāṁ no āntama utr trātā, śīvō bhavā varāthāya / vāsuvrāvā ačā nakṣi, dyumāṭtamaṁ rayīṁ dāṁ ‘Agni you are the closest to us and our protector. Become our wholesome shelter-giver.52 Come here, (being) good Agni, with good fame. Give us brilliant wealth’, and 3.24.5 āgne dā dāśū/sunderdote rayī/munderdot, vīrāvantam pārī/nunderdotasam / śiśīhí na/hunderdot sūnumāta/hunderdot ‘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.53 Of the other five, four are “historical”,54 while one appears to be a subjunctive.55

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

53 Verb initial: 6.19.10d. Verb not initial: 1.26.10c, 1.48.12c, 1.54.11a, 1.54.11d, 1.61.16c, 1.72.7b, 1.171.5c, 2.4.9d, 3.4.9d, 3.17.5d, 3.29.8d, 3.31.19d, 3.36.1a, 3.36.10.c, 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, 6.47.30a, 7.20.10a, 7.24.5d, 7.27.6c, 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 dhāḥ and dāḥ occasionally seem to be subjunctive forms, e.g.: 3.28.5 āgne tṝīve sāvane hi kāniṣṭha, puruṣāśaṁ sahasaṁ sānavān ṛhatam / āthā devēvad adhvarām vipiṇayā, dhā rāṇavantaṁ amṛneṣu jāgṛvāṁ ‘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 samīdhaṁ tābhyaṁ, sāṁsāt yaktāṁ yājate vy ū dhāḥ ‘The prayer has been made for you, O inflamed one. He will recite the incantation, and you will distribute to the sacrificer. One example of dāḥ which could possibly be subjunctive is: 6.35.1ab kadā bhuvan rāthakṣayāni brāhma, kadā stotre sahasrapoṣyāṁ dāḥ ‘when will the priests take their seats in the chariot, when will you give the praiser thousandfold nourishment’, however see Hoffmann (1967: 246). The translation of brāhma in this example follows Geldner, ad loc.
Interestingly, the negative modal syntagma *mā dhāḥ never occurs.

Of the modal examples, nine appear with sā-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 giro jūṣasva, sā vājaṃ darśi 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: 58 6.24.9bc preṣó yandhi sutapāvan vājān / sthā ā śā ārdhvā ātī 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 práti puró na ād gāḥ- ‘O Sūrya, rise again in front of us’. 63

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 āvīḥ, 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 śū 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.
tābhīr ā śū vṛtrahātye ’vīr na ‘with that help us in the slaying of obstacles’ and 10.120.3d adāh śū mádhū mádhunābhī yodhīḥ ‘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 pīphī as such. 64 An example of such usage is the form tatanah, from the root stan/tan ‘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), vocah (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 gam (7.50.1b), which is a negative modal.

A case in point is the verb kr, which has the very widely attested aor. impv. krṛdhi, 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 krṛdhi 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 krṛdhi:

triṣṭubh 6.44.18b asmābhyaṁ máhi vārivaḥ sugāṁ kaḥ

jagati 1.102.4c asmābhyaṁ indra vārivaḥ sugāṁ krṛdhi

---

64 See p. 134.
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The other modal example is 1.164.49d śārasvatī 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 arvāñcī- 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 bhūḥ, which Hoffmann says has no certain modal examples, does nevertheless occur once with śā-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 dhāḥ, 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 ηστη, 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, θέτω and δότω, corresponding to the attested Vedic forms dātu and dhātu. The Vedic evidence would seem to indicate 2nd pers. *dha, 3rd pers. dātu, etc. While the two paradigms are not directly comparable they do at least indicate that the second person imperative did not end in -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).
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kind are usually best explained as archaisms rather than innovations. Furthermore, all four of them are very common forms, which are more likely to preserve archaic morphology than less common ones.

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

The -si imperative

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

---

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

68 Insler (1972: 559) suggests that the aorist injunctive form yodhiś, used modally at 10.120.3cd is in fact formed on the basis of the anomalous imperative form yódhi.
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sigmatic aorists, e.g. prṛnāti/prās-. His third group consists of dr, yam, mā, kṣi, 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 -sati 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, διέξον, etc., noting that the Greek sigmatic aorist, like its Vedic counterpart, cannot take the 2nd sing. aor. impv. ending -dhi-/Θt.

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

70 See footnote 98, below.
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 jósì. This -i was then transferred to the sigmatic aorist by analogy.\footnote{Jasanoff (2002) comes to precisely the opposite conclusion, that the forms bodhi and yódhi were created by analogy to jósì, and the -i subsequently reanalysed as an -i imperative morpheme. See page 26.}

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 śroṣi, jósì and nakṣi, and page 62.

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

Each scholar who has dealt with the subject has produced a different list of extant forms. This work will take as a starting point 26 of the 27 forms appearing in Lubotsky (1997).\footnote{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 pururāṇā cid dhy āṣṭy, āvo nānām vāṃ varuṇa / mitra vāṃsi vāṃ sumatim ‘Because it exists so widely, I would win your grace now, O Varuṇa, your goodwill, O Mitra.’}

There are several difficulties with these forms, not the least of which is identifying them, as there are several other forms which can end in -si, such as the 2nd sing. of root presents, the 1st sing. s-aor. med., and the 3rd sing. aor. medio-passive, a fact considered significant by Watkins (1968) (see above). Some verbs have more than one of these homophonous forms.
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 caṣṭur. The examples are: 7.3.6cd divó ná te tanyatūr eti śāṣmaś, citró ná sūrah prāṭi cakṣi bhānūm, ‘Your hissing comes like thunder from heaven, show your brilliance, being bright like the sun,’ and 9.97.33ab divyāh suparnō ’va cakṣi soma, pīvan dhārāh 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 (19971), it should be considered here too.

The two passages in which it appears are 4.4.8a ārcāmi te sumatī/munderdot ghōṣi arvāk ‘I sing to your goodwill, listen here’ and 6.5.6d tāj juṣasva 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 utéva me vārūnaś 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.

**jéşi ‘win’**

*Root: ji; pres. jáyati; aor. jaïśam, jeḥ; no. of occurrences: 7*

This form is clearly derived from the sigmatic aorist stem jaiṣṇeṣ. 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 jéṣi ca púramāna máhi śrávaḥ, ‘Win and conquer great fame (for us), O purified Soma’, where it is clearly an imperative.

**jóşi ‘like’**

*Root: juḥ; pres. -; aor. juṣa-; no. of occurrences: 3, of which two are repeated. All the forms of this verb appear to be aorist, with the addition of some perfect forms. A present stem juṣa- was later built on the basis of the aorist.*

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 jóşi is derived from jóṣat, which itself appears to be part of a root aorist system, as is the form ajuṣran, 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 jóṣat as being derived from jóşi. Furthermore, it is possible that this form was created analogically on the basis of jéṣat/jéṣi.

---

74 Translation Klein (1985: 2-72).
75 As well as the common root aorist forms of this verb, one -iṣ aorist form exists, jóṣiṣat, at RV 2.35.1.
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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 *tōgs, which, he claims, derives from *tōgōss with loss of final i. See also *nakši and *śroši.

Another imperative form from the same stem, *jośā, is attested once, for which see p. 27 and p. 113. For the possibility that the form *jōśi gave rise to the forms *bodhi (*buddh) and *yōdhi see also page 26.

**dārśi** ‘pierce’

Root: *dṛ / dṛ; Pres. –78; aorist: *darṣa-; No. of occurrences: 10

The root *dṛ has several s-aorist forms, including *darṣa and *darṣasi, 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 *yakši, *parśi, *satsi, *yamśi and *darśi (the -si imperative forms which can appear in relative clauses) as presents ‘would have some support’ in the case of *darśi, unless *dar and *dart were themselves considered to be present injunctives, as for one verb to have both a root present and a root aorist would be inconceivable. The verb would accordingly have a root present, with attested forms *dar, *dart and *darśi, and a sigmatic aorist with a -si imperative.

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

Most of the examples of *darśi80 are to be classified as imperatives, e.g. 8.24.4 ā nirekāṁ utā priyāṁ, āndra dārśi jānānām / dhṛṣṭā dhṛṣṇo 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-darśi and ā-bhārā is obvious.

77 See under *parśi and *nesi for other, similar forms.

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

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

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

**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 *daksi*.

Examples are: 1.76.3ab *prá sú vīśvān rakṣāso dhāksy agne, bhāvā yajñānām abhīṣatiṁāvā*, ‘Burn up all the Rakṣasas, O Agni, become the defender of the sacrifices from curses’, 4.4.4 *úd agne tiṣṭha práty á tanuśva, ny āmīrāh oṣatāt tigmahete / yö no ārātiṁ samidhāna cakrē, nīcā tāṁ dhakṣy atasāṁ 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 śuśkāṁ vānām āṅtra hēti, rākṣo nī dhakṣy aśāṁ nā bhumā*, ‘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 *daksi*: *tvāṁ vi bhāsy ānu daksi dāvāne*, ‘you shine out, ... to give’. Geldner thinks this is the -si form from *dakṣ*, 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: *naś*; pres. *aśnoti*; aor. *āna/t* (root aorist) ; no. of occurrences: 1

This form appears once, at 5.24.2b *āchā nakṣi dyumāttaṁ rayṁ 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 *yakṣat/yakṣi.81

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

néṣi ‘lead’
Root: nī; pres. nayati; aor. anaiṣṭa, neṣat; no. of occurrences: 10
This verb is conjugated, both in the present and the aorist, in a very similar way to the verb ji, and like jēṣi/jēṣat 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 āniṣṭām, which have not been satisfactorily explained, although perhaps they should be classed together with the similarly difficult form jītam, from jī.

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

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

pārṣi ‘pass, bring’
Root: pṛ; pres. piparti; aor. parṣat;83 no. of occurrences: 1684
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 pṛ, leaves little room for doubt

81 See śru(ḥ) 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 (apiparṇ). 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.
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; 

Another imperative is also attested, 

The form 

práśi ‘fill’

Root: pf; pres. prnāti; aor. aprāśa (3rd sing. sigmatic) ; no. of occurrences: 2

This form is attested twice, 1.42.9 and 8.1.23, both times in the expression prāṣy 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.

bhaksi ‘share’

Root: bhaj; pres. bhajati/-te; aor. bhāks-; no. of occurrences: 1

The only occurrence of this form is at 7.41.2d:

prātarjɪtam bhāgam ugrām ṭavema
vayām putrām āditer yō vidharthā ||
ādhrāś cid yām mānyamānas turāścid
rājā cid yām bhāgam bhaksiyāḥāḥ ||

‘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).
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imperative strikes me as the better option. In later texts this root also has a reduplicating aorist.

**mátsi** ‘exhilarate’

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

This verb has numerous sigmatic aorist forms, including the characteristic pair *matśa/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. mimīte; 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 *māhi*\(^{88}\) and *māsva*, and the form *māsi*.

An example of *māsi* is 1.92.7cd *prajávāto nṛvāto áśvabudhyān, úśo góagrāh úpa māsi vājān* ‘measure out booty, rich in offspring and men, with horses at the bottom and with cows on top, O Uśas’, which is identical in meaning to the root-aorist imperative *māhi*, 4.22.10b *asmābhyaṃ citrāh úpa māhi vājān* ‘to us, measure out shining booty.’

*Māsi* can occur among other imperatives, e.g. 2.17.7cd *krdhí praketiám úpa māsy á bhara, daddhi bhágam tanvò yéna māmāhā* ‘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).
yáksi ‘sacrifice, worship’

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

Yaksi is the most common -si imperative form, and like yaksi, the second-most common, presents few problems. All of the aorist forms of this verb are sigmatic. For examples and further information see p. 153.

yāmsi ‘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 yāmsi exists alongside the somewhat more common root aorist imperative yandhi. 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, ayodhit; 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 asmābhyaṃ je/sunderdoti yōtsi ca ‘for us win and fight’, together with the form je/sunderdoti, on the basis of which it was probably derived ad hoc.

rátsi ‘dig’

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

90 1.13.1; 1.14.1; 1.31.17; 1.36.6; 1.75.5; 1.105.13; 1.142.11; 2.3.3; 2.6.8; 2.36.4; 3.4.1; 3.14.5; 3.17.2; 3.17.3; 5.26.1; 5.28.5; 6.4.1; 6.16.2; 6.16.9; 6.16.24; 6.48.4; 7.9.5; 7.9.6; 7.11.3; 7.16.5; 7.17.3; 7.39.4; 8.102.16; 10.1.6; 10.70.4; 10.70.9; 10.110.3; 10.110.9.

91 There is one attested occurrence of yaksi in a relative clause in Taittirīya-Saṃhitā 2.16.12.5, but not in the Rigveda. Also, for the very interesting 3rd dual form yaksatām, 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 párināsā, rátsi vājāya pánthām ‘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 ā bhara in (a).

rási ‘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 / rāsya. Beginning in the Rigveda, but more so in later texts, a new thematic present rása- was derived from the aorist subjunctive forms such as rāsate.

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

2.11.13d asmé rayīr rāsi vīrāvantam
2.11.14a rási kṣāyaṃ rāsi mitrām asmé
rāsi sārdha indra mārutraṃ 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 párinās, and for the formula rāyā párināsā, 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. vahātī, at; aor. avāt, vakṣat; no. of occurrences: 24
Narten (1964: 240), cites Lat. vexi, and Cypriot Greek ἐκεῖ to show that this is a very ancient sigmatic formation. To this LIV² adds Old Church Slavonic otn-vēsta. Nearer to hand we also have Avestan (uz-)waažat, 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 satśi. 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 ā vakṣi devāḥ ihā vipra yākṣi ca, which account for approx. half of the total occurrences of this form, and also the common proximity of other -si imperatives satśi and yaksī, other actions associated with Agni in his sacrificial role.

vēśi ‘pursue’
Root: vī; pres. veti; aor. veṣat; no. of occurrences: 5
Veśi, 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 veṣat. 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; 3.14.2; 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: volhām and volhām. There have been attempts in the past (Debrunner, Nachtr. zu Wackernagel I 275, 8) to explain these forms as sigmatic. Narten disagrees with this on the grounds that the sigmatic forms should most likely have full-grade in the root. LIV² ascribes them to the root present, on semantic grounds. See also p. 164.

97 Once again we have a disagreement on the number of attested forms, Lubotsky (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.
Examples include 6.4.8a-c ná no agne ‘vṛkēbhih svastī, vēṣī rāyāh pathiḥbhiḥ pārṣy āmpahāḥ / tā sūrbhīyo gṛṇatē rāsi sūmnām ‘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 vēṣī in the same sentence as two other -si imperatives would make it hard to interpret it any other way. Likewise 7.16.5d yākiṣi vēṣi ca vāryam ‘Make an offering, and seek desirable things’ is hardly mistakable as being an imperative.98

śrōṣi ‘hear’

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

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

Here, therefore, we must conclude that the -si imperative was formed by analogy. Jasanoff (1987) not only assumes this, but places the derivation in the PIE period, based on the existence of a Tocharian form (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 srarosānē, Lithuanian kláusti (which is shown by its accentuation to be a desiderative and which actually means ‘to ask’), and

98 The similarly conjugated verb kṣi, ‘to dwell’, has a present form kṣesi, which is not a -si imperative. However, it also has a subjunctive form kṣesat. Whether this means that the imperative usage is simply unattested, or that the subjunctive form was derived by analogy, e.g. to vēṣat, is unknown. Cardona (1965: 13) does class one occurrence of this form as an imperative, but I see no conclusive reason to do so. The example is 6.4.4cd sā tvām na āṛjaśana āṛjaṃ dhā, rājève jēr avrōkē kṣē_SY 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 kṣesi as a present indicative – ‘you (always) conquer like a king, you live in safety’. Hoffmann himself takes this approach (1967: 262), except that he also classifies dhāḥ as ‘general’, an interpretation which I do not accept, for the above reason (see also Narten (1964: 104), Joachim (1978: 72) under kṣā).
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klausýti, Tocharian B klyaušān, Old Church Slavic slyša, Old High German (h)losēn, etc.

The form šroši is attested once at 6.4.7ab tvām hī mandrātamam arkašokaīr, vavrmāhe māhī nāh šrōsy 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 yakṣi / yakṣat. Satsat occurs only once, and so perhaps is rightfully termed an Augenblicksbildung on the basis of satsi by Narten (op. cit.: 262).

The form appears in contexts such as 1.12.4c devaīr / amacron śrōtsi barhi/sunderdoti ‘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 vakṣi, e.g. 3.14.2cd vidvāh å vakṣi vidāso ni śatsi, mādhyā å barhiā ūtāye 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. asāksi, 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 sakṣya. The verb also has root aorist forms, e.g. optative sahyāh, and -iṣ- aorist forms, such as āsahiṣṭa.

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

100 See also p. 176 for the possibility that the form sākṣya may be derived from the root sac.
The sole appearance of the form *saksi* is at the unfortunately very unclear 5.33.2cd yā ithā maghavann ānu jōsam, vākṣo abhī prāryāḥ saksi jānān, translated by Geldner as ‘Komm hierher, du Freigebiger, nach deinem Wohlgefallen; fahre her, werde mit den vornehmen (Nebenbuhlern), den (anderen) Leuten fertig!’ 101 Despite all the difficulties of this passage, jānān and aryās are probably the direct object of prā-saksi, 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.

**stoṣi** ‘praise’

Root: *stu*; pres. *stumāsi, stuvánti*, 102 aor. *astoṣi, stoṣat*; no. of occurrences: 1

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

The form *stoṣi* occurs once in a difficult passage at 10.22.4d sṛjānā stōṣy ādhanah ‘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 *yēthā.* 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 (<*yaHas*), which would solve the problem of this páda 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 *staumi, stauti* are attested in the Atharvaveda.

103 Narten (1964: 276).
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hości ‘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 áhāvi, 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 hości itself only appears once, at 6.44.14cd tám u prá hości mádhumantam asmai, sóma . . . ‘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:

parśi occurs in a subordinate clause at 1.174.9cd prá yát samudrám áti šūra parśi, pārāyā turvāśam yāduṁ svasti ‘When you cross the sea, O hero, then take T. and Y. across to well-being’.

satsi – at 3.30.18bc sám yán mahír īṣa āsāṭsi pṛrvīḥ / rāyó vantāro bhṛhatāḥ syāma ‘when you gain the great, abundant refreshments, may we be the winners of great wealth’.

yaṃsi – at 1.63.8 tvām tyām na indra deva citrām, īṣam āpo ná pīpayaḥ pārījman / yāyā šūra prāty asmābhyaṃ yaṃsi, tmānām ēṛjaṃ 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 darśi at 6.26.5ab tvām tád ukthám indra barhāṇā kah, prá yuc chatā sahāsrā šūra dārsi ‘O Indra, you make this word powerful, when you destroy hundreds, thousands, O hero.’

Of these four forms, darśi can, I believe, be disregarded, if it is indeed a root 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 āgne kavyāvahānaḥ piṭṛn yāksy tṝavīḍhāḥ ‘O Agni, when you sacrifice to the Fathers . . . ’ which, interestingly enough, corresponds to a third-person passage in the RV containing an aorist subjunctive yakṣar: 10.16.11a yó agniḥ kavyāvahanaḥ piṭṛn yāksad tṝavīḍhæ. ‘Agni, who shall sacrifice to the Fathers . . . ’

105 See p. 48.
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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 darṣi 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 (dārṣi)’. 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 vakṣi 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 – jaïṣam, ājaiḥ; jěṣi : jěṣat.
- dah – dhāk; dhāksi : dhāksat
- nī – naiṣṭa; něṣi : něṣat
- pṛ – aprāḥ; prāṣi. *prāṣat is unattested.
- bhaj – bhāk; bhaksi : bhakṣat
- mad – amatsuḥ etc.; māṭsi : máṭsat
- yaj – ayāḥ, āṭ; yakṣi : yakṣat
- yam – ayāmsam, ayān; yāmsi : yāmsat
- vah – avāṭ; vakṣi : vakṣat

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

- rā – ārādhvam, ārāsata etc.; rāṣi, rāsats
- stu – astoṣi, āstoḍhvam etc.; stoṣi : stoṣats. 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 : jōṣats
- ṭṛ – ṭaṛṣi : ṭaṛṣats
- pṛ – pāṛṣi : pāṛṣats
- vī – vēṣi : vēṣats
- śru – śrōṣi : śrōṣats
- sad – sāṭsi : sāṭats

107 Indeed, this mutual implication is so all-pervading that it may have played a role in the formation of the forms yōḍhi and bodhi on the basis of (inter alia) the aorist subjunctive forms yodhat and bōḍhat (see also p. 26). Furthermore we may bring into consideration the unquestionably analogical form barbṛhi and its probably subjunctive counterpart bārbrhi. 
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 rátsi
naś – nakṣi. Although an aorist subjunctive form is unattested there is a secondary present stem nakṣa- which is likely to be derived from it.

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

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

The question of the origin of these forms has undergone a certain shift since Cardona and Szemerényi. Dunkel (1992:108 1997) and Jasanoff have suggested a much earlier derivation, and a much more widespread occurrence of these forms than was originally assumed. Jasanoff’s theories concerning the antiquity of these forms have already been mentioned under the forms śroṣi, 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 τερψίμβροτος, versipellis and flexanus. Furthermore, he compares πλησίστιος with prāsi, Κλεοσιππος with śroṣi, Ἀναβησίνεως with Vedic gāsi, Ἀνεξικόμη with sakṣi, Γεωσιστρότη with joṣi, and Ἡσιῶδος with Vedic yāsi.
other aorist stems, in cases such as *klēy-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, parṣa
  and jōṣa from
  sigmatic, thematic,
  subjunctives.

- The existence of *si
  forms implies the
  existence of
  subjunctive forms
  in -sat.
  Conversely, bodhi
  formed on basis of
  bodont.

- 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 -*i*- aorists have no way of forming it (except for the isolated form *avidhī*) 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. τούς γονεῖς τιμᾶ (Isocrates 1.16) means ‘honour thy parents’ (now and forever more), while βλέψων πρὸς τὰ ὅρη (Xenophon, Anabasis 4.1.20) means ‘Look (glance) towards the mountains’. An interesting example that illustrates the rather subtle nature of the relationship between the aorist and the present in Greek is the following from Xenophon’s Cyropaedia 4.5.47: εἰ μὲν οὖν ἄλλοις ἔχετε ὁρώσετε ἂν δοθῆτε αὐτοῖς [τοὺς ἵππους] . . . ἐκείνος δίδοτε· εἰ μέντοι ἡμᾶς βούλεσθε . . . ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς 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 utá ṛūbhir \ ṛtupāḥ pāhi sōmam\textsuperscript{111} and 2.37.1d ḫotrád sōmam \ dravīṇodaḥ pība ṛūbhīḥ. This example is significant because the adverb ṛūbhīḥ implies a repeated action; if the aorist truly denoted perfective aspect then it shouldn’t appear in this environment.

**The demise of the aorist imperative**

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

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

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

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

\textsuperscript{112} Where a pāda appears more than once, it is usually counted as more than one example. The only exception to this are the common ending of hymns of Book 7 yāyām pāta 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

<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

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>
</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

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

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

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

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.\footnote{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).}

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

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

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

Table 4

The first three of these forms, as well as dhanva, are highly characteristic Soma-vocabulary, which appear practically exclusively in Book 9. To this list may also be added a further 22 forms of the verb pū, bringing the total to 149. So we have a highly dominant element of special vocabulary in this book and none of them have any attested aor. impv. forms. If we subtract the number of occurrences of these special key-words from the total number of pres. impvs. in Book 9 we are left with 219, and the percentage of aor. impvs. after this subtraction is 18%, which is only very slightly lower than the percentage in the other books, and higher than the
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 of the form *krdhi* 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,\(^\text{115}\) 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.\(^\text{116}\) Likewise in the case of *gahi*, of 10 examples\(^\text{117}\) (counting the two recensions of the Śatapathabrahmaṇa 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,\(^\text{118}\) and one is a prose passage (ŚBM 1.1.4.12 and ŚBK 2.1.3.16): tānī vā etānī catvāri vācā ehiḥ brāhmaṇasyāgahi ādraveti vaśyasya ca rājanyābandhōścādāhavēti śūdrasya, ‘These then are the four types of speech. *ehi* belongs to the brahmin, *āgahi* and *ādrava* to the vaśya and the rājanya, and *āḍhava* to the śūdra.’\(^\text{119}\) 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 suputram subhāgām *krdhi* whereas RV 10.85.45 has suputram subhāgām *krnu*(!). 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.\(^\text{118}\)

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 *śāntātām* ‘quietest, gentlest’. A look at the attestations of the form *āgahi* in the RV
passage bears a strong affinity to RV 8.13.14a: á tū gahi pra tū drava, from which it appears to at least partially receive its inspiration. In any case, the forms are not here used in a directly imperatival sense, and gahi certainly need not be part of the living language of the Brahmins of the time.

The form śrudhi appears eight times in the Brāhmaṇas, all of which are quotes from the RV. Likewise pāhi “drink” appears 10 times, of which all are quotes from the RV, except TĀ 4.8.2, a mantra verse: āsra gharman śiṃsa / 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 -οιο / -οιο, -εω / -εω, -σι / -σσι and variant forms such as ἕμες and ὀμμές – are variants of the type which is also abundant in Rigvedic, examples being 1st pers. sing. subj. -ā, -āni, 3rd pers. sing. aor. subj. forms such as gamat, gamati, and 1st pers. plural active endings -mas and -masi, the locatives with and without -i and the

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

For the accentuation of the form ehi see footnote 141.

120 ŠBM 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. ŠBM 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 -ta and -tana. This kind of variant can be shown to be metrically motivated, as in the case of the formulaic paramé vyôman, which appears in trišṭubh cadences, and its metrical variant paramé vyômani, which appears in jagatī cadences. Likewise, the phrases 10.78.8c ādhi stotrásya sakhyásya gāta and 5.55.9c ādhi stotrásya sakhyásya gātana are differentiated only by the variant verbal endings -ta and -tana, the former being suited to the cadence of a trišṭubh pāda and the latter to that of a jagatī pāda.123

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

Limitations on the placement of words within the pāda

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

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

124 This is not the first time that it has been suggested that different verbal categories act as metrical variants. Hoffmann (1967: 263) shows that the aorist imperative and aorist injunctive act in a similar manner in 6.44.18b – asmábhyaṁ māhi várīvah sugāṁ kāh and 1.102.4c – asmábhyaṁ indra várīvah sugāṁ krdhi, where an aorist injunctive stands at the end of a trišṭubh pāda, and an aorist imperative at the end of a jagatī pāda. Renou (1925: 45f.) 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 \( \cup \cup \) and \( \cup \cup \cup \) 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 triśūbh pādas.

**Disyllabic words \( \cup \cup \)**

**In hendecasyllables**

Short-short disyllabic words are very limited in their placement, and thus are quite rare in the triśūbh, 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 *gahi* is never found in this position. The reason for this is that the form *gahi* never appears without the preverb *ā*. When the verb and preverb are juxtaposed, the combination *ā-gahi* will in effect behave in the same way as a trisyllabic form with the metrical structure — \( \cup \cup \); cf. the common placement of the form *gātana* in the cadence of jagati pādas.

10.116.1a *pībā sōmam \ mahatā indriyāya, pībā*\(^{125}\) *vṛtrāya \ hāntave śaviṣtha*

10.116.1c *pība rāyē \ śāvase hāyāmānāḥ, pība mādhvas \ tṛpād indrā vṛṣasva*

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

3.35.9d *agnēḥ pība \ jihvāyā sōmam indra*

2.30.10b *vīryā kṛdhi \ yāni te kārtvānī*

6.5.6a *sā tāt kṛdhi \ īśīśa tūyam agne*

6.23.7d *urūṃ kṛdhi \ pāvātā ulokām*

7.25.5c *satrā kṛdhi \ 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 \ kṛdhi mā devāvantam
8.96.8c úpa tvēmaḥ \ kṛdhi no bhāgadēyaṃ
10.104.1d dadhamirā \ indra \ pībā sutāsya

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

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 kṛdhi sahasrasāṃ īśim
9.61.28b kṛdhi no yaśāso jāne
1.44.13a śrudhi 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 śāvanā gahi
1.4.3c mā no āti khyā ā gahi
6.2.10c samśādo viśpate kṛṇu
6.53.7a ā rikha kikirā kṛṇu (also 6.53.8d)
10.85.45b suputṛāṃ subhāgāṁ kṛṇu
1.14.7b -āgne pāṁiṇivasas kṛdhi
1.42.6c dhānānī suṣaṇā kṛdhi
1.127.11d māhi śaviṣṭha nas kṛdhi
5.51.14d stvatī no adite kṛdhi

126 See however my remark above about juxtaposition of gahi with the preverb ā. The form gahi appears exclusively with the preverb ā in gayārī cadences.
Other examples: śrūdhī hāvam – Aside from 9.104.6a sānemī kṛdhī asmād ā, most of the examples in which the verb is not either at the beginning or the end of the pāda contain the syntagm śrūdhī (...) hāvam.

8.66.12d sāviṣṭha śrūdhī me hāvam
8.82.6a īndra śrūdhī sā me hāvam
8.6.18c māmēd ugra śrūdhī hāvam
8.74.11c sā pāvaka śrūdhī hāvam

A few examples contain variations on the theme of drinking soma:
1.15.1a īndra sōmam pība ṛtūnā
1.15.3b gnāvo nēṣṭah pība ṛtūnā
1.15.4c pāri bhūsa pība ṛ tūnā
4.46.1a ágram pībā mādhūnāṁ
8.17.1b īndra sōmam pībā īmām
8.32.19c īndra pība sutānāṁ

In dodecasyllables
Behave as in octosyllables:

Pāda-initial
2.17.7c kṛdhī praketāṁ \ ṛpa māśy ā bhara
7.16.6a kṛdhī rātnāṁ \ yājamānāya sukrato

Pāda-final
2.23.7d sugāṁ no asya\ devāvītaye kṛdhī
8.66.8c sēmāṁ na stōmaṁ \ jujūṣṭaṁ ā gahi

Two exceptions:
6.51.13c daviṣṭhāṁ asya\ satpate kṛdhī sugāṁ
9.85.4d urūṁ no gātūṁ \ kṛhm soma mādhūvāṁ
Disyllabic forms — ∪

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

**Pāḍa-initial** – The examples of pāḍa-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 ∪ dārād ārād abhiśṭābhīḥ

Immediately after the caesura

2.11.15b ṭrpaṭ sōmam ∪ pāhi drahyād indra (10 sylls)
2.11.17b trikaḍrukeṣu ∪ pāhi sōmam indra

**Pāḍa-final**

3.35.6b śāśvattamām ∪ sumāṇā asyā pāhi
3.35.8c tāśyāgāyā ∪ sumāṇā ṛṣva pāhi

Immediately before the caesura

3.36.3d evā pāhi ∪ pānyo adyā nāvīyān
4.34.7b sajōsāḥ pāhi ∪ girvāno marūdbhīḥ

**Third and fourth syllable before end**

3.47.3a utā rṭūbhir ∪ rṭupaṭ pāhi sōmam
3.51.7a ḍṇḍra marutaṇa ∪ ēḥa pāhi sōmaṇaṃ
5.43.3c hōteva naḥ ∪ prathamāḥ pāḥy 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 ∪ kṛṇuhi stāvānaḥ
Only one exception to this has been found in the test corpus:

3.58.7d sómam pibatam \ asrídhā sudānū

In octosyllables

Pāda-initial

1.18.1b kṛṇuhi brahmaṇas pate
8.13.7b śṛṇudhī jaritūr hāvam

Middle of pāda

At 3rd syllable

1.13.2c adyā kṛṇuhi vītāye
6.53.10c nṛvāt kṛṇuhi vītāye
10.60.11d nīyag bhavatu te rápaḥ

At 4th syllable

8.84.3b nṛṛḥḥ pāḥi śṛṇudhī gīraḥ
4.9.7c asmākam śṛṇudhī hāvam
8.74.8b cāniśṭhā bhavatu priyā

In dodecasyllables

In this case the behaviour is the same as in hendecasyllables.

6.48.4c arvācaḥ sīṃ kṛṇuhy agnē avase
9.82.4b pājṛyāg garbha śṛṇuhi brāvīmi te
1.94.8a pārvo devā bhavatu sunvatō rátho

Trisyllabic words \ — \ — \ —

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

Pāda-final

5.2.6cd brāhmāṇy ātrer \ āva tāṃ srjantu, ninditāro \ nindīyāso bhavantu
Aorist versus present imperative

7.35.5c śām na ṣadhir \ vanino bhavantu

Immediately before caesura
5.83.7d samā bhavantu- \ -advāto nipādāḥ
7.17.5b satyā bhavantu- \ aśīno no adyā

Pāda-initial
6.51.11d bhāvantu nah \ sutrātrāṣaḥ sugopāḥ
1.114.11b śṛṇoṭu no \ hávaṇ rudró marūtvān

One exception
One example is completely unlike the others:
10.67.11c paścā mṛḍho \ 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 urú kṛdhī \ maghavaṇ chaiḍhi rāyāḥ. It is true that in this example the second verb is also aorist, thus we have an aorist environment and a possible justification for the use of the form kṛdhī. However, the point here is that in this case, because of the fixing of the sentence, the poet could not have used the present in the first clause even had he wanted to, as the forms can only go after the caesura, but in this example, that position is occupied by a different clause. The form kṛṇu is unattested in triṣṭubh pādas, and so the only choice the poet had here, if he wished to use any form of the verb kṛ, is the form kṛdhī. Even if the caesura were after the fifth rather than the fourth syllable, the
opening \textit{urú kr̥nuhi} would, according to the findings of this work, be exceptionally rare, only one similar example having been found.

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

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

The almost universal use of \textit{∪ ∪ ∪} forms such as kr̥nuhi 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 \textit{∪ ∪ —}. While stating that the final syllable of śr̥nuhi is always long, Arnold (p.118) suggests that the vowel in other forms ending in -uhi was considered short, \textit{inter alia} because of its “rather frequent occurrences before consonant groups”. This would appear not to be the case. In fact kr̥nuhi only occurs four times before a consonant group\textsuperscript{127}, thus indicating that either the final vowel of kr̥nuhi was in fact lengthened, or that the sequence \textit{∪ ∪ ∪} was not only admissible immediately after the caesura, but actually common, both in variants 1) and 2) of the triśṭubh metre.

The similarity of the behaviour of the forms such as pibatam, where the final syllable is often lengthened by position, and kr̥nuhi, and the lack of distinction between cases where kr̥nuhi 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. \textit{∪} rather than —.

Likewise, pāda-initial \textit{∪ ∪} and — \textit{∪} raise the same questions about the length of the final vowel. While the \textit{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 kṛdhi, when occupying the third and fourth syllables, never are. Does this mean that we should

\textsuperscript{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, ∪ ?

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 krdhi may occur in this position. When the caesura is after the fifth syllable, the fourth syllable is still long, but the first syllable of these forms, which now falls in this position, may not be lengthened and thus they cannot occur.

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

The triśṭuph 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 triśṭuph is a catalectic variant, as ∪∪∪∪∪∪ | ∪∪∪∪∪∪ for the late-caesura variant and ∪∪∪∪∪∪ | ∪∪∪∪∪∪ for the early-caesura one. By his reasoning the scheme of the triśṭuph would be the same, but minus the last syllable, and the new last syllable would then become anceps, thus: ∪∪∪∪∪∪ | ∪∪∪∪∪∪ and ∪∪∪∪∪∪ | ∪∪∪∪∪∪. As far as the final syllable of the forms krdhi and kru is concerned, for the former, in the majority of cases, we can draw no conclusion, as it occurs in the opening, however in the few cases when krdhi occurs in the cadence, as in 7.27.5a nā indra rāyē \ vārvivas krdhi nāh, 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 (∪ — ∪ ∪) is the same as that of the jagatī and thus can accommodate the ∪ ∪ forms such as krūḍhi. 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 śruḍhī hāvam. 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 *hāvam śruḍhī 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 śruḍhī hāvam, took some measures to accommodate it more easily within the octosyllabic line. On one occasion the phrase was actually split across two lines, so that the verb is at the more usual final position:

1.25.19ab imām me vaṇṇa śruḍhī, hāvam adyā ca mṛlaya

Except for the trochaic gāyatrī. The anuṣṭubh has no such variant.
The other method used to regularise this formula was to use the form śṛudhī to replace the verb śṛudhī. It has already been noticed by Lubotsky (1995) that this form is typically (in fact only) used in the same formulae as śṛudhī (p. 135) and that the ending -dhi is ‘probably due to the influence of śṛudhī.’ However, in addition to Lubotsky’s observations, we may now add that the form śṛudhī only occurs in octosyllabic lines. Within these lines it occurs four times out of five at the fourth syllable, a position at least more characteristic of octosyllable phraseology than the formula śṛudhī hāvam allows. I believe that the form śṛudhī was specially coined to allow easier accommodation of the formula śṛudhī 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 ákṣitam was replaced by the later ákṣitá śrāvas because it fits better into the cadence of the Rigvedic octosyllable (1974: 153ff.).

Thus, the fact that śṛudhī 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 VO 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 śṛudhī 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.

---

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 śrudhī, as a part of a formula used in prayers to invoke the gods, furthermore, has a precise counterpart in Homeric Greek, where the form κλδθ羌 is used exclusively in prayers. A selection of examples is:

**Iliad**

1.37 – κλδθ羌 μευ, ἄργυρότοξ’, ὃς Χρύσην ἀμφιβεβηκας
“hear me, you of the silver bow, who have under your protection Chryse . . .”

5.115 – κλδθ羌 μευ, αἰγίχοχοι Διός τέκος, Ἀτρυτώνη
Hear me, child of Zeus who bears the aegis, Atrytone!

10.278 – κλδθ羌 μευ, αἰγίχοχοι Διός τέκος, . . .
Hear me, child of Zeus who bears the aegis, . . .

**Odyssey**

5.445 – κλδθ羌, ὁναξ, ὃς ἐστὶ πολύλλιστον δε σικάνω
Hear me, O king, whosoever thou art, as to one greatly longed for do I come to thee

9.528 – κλδθ羌, Ποσείδαον γαίροχε κυνοχαίτα
Hear me, Poseidon, earth-enfolder, thou dark haired god

3.55 – κλδθ羌, Ποσείδαον γαίροχε, μηδὲ μεγήρης
Hear me, Poseidon, earth-enfolder, and grudge not in answer . . .

4.762 – κλδθ羌 μευ, αἰγίχοχοι Διός τέκος, Ἀτρυτώνη
Hear me, child of Zeus who bears the aegis, unwearied one

4.767 – ὃς εἰπώσει ὁλόλυξε, θεα δε οι έκλυεν άρης

---

131 For the lengthening of the vowel in κλδθ羌 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,¹³⁴ and the goddess heard her prayer

Schmitt (§§ 400-405) considers the formula *kludhi moij (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 कलुधि मेव occurs only in prayers in the Iliad. When humans spoke to each other, they used a different expression for “hear me”. The Vedic phrase śruđhi me (and śruđhi 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.135 A noteworthy fact in this case is that the form pāhi, when meaning ‘drink’ rather than ‘protect’, almost never occurs pāda-initially. The reason for this is that in cases where the VO word order may be preserved, and where the metre permits it, the underlying formula 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: jeśī 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 upariṣṭājjyotis 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 sajōṣasā uṣ sā sūryeṇa ca, īṣaṁ no volham aśvinā

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

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

13cd sajōṣasā uṣ sā sūryeṇa ca, ādityaṁ 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, 22cd ā yātam aśvinā gatam, avasyūr vām ahāṁ huve, dhattam rāṁāṇi dāṣuṣe, it seems clear that gatam was chosen because it sounds similar to yātam and dhattam, and also because it fits into the characteristic position at the end of a pāda, especially as the form hatam has also appeared recently in the same vicinity (16-18b).

Another case in point is RV 7.35, which has approx. 40 imperative forms, mostly third person forms from bhū and as in the expressions sām astu and sām bhavatu. The following is the text in full:
1 śām na indrāgniḥ bhavātāṁ ávobhiḥ, śām na ŭndrāvāruṇā rātāhavāyā śām ŭndrāśomā suvītāya śām yōḥ, śāṃ na ŭndrāpūśaṇā vājasaṭāu

2 śāṃ no bhāgaḥ śāṃ u nāh śāṃso astu, śāṃ nāḥ pūramdhīḥ śāṃ u sāntu rāyāḥ śāṃ nāḥ satyāṣya svāyāmasya śāṃsah, śāṃ no aryamā puruṣatō astu

3 śāṃ no dhātaḥ śāṃ u dhartā no astu, śāṃ na urucīṁ bhavatāṁ svadhābhīḥ śāṃ rōdast brhaṭ śāṃ no Ṛdṛḥ, śāṃ no devānāṁ suhāvāṁ sāntu

4 śāṃ no agrār jyōṭirānīko astu, śāṃ no mitrāvāruṇāv āśvānā śāṃ śāṃ nāḥ sukrāṇī sukrāṇīṁ sāntu, śāṃ na iṣirō abhī vātu vālaḥ

5 śāṃ no dyāvāpyrhīvī pūrvāhātāu, śāṃ antārikṣaṁ drṣṭāye no astu śāṃ na Ṛṣadhir vanino bhavantu, śāṃ no rājasāṁ pātir astu jiṣṭāḥ

6 śāṃ na ŭndrō vāsubhir devaḥ astu, śāṃ ōdityēbhīr vāruṇāḥ susāmsaḥ śāṃ no Ṛudro Ṛudrēbhīr jālāṣaḥ, śāṃ na Ṛvāṣṭāṅ gnābhīr ihā śṛṇotu

7 śāṃ nāḥ sómo bhavatu brāhma śāṃ nāḥ, śāṃ no grāvāṇaḥ śāṃ u sāntu yaṃnāḥ śāṃ nāḥ svārīṇāṁ mitāyo bhavantu, śāṃ nāḥ prasvāḥ śāṃ v astu vēdīḥ

8 śāṃ nāḥ śārya urucāśā ud etu, śāṃ na śāṣaṇkatā pradiśaḥ bhavantu śāṃ nāḥ pūrvatāḥ dhruvāyo bhavantu, śāṃ nāḥ śūndhavaḥ śāṃ u sāntō āpāḥ

9 śāṃ no ādīrī bhavatū vṛtābhīḥ, śāṃ no bhavatū marūṭaḥ svarkaḥ śāṃ no viṣṇuḥ śāṃ u pūṣāḥ no astu, śāṃ no bhavirāmūḥ śāṃ v astu vāyūḥ

10 śāṃ no devāḥ savitaḥ trāyamāṇaḥ, śāṃ no bhavatūśaḥ vibhāṭīḥ śāṃ nāḥ parjānyo bhavatu praṣābhyaḥ, śāṃ nāḥ kṣetrasya pātir astu śambhūḥ

11 śāṃ no devāḥ viśvādevāḥ bhavantu, śāṃ sārasvatiḥ sahā dhībhīḥ astu śāṃ abhiśācaḥ śāṃ u rātiśaḥaḥ, śāṃ no divyāḥ pārvīvāḥ śāṃ no Ṛpāḥ

12 śāṃ nāḥ satyāṣyaḥ pātayo bhavantu, śāṃ no Ṛrvantaḥ śāṃ u sāntu gāvaḥ
Aorist versus present imperative

śaṁ na ṛbhāvaḥ sukṣṭaḥ suhāstaḥ, śaṁ no bhavantu 
pitārō hāveṣu

13 śaṁ no ajā ᵀhapus devō astu, śaṁ nó ḍhir budhnyāḥ śaṁ samudraḥ
śaṁ no apāṁ 

14 Ṓdityā rudrā 
vāsavo juṣanta, idām brāhma kriyāmaṇaṁ nāvyaḥ
śṛṇvāntu no 
divyāḥ pārthivāso, gójātā utā yē yajñīyāsaḥ

15 yē devānāṁ yajñīyā yajñīyānām, mānor yājatra amṛtā rtañjāḥ
tē no rāsantām 

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.
Index of attested imperative forms in the Rigveda

Root notation and classification are based on that of Lubotsky (1997). As that work keeps to a strictly traditional classification it has occasionally been found necessary to reclassify forms under different roots, or, in a few cases, to change the notation of roots. All such instances have been noted. If the form is attested with accentuation then it will appear accented here, otherwise it is listed without accentuation. The number of occurrences of each form is noted in brackets. Hapax legomena are referenced explicitly.

**aj** ‘drive’
- **pres. act.** 2nd sing. ája (6), 3rd sing. ajatu (2), 2nd dual ajatum (2.39.7b)
- **pres. med.** 2nd pl. ajadhvam (6.48.11b)

**añc₁** ‘bend’
- **pres. act.** 2nd sing. aca (9.97.54d)

**añc₂** ‘draw (water)’
- **pres. act.** 2nd sing. aca (5.83.8a)
For the meaning of this verb see Hoffmann (1965). Though Hoffmann considers this meaning to be a semantic development from the meaning ‘bend’ of añć₁, Mayrhofer (1986: s.v.) suggests this is a separate root.¹³⁶

**añj** ‘anoint’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Example 1</th>
<th>Example 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>añj</td>
<td>pres. act.</td>
<td>2nd sing.</td>
<td>ańgdhi (9.5.10b)</td>
<td>añdhí (10.156.3c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd sing.</td>
<td>anaktu (6)</td>
<td>anaktana (10.76.1b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd pl.</td>
<td>ańjanta (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd pl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ad* ‘eat’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Example 1</th>
<th>Example 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ad</td>
<td>pres. act.</td>
<td>2nd sing.</td>
<td>addhí (6)</td>
<td>attu (10.15.8d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd sing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd pl.</td>
<td>attá (10.15.11d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd pl.</td>
<td>ańjantu (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the exception of the form addhí, the imperative of this verb only appears in late texts; eight times in Book 10, and once at hymn 1.164.40c. Of the occurrences in Book 10, 4 are in syntagmas with hávis or havimśi ‘oblation’. Since the oblation consisted of ghee, this corresponds with the description of ghee as ‘food’ (anma-) of the gods, as in e.g. 2.35.11c híranyavarṇam ghṛtám ānnaṁ 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’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Example 1</th>
<th>Example 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arthaya</td>
<td>pres med.</td>
<td>2nd sing.</td>
<td>arthayasva (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd sing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**aryṣ** ‘flow’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Example 1</th>
<th>Example 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aṛṣa</td>
<td>pres. act.</td>
<td>2nd sing.</td>
<td>aṛṣa (38)</td>
<td>arṣata (4.58.10a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd sing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd pl.</td>
<td>aṛṣantu (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd pl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second person singular of this Soma key-word is entirely restricted to Book 9. This verb characteristically appears – usually with the preverb abhi – in expressions such as 9.20.4 abhi aṛṣa bṛhād yāśo, maghāvadbhyo dhruvaṁ rayīṁ / iśāṁ stotṛbhyā ā bhara ‘flow high honour, secure property for the liberal ones, bring

¹³⁶ See also Joachim (1978: 37).
nourishment for the praisers’. Gotô (1987: 104-105) is adamant that this verb is always intransitive, the acc. being an acc. of goal. This could often be the case, as in 9.63.12 abhy ārṣa sahasrīṇaṁ, rayiṁ gāmantam aśvīnaiṁ / abhī vājam utā śrāvāḥ ‘flow for thousand-fold property, rich in cows and horses, for booty and for glory’. However, in 9.20.4a (above), there is an extra dative element as well as the accusative. Thus it is entirely possible that abhī-arṣa + acc. + dat. and ā-bhara + acc. + dat. are in effect synonymous. In other words, abhī-arṣa yāsas (acc.) maghāvadbhyas (dat.) is exactly parallel to ā bhara ivaṁ stotṛbhyas. Another example with the extra dative (if naḥ is indeed to be analysed as dative and not genetive as is done by Geldner) is 9.97.51ab: abhī no arṣa divyā vāsāny, abhī viśvā pārthivā pāyamānaḥ ‘Flow heavenly goods to us, and all things on earth as you are purified’ 137.

avī ‘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. avīdhē (7), 2nd pl. āviṣṭu (3), 2nd dual āviṣṭām (9), 3rd dual āviṣṭām (2), 2nd pl. āviṣṭa (7.34.12a), āviṣṭāna (7.18.25c)

[aor. inj. āvī (6.25.1c)]

For a discussion of the form avitā, which appears at 7.59.6 ā ca no barhiḥ sādatāvītā ca naḥ “sit on the altar-grass and help us” and for a history of attempts to classify it as a form of the verb av, see Narten (1964: 87). Narten (op. cit.: 88) also suggests a different reading, ā ca no barhiḥ sādatā 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-té, 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. āvīt (\(^{<}\text{h}_1\text{eyH}-t\), analogous to the form kar(t)
).

\(\text{āvīḍḍhi}\) and \(\text{aviṣṭu}\) 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. śnatihi, stanihi, etc.), the original zero-
grade root aorist form would probably have been \(*\text{āhī} < *\text{h}_2\text{uH}-\text{dhī}\), and thus the
form \(\text{āvīḍḍhi}\) would have been formed by analogy to the rest of the paradigm for the
sake of comprehensibility.

\(\text{aś}\) ‘eat’

\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. \(\text{aśāna}\) (2)

For the form \(\text{aśāna}\), and similar forms, see p. 28.

\(\text{aś}_1\) ‘be’

\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. \(\text{edhi}\) (16), 3rd sing. \(\text{āstu}\) (171), 2nd dual \(\text{stam}\) (10.85.42a), 3rd
pl. \(\text{sāntu}\) (61)

\(\text{edhi}\) is a perfectly regular development of \(*\text{as-dhi}\), which must have replaced an
earlier form from \(*\text{h}_3\text{s-dhi}\), cf. Av. zdī, Gk. ἰωθί .

\(\text{aś}_2\) ‘throw’

\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. \(\text{asya}\) (6), 3rd sing. \(\text{asyatu}\) (1.114.4c), 2nd dual \(\text{asyatam}\)
(7.104.25c)

\textbf{pres. med.} 2nd pl. \(\text{asyadhvam}\) (10.30.2d)

\(\text{ās}\) ‘sit’

\textbf{pres. med.} 3rd sing. \(\text{āstām}\) (2), 2nd pl. \(\text{ādhvam}\) (7.33.14c)

Both attestations of \(\text{āstām}\) occur in the repeated pāda: \(\text{barhīr na āstām ādītiḥ suputrā ‘may Aditi sit on our barhis, she of good sons’}\), 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).
Index of attested imperative forms

i ‘go’


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

The stem *inu*- is effectively the causative of *i*, as in i.e. 6.10.7a ví dvēsāmsīnuhí 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.140

Dunkel (1985) suggests that the form *étā* which appears in such expressions as 5.45.5a *éto nv ādyā suddhyō bhāvāma* ‘come let us have good thoughts today’ and 8.24.19a *éto 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 *ēti* in such Greek examples as *ēti ... ἔκκουσον* ‘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 piḥa* ‘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 *āvīhi*. If it really were a full-grade imperative form the accent would be on the second syllable, cf. *yandhī*. 141

---

140 For further discussion of the connection between *eti* and *inoti* see Mayrhofer (1986: s. AY¹, AY²), Joachim, (1978: 39f. and 138). Also Insler (1972).  

141 As shown on page 23, the ending -dhi is always accented, except for the single form *yōdhi*, if indeed this form does have the -dhi ending. Insler (1972) has suggested that imperative forms with full-grade roots and root-accent could have existed, although he is unable to provide a convincing example. Since the form *ēhi* is preserved only in an archaic formula, then maybe this is what we are dealing with here. On the same subject, note the accentuation *ēhi* which occurs in the quoted form at ŚBM 1.1.4.12 and ŚBK 2.1.3.16 (see page 71). Since the other forms in the same sentence are accented on their preverbs, this may show that the composers of that text did not recognise a preverb in this form. See also page 123.
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\textit{i} {} \textit{2, inv} see \textit{i}

\textit{iṅg} ‘set in motion’
\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. \textit{iṅgaya} (4.57.4d)

\textit{idh} ‘kindle’
\textbf{pres. med.} 2nd pl. \textit{indhvaṃ} (10.101.1b), 3rd pl. \textit{indhatām} (1.170.4b)

\textit{īl} ‘come to rest’
\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd pl. \textit{īlāyata} (1.191.6d)

\textit{iṣ} \textit{1} ‘send’
\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd pl. \textit{iṣyata} (1.15.9c)

\textit{iṣ} \textit{2} ‘seek’
\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. \textit{iṣaḥ} (4), \textit{iṣatu} (7.102.1c), \textit{iṣāta} (7.104.18a)
\textbf{pres. med.} 2nd sing. \textit{iḥaṃva} (10.10.10d)

\textit{iṣaṇy}-'drive’
\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. \textit{iṣaṇya} (3.50.3d), 2nd pl. \textit{iṣaṇyata} (5.52.14d)
For a discussion and bibliography on the connection of this stem to \textit{iṣ} \textit{1} ‘send’ see Mayrhofer (1986: s. E/S).

\textit{iṅkhaya}-'to swing, rock’
\textbf{pres act.} 2nd sing. \textit{iṅkhaya} (3)
All three attestations of this form are in 9.52.3: \textit{carur nā yās tām iṅkhaya-, īndo nā dānam iṅkhaya / vadhaṅ nāve ṣaṅkhaya ‘that which is like a pot, rock it, O drop, rock the gift, rock with weapons, O weapons bearer’.

\textit{īd} ‘praise’
\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. \textit{īḍiya} (8.23.1a)

\textit{īr} see \textit{ṛ}
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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 anít root $u$, *$h₂y-ēfe*-. From this present stem were later on secondarily derived such forms as the future $vayiyánt$-142. The form $vaya$ occurs only in 10.130.1d: *prá vayápa vayéty āsate tátê ‘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 ghrtá-, 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 gávyáitum $ukṣatam$ ghrtáéna ‘sprinkle our pastures with ghee’, or + acc. + dat. as in 1.87.2d ā ghrtátm $ukṣatā$ mádhuvarṇam árcate ‘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 ghrtá- : 5.83.8c ghrtáéna dyáváprthiví vy $undhi$ ‘moisten the heavens and the earth with ghee’ apparently addressed to the rain, and 5.42.3ab úd īraya kavítama $kavīn$-m, unáttainam abhí mádhvá ghrtáéna ‘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).

---

**uruṣy-** ‘protect’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pres. act.</td>
<td>2nd sing.</td>
<td>uruṣyá</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd sing.</td>
<td>uruṣyatu</td>
<td>8.47.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd dual.</td>
<td>uruṣyátam</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd dual.</td>
<td>uruṣyátam</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd pl.</td>
<td>uruṣyata</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd pl.</td>
<td>uruṣyántu</td>
<td>8.25.10c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**uş** ‘burn’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pres. act.</td>
<td>2nd sing.</td>
<td>oṣa</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd sing.</td>
<td>oṣatāt</td>
<td>4.4.4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd dual.</td>
<td>oṣatāt</td>
<td>4.4.4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd pl.</td>
<td>oṣatam</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd pl.</td>
<td>oṣantu</td>
<td>8.25.10c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**र्‍य** ‘go, move, rise’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pres. act.</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>iyarta</td>
<td>8.7.13c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres. med.</td>
<td>2nd sing.</td>
<td>īṛṣva</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd dual.</td>
<td>īṛṭām</td>
<td>8.73.1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd pl.</td>
<td>īṛdhvam</td>
<td>1.113.16a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres. caus.</td>
<td>2nd sing.</td>
<td>īrpayati</td>
<td>2.33.4c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd dual.</td>
<td>īrpayatam</td>
<td>7.104.1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres. X</td>
<td>2nd sing.</td>
<td>īraya</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd dual.</td>
<td>īrayatam</td>
<td>10.39.2b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The single attestation of the transitive reduplicated present impv. īyarta ( <*h3ĕ-ĕr-te>) is 8.7.13 ā no īrayām . . . īyartā marato divāh ‘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 ॆद ṭṛṣva nāry abhi jiivalokām ‘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 asme rayām ērayadhvam ‘bring us the good-heroed property’ and is derived from the middle voice present īrte, which had been reanalysed as belonging to a root īr.

Jamison (1983: 124) derives arpayati from the root *h2er ‘to fit’, whence also e.g. Greek ὅρφεῖκος. Mayrhofer (1986: s. āram) appears to agree with this (despite treating all the finite forms together under AR?), however synchronically speaking the two roots *h2er and *h3er have merged into a single root *r143.

**र्‍य2** ‘arrive, hit’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pres. act.</td>
<td>3rd sing.</td>
<td>rchatu</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd pl.</td>
<td>rchantu</td>
<td>10.87.15c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

143 See Mayrhofer (1986: s. AR?), LIV under 1. *h2er.
This verb is unattested outside of Book 10. The two examples of the form /rchatu/ both occur in the same verse, 10.164.5de: yāṃ dvīṃmās tāṁ sā ṛchatu, yó no dvēṣṭi tām ṛchatu ' he whom we hate, may it hit him, he who hates us, may it hit him’.

/ṛc/ ‘sing’

pres. act. 2nd sing. äche (25), 3rd sing.  acompaña (10.36.5b), 2nd pl.  acompaña (24). 3rd pl.  acompaña (2)

d ‘agitare, slay’

pres. act. ḍanta (7.104.24c), caus. pres. ardaya (2)

dh ‘attain, thrive’

-ya-pres. ḍhymā (10.85.27a)

Only occurs once at 10.85.27a iḥā priyām prajyā te sām ṛdhymā. 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 prajyā refers to the scope of prosperity, as in the case of other verbs of similar meaning, such as ṛṣya-. 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, ḍhnoti, as well as a -na- infix present ḍhatha, for which no imperatives are attested.

/ej/ ‘move’

pres. act. 3rd sing. échange (5.78.7c)

kăn ‘enjoy’

iṣ-aor. caniṣṭām (7.70.4a)

perf. act. cākandhi (10.147.3a), cākantu (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 cākandhi see Kümmel (2000: 130f.). For the irregular full grade in the root of this form see p. 25.
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$k\rho$ ‘do’

pres. act. 2nd sing. $k\rho\nu$ (8), $kuru$ (2), $k\rho\nuh\acute{i}$ (28), $k\rho\nu\acute{t}\acute{a}$ (2.30.5d), 3rd sing. $k\rho\nu\acute{t}u$ (14), 2nd dual $k\rho\nu\acute{t}\acute{a}m$ (6), 2nd pl. $k\rho\nu\acute{t}a$ (9), $k\rho\nu\acute{t}a$ (5), $k\rho\nu\acute{t}a$ (5), 3rd pl. $k\rho\nu\acute{v}\acute{a}ntu$ (5)

pres. med. 2nd sing. $k\rho\nu\acute{sv}a$ (14), 3rd sing. $k\rho\nu\acute{t}\acute{a}m$ (2.5.7b), 2nd pl. $k\rho\nu\acute{d}h\acute{v}\acute{a}m$ (27)

root aor. act. 2nd sing. $k\acute{r}\acute{d}h\acute{i}$ (100), 2nd dual $k\acute{r}t\acute{a}m$ (16), 2nd pl. $k\acute{r}t\acute{a}$ (2), $k\acute{r}t\acute{a}$ (9), $k\acute{r}t\acute{a}$ (6)

root aor. med. 2nd sing. $k\acute{r}\acute{s}v\acute{a}$ (8), 2nd pl. $k\acute{r}\acute{d}h\acute{v}a$ (7.34.15b)

a-aor. act. 2nd dual $k\acute{r}\acute{a}t\acute{a}m$ (7.65.2b), 3rd dual $k\acute{r}\acute{a}t\acute{a}m$ (4.55.3d)

[aor. inj. $k\acute{a}$ (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 bhadrám mána $k\rho\nu\acute{sv}a$ vrtratúrye / haví $k\rho\nu\acute{sv}a$ subhágo yáthasí ‘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 áví $k\rho\nu\acute{sv}a$ daívyâny agne ‘Make your (own) divine [powers] visible, O Agni’.

The expression prá $k\rho$ (med.) + dat. means ‘make [a god] well disposed towards yourselves’, as in 1.186.10ab pró aśvínāv ávase $k\rho\nu\acute{d}h\acute{v}a$m, prá pásānaṁ svátavasó hi sánti ‘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 ny ā $kuru$ ‘make them [the cows] go back’ and 10.145.2d pátim me kévala $kuru$ ‘make my husband mine alone’. This, and the form $kur\nu$ (10.51.7a), are the only occurrences in the RV of the later present stem of the verb $k\rho$\textsuperscript{144}. The a-aorist forms are a secondary derivation from the root-aorist subjunctive stem kara-.

$k\rho\nu$ and $k\rho\nuh\acute{i}$ have a metrically complementary distribution: whereas the former – with one exception – usually appears at the end of eight-syllable lines, $k\rho\nuh\acute{i}$ generally occurs in eleven-syllable lines immediately after the caesura. $k\rho\nuh\acute{i}$ also appears twice in eight-syllable lines at the third, fourth and fifth syllable.

\textsuperscript{144} For the formation of the kar-/kur- stem see Hoffmann (1976)}
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kṛṣ ‘pull’

pres. act. I kṛṣa (5.83.7c)
pres. IV. kṛṣatu (4.57.4b), kṛṣantu (4.57.8a)
pres. med. kṛṣava (10.34.13a)

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

kṛṣ 1 ‘scatter’

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

kṛṣ 2 ‘praise’

int. pres. 2nd sing. carkṛtā (1.104.5c)

kḷp ‘put in order, fit together’

pres. med. 2nd sing. kalpasva (1.170.2d)
caus. act. pres. 2nd sing. kalpaya (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 tēbhiḥ kalpasva sādhuyā, mā naḥ samāraṇe vadhiḥ ‘Be in real harmony with them [the Maruts], do not kill us in battle’.

The causative means ‘to arrange’, as in 10.18.5cd yāthā nā pārvam āparo jāhāty, evā dhātar ōyūṃsi kalpayasam ‘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 anyēna mát pramūdaḥ 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

krand ‘cry out’

pres. act. 2nd sing. kranda (2), 3rd sing. krandatu (5.58.6)
pres. caus. 2nd sing. krandaṇa (6.47.30a)

145 See also Jamison (1983: 124.).
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**kram** ‘stride’
- **pres. act.** 2nd sing. krāma (10.164.1b)
- **pres. med.** 2nd sing. kramasva (4)
- **aor. act.** 2nd dual. kramiṣṭam (1.182.3c)

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

**kṣam** ‘pardon, be favourable’
- **pres. med.** 2nd pl. kṣāmadhvam (2)

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

**kṣar** ‘flow’
- **pres. act.** 2nd sing. ksāra (4), 3rd pl. kṣarantu (9.86.37c)

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

---

146 For literature on the stems *krānatī : 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 kāprn narah kapṛţhām īd dadhātana codāyata khudāta vājāsātaye ‘The penis, O Men, erect the penis, thrust it, insert it for the winning of booty!’

**gam** ‘go, come’
**pres. act.** 2nd sing. gācha (6), 3rd sing. gachatu (4), gachatāt (5), 2nd dual gāchatam (20), gachatām (3), 2nd pl. gachata (10.15.11a), 3rd pl. gachantu (2)
**pres. med.** 2nd sing. gachasva (2), 2nd pl. gachadhvam (10.191.2a)
**aor. act.** 2nd sing. gahi (84), gadhi (8.98.4a), 3rd sing. gantu (7), 2nd dual gatām (68), gantām (14), 2nd pl. gata (12), gánta (8), gantā (6.49.11b), gantana (9), 3rd pl. gántantu (6)
**-i/ s** **pres. impv.** 2nd dual gamiṣṭam (2)
**caus. pres.** 2nd sing. gamaya (10.152.4d), gāmaya (5.5.10c)

With the exception of the forms gachatam and gachatām, 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 gachasva pitṛbhīh sāṃ yamēna- ... sāṃ gachasva taṃvā suvārcāh ‘Come together with the fathers, with Yama ... come together with a (new) body (when you are) well-shining’
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The second person singular root-aorist form *gadhi* is a hapax legomenon, occurring only at 8.98.4a.148

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

For the ablaut variants *gata*, *gānta* and *gantā* see page 31.

For the form *gachatāt* see page 35.

**gū1 ‘go’**


**aor. act.** 2nd pl. *gāta* (3), *gātana* (5.55.9c)

[aor. inj. *gāḥ* (4)]

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

**gū2 ‘sing’**

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *gāya* (7), 2nd pl. *gāyata* (28)

**aor. act.?** 2nd pl. *gātā* (8.2.38)

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

148 See Lubotsky (1995: 133ff.).
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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 śakune sāma gāyasi ‘O bird, you sing like an udgār singing a sāman’or 10.71.11b gāyatṛām tvo gāyati sākvarīśu ‘the one sings a song in Śakvarī stanzas’, it can also mean “to sing of, praise” as in 1.21.2 tā yajñēśu prā śaṁsata-, indrāgni śumbhatā naraḥ / tā gāyatṛēśu 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 jāyamānau juṣanta-, imaū tāmāṃsi gūhatām āju/tā ‘(All the gods) were happy when these two gods were born, these two abolished the unhappy darkness.’
For long vowel in stem as generalisation of gūdhā- see Gotō (1987: 296 fn. 704).

**gūrdhay-** ‘praise’
**pres. act.** 2nd sing. gūrdhaya (8.19.1a)
Appears only at 8.19.1ab tām gūrdhayā 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. jāgrhí (4), 2nd dual jāgrtam (2)
**aor. act.** 2nd dual jīgrtám (5), 2nd pl. jīgrtá (7.57.6d)
The long vowel in jāgrhí is a result of a laryngeal at the beginning of the root, *h₁ger*.
The aor. impv. examples of this verb are all transitive, the reduplicated stem ájīgar- being the aorist of the pres. caus. stem jāraya-, which is attested three times in the RV; e.g. 1.158.2c jīgrtám asmé revātih pūraṇḍhīh, ‘make rich wealth awaken for us’.
The aorist occurs twice with pūraṇḍhīh ‘riches’ as direct object (1.158.2c and 4.50.11c, which is repeated several times elsewhere) and once with rāyāh ‘property’ (7.57.6d). The examples of the perfect and present impvs. are intransitive. jarasva means ‘wake up’, while jāgrhi means ‘be watchful, awake’.
The aor. impv. forms have a short reduplicating syllable, cf. didhrtam (q.v. under dhr).

**gṛbh/ghrí** ‘seize’
**pres. act.** 2nd sing. gṛbhāyā (13), 2nd pl. gṛbhāyāta (2)
**pres. IX act.** 2nd sing. gṛhā (10.103.12b), 3rd sing. gṛhātu (4.57.7a)
For ‘deverbative’ gṛbhāya- besides gṛhṇāti see LIV s. gṛrebha₂ and bibliography in Gotō (1988: fn. 5), Mayrhofer (1986: s. GRABH). For class IX impvs. in -āna, see p. 28.

**gṛ)** ‘praise, welcome’
**pres. IX act.** 2nd sing. gṛṇīhí (9), 3rd sing. gṛṇātu (2), 3rd dual. gṛṇātām (10.47.8c), 2nd pl. gṛṇāta (10.15.6b)
**pres. I med.** 2nd sing. jarasva (7.9.6c), 3rd sing. jaraṭām (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: puroldhāṃ pacatyāṃ, juśāsvendrā gurasva ca ‘Enjoy the cooked rice-cake, and welcome it, Indra’. For its classification as an

---


152 Jamison (1983: 126f.).
aorist imperative, constructed from \(*g\=r\=s\=v\=a\) on the basis of the form \(ju\=s\=a\=s\=v\=a\), see Gotô (1987: 154, fn. 242). Joachim (1978: 75f.) suggests the forms could be derived from \(g\=r\=s\#\) ‘to swallow’. For the possibility that the root \(*g\=r\=d\=h\) may be secondarily derived from this root, see page 105.

**gopāy-** ‘guard’

*pres. act.* 2nd dual *gopāyātām* (6.74.4d)

**gras** ‘swallow’

*pres. med.* 2nd dual *grāsetām* (3.53.3c)

**ghuṣ** ‘hear’

*aor. si-impv.* *ghōśi* (2)

See discussion of this controversial form on page 46.

**cakṣ** ‘look’

*aor. -si impv.* 2nd sing. *cakṣi* (2)

*aor. med.* 2nd sing. *cakṣya* (3)

*caus.* 2nd sing. *cakṣaya* (2)

Almost all occurrences of this secondary root are middle voice: e.g. 7.104.25ab *prāti cakṣya vi cakṣya-, -indraś ca soma jāgṛtam* ‘Look here, look around, O Indra and Soma, be aware’.

The active -si-impv. *cakṣi* means, on one occasion, with the preverb *prāti* ‘to show’ 7.3.6cd *divō nā te tanyātār eti śūṣmaś, citrō nā sārāḥ prāti cakṣi bhānūm* ‘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 suparṇo ‘va cakṣi soma* ‘Look down like a heavenly eagle, O Soma’.

The causative form *cakṣaya* appears twice with the preverb *prā* with the meaning ‘to reveal’ or even ‘illuminate’: 1.134.3def *prā bodhayā pāraṁdhīm, jārā ā sasatīm iva / prā cakṣaya rōdasī vāsāvēsāsah* ‘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 *vī caṣṭe* ‘appear’. No such transitive use with *vī* occurs in the imperative form.
**cat** ‘hide’

caus. med. 2nd sing. *cätāyasva* (3)

The form *cätāyasva* + acc. + abl. means ‘to make X hide from Y’¹⁵³ i.e. to drive away’: 2.33.2ed *vy āśmad dvēśo vitarām vy āṁho*, *vy āṁivāś cätāyasvā viśūcīḥ* ‘drive all hostilities, all trouble far away from us, all distress in all directions’.

**canasya-** ‘take pleasure in’

pres. act. 2nd dual *canasyāṭam* (1.3.1c)

A “tertiary derivation” denominate verb from the noun *cánas-*, which in turn is from the verbal root *kan*¹⁵⁴; cf. *manasya- < mānas- < man-.*

**car** ‘move’

pres. act. 2nd sing. *cara* (11), 3rd pl. *carantu* (3)

**ci** ‘clear, pile’

pres. act. 2nd sing. *cinuhí* (6.53.4b), 3rd sing. *cinotu* (10.87.5d)

root aor. act. 2nd pl. *citana* (4.37.7b), 3rd pl. *ciyántu* (1.90.4b)

iṣ-aor. active 2nd dual *caviṣṭam* (6.67.8d)

The form *caviṣṭam* is another of those derived from superlative adjectives; cf. *caniṣṭam* and *gamiṣṭam.*¹⁵⁵ It occurs once at 6.67.8d *yuvāṁ dāśāśe vī caviṣṭam āṁhaḥ* ‘you two clear away the troubles of the worshipper’. With the preverb *vī*, the root often means ‘to clear (a path)’, as in 6.53.4ab *vī pathō vājasātaye, cinuhí vī mṛdho jahi* ‘clear the paths to the capture of booty, smite away the enemies’ and 4.37.7ab *vī no vājā rbhuksanah, pathāś citana yāṣṭave* ‘Clear the way to the sacrifice, O Vājas, O Ṙbhukṣanś’, 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. cikitsa (2)

The perfect form cikiddhī is by far the most common imperative of this verb, and has transitive meaning ‘to perceive’, as in 4.4.11c tvāṃ no asyā vācasaś cikiddhī ‘you take heed of this word for us’ and 2.43.3b tūṣṇīṃ āśinaḥ sumatiṃ cikiddhī naḥ ‘sitting quietly, perceive goodwill for us’, as does the present cetatām 10.35.1c mahī dyāvāpythivī 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 āpā prēta kuśikāś cetāyadhvam, āśvaṃ rāyē prá muṇcaṭā sudāsāḥ ‘go to his side, be attentive, let the horse of Sudās go, so he may win property’ and 8.9.10 yād vāṃ kakṣīvāḥ utā yād vyāśva, ṣṝr yād vāṃ dirghātamā juhāvā / praghyāḥ yād vāṃ vāmṛ śādaneṣv, evēd āto aśvinā cetayethām ‘When K. and the Rṣī 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)

caus. pres. 2nd sing. codāya (19), 2nd dual codāyatam (10.39.2a), 2nd pl. codāyata (10.101.12b)

Jamison (1983: 153) claims that the causative form has a generally later distribution than the synonymous simple present, and thus was used as a replacement for it. As far as the imperative is concerned, two of the four attestations of the stem coda- occur in the late Book 1. However, one of them (1.48.2d) is a repetition of 7.96.2d. In any case, the causative stem is far more common than the simple present, suggesting that Jamison is correct, whatever the distribution of the forms. While the med. is usually intransitive (‘hurries’), one example of the form codasva is transitive 8.75.6c vṛṇye codasva sūṣṭutīṃ ‘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 *jāy-* 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 rayiṁ rārāṇah, prā jāyasva prajāyā putrakāma* ‘bestowing offspring here, property here, be born with offspring, O desirous of sons’ and 10.43.9a *új jāyatām paraśūr jyōtiśā 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\textsuperscript{157}, e.g. 9.97.36d vārdhāyā vācām janāyā pūraṇḍhīm strengthen our speech, generate wealth!’ while the med. of the caus. is affective, i.e. ‘to create for oneself’\textsuperscript{158}.

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

\textit{jas} ‘go away, wither’
\textbf{-ya- pres. act.} 2nd pl. jasyata (1.191.7d)
\textbf{perf. act.} 2nd dual jajastām (2)
The transitive perf. only occurs in two instances of a repeated pāda: 4.50.11d and 7.97.9d jajastām aryō vanāśaṁ ārāṭhī ‘make the hostility of the stranger, of the aggressors disappear’. The -ya- forms are intransitive 1.191.7d sārve sākāṁ nī jasyata ‘Let all of you disappear at once’ \textsuperscript{159}.

\textit{ji} ‘win’
\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. jáya (6), 3rd sing. jayatū (6.47.26d), 2nd dual jāyatam (2), 2nd pl. jāyata (2), 3rd pl. jayantu (2)
\textbf{pres. med.} 3rd pl. jayantām (10.87.18d)
\textbf{aor. -si impv.} 2nd sing. jēśi (7)
\textbf{root aor.} (7) 2nd dual. jītam (9.7.9c)
The active forms of this verb are transitive, meaning ‘to win, capture (something)’, e.g. 8.75.12c saṁvārgam sām 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 pārā bhāgāṁ oṣadhināṁ jayantām ‘let them gamble away their share in the plants’.
An extremely interesting example is 8.89.4d hāno vytrāṁ jāyā svāḥ ‘you will smite Vṛtra, (and) win the sun’. The pāda is almost identical to 1.80.3d hāno vytrāṁ jāyā

\textsuperscript{157} Jamison (1983: 154).
\textsuperscript{158} Gotō (1987: 146 fn 206).
\textsuperscript{159} Kulikov (2001: 401).
apāḥ in which jāyā is to be read as a subjunctive jāyāḥ. The syntagma ji- svāḥ is attested elsewhere; once with an impv. – svār jaya – at 8.15.12c, and once with an imperfect – ajayaḥ svāḥ – at 10.167.1d, and, as sāryam jāyat, at 10.43.5b. ji- apāḥ is further attested at 5.30.5d making it the earlier of the two formulas to be attested. Therefore, if ji- apāḥ is the original (despite on the face of it being attested later), then one may assume that apāḥ was substituted with svāḥ, leaving the rest of the pāda undisturbed. It is possible that, as the sandhi of the visarga is unstable before /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 *jāyās svāḥ should yield *jāyāḥ svāḥ, The former explanation is to my mind more likely, as the subjunctive makes more sense in this context.

While the present stem mostly means ‘to capture’, with direct object denoting the item captured, the aorist -si impv. jeśi can also mean ‘to defeat’ in the formulaic syntagma jeśi śātrūn. 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 [asmābhyaś] śrāvo vāsūni sām jitam ‘[for us] capture glory and goods’.

jinv ‘impel’

pres. act. 2nd sing. jīna (9), 3rd sing. jīnva (4), 2nd dual jīvatam (10), jīnva (10.66.12d)

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

jīv ‘live’

pres. act. jīva (10.161.4a), jīvantu (10.18.4c)

---

160 See p. 86.
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juṣ `like’
a-aor. 2nd sing. juṣasva (58), 3rd sing. juṣatām (10.165.2c), 2nd dual juṣethām (9), 3rd dual juṣetām (5.72.3b), 2nd pl. juṣādhvam (6), 3rd pl. juṣāntām (3)
aor. si-impv. jōṣi (3)
secondary thematic aor. impv. 2nd sing. jōṣa (10.158.2a)
perf. 2nd pl. jujuṣṭana (2)
thematicised perf. 2nd dual. jujuṣṭatam (1.93.11b)
The extremely common a-aor. med. form juṣasva means ‘find favour in’ and is transitive e.g. 1.12.12c imām stōmam juṣasva nah ‘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 joy 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.\textsuperscript{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 nṭ (see also p. 27). This form only occurs once at 10.158.2ab jōṣā savitar yāṣya te, háraḥ śatām savān 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 jī

jī ‘make old’
press. act. 2nd dual jāratam (2)
va-pres. 2nd sing. jūrva (6.6.6d)
aor. act. 2nd dual jurātam (1.182.3c)
The present stem jāra- occurs only in the repeated line 7.67.10c and 7.69.8c dhattāṁ rātnāni jāratam ca sūrīn ‘give gifts, and allow the patrons to grow old.’ The form jurātam is considered by Gotō (1987: 152) to be an aorist, but is thought to be a

\textsuperscript{161} LIV s. ĝegs, Gotō (1987: 154 fn. 242).
present by Narten (1964: 121) and Joachim (1978: 83). The form is only attested once: 1.182.3c āti kramiṣṭam jurātam paṇēr āśum ‘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 bādhāsvāpā bhayā sāhobhi, spṛdho vanuyān vanūso nī jūrva ‘drive away the dangers with might, attacking the hostile ones, crush our enemies.’

jiṅā ‘know’

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

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

The middle voice impv. jānatām occurs only at 10.191.2ab, which is remarkable in that it also contains extremely rare instances of middle voice from both gam and vad: sām gachadhvaṃ sām vadadhvaṃ, sām vo 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 mṛj (< *melh₁) ‘grind’ and mlā (<*meH) ‘wither’. See Thieme (1939) and Mayrhofer (1986: s. MLĀ).

164 See Gotō (1987: 152f.).

165 LIV s. *tetk.
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 *tadž-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 bālunderbarhi (< bāndh) and sālher (< sāh). They descend from *bažh-tá and *sážh-ty respectively, with subsequent transfer of the voiced aspiration by Bartholomae’s Law. On the other hand, *važtám (vah) yields volhām, which is shown by Lubotsky (2000]) to be the result of the preceding /v/168.

*taŋ1 ‘stretch’

pres. act. 2nd sing. tanu (1.120.11a), tanuhi (5)

pres. med. 2nd sing. tanuśva (5), 2nd pl. tanudhvam (2)

Both tanuhi and tanuśva 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 bow string, or somebody else’s, e.g. 4.4.5c áva sthirā tanuhi yātuḥjānāṃ ‘Slacken the bow strings of those driven by sorcerers’. and 2.33.14cd áva sthirā maghāvadbhyas tanuśva, midhvas tokāya tānayāya mṛla ‘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 á: 10.120.4c ājīyo dhṛṣṇo sthirām á tanuśva ‘(Ever) braver, stretch your bowstring, O daring one.’

*taŋ2 ‘thunder’, see 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.
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**tap** ‘burn’

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

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

Act. may be both transitive, as the first two instances of the following example, and intransitive as – apparently – in the third: 3.18.2abc, tápo śv āgne āntarāḥ amitrān, tápā śāṃsam āraraṣṭaḥ párasya / tápo vaso cikitānō acitān ‘burn our closer enemies, O Agni, burn the word of our further enemy, and burn, O good one, seeing the unseen ones.’ The very rare middle-voice is affective – ‘to heat for oneself’169, as in 10.16.4ab ajó bhāgās tápasā tām tapasva, tām te śocīs tapatu tām 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 máhi sthūrāḥ śaśayāḥ rádho āhrayam, prāṣanvāya nī tośaya ‘drive great, mighty, unbeatable, bold favour to Praskanva.’171.

---

169 See also Gotō (1987: 159f.).

170 Gotō (1987: 166ff.).

171 See also Jamison (1983: 128.).
Index of attested imperative forms

*trd* ‘pierce, drill’

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

*trp* ‘be satiated’

**pres. act. VII** 2nd sing. *trpṇuhi* (2), 2nd dual *trpṇutām* (8.35.10a), 2nd pl. *trpṇuta* (1.110.1d)

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

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

**caus. med.** 2nd dual *tarpayethām* (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 *indra sōmasya vrṣabhāsya trpṇuhi* ‘Indra, be satiated with the bull-like Soma’, 4.46.2c vāyo sutāsya trmpatam ‘O Vāyu [and Indra] be satiated from the pressed (Soma)’. The active causative *tarpāya* occurs with an accusative direct object and the genitive again denoting the item with which one is satisfied: 1.54.9c vy āśnuhi tarpāyā kāmam eśām ‘attain, fulfill your desire from them (cups full of Soma)’. In other words, it is a true causative of the intransitive present stem with the basic valency maintained throughout – ‘cause your desire to be satisfied from them’. The med. caus. has the same valency, and appears to mean the same. 1.17.3ab *anukāmām tarpayethām, īndrāvaruṇa rōyā ā* ‘satisfy your desire for property’.

*țf* ‘pass’

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


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

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

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

**s-aor.** *tāriṣtam* (2)

[aor. inj. *tāriḥ* (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 pārasya ādhi saṃvātō ‘varāḥ abhy ā tara ‘from the further area, pass over to those (who are) nearer’. It can also mean ‘overcome’ 9.59.3b viśvāni duritā tara ‘overcome all dangers’. The second, which only appears with preverbs, has meanings which vary according to the preverb used, but in all cases the verb is transitive with a concrete object. In a large proportion of its occurrences, it appears in the formula prā tīrṇa dūṣaḥ, ‘extend (someone’s) lifespan’.

The stem tūrva-, also transitive, means ‘overcome’, and only appears once in the imperative: 6.50.10cd ātriṇā mahās tāmaso ‘mumukṣaṇaḥ, tārvatāḥ narā duritād abhiyā. This example is problematic. It could mean ‘as you freed Atri from the great darkness, bring us out of the danger which is in front of us, O Heroes’173, but this is not consistent with the meaning of this form in its other occurrences. This has led Gotō (1987: 163 fn. 258) to suggest that this example is parenthetical: ‘überwindet, ihr Männer!’173. Grassmann (1872: s. muc) takes the form mumukṣaṇaḥ, 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.

tūrva is a nonce-formation, appearing once at 8.99.5 tvām tūrva taruṣyatāḥ ‘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 °-tūrva-, as in śatrutārva- ‘overcoming the enemy’ and vrtraṭūrva- ‘overcoming V.’.

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

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

174 Narten (1964: 128ff.).

Index of attested imperative forms

\section*{trā 'save'}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{lll}
\textbf{med. pres.} & 2nd sing. & \textit{trāyasva} (4), 3rd sing. \textit{trāyatām} (3), 2nd dual \textit{trāyethām} (5.70.3b), 3rd dual \textit{trāyetām} (10.35.3b), 2nd pl. \textit{trāyadhvam} (10.63.11b), 3rd pl. \textit{trāyantām} (2)
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{lll}
\textbf{s-aor. med.} & 2nd sing. & \textit{trāsva} (2), 2nd pl. \textit{trādhvam} (2)
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

The forms \textit{trāsva} and \textit{trādhvam} must be sigmatic aorists and not root aorists both because of the rest of the paradigm, which is sigmatic, and also because of the parallel Gāthā Avestan form \textit{θράζδαμ} \cite{narten1964}. Both attestations of the form \textit{trādhvam} occur at 2.29.6cd: \textit{trādhvam no devā nijūro vṛkasya, trādhvam kartād avapādo yajatrāḥ} ‘Save us from the crushing (jaws) of the wolf, save us from falling into the pit, O worship-worthy ones’

\section*{daṃś ‘bite’}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{lll}
\textbf{pres. act.} & 2nd sing. & \textit{daśa} (6.31.3c)
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\section*{dakṣ ‘put right’}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{lll}
\textbf{pres. act.} & 2nd sing. & \textit{dākṣata} (2)
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

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

\section*{dad ‘hold’}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{lll}
\textbf{pres. act.} & 3rd sing. & \textit{dadatām} (3.53.17c)
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

This is a secondary root derived from \textit{dā} ‘give’ \cite{gotou1987}. Cf. also \textit{dadhantu} from \textit{dhā}, in addition to the regular \textit{dadhatu}, which shows a similar kind of thematic derivation, although in the case of \textit{dad} the change in the root’s meaning justifies the classification as a separate root. The imperative appears only at 3.53.17c \textit{īndraḥ pātyāy ādhatām śārītor} ‘let Indra protect the two wagon-supports (?) from breakage’.

\section*{dambh ‘annihilate’}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{lll}
\textbf{pres. caus. act.} & 2nd sing. & \textit{dambhaya} (2)
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

---

\footnotesize


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 *daśasyántam* (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 cānas and mānas respectively. See Mayrhofer (1986: *ad loc.*).

**dah** ‘burn’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *dāha* (14), *dahatāt* (3.18.1d), 3rd pl. *dahantu* (10.87.12d)

**aor. si-impv.** *dhák/sunderdoti* (3)

For the form *dhaksi* see page 49. The unclear form *daksi*, which occurs only at 2.1.10c, has been connected with this verb, but the semantic environment in which it occurs is unsuitable for this to be the case. For further information and examples, see page 49.

**dā₁** ‘give’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *daddhí* (8), *dehí* (10), *dattāt* (10.16.2b), 3rd sing. *dādātu* (17),

2nd dual *dattam* (1.34.6b), 3rd dual *dattām* (10.84.7b), 2nd pl. *datta* (3), *dādāta* (7.57.6c), *dādātana* (10.36.10b)

**aor. act.** 3rd sing. *dātu* (2)

[aor. inj. *dāḥ* (17)]

For a discussion of the forms *dehí* and *daddhí* see p.29.

Another problem with the verb *dā* is the lack of a 2nd pers. sing. aor. impv., for which see p. 37ff. and 42f.

**dā₂** ‘distribute’

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

**diś** ‘show’

**Index of attested imperative forms**

*didístana* 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 *didístha* would have ended in *-at* had it been a perfect.

**dī₁** ‘shine’

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

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

Cf. *pīpihí, 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 *didihí*, which has the same forms as present impvs. such as *piprīhí, mimīhí*, etc. Also brought into consideration is the thematicised perf. impv. *didayatam*, which is probably constructed on the basis of the subjunctive stem¹⁷⁸. 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. ¹⁷⁹

**dī₂** ‘fly’

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

*duvasy* ‘honor (with gifts)’


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. *deih₂*).
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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 *dhenūr iva pāyo asm/amacronacute su dhuk/sunderdotva* ‘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/amacronacute va dhukṣata dvitā, dhenū/underdot ca viśvādohasam / ī/sunderdota/underdot ca viśvābhajasam* ‘For Bharādvāja now milk the cow who gives all milk, and the all-nourishing nourishment.’.

For the form *duhām* see p. 35.

**dr** ‘pierce’
- **si-impv.** 2nd sing. *dārśi* (10)
- **int.** 2nd sing. *dard/underdot hi* (3), 3rd sing. *dard/underdot tu* (7.55.4b)
- **perf.** 2nd sing. *dād/underdot hī* (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-*. *dād/underdot hī* is the only form of the perfect of this verb with a long reduplication vowel. The form itself is only attested once, at 1.133.6a *avār mahā indra dād/underdot hī śrudh/imacronacute na/hunderdot* ‘blast the great ones down, O Indra, hear us’ and cannot be differentiated in function from a pres. impv. Given this, it does seem like that *dād/underdot hī* could be some kind of nonce-variant of the intensive present *dard/underdot hi*.

**dṛh** ‘fasten, be fastened’
- **pres. act. I** 2nd pl. *dṛmhata* (10.101.8d)
- **pres IV act.** 2nd sing. *dṛhya* (3)
- **pres. IV med.** 2nd sing. *dṛhyasva* (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 susroč camasō dṛṇhātā tām ‘let your cup not leak, fasten it!’ while `dṛhya-` is intransitive, meaning ‘be fast, strong’, as in 3.30.15a `indra 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 `indra dṛhyasva pār asī` ‘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. act. 2nd sing. dṛāva` (8), `3rd sing. dṛāvatām` (3.14.3a), `3rd pl. dṛāvantu` (2)

`pres. caus. 2nd sing. dṛāvāya` (8.4.11a)

The causative form occurs once with the meaning ‘let flow’: 8.4.11ab `ādhvaryo dṛāvāyā tvām, sōmam indraḥ pipāsati` ‘Adhvaryu, let the Soma flow, Indra wants to drink’. The intransitive stem `dṛavā-` occurs several times in Book 8 in the seemingly formulaic sequence `ēhi dṛavā pība`, as for example 8.17.11 `ayāṁ ta indra sōmo, nīpūto ādhi barhiśi / ēhīm asyā dṛavā pība` ‘This is your Soma, purified on the altar-grass, come, hurry, drink it’.

`dhanv` ‘run’

`va-pres. 2nd sing. dhanvā` (12), `2nd pl. dhanvantu` (4)

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 *dhenh₁²¹⁸⁵, by the time of the RV it had become a root in its own right, as shown by forms such as the perfect dadhané and the aorist ádhanviṣur²¹⁸⁶.

**dham** 'blow'

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

Appears once, with transitive function: 10.145.2cd sapátāṁ me pārā dhama, pātim me kēvalaṁ kuru 'Blow away my co-wife²¹⁸⁷, make my husband mine alone'

**dhā** 'put, place, give'

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. dhehí (64), dhattā (3.8.1c), 3rd sing. dádhātu (16), 2nd dual dhattám (40), 3rd dual dhattām (10.184.2d), 2nd pl. dhattá (12), dhattána (5), dádhāta (14), dádhātana (11), dhetana (2), 3rd pl. dadhatu (7.51.1d), dadhantu (7.62.6b)

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

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

**aor. med.** 2nd sing. dhi/sunderdotvā (8)

**perf. med.** 2nd sing. dadhi/sunderdotvā (6), 2nd pl. dadhidhvam (3)

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

**desid.** 3rd pl. didhi/sunderdotantu (3.8.6d)

[aor. inj. dhāh (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 dhehí see p. 29. With the exception of dhehí, the only present form which has no parallel elsewhere is dhetana, which must have been formed analogically to dhehí. dhā is such a well-attested verb that it has a full complement of full- and zero-grade second

---

²¹⁸⁵ Hollifield (1978: 180ff.).

²¹⁸⁶ See also Gotō (1987: 178ff).

²¹⁸⁷ For a study of the meaning of the word sapāṇi, 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 vyktvā āpi dhatsvāsān ‘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 divi śrāvāṇasy uttamānī dhīṣva ‘take (for yourself) the highest glories’, and 3.6.6a ghṛtasnvāṇā rōhiṭā dhurī 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 dadhi/sunderdotvā and dadhidhvam may actually belong to the reduplicated present. On purely formal grounds he classifies them as perfects, because the dhadhī- 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 dadhi/sunderdotv/amacronacute ja/tunderdothāre sutā/munderdot, sómam indra váre/nunderdotyam ‘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 madhyāndinam pāri / śraddhāṃ sūryasya nimāci, śrāddhe śrād dhāpayehā naḥ ‘We call on Belief in the morning, on Belief in the afternoon, on Belief at the setting of the sun, O Belief, make us believe here’.

The desiderative didhi/sunderdotantu appears once at 3.8.6cd té devāsah svāravas tathivāṃsaḥ, prajāvad asmē didhiśantu 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’,\(^{189}\) e.g. 9.49.4a pavítraṃ dhāva dhārayā ‘flow through the sieve in a stream’.

**dhāva**

See **dhū**

**dhunay** ‘rush’

**pres. act.** dhunayantām (3.55.16a)

**dhū** ‘shake, mix’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. dhūnuhi (3), 2nd pl. dhūnuta (1)

**them. pres.** 2nd dual dhūvatam, 2nd pl. dhūvata

The stem dhūnu- is transitive, meaning ‘to shake’, 3.45.4cd vṛksāṃ pavāvām phālam ankāvā dhūnuhi-, āśvīra sampāraṇaṃ vāsū ‘O Indra, shake down helpful goodness, as [one shakes] a tree, ripe with fruit’. Gotō (1987: 186) shows that the form ā dhāva- is a technical term used to describe part of the process of preparing Soma, e.g. 8.1.17ab sōta hī sōnam ādribhir ēm enam apsū dhāvata ‘Press it with stones, and ? it in water’. The precise nature of the action, in his opinion, cannot be ascertained, although it may mean ‘shake’ or ‘mix with water’. 1.109.4cd tāv aśvinā bhadrāhastā supaṃti ā dhāvatam mādhunā pṛkṣām apsū ‘You two Aśvins, of the blessed hands, having good hands, shake it with honey, mix it in water’\(^{190}\), probably gives an indication that this interpretation is correct, as it is more or less synonymous with prc ‘to mix’.

**dhūrv** ‘destroy’

**pres. act.** 3rd pl. dhūrvanta (6.75.19c)

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

---


\(^{190}\) Or possibly, ‘shake (it), mix it with honey, in the water’.
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túrva- from tf (q.v.)\(^{191}\). Lubotsky (1997)\(^2\), on the other hand, finds that the sequence *-urv- is regularly lengthened when accented.

\textit{dhṛ} ‘hold’

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

\textbf{med. pres.} 2nd dual dhārāyethām (6.74.1a), 2nd pl. dhārayadhvam (10.70.5d)

\textbf{aor.} 2nd dual didhṛtam (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. \textit{dēr}, quoting the unpublished dissertation by J. Bendahan, asserts that these forms are an original reduplicated present, which was interpreted as an aorist on this basis. A further factor in the shaping of the forms of this root is undoubtedly its tendency to mimic the forms of the root gr, ‘be awake, awaken’ (q.v.). Thus jārāya- : dhārāya, jāgāra : dādhāra, dājgar : dādhar, jīgṛtām : didhṛtām and even jāgṛvi- : dādhrvi-. Since the lengthening of the reduplicating vowel in forms such as jāgāra and jāgṛvi- can be shown to stem from a root-initial laryngeal, and since the root \textit{dhṛ} probably does not have a laryngeal at the beginning, then the original must be gr, and \textit{dhṛ} the mimic.

\textit{dhṛṣ} ‘attack, be brave’

\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. dhṛṣṇuh (1.80.3a)

Occurs only once, at 1.80.3ab prehī abhīhi dhṛṣṇuhī, nā te vājro nī yaṃsate ‘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, \textit{dhṛṣ} must here be a verb of motion too, meaning “attack”. He sees the same meaning at 1.183.4a: mā vāṃ vīko mā vṛkṛ ā dadhrṣīt ‘Neither the he-wolf nor the she-wolf shall attack you two’.

\textit{nakṣ} ‘reach, attain’

\textbf{pres. med.} 2nd sing. nakṣasva (8.54.7c)

\(^{191}\) See also LIV s. *dēger.
This is a secondary root, derived from *naś, probably from an unattested aor. subj. *náksati. See p. 49 under nakṣi.

**nabh** ‘pierce, burst’

**pres. med.** 3rd pl. nābhantām (40)

This is the only attested form of this root in the RV, although others occur in later texts. Although it is attested 40 times, it actually only appears in two obviously related formulae: nābhantām anyakē same, ‘let all the others (or foreigners) be destroyed’ which occurs 10 times in 8.39, 11 times in 8.40, 10 times in 8.41 and three times in 8.42, and fyākā . . . nābhantām anyakēśām ‘let the bowstrings of the foreigners be destroyed’, which occurs six times in 10.133.

**nam** ‘bend, bow’

**pres. act.** nama (2)

**pres. med.** namesva (8.75.5b), namadhvam (2), namantām (5)

The active forms are generally transitive, while the middle-voice forms are intransitive, e.g. 1.129.5a nī sā namaṇḍitaṁ kāyasya cīt ‘Bend down anyone’s arrogance’, and 3.33.9c nī sā namadhvam bhāvatā supārāḥ ‘bend over, become easy to cross’. However, in 10.142.6c uc chvaṇcasva nī 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 śvaṇcasva which precedes it, suggesting that ‘the repetition of the middle ending immediately after uc śvaṇcasva might be regarded as a superfluity and therefore be avoided’. 193 Cf. the use of the hapax active pāva together with pāvasva, under pā, p. 135.

The middle voice with the preverb ā is affective194, i.e. ‘bend for oneself’, e.g. 8.75.5bc ā namaṇsva sāhūtibhiḥ / nēdiyo yajñāṁ angiraḥ ‘bend him nearer to the (your own) sacrifice with invocations, O Āṅgiras.’

---

192 For what little is known about this root see Mayrhofer (1986: s. **NABH**).

193 The synonymity of the roots nam and śvaṇic was described by Hoffmann (1960).

194 Gotō loc. cit.
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namasy- ‘worship’
pres. act. 2nd sing. namasyá (5), 2nd pl. namasyáta (3)
Denominative stem derived from námas- ‘homage’, which is of course in turn derived from the root nam. Cf. canasy-, daśasy- etc.

naśi ‘attain’
pres. act. 2nd sing. aśnúhi (3), 3rd sing. aśnotu (3), 2nd dual aśnutam (2), 3rd pl. aśnúvantu (2)
aor. si-impv. 2nd sing. nakśi (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 náśya- 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. nocēre assure the antiquity of these forms. The pres. act. is intransitive, e.g.:

10.97.13d sākā/munderdo naśya
nih/amacronacutekayā ‘disappear together with the snowstorm’, while the causative means ‘make disappear’ 1.50.11cd ḫṛdgām mána sūrya, harimāṇam ca nāśaya ‘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 priy/amacronacute didi/sunderdot/tunderdotana, sāro ninikta āśmībhīḥ ‘show kindness, wash [our sins?] away with the suns rays’.

nah2 'bind'

naś1 'attain'

naś2 'perish'

nah 'bind'

nij 'clean'
**ni** ‘lead’

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

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

-**si impv néṣi** (10)

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

**nud** ‘push’

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

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

The active form nudata is one of only three active forms attested for this verb, the others being an imperfect anudaḥ and a participle nudān. All of the active forms are limited solely to Book 10. The middle voice forms are transitive and usually occur with words meaning ‘enemies,’ such as mfēḥ, 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 ávasṛṣṭā pārā pata, śāravye ... ‘having been released, fly away, O arrow ...’ or 5.78.1-3c haṁśāv iva 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 pat means ‘to fall’: áva svéḍā iváḥ́ito, viśvak patantu didyávah ‘May the arrows fall all around like drops of sweat.’ The aorist only occurs once and is undifferentiated in meaning: 1.88.1d váyo ná paptáitśumáyáh ‘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. spāśáyasva (1.176.3c)

This root splits neatly between those forms which don’t have the initial /s/ – i.e. the pres. and impf. – and those that do, which are the aorist áspaśa, the perfect paspaśé and the med. caus. spāśáyasva. There is also a ppp. ánu-spaśta. 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.
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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 drś, with the spaś forms having diverged semantically sufficiently to be considered separate. Thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>See, look</th>
<th>Watch over, spy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pres.</td>
<td>paśyati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aor.</td>
<td>ádaṛṣṭam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>dadāṛṣṭa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pres. middle-voice impv. of paś means ‘to look’ in its one attestation: 8.33.19a adhāḥ paśyasva mópāri ‘look down not up’, while the active is transitive, as in e.g.: 6.9.4a ayāṁ hōṁ prathamāḥ paśyatemāṁ ‘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’.

**pāḥ** ‘protect’

| pres. act. | 2nd sing. pāḥ (70), 3rd sing. pātu (35), 2nd dual pātām (12), 3rd dual pātām (1.185.10c), 2nd pl. pāta (82), 3rd pl. pāntu (4) |

This is an extremely well-attested root. However the huge number of attestations of the 2nd pl. form is misleading, because it only appears in the typical hymn ending of Book 7 yūyāṁ pāta svastībhīḥ sādā nāḥ ‘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 drś.
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pā́2 'drink'

pres. act. 2nd sing. pība (118), 3rd sing. pībatu (7), 2nd dual pībatam (43), 2nd pl. pībata (9), 3rd pl. pībantu (4)
pres. med. 2nd sing. pībasva (4.35.7c), 2nd pl. pībadhvam (3)
root aor. 2nd sing. pāhí (25), 2nd dual pātám (4), 2nd pl. pātá (3)
caus. act. pāyáya (4)

The pres. impv. of pā́ is another hugely attested form, mostly, of course in reference to drinking Soma. It is usually transitive, with an accusative object pībā́ sōmam ... (passim) but also commonly occurs with a partitive genitive object, as in e.g. 8.37.1g pībā́ sōmasya vajrivaḥ '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 rhhūḥhīḥ pībasya ratnadēbhiḥ, sākhyār yāñ indra cakṛṣī sukṛtyā ‘drink together with the Rhbus, who bring gifts, O Indra, whom you made your friends, on account of their good deeds.’ In the same hymn, the form pībadhvam is also attested: 4.35.9d sám mādebhir indrīyēbhīḥ pībadhvam ‘(O Rhus) drink together, with the exhilarations of Indra’. The fourth attestation is with the preverb ví: 3.53.10cd devēbhir viprāḥ rṣaya nrcakṣaso, ví pībadhvam kuśikāḥ somyām 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 ví 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 sujīhva 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 pība is one of only two imperatives to appear in āmreḍīta, at 2.11.11a: pībā-pibēd indra śūra sómam ‘Drink, drink the Soma, O Indra, O Hero.’

*pinv* see pī

piś ‘carve, paint’

pres. act. 3rd sing. pīṃśatu (10.184.1b), 2nd pl. pīṃśata (10.53.7b)

them. aor. 2nd sing. piśā (7.18.2c)

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

piś ‘trample, crush’

pres. act. 2nd pl. pīnasṭana (7.104.18b)

pī ‘swell’

pres. act. 2nd sing. pīva (4), 2nd dual pīnvatam (9), 3rd dual pīnvatām (6.70.6a), 2nd pl. pīvata (5.83.6b)

pres. med. 2nd sing. pīnvasva (3.3.7b), 3rd sing. pīnvatām (10.36.5a), 2nd pl. pīnvdhvam (3.3.12c)

perf. 2nd sing. pīpihī (2)

them. red. aor. 2nd sing. pīpaya (3.15.6a), 2nd pl. pīpayata (10.64.12c)

them. perf. 2nd dual pīpyatam (4), 3rd dual pīpyatām (6.50.12d), pīpyata (2.34.6c)

The thematic present pīnva- has completely replaced an old -nu- present *pinoti, which is attested in Avestan as fra-pinaoiti (V. 3.31). This present stem was subsequently reanalysed as a root pīnv, from which are attested non-present forms such as perfect pipinvāthuḥ.

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 pīpihī, which he considers to be a reduplicated aorist. There are valid semantic reasons for this; the red. aor. is mostly factitive while the perf. is mostly – but not exclusively – intransitive-stative. However, if this were the case, this would be the

202 The other form being stuhi, at 8.1.30a.

only example of a reduplicated aor. with the ending -hi. Since the -hi ending is common with perfects, then it is far more likely to be an original perfect form. Since the perfect and reduplicated aorist are in any case outwardly very similar forms, this perfect could easily have been transferred to the aorist paradigm, which would have involved the lengthening of its reduplication syllable, and assumed an aorist meaning. 204

The forms pīpaya and pīpayata are most likely secondarily thematicised aorists, for which see Kümmel (op. cit.: 300 fn. 495), who also admits to the possibility that they could be hybrid forms derived from a subjunctive pīpāyai. See also p. 34. Semantically, the present active is transitive-factitive: 6.39.5b īṣaḥ pinva vasudēyāya pārvīḥ ‘make much refreshment swell for the giving of goods’, while the middle-voice is intransitive: 3.3.7ab ārjā pinvasva sām īṣo didīhi nah ‘swell with power, illuminate refreshment for us.’ The reduplicated forms are all active, and are mostly indistinguishable in meaning from the active present, while on one occasion it has intransitive meaning: 2.39.6b stānāv īva 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. puniḥi (8), puniṭāt (10.30.5d), 3rd sing. punātu (9.67.22c), 2nd pl. puniṭā (9.67.27c), puniṭāna (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 gṛtām pavasva dhārayā, yajñēṣu devaviśamaḥ / asmābhyam vṛṣṭīm ā pava. The

204 Kümmel (op. cit.: 310) quotes an example of a form pipihi, which appears at MS 4.9.9.: 129.7. This form has a characteristically perfect meaning. The parallel passage in the TĀ has pipihi, explained by Kümmel as having been influenced by the RVic form. Also, cf. the forms didīhi and didihī, both of which are perfect.
form á pavasva + acc means ‘become pure’ with acc. of content or goal205, and this example is undifferentiated in meaning from the middle voice. As in the case of the single instance of the active nama, which gets its mediality from the juxtaposed verb śvañcasva, Gonda (1979: 98) proposes that the middle voice meaning is transferred from the juxtaposed middle form206. Thus we can translate the verse ‘purify yourself as ghee by pouring, .... be pure for us as (with respect to) rain’207.

Every single example of the imperative of pū occurs in Book 9, making it the most characteristic Soma keyword of all. Of the 15 examples of the imperative of the factitive stem punā-, eight occur in six consecutive verses (22-27) of 9.27. The form 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. gánta etc.

**pṛ** ‘bring over’

**red. pres. act.** 2nd sing. pipṛhi (2). 3rd sing. pipartu (3). 2nd dual pipṛtām (5). 3rd dual pipṛtām (1.22.13c). 2nd pl. pipṛtā (2). pipartana (9)

**aor. -si impv. pāṛṣi** (16)

**sec. thematised aor. impv. parṣa** (1.97.8b)

**caus.** 2nd sing. pāṛāya (5). 2nd dual. pārayatam (2.39.4a)

Jamison (1983: 102) considers the caus. form pāṛāya, 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 titarat.

For the -si impv. parṣi and for the form parṣa see p. 50. Cf. joṣa, and AV neṣa.

---


206 See also p. 128.

207 Gonda translates ‘clarify thyself (so as to give) ghee . . . (while) clarify(ing) (thyself) (bring) rain’. Gotō *loc. cit* ‘als (bezv. zur) Schmelzbutter läutere dich . . .für uns läutere dich zum Regen’.
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\textit{pṛc} ‘mix, pour out abundantly, fill’

\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. \textit{pṛiddhi} (2.24.15c), 3rd sing. \textit{pṛṇāktu} (1.84.1c), 2nd dual \textit{pṛṇktām} (5)

\textbf{red. pres. act.} 2nd sing. \textit{pipṛgdhi} (10.10.11d), 2nd pl. \textit{pipṛkta} (3.54.21b)

\textbf{pres. pass.} 3rd sing. \textit{prcyatām} (6.28.8b)

Each of the reduplicated forms appears once only, \textit{pipṛgdhi} at 10.10.11 and \textit{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 \textit{mimikṣa-}, 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 \textit{ūpedām upapārcanam, āsū gōśūpa prcyatām} ‘let this mixture be added to (i.e. mixed with) the cows (or, more likely, with milk)’.

For an example containing the present of \textit{pṛc} see above under \textit{dhū}. 208

\textit{pṛi} ‘fill’

\textbf{pres. act.} \textit{prṇītana} (5.5.5c)

\textbf{them. pres.} 2nd sing. \textit{prṇa} (8), 2nd pl. \textit{prṇata} (3)


\textbf{red. aor.} \textit{pāpuraṇtu} (7.62.3d)

-\textit{sī impv.} prāśi (2)

For the form \textit{prṇa} see page 28f.

The thematic present, which often appears with the preverb \textit{ā}, is transitive and usually means ‘fulfil’, often occurring with \textit{kāmam} ‘desire’, e.g. 1.16.9a \textit{sēmāṁ naḥ kāmam ā prṇa ‘fulfill this desire of ours’}. It can also mean ‘fill’, as in 9.41.5a \textit{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 \textit{pṛi} (q.v. below), thus the sole example of the imperative of this

\footnotesize{
\text{208 For the possibility that this root (PIE *\textit{pel-k}) may be an alternative form of the root \textit{pṛ} (\textit{pel-h₁}) see Mayrhofer (1986: s. \textit{PARC}, with bibliography), and LIV s. *\textit{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 prá-prá yajñáṃ prñitäna ‘fulfil the sacrifice’.209

The middle voice present, which is always thematic, means ‘to fill up, become full’, e.g. 3.50.1c órvuvahcäh prñatám ebhír ámnaih ‘having wide reach, let him be filled with this food’. The middle voice may also have affective meaning, as in 10.104.2b nÝbhíh sutásya jatháram prñasva ‘fill your (own) stomach with (Soma) pressed by men’.

The red. aor. form püpántu corresponds to a caus. púrayati, which is attested in the AV, but not the RV. This form, however, which must have been part of the language of the time, as the aor. is dependent on it for its vocalism210. For an example containing the -si impv. práśi see under p‡2.

p‡₂ ‘give’

pres. act. 2nd dual prñitám (7.65.4d), 2nd pl. prñitá (1.23.21a)

root aor. pürdhí (7)

First differentiated from p‡₁ by Kuiper (1938: 313ff.)211. While the aorist impvs. of these roots are strictly differentiated, the present stems are the same – prñáti. Historically the two roots are completely different; p‡₁ < *pelh₁ while p‡₂ < *perh₃.

The two attested examples of the pres. stem prñá-/prñᵜ- of which simplex forms occur both belong to this root, a fact recognised by Kuiper (1938: 319). Thus 1.23.21ab ápah prñáta bheṣajām várūthaḥ tanvē māma ‘O waters, give a potion, protection for my body’ and 7.65.4d prñitám udná divyāsya cároḥ ‘give (us) of the dear, divine, waters’.

The root aorist form appears, inter alia, in the memorable string of impvs. at 1.42.9ab, where it is clearly differentiated from the -si impv. of p‡₁, and clearly meant to be synonymous with the following prá yaṁsi ‘extend (gifts)’: śagdhí pürdhí prá yaṁsi ca, śiśhí práśy udáram ‘be powerful, give and extend (gifts),

209 See Kuiper (1938: especially 314-320).


211 For further extensive bibliography see Mayrhofer (1986: s. PAR²). See also LIV s. *perh₃.
sharpen (us), fill our stomachs.’ This ‘absolute’ usage of the transitive is mirrored in 1.125.5b yāḥ prati śa 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 pṛ₁

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, pipaya, pipayata. See p. 34. ²¹²

**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 ṛ krandaya bālam ojo na ḍhā, nī ṣṭhaniḥ durtā bādhamānah / ṛ 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 ṛ protha ... duchānā certainly being parallel to that of nī ṣṭhaniḥ durtā, for which see Narten (1993: 319), who translates

²¹² Also Kümmel (2000: 322ff.).
it as ‘dennere 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 badhānā is first attested in the Atharvaveda. Finite forms of this verb are quite sparsely attested in the Rigveda, despite there being many nominal derivatives. The active pres. is not attested at all. Most of the attested forms are passive, such as this one impv.

**bādh** ‘repel, push away, push down’

*pres. med.* 2nd sing. bādhasva (9), 3rd sing. bādhatām (5), 2nd dual bādhetām (6.74.2c), 2nd pl. 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. bodhayā (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 bōdhat is still to be regarded synchronically as such at 4.15.7 bōdhad yān mā hāribhyāṁ kumārāḥ sāhadevāḥ, āchā nā hūtā ūd 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.’

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 *āśayā, which became áśayat. While in the latter case the rest of the paradigm preserved the identity of the form áśayat as a middle-voice form, in the

---

213 Trans. Insler (*op. cit.*).
case of *bodhā(t) it did not, and the forms were subsequently reinterpreted as being active. Once this had happened, the form bodhi was coined on the basis of the pattern established by the form yódhi 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 CēRCi are active.

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

Furthermore, bódha only occurs pāda-initially, with lengthened second syllable, while bodhi never does, indicating a metrical complementary distribution. Both may take either a genetive or accusative complement. Examples are: 8.43.27c ágne sá bodhi me váca/hunderdot, ‘O Agni, take notice of my speech’, 3.14.7c tvám víśvasya suráthasya bodhi, ‘take notice of him who has a good chariot’, 1.147.2a bódhā me asyā vácaso yaviṣṭha, ‘take notice of this my speech, O Youngest One’, and 7.21.1d bódhā na stómam ándhaso máde/sunderdotu, ‘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 ábodhy agnír jmá úd eti sáryo ‘Agni has awoken, the sun rises from the earth’.

One notable exception to the above is 1.29.4ab sasántu ty/amacronacute árātayo, bódhantu śūra rātáya/hunderdot ‘Let those enemies sleep, let these heroes be awake.’ Gotô (1987: 220) suggests the possibility that ‘Hier hat wahrscheinlich eine akustische Anpassung an sasántu eine Rolle gespielt.’

The causative bodhayā mean ‘awaken, wake (someone) up’, as in 1.124.10ab prá bodhayo/sunderdota/hunderdot p/runderdot/nunderdotató maghony, ábudhyamánaḥ paṇáyaḥ sasantu ‘Awaken the givers, O generous Usās, let the demons sleep, never awakening’.

bhr ‘strengthen’

pres. act. 2nd sing. barhraya (3)

int. 2nd sing. barbrhi (10.10.10c)

Wackernagel (1896: 251) shows that the -hi ending in barbhṛhi is an analogical reconstruction; the form should have been *barbhṛhi (< *barbr̥-dhṛi < *barbr̥h- dhi). If, as was usually the case, the vowel preceding the */zdhi/ cluster had

214 The form bódhat is a secondary shortening, according to Insler (op. cit.).
undergone compensatory lengthening, then the form would have been *barbřhi.\textsuperscript{215}

For the possibility that the form barbřhi may have been derived from the form bàrhrhat (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 barbřhi 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 barbṛhi vṛṣabhāya bāhūm, anyām ichasva 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. upabārha-, as well as the word barhīs- ‘altar-grass’, so semantically at least this seems possible. The intensive stem appears, with the same meaning, at 5.61.5cd Śyāvāśvastutāya yā, dōr vīrāyopabārhrhat ‘she who shall lay her arms under the man who is praised by Śyāvāśva’.\textsuperscript{216}

\textbf{brū} ‘say’

pres. act. 2nd sing. brūhi (4), 3rd sing. bravītu (4), 2nd pl. brūta (10.52.1c), bravītana (2), 3rd pl. bruvantu (4)

The second person brūta and bravītana plural forms show characteristic zero-grade vs full-grade; cf. kṛta, kartana. See page 31.

\textbf{bhaj} ‘share’

pres. act. 2nd sing. bhaja (12), 2nd dual. bhajātam (10.106.9d), 2nd pl. bhajatana (7.56.21c)

pres. med. 2nd sing. bhajasva (2)

-sī impv. bhaksi (7.41.2d)

caus. bhājayata (10.9.2b)

For the form bhajatana, which is one of only three thematic stems showing the ending -tana, see page 32.

The active impv. almost always appears with the preverb ā, in which case it means ‘let (someone) have a share in (something)’, with acc. and loc. respectively, e.g.

\textsuperscript{215} cf. tañīti.

\textsuperscript{216} See also Schaefer (1994: 39, 157-159).
1.43.8c ā na indo váje bhaja ‘give us, O drop, a share in the prize’. Without ā, it means ‘to apportion’ as in 10.106.9d -āṁśeva no bhajataṁ citrām āṁpah ‘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 bhūridŚeva hy āsi śrutiḥ ... ā no bhajasva rádhasi ‘because you are the famous plenty-giver, ..., give us a share in your gift.’ The causative stem, which is only attested once in the entire RV, means ‘allow to partake’: 10.9.2ab yó vah śivātamo rāsas, tásya bhājayaḥetvā nah ‘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’217.

bhañj ‘break’
pres. act. 2nd sing. bhanḍhi (10.87.4d)

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

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

bhīṣajya- ‘heal’
pres. act. 2nd dual bhīṣajyātam (8.22.10d)

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

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

---

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

pres. act. 2nd sing. bhāva (105), bhavatāt (3.23.2d), 3rd sing. bhavatu (34), 2nd dual bhāvatam (10), 3rd dual bhavatām (3), 2nd pl. bhāvata (6), 3rd pl. bhāvantu (30)
aor. 2nd sing. bodhī (38), 3rd sing. bhūtu (42), 2nd dual bhūtām (20), 2nd pl. bhūtā (11), bhūtana (10.30.11d)
perf. bhūtātu (1.127.10c)
[aor. inj. bhū (6.15.3a)]

For the form bodhī see page 25.

bhūṣ ‘exert oneself for smbd.’

pres. act. 2nd sing. bhūṣa (3), 3rd sing. bhūṣatu (8.90.1b), 2nd dual bhūṣatam (2), 2nd pl. bhūṣata (2)

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).

bhṛ ‘carry, bring’

pres. act. 2nd sing. bhāra (134), 2nd dual bharatam (1.109.7a), 3rd dual bhāratām (10.59.8c), 2nd pl. bharata (17)
pres. med. 2nd sing. bhārasva (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 ā and a dative indirect object with the meaning ‘bring something to somebody’, as in e.g. 1.79.8a ā no agne rayīṁ bhara ‘O Agni, bring us property’. The much rarer middle-voice forms are affective or affective-possessive: 1.79.10bc vāco gotamāgnāye / bhārasva sumnayār gīrāṁ ‘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 māṭeva putrām bibhṛtām upāśthe ‘let the two [ends of the bow] carry [the arrow] like a mother her son in her lap’. 
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**manḥ** ‘lavish’

**them. perf. med.** 2nd sing. māmahasva (2), 3rd pl. māmahantām (20)

**pres. caus. manḥhaya** (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 ṛtyāe dhānāḥ sāvane puṇuṣuṭu, puṇolāśam āhutam māmahasva naha ‘at the third pressing, be bountiful for us with regard to grains, the sacrificed rice cakes’. The third pers. plural form māmahantām, 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: tāṇ no mitrō vārūṇo māmahantām, ṛtiṇiḥ sīndhuḥ prthivī utā dyauḥ ‘In this matter, may Mitra and Varuṇa be bountiful, and also Aditi, Sindhu, Prthivī and Dyaus.’ The causative form is semantically problematic, mainly because it is very sparsely attested.218 For the thematicised perfect stems see p.34.

**mad** ‘exhilarate, intoxicate’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. mada (10.63.3d), 3rd dual mādatām (1.121.11b), 2nd pl. mādata (2), 3rd pl. mādata (6.75.18d)

**sec. pres. act.** 2nd sing. manda (6.18.9d), 3rd sing. māndatū (2), 3rd pl. māndantu (8)

**sec. pres. med.** 2nd sing. 1māndasva (6)

**caus.** 3rd pl. mādayantu (7.23.5a)

**med. caus.** 2nd sing. mādāyasva (19), 2nd dual mādāyethām (5), 2nd pl. mādāyadhvam (8), 3rd pl. mādayantām (6)

**sec. caus.** 2nd sing. mandaya (2)

-ṣi impv. 2nd sing. mātsi (15)

**s-aor. med.** 2nd sing. mātsva (14)

**perf.** 2nd sing. mamaddhī (2), 3rd sing. mamāṭtu (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. Gotô (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 Gotô’s assertion (1987: 235) that the stem máda- is intransitive, most of the attestations of the imperative of this stem are clearly transitive, meaning ‘to delight’, e.g.: 10.63.3d tān ādityān ānu madā 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 – mádatā 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 pībā sōnam indra māndatu tvā ‘drink the Soma, O Indra, let it intoxicate you’. The commonly attested -si impv. form mātsi, most of whose attestations are in Book 9, means the same, as can be clearly seen from 9.90.5, which contains the form no fewer than six times: mātsi soma vāruṇaṁ mātsi mitrāṁ, mātsīndram indo pavamāṇa viṣṇum / mātsi śārdho māruṁ mātsi devān, mātsi mahāṁ īndram 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 tā gahi prá tā drava, māsvā sutāsyā gomataḥ ‘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 máda-, meaning ‘rejoice’, rather than ‘be intoxicated’ with an accompanying locative or instrumental denoting the cause of the exhilaration, e.g.: 7.29.2c asmīn nā śāvane mādayasva ‘rejoice in this pressing’, or 1.101.9d asmīn yajñē barhiṣi mādayasva ‘rejoice in this sacrifice on the altar-grass’.
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**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 śa prá sedhrīr 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 μέμονα ‘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. *māntahata* (3.29.5a)

**mand**

see *mad*

**mahay**

‘exalt’

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

**mā**

1. ‘measure’
   - **pres. act.** 2nd sing. *mimihī* (7), 2nd dual *mimitām* (2), 3rd dual *mimitām* (5.51.11a)
   - **pres. med.** 2nd dual *mimāthām* (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 *ūpa*, the present either with *ūpa*, or *sām* – and generally an accusative object and dative indirect object, with the meaning ‘distribute, measure out’, as in e.g. 3.54.22b\(^{219}\) *asmadṛyāk sāṃ mimihī śravāṃsi* ‘in our direction measure out glories’.

---

219 Repeated at 5.4.2d and 6.19.3b.
and 7.26.5c sahasrīṇa úpa no māhi vājān ‘give out to us thousandfold prizes’. The middle-voice forms have similar meaning, and the same valency: 9.93.5a nū no rayīṁ úpa māsva nyāvantam ‘now distribute to us property, rich in men’. Without preverbs, the meaning and valency may again be the same: 4.44.6ab nū no rayīṁ puruvīram bhāṁtāṃ, dāsrā mīmāṁhām udbhāyasy 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 mīmīḥī ślokām āsyē, parjānya iva tataṅāḥ ‘Measure the sound in your mouth, thunder like Parjanya’.

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

**mi** ‘build’
pres. act. 3rd sing. mīnōtu (10.18.13d)

**muc** ‘free’
pres. act. 2nd sing. mūṅca (2), 2nd dual mūṅcātam (3), 2nd pl. mūṅcāta (4), 3rd pl. mūṅcāntu (2)
pres. med. 2nd sing. mūṅcasva (10.38.5c)
a-aor. 2nd sing. mūca (4)
aor. med. 2nd pl. mūcadhvam (1.171.1d)
perf. 2nd sing. mumugdhī (6), 3rd sing. mumoktu (2), 2nd dual mumuktam (2)
thematicised perf. 2nd dual mumócatam (5), 2nd pl. mumócatā (8.67.14b)

Kümmel (2000: 382) states that there is no difference in meaning between the present and perfect stems. While this may be true, there is certainly a difference in their characteristic valency. The perfect form mumugdhī almost always occurs – with a variety of preverbs – with an accusative and an ablative in an expression meaning ‘remove [something bad] from us’, as in 1.24.9d kṛtāṁ cid ēnāḥ pra mumugdhī asmāt ‘release the sin we have committed from us’, and 5.2.7c evāsmād agne vī mumugdhī pāśān ‘So remove the bonds from us, O Agni’.

The present, on the other hand, characteristically occurs with reversed valency, as in 6.74.4c prā no muṅcatam vārūṇasya pāśād, ‘release us from the bond of Varuṇa’. This is not however a hard and fast rule; while the majority of attestations of perfect forms do have the characteristically perfect valency, there are a couple of instances in
which the present has the characteristically perfect valency: 4.12.6c evó śv āsmán muñcatā vy āṃhah ‘thus release the trouble from us’ and 6.74.3cd āva syataṁ muñcātaṁ yān no āsti, tanāṣu buddhāṁ 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 ví with a single accusative object, e.g. 1.177.4cd stīr/nunderdotám barhīr ā ṭū śakra prá yāhi, pībā niśādyā ví mucā hārī ihā ‘drive forth to the strewn altar grass, O Mighty One, drink, sitting down, unyoke the two bays here’.

The thematicised perfect forms, presumably derived from the subjunctive *mumócati220 is only attested in Book 8, and, whether or not by chance, is the only impv. form of this verb attested there. It occurs five times in a single, rather difficult formula: 8.86.1-5d mā no ví yauṣṭaṁ sakhyā mumócatam ‘do not reject our friendship, free [us] (?)’. However, given the frequency of the combination ví muc + acc. it is possible that Geldner (ad loc.) is correct that the preverb ví actually belongs with mumócatam (or maybe more likely to both verbs), despite the difficulty posed by the word order. For the thematicised perfect stems see p. 34.

There are only two attestations of middle-voice forms, one of which is reflexive: 10.38.5c prá muñcasva pári kāṭsād ihā gahi ‘free yourself from Kutsa, come here’, while the other is affective-possessive: 1.171.1d nī hēlo dhattā ví mudadhvam āśvān ‘lay down your anger, unyoke your (own) horses’.

For the possibility that the form ’mumukta/munderdot 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. mumocati see Kümmel (op. cit: 383).
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**mr̥j** ‘clean’
sa-aor. 2nd dual mr̥ṣatam (2)
caus. med. pres. 2nd pl. marjayadhvam (7.2.4d)

**mr̥d** ‘have mercy’

pres. act. 2nd sing. mr̥ḷā (19), 3rd sing. mr̥ḷatu (1.179.5c), 2nd dual. mr̥ḷatam (6.74.4b), 3rd dual mr̥ḷatām (10.93.7a), 2nd pl. mr̥ḷāta (11), 3rd pl. mr̥ḷantu (2)
caus. act. 2nd sing. mr̥ḷāya (18), 2nd pl. mr̥ḷāyata (2.29.2d), 3rd pl. mr̥ḷayantu (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 cakrmā tāt sū mṛla ‘the sin which we have committed, regarding this matter please have mercy’.

**mr̥ś** ‘touch’

pres. act. 2nd sing. mr̥śa (3)
pres. med. 2nd sing. mr̥śasva (8.70.9b)

**mṛ̥f₁** ‘crush’

pres. act. 2nd sing. mṛ̥fihī (4.4.5d), mṛ̥ṇa (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 pṛ̥f₁ ‘fill’ and pṛ̥f₂ ‘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 – prā may be combined with either root, or by form, as both may be thematic or athematic. It is clear that 7.104.22d dṛṣādeva prā mṛṇa rākṣa indra ‘Crush harm as with a mill-stone’ means ‘crush’, because of the analogy of the mill-stone. Thieme claims that at 6.44.17 prā mṛṇa means ‘catch’: pārāca indra prā mṛṇa 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’.
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For the morphology of the imperative forms of this verb see page 28f.

\textit{mf}_2 \text{‘hinder’}

\textbf{int.} 3rd sing. \textit{marmartu} (2.23.6d)

This root only has one imperative form: 2.23.6cd \textit{bṛhaspate yā no abhī hvāro dudhé, svā tām marmartu duchānā hārasvatī}. Insler (1972: 92) suggests differentiating this intensive from the previous \textit{mf}_2 \text{‘to crush’}, with the meaning ‘hinder’, translating the passage ‘Brhaspati, he who poses an obstacle for us, let that own angering \textit{mischief of his hinder him’}. Mayrhofer (1986 s. \textit{MAR}^{13}) appears to agree, while Schaefer (1994: 166f.) rejects this, preferring to classify this form under \textit{mf}_2 \text{‘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 \textit{āmūr}, ‘hindrance’ (Insler \textit{[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.

\textit{med} \text{‘be fat’}

\textbf{pres. act.} 3rd pl. \textit{médyantu} (2.37.3a)

Some scholars, such as Geldner (\textit{ad loc.}), and Joachim (1978: 132) consider the form \textit{medātm}, which occurs at 10.93.11d, to be a 3rd sing. med. impv. form. The text is: 10.93.11cd \textit{sādā pāhy abhīṣtayye, medātm vedātm vaso} which has been translated either as ‘(Die Rede) soll an Weisheit fett werden, du Guter’ (Geldner) or ‘Beschütze unser Genossentumswerden (unser fettes Gedeihen?) entsprechend unserem Weisheitwesen, du Guter’ (Oldenberg [1909: \textit{ad. loc.}]), in which case the form \textit{medātm} is seen as an accusative verbal noun.

\textit{myakṣ} \text{‘be attached’}

\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. \textit{myakṣa} (2.28.6a)

\textbf{sec. pres. act.} 2nd sing. \textit{mimikṣa} (9.107.6d), 2nd dual \textit{mimikṣatam} (4), 3rd dual \textit{mimikṣatām} (2)

\textbf{perf. med.} 2nd sing. \textit{mimikṣva} (1.48.16b)

\[221\] I.e. ‘which angers us’.
The impv. form *myakṣa* is the only extant form of this present stem. It occurs with the preverb *ápa*, which has the effect of giving it the opposite meaning to that of the simplex, i.e. ‘unattach’, as opposed to ‘attach’: 2.28.6a *ápo sú myakṣa varuṇa bhīyāsam māt* ‘O Varuṇa, detach fear from me’.

The other reduplicated present forms are considered by Joachim (1978: 132f.) to be secondary derivatives from the perfect. This is rejected by Kümmel (2000: 387f.), who prefers to see them as a thematicised, factitive reduplicated present. It almost always appears in a formulaic expression, as in 9.107.6d *mādhyā yajñām mimikṣa 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 *sām no rāyā bṛhatā viśvāpeṣasā, mimikṣvā sām ṭābhir 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’


**pres. med.** 2nd sing. *yajātām* (10.70.7d), 2nd dual. *yajathām* (6.15.13d), 2nd pl. *yajadhva* (8.2.37.a), *yajadhvam* (6), 3rd pl. *yajantām* (10.128.3a)

**aor. -si impv.** 2nd sing. *yákṣi* (33)

**-s- aor.** 3rd dual *yakṣatām* (3)

**-s- aor. med.** 2nd sing. *yāksva* (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.).
The agent of the active voice forms is almost always Agni, who is himself often addressed as ‘hotar’. This, and the fact that the abovementioned dative very often does occur with the active, illustrates the meaning ‘worship on behalf of others’. The middle forms are often reflexive, or possessive-affective. This can be very explicit, there being a reflexive pronoun as direct object, as in the formulaic svayāṁ yajasva tanvāṁ ‘offer your own body’, which occurs several times. However, the middle voice with the preverb á has a special meaning and valency – ‘bring something to someone as a result of their worship’, as in 3.1.22cd prá yaṁsi hotar brhatitr īso no, ‘gne māhi drāviṁam á yajasva ‘Extend to us high refreshment, bring us great wealth, O Agni’.

The -si impv. yáksi occurs many times in formulaic yáksi deván, ‘offer to the gods’, mostly at the end of 11-syllable lines, although it does occur elsewhere too, either with accusative object of the god to which of the offering is made, or else without objects, simply meaning ‘make an offering’, as in 1.14.1c devēbhir yāhi yáksi ca ‘come here with the gods and make an offering’. Remarkably, it is once affective-possessive: 1.75.5c ágne yáksi svām dāmam ‘O Agni, sacrifice your own house’. Finally, the 2nd pers. dual form yakṣatām, which is obviously created on the basis of the aor. subj. yāksat, occurs three times in the same repeated line: 1.13.8c yajñāṁ no yakṣatām imām ‘let these two offer this offering for us’, all of them in Book 1. See also Narten (1964: 47f., 202f.).

yat ‘install, take position’

pres. act. 2nd dual yātata (8.35.12a)

pres. med. 2nd sing. yatasva (1.69.6b), 3rd pl. yatantām (5.59.8b)

yam ‘extend’

pres. act. 2nd sing. yācha (21), yachatāt (1.48.15c), 3rd sing. yachatu (13), 2nd dual yāchatam (17), 3rd dual yachatām (2.41.20c), 2nd pl. yāchata (14), 3rd pl. yāchantu (4)

pres. med. 2nd pl. yachadhvam (7.43.2b)

root. aor. 2nd sing. yandhī (8), 2nd dual yantām (6), 2nd pl. yánta (5), yantana (3)

-si impv. yámsi (4)

caus. act. 2nd sing. yāmaya (8.3.2d)

The imperative forms of this verb are entirely active and transitive, with one exception. This verb has two characteristic meanings, in one case occurring with the
noun śārman ‘shelter’, or its synonyms, as its direct object and a dative indirect object, and in the other mainly in expressions concerning the granting of gifts, etc. The difference is not inherent in the verbal stem, but rather in the choice of preverb, the expression śārma yam occurring with none, while ‘to grant {gifts}’ is expressed by prā yam. In this latter case the aorist is more common than the present, but is by no means exclusively employed in this meaning. Thus prā + yācha- means ‘grant’ in 6.59.9cd ā na ihā prā yachatam, rayīṃ viśvāyupasam ‘grant us here property that makes our whole life prosperous.’ One exception to this is is the semi-formulaic prā [dat.] yacha- avrkām prthū chardhī ‘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 gómātir 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 prá 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)

-sīṣ- aor 2nd dual yāsīṣṭām (5)

The aorist form yāsīṣṭām occurs only in the formulaic expression yāsīṣṭām varīh ‘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. precative 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 kósām 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 maghāvadbhyāh puṛukṣām, rayīṁ ni vájan śrūyatam 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), yuyotām (3), 2nd pl. yuyota (10), yuyótana (2)

sk-pres. act. 3rd pl. yuchantu (8.39.2e)

caus. pres. 3rd. 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 āsmad dvēsāmsi ‘keep hostilities away from us’. It can also have the enclitic personal pronoun naḥ in place of the proclitic āsmad in the above example, which in this case would unusually have to be considered an ablative too, as in 6.48.10c āgne hēḷāmsi 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. ūaváya- 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 brahmadviṣaḥ sāryād yāvayasa ‘keep the enemy of the priest out of the sun’.224 Jamison (op. cit) considers the reduplicated stem yuyo- to be a perfect. Gotō (1987: 315f.) disputes Jamison’s accentual grounds for this theory, but Kümmel (2000 401f.), does consider it a possibility. As the forms in question are all modal (except one example of yuyoti at 1.92.11), Kümmel considers it typical that the categorial classification of these forms is uncertain, as even in early Vedic they were no longer living forms, the only living perfect forms being the indicative and the participle.

*yuj ‘yoke’*
- **pres. act.** 2nd pl. yunāktā (2)
- **pres. med.** 2nd dual. yunāṭhām (7), 2nd pl. yunāṭhvām (3)
- **root aor. med.** 2nd sing. yuṣvā (12)
- **-ya- pass.** 2nd pl. yuyāḍhvam (10.175.1c)

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

*yudh ‘fight’*
- **pres. act.** 2nd sing. yudhya (2), 2nd pl. yudhyata (8.96.14d)
- **aor.** 2nd sing. yudhī (5.3.9a)
- **-si impv.** yōṣi (1.132.4e)
- **-si aor.** 2nd dual yodhiṣṭam (6.60.2a)
- **caus.** 2nd sing. yodháya (3.46.2d)
- **[aor. inj. yodhiḥ (10.120.3d)]**

---

224 See also Jamison (1983: 174).
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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 abhī either with the meaning ‘fight against’, as in 6.31.3ab tvām kātṣenābhir śaṣṭam indra-, -aśaṣṭam yudhva kāyavaṁ gāvīṣau ’you Indra, fight Śūṣṇa with Kutsa . . .’ or, ‘to fight for something (acc.)’, as in 6.60.2a tō yodhiṣṭam abhī gā indra nūnām ‘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 yōdhi, which is attested only at 5.3.9a āva sprdhi pitāraṁ yōdhi ... ‘Protect the father, fight (for him)’, see page 26f.

**rakṣa ‘protect’**

*pres. act.* 2nd sing. rākṣa (25), rākṣatā (4.50.2d), 3rd sing. rākṣatu (2), 2nd dual rākṣatām (9), 3rd dual rākṣatām (2), 2nd pl. rākṣata (2), 3rd pl. rākṣantu (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 rākṣatām seven occur at 1.185, in the repeated pāda 1.185.2-8d dyāvā rākṣatāṁ prthivī no ābhvāt ‘Heaven and Earth, protect us from Nothingness’ 225.

**rad ‘dig up, scrape’**

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

*-si impv. rásti (5.10.1d)

**ran ‘enjoy’**

*pres. act.* 2nd sing. rana (5)

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

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

*perf. rāṇaṅdhi* (3)

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

---

225 See also Gotō (1987: 257).
me to be a very far-reaching conclusion to base on just one attested example: 2.36.3ab ...ā hi gāntana, nī barhiṣi sadatanā rāniṣṭana ‘come here, sit on the altar-grass and enjoy yourselves’, especially as the present only occurs in a practically identical context; 5.51.8cd ā yāhy agne atrivāt sutē raṇa226 ‘drive here, Agni, and take pleasure in the pressed (Soma), like Atri.’. All other imperative forms of this verb are likewise intransitive, unless 10.59.5c rārandhī naḥ sārasya saṃḍśī is to be understood transitively, as does Geldner ‘Laß uns des Anblicks der Sonne froh werden’.

According to Jamison (1983: 75 and 143), raṇaya is a denominative from the noun raṇa ‘pleasure’.

For the form rārandhī see p. 25.

randhī ‘cast down’ 227

pres. act. 2nd sing. randhī (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 randhī is not the original reading of the text, for which he posits *randha, explaining it as a metrically-motivated abbreviation of randhaya, on the basis of a similar phrase at 7.30.2d. The advantage in suggesting the replacement of one nonce-form by an unattested nonce-form is unclear to me.228

For my suggestion that randhī was created by analogy to the form jōdhi see p. 27. The only other present-forms attested from this root are from the -āya- stem randhaya-. This last is transitive, as is the affective middle-voice form randhāyasva. The single perfect example is undifferentiated in meaning from the present.229

226 The expression sutē raṇa is repeated 5 times throughout the RV.

227 The 2nd pl. red. caus. aor. form 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.).

**rå1** ‘give, bestow’

*pres. act.* 2nd sing. riríhi (7)
*pres. med.* 2nd dual rarátām (1.117.23d), 2nd pl. rarādhvam (5.83.6a)
*si impv.* rási (11)
*āor. med.* 2nd sing. rásva (21), 2nd dual rásāthām (1.46.6c), 3rd sing. rásatām (10.36.14d), 3rd pl. rásantām (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 rása-, such as the *-si impv.* rásī. The forms rásatām and rásantām 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.).

**rå2** ‘bellow’

*pres. act.* 2nd sing. rāya (7.55.3a)

**rikh** ‘scratch’

*pres. act.* 2nd sing. rikhá (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 rocatām aruṣō bhāmūnā śūciḥ ‘The bright red one will shine with light’. The causative is factitive-transitive ‘make shine’, as in 9.36.3ab sā no jyōtīṇiṣī pārvya, pāvamāṇa ví rocaya ‘Make the lights shine for us, O First Pavamāṇa’.


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. ruhátam (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 *hleyd̠, and one meaning ‘ascend’, from an original *reyg̠/leyg̠. For our purposes, Gotō classes the aorist impv. ruhátam and the causative rohaya ‘makes ascend’, as well any present forms that occur with an accusative of goal as belonging to ruh- ‘ascend’. Thus, while at 10.85.20c á roha sūrye amṝṣasya lokām ‘Ascend to the world of immortality, O Suryā’ has the second meaning, 3.8.11ab vānaspate šatāvalśō ví roha, sahāsraśvalśā ví vayām ruhema ‘Grow with a hundred branches O Tree, with a thousand branches may we grow’, belongs to the first. This example also shows that the aorist forms can in fact also mean ‘grow’ despite what Gotō appears to say (op cit. fn 641). The aor. impv. ruhátam is unusual in meaning ‘ascend’ but being construed with a locative at 8.22.9ab á hī ruhátam 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: bhīyaṁ dādhānā hfidayeśu śātravaḥ, pārājitāso 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 iti, 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 (1.170.5e), 2nd pl. vadadhvam (10.191.2a)
The middle-voice forms of this verb are mostly attested in Books 1 and 10, although there is one occurrence of sām vade at 7.86.2a. Gotō (1987: 282) says that the middle voice has a reciprocal meaning, strengthened by use of the preverb sām, and this is well demonstrated by both of the impv. examples: 1.170.5c īndra tvām marūdbhiḥ sām vadasva- ‘Indra, you talk together with the Maruts’, and 10.191.2ab sām gachadhvam sām vadasvam, sām 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 bhadrām ā vada, visvāto naḥ śakune pūnyam ā vada ‘From all sides
announce the blessing to us, O Bird, from every side announce the good (fortune?) to us, O Bird’.

**vadh** ‘strike, kill’

**is-aor.** 2nd dual *vadhi*sunderdot/tunderdotam □ (4.41.4b)

Used once with the preverb *ní*, at 4.41.4ab *asmīn, ...ní vadhiṣṭam 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. *vanuṣva* □ (1.169.1d)

**s-aor. med.** 2nd sing. *vāmsva* □ (6)

**desid.** 2nd sing. *vivāṣa* □ (5), 2nd pl. *vivāsata* □ (2)

The sparsely attested active impv. is transitive, meaning ‘defeat’: 7.21.9cd *vanvāntu smā tē ‘vasā samūkē, ‘bhītīṁ aryā vanāśāṁ śāvāṁsi ‘May they with your help defeat in battle the attack of the foreigners, the power of the enemy.’

The single example of the middle-voice form *vanu/sunderdotva* means ‘win’, but is transitive rather than affective 1.169.1cd *sā no vedho marūṭāṁ cikivān, svamā vanu/sunderdotva tāva hī prēṣṭhā ‘O Master, knowing the Maruts, win for us their goodwill, for they are dearest to you*.231 The aorist form *vā/munderdotsvā* means the same, as in 8.23.27ab *vā/munderdotsvā no v/amacronacuteryā puru, vāmsva rāyā/hunderdot puruśaḥ/hunderdot ha/hunderdot ‘Win for us many choice things, win property desirable to many.’ This meaning, ‘win (for us)’, underlies even examples in which the indirect object is not explicitly mentioned: 7.17.5 *vāmsva vīśvā vāryāṁ pracetah, satyā/hunderdot śāśaḥ no adyā ‘win all the choice things, O perceptive one, may all our wishes come true today’*. The second half of this verse makes it obvious that Agni is being asked to win the choice things for the worshippers, and not for himself.232

---

231 Geldner’s translation “Du, Meister der Marut” is impossible, owing to the fact that *marūṭāṁ* is accented.

232 For the differentiation of the two roots *van* and *vanē* see Gotō (1987: 283ff.) For the form *vamsi*, which isn’t an imperative, see p. 54. For *vivāṣa* and other desiderative imperatives, see p. 34.
van (van)  ‘love, wish’

-sk- pres. 3rd pl. vañchantu (10.173.1c)
pres./a-aor. 2nd dual vānataṃ (3), 2nd pl. vanata (8.7.9c)
pres./a-aor med. 3rd sing. vanatām (1.162.22d)

The attestation of the form vañchantu at 10.173.1cd is the only time this stem occurs in the RV: viśas tvā sārvā vāñchantu, mā tvād rāṣṭrām ādhi bhṛasat ‘May all the tribes want you, may your realm not fall away from you.’

The form vānataṃ, which could either be a thematic present or aorist, always occurs in the formula ‘X (voc.) vānataṃ gīraḥ’, ‘want (i.e. gladly accept) our songs’, while the plural vanata occurs in a similar expression, but whose direct object is hāvam ‘call’ (8.7.9c).

The single attestation of the form vāvandhi, which appears to mean exactly the same as the others forms, occurs at 5.31.13cd vāvandhī yājyūḥ/ṃ/ṇaṃ r utā té/sunderdot u dhehy, ójo jáne/sunderdot u yē/sunderdot u te sy/ama  ‘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. vāndasva (6)

vap  ‘strew’
pres. act. 2nd sing. vapa (8.96.9d), 2nd pl. vapata (10.101.3b), 3rd pl. vapantu (2.33.11d)

varivasy-  ‘make wide space’
pres. act. 2nd sing. varivasyā (2), varivasyantu (4)

vaś  ‘wish’
pres. act. 3rd sing. vaṣṭu (1.3.10c)

vasī  ‘shine, illuminate’
-sk- pres. act. 2nd sing. uchā (14), 3rd sing. uchatu (3), 2nd pl. uchata (10.35.5c), 3rd pl. uchantu (3)
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**caus. act. 2nd sing. vāsaya (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 ví, which emphasises the scattered nature of sunrays: 1.113.12d ihádyóṣah śréṣṭhatamā vy ucha ‘shine here today, being the most beautiful Uśas’. The verb may occasionally take an accusative of goal, as in 7.77.4a ántivāmā 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 ihá in the previous one.

More intriguing, perhaps, are examples where uchá occurs with revát ‘containing riches’, as in 1.92.14c revád asmé vy ucha 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 gómant and áśvavant (both of which adjectives are attributed to Uśas in 1.92.14ab) mean cow- and horse-prosperity respectively at e.g. 9.105.4a gómman na indo áśavat ... dhana ‘O drop, flow to cow and horse prosperity’. Thus 1.92.14c means ‘shine on riches for us . . .’

The causative occurs twice, both times at 1.134.3fg: prá caksaya ródasī vāsayo/sunderdotasa/hunderdot, śrávase vāsayo/sunderdotasa/hunderdot ‘Reveal the two worlds, let the dawns shine, so you may have glory; let the worlds shine’. See also under caks.

**vās**₂ ‘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 is-aorist, both on formal and semantic grounds.

**vah** ‘drive, carry’

**pres. act. 2nd sing. váha (71), vahatít (10.24.5d), 3rd sing. vahatu (2), 2nd dual vāhatam (15), 3rd dual vāhatām (4), 2nd pl. vahata (4), 3rd pl. vāhantu (39)**

**pres. med. 2nd sing. vāhasva (2), 2nd dual vahethām (7.71.3d)**

**root aor. 2nd dual vohám (5), 3rd dual vohām (2)**

-sí impv. vakṣi (24)
All of the active forms are transitive, and seemingly undifferentiated from each other in meaning. The basic meaning is ‘to convey’, most commonly in expressions meaning ‘bring the gods here’, usually addressed to Agni, as in 1.12.3a áyne devān̄ihā vahā ‘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 āśvāsāḥ suvājo 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 trīr no rayśīm vahatam aśvīnā yuvām ‘Three times convey property to us, O Aśvins.’

The rare middle voice forms are also transitive, and additionally has affective-possessive force. The form vàhasva only occurs at 8.26.23: vāyo yāhī śivā233 divō, vàhasvā sū svāśvyam / vàhasva mahāh prthupākṣasā 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 voltāhām and voltāhā 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 voltāhām aśvīnā, rayśīm piśāṇgasamdṛśām ‘Bring us property of a reddish (gold) appearance, O Aśvins’.

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 bheṣajām, vī vāta vāhi yād rāpaḥ ‘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. *uegā, fn. 1.
10.16.13ab yām tvām agne samādahās, tām u nitr vāpayā pūnah ‘O Agni, the one whom you burnt, extinguish him again’.

**vājay**- ‘incite’
**pres. act.** 2nd sing. vājāya (10.68.2d)

**vid**₁ ‘find’
**pres. act.** 2nd sing. vinda (2)
**a-aor** 2nd sing. vidá (10.113.10d)
**[aor. inj. vidā (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 śa ṇa urviyā gādhám 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 ārvāṁ usrīyānāṁ ‘you found the pit of the reddish cows’.

**vid**₂ ‘know’
**perf. act.** 2nd sing. viddhí (8), vitt (5.60.6d), 2nd dual vittám (2)

Kümmel (2000: 495ff.) assigns no special perfect meaning to the modal forms, but rather considers them undifferentiated from a present stem meaning ‘to know’.

**viś** ‘enter, settle (down)’
**pres. act.** 2nd sing. viśā (18), 3rd pl. viśantu (7)
**pres. med.** 2nd sing. viśasva (10.56.1b), 3rd pl. viśatām (10.34.14c)
**pres. caus** 2nd sing. veśaya (1.176.2a)

A verb of motion, the well-attested present occurs with either an acc. or a loc., meaning ‘to enter’. The usual addressee is Soma, and thus the singular occurs 14 times out of 18 in Book 9. Thus, e.g. 9.25.2c dhármanā vāyām ā viśa ‘go, according to your nature, into Vāyu’, and 9.97.36c indram ā viśa brhata rāveṇa ‘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 tṛtīyena jyōtiśā sām viśasva ‘unite with the
third light’, and 10.34.14c ní vo ná manyúr višatám árātir ‘may your wrath abate, (and) your disfavour’.

viṣ ‘be active’

pres. act. 2nd sing. vívīḍḍhi (2)
See Narten (1964: 244ff.), Joachim (1978: 156), Mayrhofer (1986 s. VEṣ) for the differentiation of this root from another viṣ meaning “flow”.

vī ‘seek, pursue’

pres. act. 2nd sing. vīhī (11), vīhī (3), vītā (10.11.8d), 3rd sing. vētu (7), 2nd dual vītām (6), 2nd pl. vītā (7.59.6a), 3rd pl. vyāntu (7)

-si impv vēṣi (5)
For the possible existence of a form vitā, see p. 93. The length variation in the root, seen in vīhī and vīhī could be due to analogy with the doublets dīdihī/didihī and pipihī/pipihī. Thus the form vitā, if in fact Narten identified it correctly, is formed by analogy to the form vihī. The -si impv. vēṣi is actually the 2nd pers. sing. pres. pres. form of this verb. However it undoubtedly is used as an impv. See p. 55.

vīḍ ‘strengthen, become firm’

med. pres. 2nd sing. víḍyasva (2.37.3b)

vīravy ‘act like a hero’

pres. med. 2nd pl. vīrayadhvam (2)

vrī ‘cover’

pres. act. 2nd sing. ārṇu (9.96.11c), ārṇuhī (4), 2nd pl. ārṇuta (2.14.3d)
pres. med. 2nd sing. ārṇusva (10.16.7b)
aor. act. 2nd sing. vrddhi (8), 2nd dual vartam (6.62.11d)
The active is transitive, mostly occurring with the preverb ápa, meaning ‘open’. From the single occurrence of the middle voice, it is clear that it is reflexive: 10.16.7b sām prōrṇusva pǐvasā mēdasā 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 ū in the pres. stem does not, according to LIV, indicate an original laryngeal (**vlH-nēu, as suggested by Rasmussen [1983: 22]) but rather a variant *ulnéu with different syllabification. (op. cit.: fn.4.). Lubotsky (2001) dispenses with the multiple roots, making do with a single aniñ, laryngeal-initial root *Hyan, and explains the stem ānu- as having been formed by laryngeal metathesis. For extensive further bibliography see Mayrhofer (1986: s. VAR).

\(vr\) 2 ‘wish, choose’

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. \(vṛṇīsva\) (2), \(vṛṇēdhvām\) (5.28.6c)

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

\(vṛjī\) ‘twist’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. \(vṛṇēthi\) (2), 3rd sing. \(vṛṇēktu\) (4), 2nd pl. \(vṛṇēkta\) (1.172.3b)

\(vṛṣ\) ‘turn’

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. \(vartasva\) (10.95.17d), 3rd sing. \(vartātām\) (4), 2nd pl. \(vartadhvām\) (10.19.1a), 3rd pl. \(vartantām\) (2)

**root aor.** 2nd pl. \(vartta\) (1.165.14c)

**perf. act.** 2nd pl. \(vavṛṛtta\) (5.61.16c)

**perf. med.** 2nd sing. \(vavṛṛtsva\) (9), 2nd pl. \(vavṛṛdhvām\) (8.20.18d)

**caus. act.** 2nd sing. \(vartāya\) (11), 2nd dual. \(vartāyatam\) (2), 2nd pl. \(vartāyata\) (2.34.9c), 3rd pl. \(vartāyantu\) (2)

While the present stem of this verb is always middle-voice, and intransitive, meaning ‘turn round’, or ‘return’, the aorist and perfect stems may also be active. The active forms are also intransitive, hardly differing in meaning from the middle-voice presents: 1.165.14c \(ō śu vartta maruto vipram ācha\) ‘please turn to the seer, O Maruts’. An exception is the active perfect with the preverb \(ā\), which is transitive, as in 5.61.16 té no vāsāni kāmyā, ... / ā yajñīyāso vavṛṛtta\’a. ‘Turn desirable goods to us (in our direction), O sacrifice-worthy ones’. The causative forms, obviously, are always transitive, as in 2.23.7c bṛhaspate āpa tāṁ vartayā pathāḥ ‘Bṛhaspati, turn (divert) him (the wolf) from the path’.

235 See also Kümmel (2000: 465).
The stem vavṛt- 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 vavṛtyāti. The ending -yāt in the RV is attested only on present and perfect stems, while the aorists have the ending -yāś. The main obstacle to classifying all of the forms as perfect is the presence of the medio-passive aorist forms ávavṛtī and ávavṛtran. These must, however, be artificial forms, since the medio-passive is formed from the root and not from the aorist stem.

vṛdh ‘grow’

*pres. act.* 2nd sing. vāṛđha (10), 3rd sing. vāṛđhatu (2), 2nd dual vāṛđhatam (4.50.11a), 2nd pl. vāṛdhata (2.2.1a), 3rd pl. vāṛdhantu (13)

*pres. med.* 2nd sing. vāṛđhasva (10), 3rd sing. vāṛđhatām (4), 2nd dual vāṛđhethām (3.53.1d), 3rd pl. vāṛdhantām (2)

*them. perf.* 2nd sing. vāṛṛdhāsva (4)

*caus. act.* 2nd sing. vāṛṛḥāya (13), 2nd dual vāṛṛḥyatam (2), 3rd pl. vāṛṛḥayantu (2.11.11c)

*caus. med.* 2nd sing. vāṛṛḥāsva (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 vāṛṛḥa no gīraḥ ‘as you are purified, enhance our songs’, and 3.29.10d -āṭāḥ no vāṛṛḥāya gīraḥ ‘then magnify our songs’.

The middle-voice forms are either intransitive, meaning ‘grow’, as in 8.13.25ab vāṛṛḥasvā sā puraśṭuta, fśiṣṭatābhīr āṭībhiḥ ‘grow, O much-praised one, with aid praised by seers’, or transitive-affective, as 7.8.5d svāyāṁ vāṛṛḥasva taṇvāṁ sujāta ‘enhance your own body, O well-born’. The single example of the middle-voice causative falls into this latter category: 10.59.5d ghṛṭēna tvāṁ taṇvāṁ vāṛṛḥyasva ‘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 atheematic form would have been *vāvṛṣṭva, which could have been confused with forms from the verb vṛt.

**vṛṣc** ‘cut up’

*pres. act.* 2nd sing. vṛṣcā (9)

*perf (?)*, *act.* 2nd dual vavṛktam (6.62.10d)

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

**vṛṣi** ‘take courage’

*a-aor. med.* 2nd sing. vṛṣasva (10), 2nd dual vṛṣethām (2)

*them. perf.* 2nd sing. vavṛṣasva (8.61.7c)


**vṛṣi** ‘rain’

*pres. caus.* 2nd sing. vṛṣāya (10.98.1d), 2nd dual vavṛṣayatam (5.63.6d)

**vṛh** ‘tear out’

*pres. act.* 2nd sing. vṛhā (5), vṛhatāt (1.174.5c), 2nd dual vṛhatam (6.74.2a), 2nd pl. vṛhata (8.67.21c)

**vyath** ‘waver’

*caus. act.* 2nd sing. vyathaya (6.25.2b)

**vyadh** ‘pierce’

*pres. act.* 2nd sing. vidhya (9), 2nd dual vidhyatam (2), 3rd dual vidhyatām (6.75.4c). 2nd pl. vidhyata (1.86.9c)

**vyā** ‘enfold, swathe’

*pres. med.* 2nd sing. vyāyasva (2)
Index of attested imperative forms

śaṃs ‘proclaim, recite’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. śaṃsa (6), 2nd pl. śaṃsata (5)
**pres. caus.** śaṃsaya (7)
The causative occurs only in the repeated pāda ā tū na indra śaṃsaya gōśvā dvēṣu ‘O Indra, give us hope for cows and horses’, which occurs seven times at 1.29.1-7c²³⁹.

śak ‘be powerful, be able’

**aor. act.** 2nd sing. śagdhī (15), 2nd dual śaktam (4)
**desid. act.** 2nd sing. śikṣa (26), 3rd sing. śikṣata (1.81.6c), 2nd dual śikṣatam (6)
For an example of the form śagdhī see under pr₂, 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 śiśītām (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 sām śiśādhi at the end of the second pāda of a triṣṭubh line, an environment in which the form śiśīhī does not occur. This suggests a formulaic or phraseological reason for the preservation/coining of this form; conceivably could have been modeled on the form (ūt) śaśādhi (from śās, q.v.), which is morphologically regular, metrically identical, occurs only in the same position in triṣṭubh lines, and also isn’t too far away in meaning. For the structure of the root see Rasmussen (1989: 53), and LIV s. *kēh₃(l).

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. śaśādhi (2)

śuc ‘burn, shine’

pres. act. 2nd sing. śóca (6), 3rd sing. śocatu (6.52.2d)

pres. med. 2nd sing. śocasva (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 vas (q.v.). The active forms are intransitive, but may sometimes take an accusative of goal, meaning “shine on something”. It even occurs once with revāt (10.69.3c) in the same way as vas does, again leaving open the question whether revāt is adverbal or nominal.

The causative only occurs once in the RV, at 6.22.8d: brahmadvīṣe śocaya ksām apāś 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 rayīṁ / 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)

śṛṇ ‘smash’

pres. act. śṛṇihī (8), śṛṇītam (7.104.1c), śṛṇantu (10.87.15a)
**Index of attested imperative forms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>śnath</td>
<td>‘push, pierce’</td>
<td>śnathihi (2), śnathi (2nd sing.), śnathāh (2nd pl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>is-aor. 2nd pl. śnathiṣṭa (9.101.1c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For the mechanism which led to the formation of productive -iś- aor. forms from old sēj root aorists see Narten (1964: 53).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śrath</td>
<td>‘become loose’</td>
<td>śrathāya (2), śrathā (2nd sing.), śriṣṭha (3rd pl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>red. aor. 3rd pl. śrathānta (7.93.7d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śri</td>
<td>‘lean, incline, turn’</td>
<td>śrayā (2), śrayā (2nd sing.), śraya (3rd dual.), śrañjita (3rd sing.), śrañjita (2nd pl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For the meaning see Narten (1987).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śru</td>
<td>‘hear’</td>
<td>śrudpā (1.131.7e), śrudpā (2nd sing.), śrudpā (2nd pl.), śrudpā (3rd pl.), śrudpā (2nd dual), śrudpā (3rd sing.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>caus. act. 2nd sing. śrūvāya (3), śrūvāya (2nd dual)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An extremely common verb which has been extensively discussed elsewhere. For the aor. form śru, the formula śrudpā hāvam and the form śrudpā see p. 23 and p.82. For the full- and zero-grade variants śrudpā, śrudpā and śrudpā see p.31. For the -śi impv. form śrūsi see p. 56.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

240 The form śrayēthe is wrongly classified by Lubotsky (1997) as an imperative.
śruṣy ‘obey’

**pres. act.** 3rd sing. śroṣantu (1.86.5a)

This is a secondary root from śru. See p. 56, LIV s. kleyś and further bibliography in Mayrhofer (1986: s. ŚROŚ).

śvaṁc ‘bow’

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. śvaṁcasva (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 saca (10.75.5) is the only attested active form of this stem. Gotō (1987: 319) calls it “ganz abnorm”, and Lubotsky (1997: ad loc.) classifies it as a nonce form. Despite the reduplicated stem often being active, while the thematic stem saca- is always middle-voice (apart from the single example above), Gotō (1987: 319f.) correctly finds no difference in meaning between them, while suggesting that the reduplicated stem may originally have been iterative.242

sad ‘sit’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. sīda (16), 3rd sing. sīdatu (2), 2nd dual sīdatam (5), 3rd dual sīdatām (2), 2nd pl. sīdata (11), 3rd pl. sīdatantu (1)

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. sīdasva (1.36.9a)

---

241 For the semantics of this verb see Hoffmann (1960). See also under nam, p. 128.

242 See also Joachim (1978: 163f.). For the form sākṣva (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 ā, rather like a verb of motion, in that the seat (etc.) that is to be sat on is in the accusative: 3.53.3c édām barhīr yājamānasya sīda- ‘sit on this altar-grass of the sacrificer’. The other most common preverb with which this verb is used is ni, in which case it means ‘sit down’: 7.11.1d ny āgne hōtā prathamāh sadehā ‘O Agni, sit down here as the first hōtr’. The middle voice impv. only occurs once, and, once again like verbs of motion, is reciprocal, meaning ‘sit together’, and is strengthened by the preverb sām (cf. sām gachasva etc.): 1.36.9ab sām sīdasva mahśāh asi, sōcasva devāvihām ‘Sit together (with us), you are great, burn brightly . . .’.243.

For the causative forms see Jamison (1983: 169f.).

The lack of retroflexion in the present stem sāda- (> *si-sde-) is explained by Klingenschmitt (1982: 129) as being due to dissimilation of the internal -s- of the root from the s- of the reduplicating syllable. This is the opposite phenomenon to the assimilation of the root-initial s- with the -d-, as seen in e.g. the word nīḍā- < *ni-sdō-. The long -ī- is the result of compensatory lengthening, as in other cases of consonant loss by dissimilation. For further literature on this problem see Mayrhofer (1986: s. SÁD).

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 sastām (1.29.3b). 3rd pl. sasāntu (4)

All five occurrences of the form sástu occur at 7.55.5, as does one instance of sasāntu: sástu mātā sástu pitā, sástu śvā sástu viśpāth / sasāntu sārve jñātāyaḥ, sāstry 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. sāhasva (4), 2nd pl. sahadhvam (10.103.2c)

-sī impv. sakṣi (5.33.2d)

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

The form sākṣya only occurs at RV 1.42.1c: sākṣvā deva práṣ 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 sakṣat. The root sah also has a form sākṣva, with the same lengthening seen in some of its other sigmatic aorist forms, such as śākṣi, etc. This form, however, could also be classified as a perfect (*se-sūh*), and the other lengthened sigmatic aorist forms, which are all late, derived from it by analogy. 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.
### Index of attested imperative forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Present Stem</th>
<th>Present Med.</th>
<th>Causative Stem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sā</td>
<td>sā</td>
<td>sā</td>
<td>sā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres. act.</td>
<td>2nd sing. sya (5), 3rd sing. syatu (2), 2nd dual syatam (2), 3rd dual syatām (2.40.4d)</td>
<td>pres. med. (2) sing. syasva (3), 2nd pl. syadhvam (10.30.11c)</td>
<td>caus. act. (2) sing. sādháya (4), 2nd dual sādhāyatam (7.66.3c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The present stem is thematic: *ṣh₂-je-. 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 turīpam ādha posavīnā, déva tvāṣṭar ví rārāṇāh syasva ‘And, O god Tvaṣṭṛ, giving, release our property-bringing seed’. 

sādh | ‘bring to one’s goal, succeed’ | pres. act. 2nd sing. sādha (8) | pres. med. 3rd pl. sādhatām (6.53.4c) | caus. act. (2) 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 purudāṁsam sanīm, gōh śaśvattamām hāvamāṇāya sādha ‘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 dhīyaḥ ‘may our thoughts come to fruition’. The causative has a similar meaning to that of the active: 1.94.4c jīvāṇave pratarāṁ sādhayā dhñyāḥ ‘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.

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. med.** 2nd sing. *siṅcasva* (3.47.1c), 2nd pl. *siṅcādhvam* (7.16.11c)

The active is transitive, while the middle-voice is poorly attested, but is probably possessive-affective, as in 3.47.1c  ámbima jathāre mādhva ārmīṁ ‘Pour the wave of the sweet (drink) into (your own) stomach’.

sidh ‘drive away’


sīv ‘sew’

**pres. act.** 3rd sing. *sīvyatu* (2.32.4c)

**pres. med.** 2nd pl. *sīvyadhvam* (10.101.8b)

su ‘press’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. *sunú* (1.28.6d), 3rd sing. *sunotu* (8.33.12a), 2nd pl. *sunōta* (4), *sunōtana* (5.34.1c), *sunutā* (3)

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

root aor. 3rd sing. *sōtu* (10.76.6a), 2nd dual *sūtām* (2), 2nd pl. *sōta* (3), *sotana* (8.4.13b)

The single attestation of the middle-voice of this verb is obviously affective: 4.35.4cd áthā sunudhvaṁ sāvanam mādāya, pātā ḍhvavo mādhunaḥ somyāsyā ‘Press (for yourselves) the pressing for exhilaration, drink, O Rhbus, (of) the sweet Soma.’

sū ‘impel’


[aor. inj. *sāvīth* (3)]
Index of attested imperative forms

sūd ‘prepare’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. sūdaya (2), 3rd pl. sūdayantu (2)

Mayrhofer (1986: s. SŪD and SVAD) and Gotō (1987: 342f. and 1988: 310) cast doubt on the traditional derivation of these forms from the root svad ‘sweeten’ (as appears e.g. in Jamison [1983:99]) both on semantic and morphological grounds. LIV² (s. *syeh₂d), however, reunites them, reconstructing sūdaya- as *suh₂d-ēye 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.

sr ‘run’

them. aor. 2nd sing. sāra (9.41.6c)

srj ‘release’

**pres act.** 2nd sing. srjá (27), 2nd dual srjátam (3), 2nd pl. srjāta (4), 3rd pl. srjantu (3)

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. srjasva (2), 2nd, pl. srjādhvam (6.48.11c)

srp ‘creep’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. sarpa (10.18.10a), sarpatu (8.17.7c), sarpata (10.14.9a)

A verb of uniformly late distribution, the earliest example of any form occurring in Book 8.

skambh ‘fasten, strengthen’

**pres. act.** 2nd pl. skabhāyāta (10.76.4b)

For bibliography covering the forms in -āya- see under grh.

stan ‘thunder’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. stanāya (5.83.7a)

_root aor._ stanihi (6.47.30b)

[red. aor. _inj._ tatausahaan (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 tatausahaan as a reduplicated aor. see Hoffmann (1976³). For the sole attestation of this form see p. 148.
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\textit{stu} ‘praise’

\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. \textit{stuhi} (20), 2nd dual \textit{stutam} (8.35.11a), 2nd pl. \textit{stota} (2)

\textbf{si-impv} \textit{stosi} (10.22.4d)

\textit{stubh} ‘rejoice’

\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd pl. \textit{stobhata} (1.80.9b), \textit{stobhantu} (8.92.19b)

\textit{stt} ‘strew’

\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd dual \textit{strtitham} (8.73.3a), \textit{strtit} (3)

\textbf{pres. med.} 3rd sing. \textit{strtitam} (7.17.1b)
The single example of the middle voice is passive, or ‘fientive’: 7.17.1ab \textit{agnē bhāva susāmidhā sāmiddha, utā bāhīr urvīyā vī strtitam} ‘O Agni, may you be lit with good kindling, and may the altar-grass be spread widely’

\textit{sthā} ‘stand’

\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. \textit{tishta} (34), 3rd sing. \textit{tishtatu} (3), 2nd dual \textit{tishtatam} (1.183.3a),

\textbf{2nd pl. tishtata} (5), 3rd pl. \textit{tishtantu} (2)

\textbf{pres. med.} 2nd pl. \textit{tishtadhvam} (7.104.18a), 3rd pl. \textit{tishtantam} (3.18.2d)

\textbf{[aor. inj. stdh (6.24.9c)]}
The active forms of this verb are intransitive. With the preverb \textit{ā} it takes an accusative of goal and means ‘to get into (a chariot)’, as in 3.44.1d \textit{ā tisṭha hārita m rātham} ‘get into the gold-coloured chariot’. The middle voice only occurs with \textit{vī}, and is reflexive and reciprocal, meaning ‘to spread apart’ 3.18.2d \textit{vī te tishtantam ajārā ayāsah} ‘your (flames) will spread apart, ageless and restless’.

\textit{spaś} see \textit{paś}

\textit{spr} ‘win’

\textbf{pres. act.} 2nd sing. \textit{sprnuhi} (10.87.7a)

\textbf{root aor.} 2nd sing. \textit{sprdh (2)}, \textit{sprtam} (10.39.6d)

It is suggested by Wackernagel (1942: 176) that this is actually two roots with identical morphology, one meaning ‘win’, the other meaning ‘release’. The formal difference, as shown by Joachim (1978: 172f.) is in the valency; the former takes an accusative object, while the latter takes an ablative. Thus to the latter root belongs
e.g. 10.87.7ab utálabdham sprñuhī jātaveda, ālebhānād ṛṣṭibhir yātu dhānāt ‘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 sprñhi pīṭārāṃ y ōṭhi ... ‘Protect the father, fight (for him)’.

sprś ‘touch’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. sprśa (5), 2nd pl. sprśata (10.70.5a)

**caus. med.** 2nd sing. sparśayasva (10.112.3b)

The middle voice causative is passive, meaning ‘let (it) be touched’: 10.112.3ab hāritvatā vārcasā sāryasya, śrēṣṭhāi rāpāis tnvāṃ sparśayasva ‘Let your body be touched by the gold-coloured shine of the sun, by the most beautiful forms(?)’.

spṛṭī ‘kick away’

**pres. act.** 2nd sing. sphura (4.3.14c)

smṛ ‘remember’

**pres. med.** 2nd dual smarethām (7.104.7a)

syand ‘move quickly’

**pres. med.** 2nd sing. syandasva (9.67.28a), 3rd pl. syándantām (5.83.8b)

sṛu ‘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 (10.111.10d)

**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)
svár ‘sound’

pres. act. 2nd sing. svára (3), 3rd pl. sváranti (8.13.28a)

hán ‘slay’

pres. act. 2nd sing. jahí (50), 3rd sing. hantu (3), 3rd dual hátám (16), 2nd pl. hatá (3), 2nd pl. hantana (2), 3rd pl. ghnantu (7.104.17d)

há₁ ‘move’

pres. med. 2nd sing. jihíṣva (5.78.5a), 3rd sing. jihiṭām (4), 3rd dual jihiṭām (7.34.24a), 3rd pl. jihiṭām (2)
The form jihiṭām only occurs in 10.59.1-4d.

há₂ ‘leave’

pres. act. 3rd sing. jahātu (3.53.21d)

pass. 3rd sing. hiyaṭām (2)

Mayrhofer (1986: ad loc), considers this and há₁ to ultimately have the same origin.

LIV (s. *ghēH and *ghēH₁), while pointing out that all that differentiates between the two roots is the active and middle voice, is hesitant to consider them one root, on the grounds that “eine Vereinigung beider Wurzeln bedürfte genauerer semantischer Untermauerung.”

hi ‘launch, drive’

pres. act. 2nd sing. hinu (2), hinuḥi (2), hinuṭāt (10.16.1d), 2nd dual hinotam (1.184.4b), 2nd pl. hinōta (10), hinotana (10.30.7d), 3rd pl. hinvantu (4)
them. pres. 2nd sing. hinva (10.156.2c), 3rd sing. hinvatu (1.27.11c)

root aor. 2nd pl. heta (10.30.9b)

hu ‘sacrifice, pour’

pres. act. 2nd pl. juhōta (7), juhōṭana (6) , juhuta (2)

-si impv. hoṣi (6.44.14c)

hū ‘call’

pres. act. 2nd sing. hvaya (5.53.16c)
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**ḥṛ₁** 'take'
pres. act. 2nd sing. *hara* (2)

**ḥṛ₂** 'like'
pres. act. 2nd sing. *harya* (7), 2nd dual *hāryatam* (2), 2nd pl. *haryata* (5.54.15c)

**ḥṛṣ** 'be excited'
pres. med. 2nd sing. *ḥāṛasva* (2)
pres. caus. 2nd sing. *ḥāṛasya* (3)

**ḥvā** see ḫā
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