

This book is the first comprehensive study of the Vedic present formations with the suffix *-ya-* ('*-ya*-presents' for short), including both present passives with the accented suffix *-yá-* and non-passive *-ya*-presents with the accent on the root (class IV in the Indian tradition). It offers a complete survey of all *-ya*-presents attested in the Vedic corpus. The main issue in the spotlight of this monograph is the relationship between form (accent placement, diathesis) and function (passive/non-passive) in the system of the *-ya*-presents – one of the most solidly attested present classes in Sanskrit. One of the aims of the present study is to corroborate the systematic correlation between accent placement and the passive/non-passive distinction: passives bear the accent on the suffix, while non-passives have the accent on the root. The book also focuses on the position of the passive within the system of voices and valency-changing categories in Old Indo-Aryan.

Leonid Kulikov (PhD, Leiden University) is an Assistant Professor at Ghent University. He has published widely on synchronic and diachronic typology (in particular, on the diachronic typology of labile verbs and valency-changing categories), on the Vedic verb system and syntax, and on Vedic philology, and has edited numerous volumes in the fields of linguistic typology and Indology. He is an Associate Editor of the *Journal of Historical Linguistics*. His current research focuses on the grammar of early Vedic, a translation of the Atharvaveda, and the diachronic typology of transitivity and voice.

Leiden Studies
in Indo-European



Leonid Kulikov

The Vedic *-ya*-presents
Passives and intransitivity in Old Indo-Aryan

LSIE 19

Leonid Kulikov

The Vedic *-ya*-presents
Passives and intransitivity
in Old Indo-Aryan

Leiden Studies
in Indo-European



The Vedic *-ya*-presents
Passives and intransitivity in Old Indo-Aryan

LEIDEN STUDIES IN INDO-EUROPEAN

19

Series edited by

R.S.P. Beekes

A. Lubotsky

J.J.S. Weitenberg†

The Vedic *-ya*-presents
Passives and intransitivity
in Old Indo-Aryan

Leonid Kulikov



Amsterdam - New York, NY 2012

The paper on which this book is printed meets the requirements of "ISO 9706: 1994, Information and documentation - Paper for documents - Requirements for permanence".

ISBN: 978-90-420-3522-5

E-Book ISBN: 978-94-012-0797-3

©Editions Rodopi B.V., Amsterdam - New York, NY 2012

Printed in The Netherlands

To my mother

PREFACE

This book is partly based on my 2001 PhD thesis from Leiden University, but it has been considerably extended and, in several parts, rewritten, incorporating the results of my further research on the system of voice and valence-changing categories in Indo-Aryan in a diachronic typological perspective conducted during my VENI-scholarship.

Part A delineates the scope of this book – the Vedic present formations with the suffix *-ya-* (or “*-ya*-presents” for short), including both present passives with the accented suffix *-yá-* and non-passive *-ya*-presents with the accent on the root (class IV in the Indian tradition), as well as other passive formations attested in Vedic. It further introduces basic theoretical concepts and definitions.

The largest part of the book, Part B, is a comprehensive survey of the present formations with the suffix *-ya-*. It consists of individual lexical entries (lemmata) that discuss the relevant features of all *-ya*-presents attested in the Vedic corpus.

The concluding part, Part C, summarizes the results of this overview, offering a morphological, syntactic and semantic analysis of the *-ya*-formations and delimiting the linguistically relevant classes and groups within this category.

Appendix A is a brief survey of some post-Vedic *-ya*-presents which is relevant to the analysis of the Vedic data. Appendix B offers a discussion of the Vedic quasi-denominatives – a category of verbs hitherto unnoticed in Vedic grammar, which appears to be of crucial importance for an adequate analysis of several Middle and Late Vedic *-yá*-passives. Appendix C presents a brief overview of the passive formations attested in Vedic.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my cordial thanks to my late teacher of Sanskrit at the Institute of Oriental Studies (Moscow), Tat’jana Jakovlevna

ELIZARENKOVA. Her lessons, her explanations and comments on Classical and Vedic texts have laid the basis for my further study of the Vedic grammar. Needless to emphasize how much I owe to my first *guru* of Sanskrit.

Next, my sincerest gratitude goes to Alexander LUBOTSKY, who assisted me at all stages of my project. Without his careful reading, patience, thousands of comments, criticisms and suggestions this book might not have seen the light of day.

Werner KNOBL has also greatly contributed to the improvement of this book. His countless remarks, patient discussions, numerous explanations and suggestions have helped me to avoid many mistakes, inaccuracies and infelicitous formulations.

Earlier drafts were also read by Stanley INSLER. His sharp criticisms and invaluable remarks have helped to essentially improve parts of this book.

I am also heartily thankful to Robert BEEKES, Frederik KORTLANDT, Jos WEITENBERG, Willem ADELAAR, Arie VERHAGEN, and other Professors at Leiden University for their friendly help and advice.

Large parts of the earlier drafts of this book were also read by Henk BODEWITZ, Thomas ZEHNDER, Paul Kent ANDERSEN, Marcos ALBINO and Arlo GRIFFITHS. I am much indebted to all of them for their criticism and comments as well as for stylistic improvements. I have also greatly benefitted from the discussions of several text passages with Harry FALK, François HEENEN, Heinrich HETTRICH, Jan HOUBEN, Martin KÜMMEL, Thomas OBERLIES, Marianne OORT, Chlodwig WERBA, and Michael WITZEL.

My sincere gratitude goes out to my colleagues and friends from the Department of Comparative and Indo-European Linguistics (VIET) at Leiden University, in particular, to Slava CHIRIKBA, Helma VAN DEN BERG, Theo VAN LINT, George VAN DRIEM, Uwe BLÄSING, Michiel DE VAAN, Johnny CHEUNG, Karel JONGELING, Henry VAN DE LAAR, Michiel DRIESSEN and others. I would also like to take this opportunity to express my thanks to the members of the Research School CNWS, Leiden University Centre for Linguistics (LUCL) and Instituut Kern (particularly, to the library staff) for their friendly assistance at all stages of my research.

I am grateful for valuable comments on several text passages made by Yasuke IKARI (on *Vādhūla-Śrauta-Sūtra*), Gerhard EHLERS (on *Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa*), Chlodwig WERBA (on *Kāṭhaka*), Michiel DE VAAN (on Avestan quotations), Mislav JEŽIĆ (on *Kauṣītaki-Upaniṣad*), Alexei VIGASIN (on the *Smṛti* literature), Natasha KORNEEVA (on *Viṣṇu-Smṛti*). I particularly thank Yasuke IKARI for providing me with information on the relevant forms from

his unpublished edition of the Vādhūla-Śrauta-Sūtra, Gerhard EHLERS for sending me parts of his unpublished Habilitationsschrift with translation and discussion of books II-III of the Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa and Asko PARPOLA for sending me his unpublished edition of the Jaiminīya-Śrauta-Sūtra.

Last but not least, my special thanks go to all who helped me to prepare the manuscript of this book and to solve computer problems: Ilona MANEVSKAYA, Natasha RODINA, Haye VAN DEN OEVER, Liza BELORUSOVA, Maarten FRAANJE, John PETERSON, Robert RYAN, Mark TURIN, Maxim MARCHEVSKY, Dmitri FILIPPOV, and many others.

Special thanks are due to my mother and my wife, who have helped me immensely and encouraged me at all stages of my research, helping to bring this work to completion.

I acknowledge the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO), grant 275-70-009 (VENI-project) for financial support.

Needless to say, I take full responsibility for possible mistakes, misinterpretations and misprints.

CONTENTS

Preface	vii
Contents	xi
Abbreviations	xxiv

PART A. INTRODUCTION

I. Vedic <i>-ya</i> -formations: preliminaries	3
I.0. Introductory remarks	3
I.1. <i>-yá</i> -passives made from primary roots and <i>´ya</i> -presents (class IV)	4
I.2. <i>-yá</i> -passives made from secondary stems	10
I.3. <i>-ya</i> -presents and SIEVERS' law	11
I.4. Accentuation and semantics of <i>-ya</i> -presents	11
I.5. <i>-ya</i> -formations and related present types	14
I.5.1. The type <i>Cáya</i> -	14
I.5.2. The type <i>Cyáti</i>	15
I.5.3. The type <i>Cáya</i> -	15
II. Syntactic and semantic preliminaries	17
II.1. Voice and syntactic patterns: a theoretical framework	17
II.2. The main syntactic patterns	18
II.2.1. Transitive, absolute transitive and transitive-affective	18
II.2.2. Passive	19
II.2.2.1. Canonical passive	19
II.2.2.2. Agentless passive	19
II.2.3. Anticausative	20
II.2.4. Reflexive	21
II.2.5. Passive vs. anticausative (reflexive)	22
II.2.6. Reciprocal and sociative	24
II.3. Transitivity, objecthood and passivization test	24
II.4. 'Two pattern' transitive verbs (ditransitives)	26
II.5. Other relevant syntactic notions	27

II.6. Some relevant semantic types and oppositions	28
II.7. Simple Present and Present Continuous in English translations of -yá-passives	29
III. Corpus of texts and evaluation of evidence	30
III.1. The Vedic corpus	30
III.2. Forms under discussion and their sources	31
III.3. Statistic evaluation: hapaxes, nonce formations and ‘passive-rich’ mantras	32
IV. The structure of the survey of -ya-presents	34
IV.1. The formal classes of -ya-presents	34
IV.2. The structure of the individual lemmata	35

PART B. A SURVEY OF VEDIC -YA-PRESENTS

I. Middle -ya-presents with suffix accentuation	39
(<i>aj</i> ‘drive’: <i>ajyá-te</i>)	39
² <i>añc</i> ‘bail [water]’: - <i>acyá-te</i>	39
^(1/2) <i>añj</i> ‘anoint; manifest’: <i>ajyá-te</i>	41
<i>ad</i> ‘eat’: <i>adyá-te</i>	50
<i>aśⁱ</i> ‘eat’: <i>aśyá-te</i> (<i>asyá-te</i>)	51
<i>āp</i> ‘obtain, gain, complete’: <i>āpyá-te</i>	53
<i>idh</i> ‘kindle’: <i>idhyá-te</i>	55
<i>ṛc</i> ‘recite, praise’: <i>ṛcyá-te</i>	58
<i>kṛ</i> ‘make, prepare, accomplish’: <i>kṛyá-te</i>	62
<i>kṛt</i> ‘cut’: <i>kṛtyá-te</i>	64
<i>kṛṣ</i> ‘drag, plough’: <i>kṛṣyá-te</i>	65
<i>kṛ̥</i> ‘scatter, spill (semen)’: - <i>kṛyá-te</i>	67
<i>kram</i> ‘stride, advance’: <i>kramyá-te</i>	69
<i>krī</i> ‘buy, purchase’: <i>krīyá-te</i>	71
<i>khanⁱ</i> ‘dig’: <i>khāyá-te</i> (<i>khanya-te</i>)	72
<i>khyā</i> (<i>kśā</i>) ‘see, consider, know’: <i>khyāyá-te</i> , - <i>kśāpyá-te</i>	73
<i>gam</i> ‘go’: - <i>gamyá-te</i>	79
<i>gā</i> ‘sing, chant’: <i>gīyá-te</i>	81
<i>gup</i> ‘protect, guard’: <i>gupyá-te</i>	83
<i>gūh</i> ‘hide’: <i>guhāmāna-</i>	83
<i>gra(b)hⁱ</i> ‘seize, take, draw’: <i>grhyá-te</i>	84
<i>ghṛ</i> ‘drip’: <i>ghṛiyá-te</i> , - <i>ghāryá-te</i>	86
<i>carⁱ</i> ‘move; perform’: <i>caryá-te</i> (- <i>cārya-te</i>)	88
<i>ci</i> ‘pile, build, gather’: <i>cīyá-te</i>	91

<i>cṛt</i> ‘bind, tie, snare’: - <i>cṛtyá</i> ^{-te}	91
<i>jīv</i> ‘live’: - <i>jīvyá</i> ^{-te}	92
<i>jñā</i> ‘know, recognize, distinguish’: <i>jñāyá</i> ^{-te} , - <i>jñāpyá</i> ^{-te}	92
<i>jyut</i> ‘shine’: - <i>jyotyá</i> ^{-te}	95
¹ <i>tan</i> ⁽ⁱ⁾ ‘stretch’: <i>tāyá</i> ^{-te} (- <i>tāyyá</i> -, <i>tanya</i> ^{-te})	96
<i>tuj</i> ‘set in (vehement) motion, put to panic (flight)’: <i>tujyá</i> ^{-te}	101
<i>tṛh</i> ‘crush, shatter, kill’: <i>tṛhyá</i> ^{-te}	104
<i>dad</i> ‘hold, keep, offer’: - <i>dadyá</i> ^{-te}	106
¹ <i>dā</i> ‘give’: <i>dāyá</i> ^{-te} , - <i>ditsya</i> ^{-te} , <i>dāpya</i> ^{-te}	107
² <i>dā</i> ‘bind, tie, connect’: - <i>dāyá</i> ^{-te}	109
^{3/4} <i>dā</i> (<i>dī</i> ?) ‘destroy, cut (in pieces); divide’: - <i>dīyá</i> ^{-te}	110
<i>duh</i> ‘milk’: <i>duhyá</i> ^{-te} , <i>dohyāmāna</i> -	112
<i>dṛ</i> ‘heed, care’: - <i>driyá</i> ^{-te}	121
<i>dṛś</i> ‘see’: <i>dṛśyá</i> ^{-te}	123
<i>dhām</i> ⁱ (<i>dhmā</i>) ‘blow, inflate’: <i>dhāmya</i> ^{-te} , <i>dhmāyá</i> ^{-te}	125
<i>dhā</i> ‘put, place; create’: <i>dhāyá</i> ^{-te} , - <i>dhāpyamāna</i> -	130
<i>dhū</i> ‘shake’: - <i>dhūyá</i> ^{-te}	134
<i>dhūp</i> ‘smoke, fumigate’: <i>dhūpyá</i> ^{-te}	135
<i>dhṛ</i> ‘stay’: ‘decide’: <i>dhriyá</i> ^{-te} , <i>dhāryá</i> ^{-te}	138
<i>nah</i> ‘tie, bind’: - <i>nahyá</i> ^{-te}	140
<i>nid</i> ‘revile, blame, mock’: <i>nidyāmāna</i> - (<i>nindya</i> ^{-te})	140
<i>nī</i> ‘lead, conduct, pour’: <i>nīyá</i> ^{-te}	141
<i>paṇ</i> ‘bargain (for)’: <i>paṇyāmāna</i> -	143
<i>paṇ</i> ⁱ ‘admire, glorify’: - <i>panyá</i> ^{-te}	143
² <i>pā</i> ‘drink’: <i>pīyá</i> ^{-te} , - <i>pāyya</i> ^{-te}	146
<i>piś</i> ‘adorn, dress’: <i>piśyāmānā</i> -	147
<i>piś</i> ‘crush, grind’: <i>piśyá</i> ^{-te}	149
¹ <i>pū</i> ‘purify, cleanse’: <i>pūyá</i> ^{-te} , <i>pāvya</i> ^{-te}	150
<i>pṛc</i> ‘fill; unite, mix’: <i>pṛcyá</i> ^{-te}	152
<i>pṛch/prach</i> (<i>praś</i>) ‘ask’: <i>pṛchyá</i> ^{-te}	157
<i>pyā</i> ‘swell’: - <i>pyāyāmāna</i> -	157
<i>bandh</i> ‘bind’: <i>badhyá</i> ^{-te}	158
<i>bhakṣ</i> ‘consume, drink’: <i>bhakṣyāmāna</i> -	159
<i>bhaj</i> ‘share, distribute, divide’: - <i>bhājyá</i> ^{-te}	160
<i>bhuj</i> ‘consume, enjoy, use’: <i>bhujyá</i> ^{-te}	167
<i>bhṛ</i> ‘carry, bring’: <i>bhriyá</i> ^{-te}	168
<i>mad</i> ‘rejoice’: - <i>madyāmāna</i> -	170
<i>man</i> ‘think’: <i>mīmāṃṣyāmāna</i> -	171
<i>mantr</i> ‘pronounce a mantra; address’: - <i>mantryāmāna</i> -	171

<i>manth</i> ‘stir, whip; churn, produce [fire]’: <i>mathyá-te</i>	172
(² <i>mā</i> ‘measure’: <i>mīyá-te</i>)	173
<i>mi</i> ‘fix, set up’: <i>mīyá-te</i>	175
<i>mṛ</i> ‘die’: <i>mriyá-te</i> , <i>māryá-te</i>	179
<i>mṛj</i> ‘wipe, cleanse, adorn’: <i>mṛjyá-te</i>	182
<i>mṛd</i> ‘rub, crush, tread’: <i>mṛdyá-te</i>	185
<i>mṛś</i> ‘touch’: <i>-mṛśyá-te</i>	186
<i>mṛ</i> ‘crush, destroy’: <i>-mūryá-te</i>	187
<i>yaj</i> ‘perform [sacrifice], worship’: <i>ijyá-te</i> , <i>yājya-te</i>	187
<i>yam</i> ‘hold, submit, yield’: <i>yamyá-te</i>	189
<i>yuj</i> ‘yoke, join; employ’: <i>yujyá-te</i>	192
<i>rabh/labh</i> ‘take, seize’: <i>-rabhyá-te</i> / <i>labhyá-te</i>	195
(¹) <i>rudh</i> ‘obstruct, keep (back)’: <i>rudhyá-te/(-ti)</i> , <i>-rurutsyámāna-</i>	198
<i>ruh/(rup)</i> ‘rise, ascend’: <i>-ropyámāna-</i> , <i>-rohyamāna-</i>	207
<i>lip</i> ‘stick, smear; stain’: <i>lipyá-te</i>	208
<i>vac</i> ‘speak; pronounce; call’: <i>ucyá-te</i> , <i>vācyá-te</i>	211
<i>vañc</i> ‘move (waveringly), jump’: <i>vacyá-te</i>	218
<i>vad</i> ‘(re)sound, speak, pronounce, declare’: <i>udyá-te</i> , <i>vādyá-te</i>	224
<i>vap</i> ‘sow, scatter’: <i>upyá-te</i>	225
³ <i>vas</i> ‘dwell, stay’: <i>-vāsyá-te</i>	231
<i>vah</i> ‘carry, convey; marry’: <i>uhyá-te</i> (/ <i>ūhyá-te</i>)	
<i>ūh</i> ‘shift, transpose’: <i>-ūhyá-te</i>	231
<i>vic</i> ‘sift, separate’: <i>-vicyá-te</i>	239
<i>vich</i> ‘impel [by (brutal) whacks]’: <i>-vich[y]á-te</i>	240
¹ <i>vid</i> ‘find’: <i>vidyá-te</i>	241
<i>viṣṭ</i> ‘wrap, cover’: <i>veṣṭyámāna-</i>	245
<i>vṛ</i> ‘pursue, strive after, approach’: <i>vīryá-te</i>	246
<i>vṛj</i> ‘prepare, do; lay’: <i>vṛjyá-te</i>	247
<i>vṛt</i> ‘turn’: <i>-vartyá-te</i>	249
<i>vṛ</i> (¹ <i>vṛ</i>) ‘choose’: <i>-varyámāna-</i> , <i>-vriyamāna-</i>	250
<i>vyā</i> (<i>vṛ</i>) ‘envelop, cover’: <i>vīryá-te</i>	252
<i>vraśc/vṛśc</i> ‘cut off’: <i>vṛścya-te</i> (<i>vṛścá-te</i>)	255
<i>śams</i> ‘recite, praise’: <i>śasyá-te</i>	261
<i>śas</i> ‘cut’: <i>śasyá-te</i>	264
<i>śrā</i> ‘cook’: <i>śrapyá-te</i>	265
<i>śri</i> ‘lay on, fix on’: <i>-śrīyá-te</i> (<i>-śriya-te</i>)	265
<i>śru</i> ‘hear’: <i>śrūyá-te</i> , <i>-śrāvya-te</i>	271
<i>sa(ñ)j</i> ‘hang, attach, consign’: <i>sajyá-te</i> (<i>sajja-ti/te</i>)	273
<i>sad</i> ‘sit’: <i>-sadyá-te</i> , <i>sādyá-te</i>	275

<i>sic</i> ‘pour (out)’: <i>sicyá-^{te}</i>	279
<i>su</i> ‘press out’: <i>sūyá-^{te}</i>	282
¹ <i>sū</i> ‘impel, urge; consecrate’: <i>sūyá-^{te}</i> ‘be consecrated’	284
<i>srj</i> ‘set free [for running etc.]; emit; create’: <i>srjyá-^{te}</i>	286
<i>sku</i> ‘poke’: <i>skūyāmāna-</i>	291
<i>stu</i> ‘praise’: <i>stūyá-^{te}</i>	292
<i>stṛ</i> ‘strew, spread; cover’: <i>stīryá-^{te}</i>	297
<i>han</i> ‘kill, smite, hit’: <i>hanyá-^{te}</i>	299
<i>hu</i> ‘offer, pour [oblation]’: <i>hūyá-^{te}</i>	303
<i>hū</i> (<i>hvā</i>) ‘call, invoke’: <i>hūyá-^{te}</i>	306
<i>hr</i> ‘bring, take’: <i>hriyá-^{te}</i> (<i>hrīya-^{te}</i>)	310
II. Middle -ya-presents with root accentuation	313
<i>iṅg</i> (<i>aṅg</i>) ‘move, stir’: <i>-iṅgya-^{te}</i> (<i>-áṅgya-^{te}</i>)	313
<i>īr</i> ‘move’: <i>īrya-^{te}</i>	315
<i>ṛj</i> ‘direct, stretch’: <i>ṛjya-^{te}</i> (<i>ṛjīyānt-</i>)	316
<i>kā</i> ‘long (for), yearn, desire’: <i>kāyamāna-</i>	319
<i>janⁱ</i> ‘be born, arise’: <i>jāya-^{te}</i> (<i>janya-^{te}</i>)	320
<i>trā</i> ‘protect, rescue’: <i>trāya-^{te}</i>	322
<i>dīp</i> ‘shine, blaze’: <i>dīpya-^{te/(ti)}</i>	323
² <i>pat</i> ‘rule; possess’: <i>pátya-^{te}</i>	324
<i>pad</i> ‘fall, move’: <i>pādya-^{te/(ti)}</i> , <i>-pādyā-^{te}</i>	326
<i>pyā</i> ‘fill, swell’: <i>(-)pyāya-^{te}</i>	330
<i>budh</i> ‘(a)wake; perceive, notice’: <i>búdhya-^{te}</i>	332
<i>man</i> ‘think; respect’: <i>mānya-^{te/(ti)}</i> , ⁽⁺⁾ <i>mīmāṃṣyāmāna-</i>	336
¹ <i>yā</i> ‘drive (fast), speed’: <i>īya-^{te}</i>	347
(i ‘go’: <i>-īyate</i>)	347
<i>rādh</i> ‘succeed, be successful’: <i>rādhya-^{te}</i>	350
<i>rī</i> ‘whirl, swirl’: <i>rīya-^{te}</i>	353
<i>lī</i> ‘dissolve, disappear; ‘adhere, cling’: <i>līya-^{te}</i>	354
<i>vās</i> ‘bellow’: <i>vāsya-^{te}</i> (<i>vāsyā-^{te}</i>)	359
III. Middle -ya-presents with fluctuating accentuation	362
<i>ṛdh</i> ‘succeed, be successful, go well’: <i>ṛdhyá-^{te}</i>	362
³ <i>kṣi</i> (<i>kṣī</i>) ‘perish, disappear’: <i>kṣīyá-^{te}</i>	370
<i>chid</i> ‘break, cut off’: <i>chídya-^{te}</i>	373
<i>jyā</i> (<i>jī</i>) ‘deprive of, suffer loss, suffer violence’: <i>jīyá-^{te}</i>	376
<i>tap</i> ‘become hot; suffer; perform austerity’: <i>tápyá-^{te}</i> , <i>tāpya-^{te}</i>	380
<i>dah</i> ‘burn’: <i>dāhya-^{te/(ti)}</i> (<i>-dāhya-^{te}</i>)	390
<i>dṛ</i> (<i>dṛ</i>) ‘crack, split, break, burst’: <i>dīryá-^{te}</i>	397

<i>pac</i> ‘cook’; ‘ripen’: <i>pácyá-te</i>	400
<i>pṛ</i> (<i>pūr</i>) ‘fill, become/grow full’: <i>púrýá-te</i>	406
<i>bhid</i> ‘split’: <i>bhidyá-te</i>	412
¹ <i>mṭ</i> ‘damage, diminish, violate, perish’: <i>mýá-te</i>	415
<i>muc</i> ‘release, become free, escape’: <i>múcyá-te</i>	420
<i>ric</i> ‘empty; surpass; leave (over)’: <i>rícyá-te</i>	425
<i>lup</i> ‘damage, rip (off), tear, omit’: <i>lúpyá-te</i>	428
<i>śis</i> ‘leave (over)’: <i>śísyá-te</i>	431
<i>śt</i> ‘fall’: <i>śtyá-te</i>	434
<i>śṭ</i> ‘break (off), split, collapse’: <i>śtryá-te</i>	443
<i>hā</i> ‘leave (behind), omit, exclude’: <i>híyá-te</i>	448
IV. Unaccented middle -ya-presents	452
¹ <i>añc</i> ‘bend’: <i>-acya-te</i>	452
<i>am</i> ⁱ ‘grasp; swear, make alliance’: <i>-amya-te</i>	457
<i>i</i> ‘go’: <i>-īya-te</i>	458
¹ <i>iṣ</i> ‘seek, wish, desire’: <i>iṣya-te</i>	458
² <i>iṣ</i> ‘send’: <i>-iṣya-te</i>	460
<i>u</i> (³ <i>vā</i>) ‘weave’: <i>ūya-te</i>	460
<i>ukṣ</i> ‘(be)sprinkle’: <i>-ukṣya-te</i>	460
<i>ud</i> ‘moisten, wet’: <i>udya-te</i>	462
<i>uṣ</i> ‘scorch, burn’: <i>-uṣya-te</i>	463
<i>kḷp</i> ‘arrange, fit’: <i>kalpya-te</i> (<i>-kḷpya-te</i>)	464
<i>krūḍ</i> ‘burn’ (?) (of milk): <i>krūḍya-te</i>	465
<i>cāy</i> ‘observe, respect’: <i>-cāyya-te</i>	467
<i>chad</i> ‘cover, veil’: <i>chādyā-te</i>	467
<i>jval</i> ‘burn, flame’: <i>-jvālyā-te</i>	468
<i>tṛ</i> (<i>ṭr</i>) ‘pass; overcome; save’: <i>-tīrya-te</i> , <i>-tārya-te</i>	469
<i>dabh</i> ‘deceive’: <i>dabhya-te</i>	472
<i>diś</i> ‘point (out), prescribe, teach’: <i>diśya-te</i>	472
<i>dih</i> ‘smear’: <i>dihya-te</i>	474
<i>du</i> (<i>dū</i>) ‘burn’: <i>dūya-te</i>	474
<i>dhāv</i> ‘rub’: <i>-dhāvya-te</i>	475
<i>nam</i> ‘bend, bow’: <i>namyá-te</i>	476
<i>nud</i> ‘push’: <i>nudya-te</i>	477
<i>pīḍ</i> ‘press, squeeze’: <i>pīḍya-te</i>	478
<i>prī</i> ‘please’: <i>prīya-te</i> (<i>priya-te</i>)	479
(<i>pluṣ</i> ‘burn’: <i>ploṣya-te</i>)	481
(<i>psā</i> ‘chew’: <i>-psīya-te</i>)	481

<i>bha(ñ)j</i> ‘defeat, break’: <i>bhajya-te</i>	481
<i>bhāṣ</i> ‘speak’: <i>bhāṣya-te</i>	482
<i>bhr̥j(j)</i> ‘roast, parch’: <i>bhr̥j(j)ya-te</i>	483
<i>bhrañś</i> ‘fall, miss’: <i>bhra(ñ)śya-te</i>	484
<i>mīv</i> ‘move, impel’: <i>-mīvyā-te</i>	485
<i>muṣ</i> ‘steal, rob’: <i>muṣya-te</i>	486
<i>mṛt</i> ‘destroy’: <i>-mṛtya-te</i>	487
<i>mṛṣ</i> ‘forget’: <i>mṛṣya-te</i>	487
<i>yat</i> ‘be/put in place’: <i>-yātya-te</i>	488
<i>yabh</i> ‘fuck, copulate’: <i>yabhya-te</i> , <i>yīyapsya-te</i>	488
² <i>yā (ī)</i> ‘implore, request’: <i>īya-te</i>	494
<i>raj</i> ‘colour, become red’: <i>rajya-te</i> , <i>lajja-te</i>	497
<i>ribh</i> ‘creak, rasp (?)’; sing’: <i>ribhya-te</i>	498
<i>ruc</i> ‘shine, glow’: <i>rocya-te</i>	499
(<i>vīp</i> ‘tremble’: <i>vepya-te</i>)	499
<i>viṣ</i> ‘be active’: <i>viṣya-te</i>	500
<i>vr̥h (bṛh)</i> ‘tear (off)’: <i>-vr̥hya-te</i> (<i>-bṛhya-te</i>)	501
<i>vlī (plī, blī)</i> ‘oppress; collapse’: <i>vlīya-te</i> (<i>-plīya-te</i>)	503
<i>ślāgh</i> ‘laud, brag’: <i>ślāghya-te</i>	507
² <i>sidh</i> ‘repel’: <i>-sidhya-te</i>	507
² <i>sū</i> ‘generate, bear, beget’: <i>sūya-te</i>	508
² <i>sr̥</i> ‘stretch’: <i>-sriya-te</i> , <i>-sārya-te</i>	510
<i>styā</i> ‘become coagulated, stiff’: <i>-styāya-te</i>	511
<i>sthā</i> ‘stand’: <i>sthīya-te</i> , <i>sthāpya-te</i>	512
<i>sphā</i> ‘fatten, swell; prosper’: <i>-sphāya-te</i> (<i>sphīya-te</i>)	514
<i>smṛ</i> ‘remember’: <i>smarya-te</i>	515
<i>hi(ṃ)s</i> ‘injure, harm’: <i>-hiṃsyamāna-</i>	516
V. Active -ya-presents	517
<i>as</i> ‘throw, shoot’: <i>ás(i)ya-ti/te</i>	517
<i>ār</i> ‘recognize, treat as an ārya’: <i>(-)ārya-ti</i>	522
² <i>iṣ</i> ‘send, dispatch, impel’: <i>íṣya-ti/(te)</i>	523
<i>ūrṣ</i> ‘be/become angry’: <i>ūrṣya-ti</i>	527
<i>uc</i> ‘be/become accustomed to, take pleasure’: <i>-ucya-ti</i>	528
<i>kup</i> ‘be/become angry, quake’: <i>kupya-ti</i>	530
<i>kṛś</i> ‘be/become lean’: <i>kṛśya-ti</i>	531
<i>krudh</i> ‘be/become angry’: <i>krúdhya-ti/(te)</i>	531
<i>kṣā</i> ‘burn’: <i>kṣā́ya-ti</i>	532
<i>kṣudh</i> ‘be/become hungry’: <i>kṣúdhya-ti</i>	534

(<i>gā</i> ‘sing’: <i>gāya</i> - ^{ti/te})	535
<i>gr̥dh</i> ‘be/become greedy, eager, hanker’: <i>gr̥dhya</i> - ^{ti}	535
<i>glā</i> ‘be/become weary, relax’: <i>glāya</i> - ^{ti}	536
<i>jas</i> ‘disappear, get lost’: <i>-jasya</i> - ^{ti}	536
<i>jī</i> ‘grow old, decay, age, wear (out)’: <i>jīrya</i> - ^{ti} , <i>jīrya</i> - ^{ti/(te)}	538
² <i>tan</i> (ⁱ) (<i>stan</i> (ⁱ)) ‘thunder’: <i>tanya</i> - ^{ti}	541
<i>tam</i> ⁱ ‘be/become exhausted, out of breath’: <i>tāmya</i> - ^{ti/(te)}	543
<i>tuṣ</i> ‘be satisfied, be pleased’: <i>tuṣya</i> - ^{ti}	544
<i>tṛp</i> ‘be/become satisfied, pleased, satiated’: <i>tṛpya</i> - ^{ti/(te)}	545
<i>tṛṣ</i> ‘be/become thirsty, thirst’: <i>tṛṣya</i> - ^{ti}	548
<i>tī</i> (<i>tūr</i>) ‘surpass, overcome’: <i>tūrya</i> - ^{ti}	549
<i>dam</i> ⁱ ‘control, restrain (oneself)’: <i>dāmya</i> - ^{ti}	550
<i>das</i> ‘waste, become exhausted’: <i>dāsyā</i> - ^{ti}	551
¹ <i>dī</i> ‘fly’: <i>dīya</i> - ^{ti/(te)}	554
<i>dīv</i> ‘play’: <i>dīvyā</i> - ^{ti/te}	556
<i>duṣ</i> ‘spoil’: <i>duṣya</i> - ^{ti} , <i>dūṣya</i> - ^{te}	560
<i>dṛp</i> ‘be/become bewildered, mad, ignorant’: <i>dṛpya</i> - ^{ti}	562
<i>dṛh</i> ‘be/become firm’: <i>dṛhya</i> - ^{ti/(te)}	563
<i>druh</i> ‘deceive, be/become deceitful’: <i>druhya</i> - ^{ti}	564
<i>dhyā</i> ‘think of, meditate, contemplate’: <i>dhyāya</i> - ^{ti/(te)}	565
<i>dhvaṃs</i> ‘become ruined, corrupted’: <i>-dhvasya</i> - ^{ti}	568
¹ <i>naś</i> ‘perish, disappear’: <i>nāśya</i> - ^{ti/(te)}	569
² <i>naś</i> (<i>aś</i>) ‘reach’: <i>-āśyant-</i> (<i>-aś[nu]vant-</i>)	570
<i>nah</i> (<i>nadh</i>) ‘tie, bind’: <i>nāhya</i> - ^{ti/te}	572
<i>nṛt</i> ‘dance’: <i>nṛtya</i> - ^{ti/(te)}	578
<i>paś</i> ‘see’: <i>pāśya</i> - ^{ti/te}	580
¹ <i>pā</i> ‘protect’: <i>*pāya</i> - ^{ti} (?)	583
<i>pīs</i> ‘prosper’: <i>pīsyā</i> - ^{ti}	584
² <i>pī</i> (<i>pīy</i>) ‘blame, revile, scorn, speak evil’: <i>pīya</i> - ^{ti}	584
<i>puṣ</i> ‘prosper; (make prosper)’: <i>púsyā</i> - ^{ti/(te)}	586
² <i>pū</i> ‘stink, rot, be/become putrid’: <i>pūya</i> - ^{ti}	590
(<i>praj</i> (<i>j</i>) ‘end, stop’ (of web warp): <i>-prj(y)a</i> - ^{ti/(te)})	592
<i>pruṣ</i> ‘sprinkle, spurt’: <i>-pruṣya</i> - ^{ti}	594
(<i>bhrj</i> (<i>j</i>) ‘roast’: <i>bhrj(j)yéyuh</i>)	594
<i>mād</i> ‘be/become drunk, intoxicated; inebriate’: <i>mādyā</i> - ^{ti}	595
<i>muh</i> ‘be/become confused, err’: <i>múhya</i> - ^{ti}	596
<i>mṛc</i> ‘be/become hurt, damaged’: <i>-mṛcya</i> - ^{ti}	597
(<i>mṛt</i> (<i>mrit</i> , <i>mlit</i>) ‘damage, destroy’: <i>-mṛityét</i> , <i>-mṛityeyuh</i>)	598
<i>med</i> ‘be/become fat’: <i>médya</i> - ^{ti}	599

<i>mlā</i> ‘wither, relax’: <i>mlāya</i> - ^{ti}	599
<i>yas</i> ‘be/become heated, boil’: - <i>yāsya</i> - ^{ti}	600
<i>yudh</i> ‘fight’: <i>yúdhya</i> - ^{ti/te}	601
<i>ran</i> ⁽ⁱ⁾ (<i>ran</i> ⁽ⁱ⁾) ‘rejoice’: <i>rānya</i> - ^{ti}	604
<i>randh</i> ‘be/become subject’: <i>rādhya</i> - ^{ti/(te)}	606
(<i>ras</i> : - <i>rasya</i> -)	608
² <i>rā</i> ‘bark’: <i>rāya</i> - ^{ti}	608
<i>riṣ</i> ‘be hurt, injured; injure’: <i>rīṣya</i> - ^{ti/(te)}	609
<i>rup</i> ‘suffer (stomach) pain’: <i>rúpya</i> - ^{ti}	612
<i>lubh</i> ‘be/become disturbed, confused’: <i>lúbhya</i> - ^{ti}	612
² <i>vā</i> ‘wane, fade, vanish’: <i>vāya</i> - ^{ti/(te)}	613
¹ <i>vā</i> ‘blow’: <i>vāya</i> - ^{ti/te} (/ <i>vāti</i> etc.)	615
<i>vyadh</i> ‘pierce, shoot’: <i>vidhya</i> - ^{ti/(te)}	616
<i>sam</i> ⁱ ‘be/become extinguished, appeased’: <i>śāmya</i> - ^{ti/(te)}	618
<i>śVmya</i> - ^{ti} ‘prepare for sacrifice’	624
<i>śuc</i> ‘(flame up); suffer, pain’: <i>śúcya</i> - ^{ti}	629
<i>śu(n)dh</i> ‘become pure, clean’: <i>śudhya</i> - ^{ti/te} , <i>śodhya</i> - ^{te}	630
<i>śuṣ</i> ‘be/become dry, dry (up)’: <i>śúṣya</i> - ^{ti/(te)}	634
<i>śyā</i> ‘congeal, coagulate, freeze’: <i>śyāya</i> - ^{ti}	636
<i>śram</i> ⁱ ‘become weary; toil’: <i>śrámya</i> - ^{ti}	638
<i>śrā</i> ‘become ready’: <i>śráya</i> - ^{ti}	641
<i>śliṣ</i> (<i>śriṣ</i>) ‘adhere, stick, clasp, embrace’: <i>ślīṣya</i> - ^{ti/(te)}	642
<i>śvā</i> (<i>śū</i>) ‘swell’: - <i>śūya</i> - ^{ti}	645
<i>sādh</i> / ¹ <i>sidh</i> ‘succeed, be successful’: <i>sídhya</i> - ^{ti}	646
<i>sīv</i> ‘sew, stitch’: <i>sīvyā</i> - ^{ti/(te)}	648
<i>stā</i> (<i>tā</i>) ‘steal, act secretly’: *(<i>s</i>) <i>tāya</i> - ^{ti}	649
<i>srīv</i> (<i>śrīv</i>) ‘be aborted’: <i>srīvyā</i> - ^{ti}	650
<i>svid</i> ‘sweat’: <i>svidya</i> - ^{ti}	652
<i>har</i> ⁱ (² <i>hṛ</i>) ‘enjoy; wish’: <i>hārya</i> - ^{ti/(te)}	652
<i>hṛṣ</i> ‘be/become excited’: <i>hṛṣya</i> - ^{ti}	659
VI. <i>Cyāti</i> presents	661
<i>chā</i> ‘cut [skin], flay’: - <i>ch</i> _(i) <i>yā</i> - ^{ti}	661
² <i>dā</i> ‘bind, tie’: - <i>d</i> _(i) <i>yā</i> - ^{ti}	
^{3/4} <i>dā</i> (/ ^{1/2} <i>day</i>) ‘destroy, cut (in pieces)’: - <i>dya</i> - ^{ti/(te)}	663
<i>śā</i> ‘sharpen, hone’: (-) <i>ś</i> _(i) <i>yā</i> - ^{ti/(te)} (- <i>s</i> _(i) <i>yā</i> - ^{ti})	675
<i>sā</i> (<i>si</i>) ‘bind’: - <i>s</i> _(i) <i>yā</i> - ^{ti/(te)}	677

**PART C. A SYSTEMATIC ANALYSIS AND CLASSIFICATION
OF -YA-PRESENTS**

I. Morphophonological classes of - <i>ya</i> -stems	683
I.1. Roots from which middle - <i>ya</i> -presents are derived	683
I.2. Roots from which active - <i>ya</i> -presents are derived	687
I.3. Remarks on phonological types of the root structures in - <i>ya</i> -presents	688
II. Semantics of - <i>ya</i> -presents	691
II.1. Passive - <i>yá</i> -presents	691
II.1.1. A synopsis	691
II.1.2. Semantics of - <i>yá</i> -passives	695
II.1.2.1. Passives derived from primary verbs	695
II.1.2.2. Passives derived from causatives	696
II.1.2.3. Passives derived from desideratives	699
II.1.2.4. Passives derived from denominatives and quasi-denominatives	701
II.1.3. Syntax of passive constructions, objecthood and transitivity	701
II.1.3.1. Passives of 'two pattern' verbs	701
II.1.3.2. Passivization test and transitivity of compounds	703
II.1.3.3. Other non-direct accusative objects	704
II.2. Non-passive middle - <i>ya</i> -presents with stable (root) accentuation	705
II.2.1. A synopsis	705
II.2.2. Semantics of middle - <i>ya</i> -presents	706
II.2.3. Non-passive - <i>ya</i> -presents with suffix accentuation: the type <i>mriyáte</i>	707
II.3. Middle - <i>ya</i> -presents with fluctuating accentuation	709
II.3.1. A synopsis	709
II.3.2. Accentual patterning of - <i>yá</i> -presents	710
II.3.2.1. General rule	710
II.3.2.2. Exceptions	713
II.3.2.3. Semantically motivated accent shifts	715
II.3.2.4. History of the problem	715
II.3.3. Semantics of - <i>yá</i> -presents	716
II.3.4. Remarks on the syntax of - <i>yá</i> -presents	718
II.3.5. Paradigmatic features	719
II.3.6. Phonological similarity	719
II.3.7. Accent fluctuation in a diachronic perspective	720

II.4. Unaccented middle <i>-ya</i> -presents: reconstructing accentuation	721
II.5. Active <i>-ya</i> -presents	723
II.6. The type <i>syāti</i>	725
III. Transitivity alternations and paradigmatic oppositions	
within the system of <i>-ya</i> -presents	726
III.1. Transitive counterparts of <i>-ya</i> -passives	726
III.2. Transitive-causative counterparts of middle non-passive <i>-ya</i> -presents	727
III.3. Transitive-causative counterparts of active intransitive <i>-ya</i> -presents	729
III.4. <i>-yá</i> -passives corresponding to transitive <i>'-ya</i> -presents	730
IV. Remarks on paradigmatic properties of <i>-ya</i> -presents	732
IV.1. The defective paradigm of <i>-yá</i> -passives in early Vedic	732
IV.2. Non-passive <i>-ya</i> -presents: paradigm and nominal derivatives	735
V. <i>-ya</i> -passives and other passive formations	738
V.1. <i>-yá</i> -passives and other presents in the passive usage	738
V.2. <i>-ya</i> -presents and associated aorists	740
V.2.1. Middle <i>-ya</i> -presents, <i>-i</i> -aorists and sigmatic aorists	740
V.2.2. Active <i>-ya</i> -presents and thematic aorists	744
V.3. Perfects and statives in the passive usage	744
V.4. Middle futures in the passive usage	745
VI. Diathesis fluctuations in <i>-ya</i> -presents	746
VI.1. Active forms in the paradigm of middle <i>-ya</i> -presents	746
(1) Forms with unmotivated diathesis change	747
(2) Secondary transitives	748
VI.2. Middle forms in the paradigm of active <i>-ya</i> -presents	748
VI.2.1. Functional opposition	748
VI.2.2. Semantic analogy	749
VII. Vedic <i>-ya</i> -presents in a diachronic perspective	751
VII.1. Vedic <i>-ya</i> -presents: main developments within the historical period	751
VII.2. Remarks on the origin and genesis of <i>-ya</i> -presents	758
VII.2.1. Possible sources of the present suffix <i>-ya-</i>	758
VII.2.2. The original accentuation of (middle) <i>-ya</i> -presents	759
VII.2.3. Evidence for heterogeneous origin of <i>-ya</i> -presents	761
VII.2.4. Remarks on possible sources of the Vedic <i>-ya</i> -presents	763

APPENDICES

I. Post-Vedic -ya-presents: a selection	767
<i>īkṣ</i> ‘perceive, look’: <i>īkṣya-te</i>	767
<i>kal</i> ‘drive’: <i>-kālya-te</i>	768
<i>kṣal</i> ‘wash’: <i>-kṣālyamāna-</i>	768
<i>kṣip</i> ‘throw’: <i>kṣipyā-te</i>	769
<i>cint</i> ‘think, consider’: <i>cintya-te</i>	770
<i>cud</i> ‘impel’: <i>codya-te</i> ‘be prescribed, enjoined’	770
<i>jī</i> ‘defeat, win, overpower’: <i>-jīya-te</i>	770
<i>dhṛṣ</i> ‘dare’: <i>-dhṛṣyamāṇa-</i>	771
(<i>bhī</i> ‘fear’: <i>bhīya-te</i>)	771
<i>bhū</i> ‘become’: <i>-bhūya-te</i> , <i>-bhūya-ti</i>	772
<i>bhram</i> ‘wander, move (chaotically), err’: <i>bhrāmya-te/(ti)</i>	773
<i>mnā</i> ‘mention’: <i>-mnāya-te</i>	775
<i>rakṣ</i> ‘protect’: <i>rakṣya-te</i>	775
<i>ram</i> ‘come to peace, stop; be satisfied’: <i>ramya-te</i>	777
<i>riph</i> ‘snarl’: <i>riphyā-te</i>	777
<i>ruj</i> ‘hurt’: <i>-rujya-te</i>	778
<i>lakṣ</i> ‘mark, indicate, designate’: <i>lakṣya-te</i>	778
<i>likh</i> ‘scratch, scrape’: <i>-likhya-te</i>	779
<i>vadh</i> (<i>badh</i>) ‘slay, kill’: <i>vadhya-te</i>	779
<i>viś</i> ‘enter’: <i>-veśya-te</i>	780
<i>vṛṣ</i> ‘rain’: <i>-vṛṣya-te</i>	780
<i>śak</i> ‘be able to (do)’: <i>śakya-te</i>	780
<i>śap</i> ‘curse’: <i>śapya-te</i>	781
<i>śās</i> ‘order’: <i>śāśya-te</i> , <i>śiśya-te</i>	781
<i>snā</i> ‘bathe’: <i>snāya-te</i>	782
<i>sniḥ</i> ‘stick, be sticky’: <i>snihya-ti/(te)</i>	782
<i>sramṣ</i> ‘fall asunder, break down’: <i>-srasya-te</i>	783
II. Vedic quasi-denominatives and their passives	785
III. -yá-passives and other formations attested in the passive usage: a synopsis	797

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Texts	801
II. Secondary literature	825
Abbreviations	923

INDICES

Index verborum	929
Index locorum	951
Index rerum	990

ABBREVIATIONS

I. Texts

AĀ	Aitareya-Āraṇyaka
AB	Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa
ĀgnivGS	Āgniveśya-Gṛhya-Sūtra
AitU	Aitareya-Upaniṣad
ĀpDhS	Āpastamba-Dharma-Sūtra
ĀpGS	Āpastamba-Gṛhya-Sūtra
ĀpM	Āpastamba-Mantrapāṭha
APrāyaśc.	Atharvaprāyaścittāni
ĀpŚS	Āpastamba-Śrauta-Sūtra
Ār.	Āraṇyaka(s)
ĀrṣB	Ārṣeya-Brāhmaṇa
ĀrṣU	Ārṣeya-Upaniṣad
ĀśGS	Āśvalāyana-Gṛhya-Sūtra
ĀśŚS	Āśvalāyana-Śrauta-Sūtra
AV	Atharvaveda
AVP	AV, Paippalāda recension
AVPariś.	Atharvaveda-Pariśiṣṭa
AVP-Kashm.	AVP, Kashmir ms.
AVP-Or.	AVP, Orissa mss.
AVŚ	AV, Śaunakīya recension
BaudhDhS	Baudhāyana-Dharma-Sūtra
BaudhGPariś.	Baudhāyana-Gṛhya-Pariśiṣṭasūtra
BaudhGS	Baudhāyana-Gṛhya-Sūtra
BaudhPS	Baudhāyana-Pitṛmedha-Sūtra
BaudhŚS	Baudhāyana-Śrauta-Sūtra
BĀU(K)	Bṛhad-Āraṇyaka-Upaniṣad (Kāṇva recension)
BĀUM	Bṛhad-Āraṇyaka-Upaniṣad, Mādhyandina recension
BhāgP	Bhāgavata-Purāṇa
BhārGS	Bhāradvāja-Gṛhya-Sūtra
BhārPS	Bhāradvāja-Pitṛmedha-Sūtra
BhārŚS	Bhāradvāja-Śrauta-Sūtra
Br.	Brāhmaṇa(s)
BṛhDev.	Bṛhad-Devatā

ChU	Chāndogya-Upaniṣad
Cl.	Classical Sanskrit
DevatādhB	Devatādhyāya-Brāhmaṇa
DhSū.	Dharma-Sūtra(s)
DhP	Dhātupāṭha
DrāhyGS	Drāhyāyaṇa-Gṛhya-Sūtra
DrāhyŚS	Drāhyāyaṇa-Śrauta-Sūtra
Ep.	Epics, Epic Sanskrit
GauḍĀgŚ	Gauḍapāda's Āgamaśāstra
GautDhS	Gautama-Dharma-Sūtra
GB	Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa
GobhGS	Gobhila-Gṛhya-Sūtra
GṛSū.	Gṛhya-Sūtra(s)
GTU	Ganeśatāpanīya-Upaniṣad
HirDhS	Hiraṇyakeśi-Dharma-Sūtra
HirGS	Hiraṇyakeśi-Gṛhya-Sūtra
HirPS	Hiraṇyakeśi-Pitṛmedha-Sūtra
HirŚS	Hiraṇyakeśi-Śrauta-Sūtra
ĪsU	Īśa-Upaniṣad
JĀrṣB	Jaiminīya-Ārṣeya-Brāhmaṇa
JB	Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa
JGS	Jaiminīya-Gṛhya-Sūtra
JŚS	Jaiminīya-Śrauta-Sūtra
JUB	Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa
KA	Kauṭīliya's Arthaśāstra
KaṭhĀ	Kaṭha-Āraṇyaka
KāṭhGS	Kāṭhaka-Gṛhya-Sūtra
Kāṭh-Saṃk.	Kāṭhaka-Saṃkalana
KaṭhU	Kaṭha-Upaniṣad
KātyŚS	Kātyāyana-Śrauta-Sūtra
Kathās.	Kathāsaritsāgara
KauṣGS	Kauṣītaka-Gṛhya-Sūtra
KauṣU	Kauṣītaki-Upaniṣad
KauśS	Kauśika-Sūtra
KB	Kauṣītaki-Brāhmaṇa
KenaU	Kena-Upaniṣad
KpS	Kapiṣṭhala-Kaṭha-Saṃhitā
KS	Kāṭhaka(-Saṃhitā)
^A KS	accentuated parts of the Kāṭhaka (in ed. SCHROEDER)

^u KS	unaccentuated parts of the Kāṭhaka (in ed. SCHROEDER)
KubjU	Kubjikā-Upaniṣad
LātyŚS	Lātyāyana-Śrauta-Sūtra
LaugGS	Laugākṣi-Gṛhya-Sūtra
Lost-Br.	“Lost Brāhmaṇas” (ed. GHOSH)
[X] ^m	mantra part of the text [X]
MaitrU	Maitri- (Maitrī-), Maitrāyaṇa-, Maitrāyaṇīya-Upaniṣad
MaitrāyaṇyU	Maitrāyaṇy-Upaniṣad
ManB	Mantra-Brāhmaṇa (= Chāndogya-Brāhmaṇa)
MānGS	Mānava-Gṛhya-Sūtra
MānŚS	Mānava-Śrauta-Sūtra
ManuSmṛ.	Manu-Smṛti (= Mānava-Dharma-Śāstra)
MBh.	Mahā-Bhārata
MNU	Mahā-Nārāyaṇa-Upaniṣad
MS	Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā
MuṇḍU	Muṇḍaka-Upaniṣad
NārSmṛ.	Nārada-Smṛti
NidānaS	Nidāna-Sūtra
[X] ^p	prose part of the text [X]
Pāṇ.	Pāṇini (Aṣṭādhyāyī)
ParāśSmṛ.	Parāśara-Smṛti
PārGS	Pāraskara-Gṛhya-Sūtra
Pat.	Patañjali (Mahābhāṣya)
PB	Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa (= Tāṇḍyamahā-Brāhmaṇa)
PitṛmSū.	Pitṛmedha-Sūtra(s)
Pp.	Padapāṭha
PraśU	Praśna-Upaniṣad
Rām.	Rāmāyaṇa
RV	Ṛgveda
RVKh.	Ṛgveda-Khilāni
Saṃh.	Saṃhitā(s)
Smṛ.	Smṛti
Sū.	Sūtra(s)
SUB	Saṃhitopaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa
SV	Sāmaveda (Kauthuma recension)
SVB	Sāmavidhāna-Brāhmaṇa
SVJ	Sāmaveda, Jaiminīya recension
ŚĀ	Śāṅkhāyana-Āraṇyaka
ŚātyB	Śātyāyana-Brāhmaṇa

ŚB(M)	Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa (Mādhyandina recension)
ŚBK	Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, Kāṇva recension
ŚGS	Śāṅkhāyana-Gṛhya-Sūtra
ŚrSū.	Śrauta-Sūtra(s)
ŚŚS	Śāṅkhāyana-Śrauta-Sūtra
ŚvetU	Śvetāśvatara-Upaniṣad
ŚB	Ṣaḍviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa
TĀ	Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka
TĀ-Āndhra	Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka, Āndhra-Pāṭha
TaiU	Taittirīya-Upaniṣad
TB	Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa
TS	Taittirīya-Saṃhitā
Up.	Upaniṣad(s)
Vd	Vidēvdāt
VādhAnv	Vādhūla-Anvākhyāna (= Vādhūla-Brāhmaṇa)
VādhS	Vādhūla-Sūtra (including VādhAnv, VādhŚS)
VādhŚS	Vādhūla-Śrauta-Sūtra
VaikhDhS	Vaikhānasa-Dharma-Sūtra
VaikhGS	Vaikhānasa-Gṛhya-Sūtra
VaikhŚS	Vaikhānasa-Śrauta-Sūtra
VaitS	Vaitāna-Sūtra
Vāl.	Vāḷakhilya (= RV 8.49-59)
VaṃśaB	Vaṃśa-Brāhmaṇa
VārGS	Vārāha-Gṛhya-Sūtra
VārŚS	Vārāha-Śrauta-Sūtra
VāsDhS	Vāsiṣṭha-Dharma-Sūtra
ViṣṇuSmṛ.	Viṣṇu-Smṛti
VPrātiś.	Vājasaneyi-Prātiśākhya
VSK	Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā, Kāṇva recension
VS(M)	Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā (Mādhyandina recension)
Y	Yasna
Yā.	Yāska (Nirukta)
YājñSmṛ.	Yājñavalkya-Smṛti
Yt	Yašt
YV	Yajurveda(-Saṃhitā) (= VS(K), MS, KS, KpS, TS)
+	attested also in later texts
(+)	attested also in post-Vedic texts

II. Other abbreviations

acc., ACC	accusative
act.	active
adv.	adverb
aff.	affective
anticaus.	anticausative
aor.	aorist
Av.	Avestan
bibl.	bibliography
caus.	causative
dat., DAT	dative
denom.	denominative
deriv.	derivative
desid.	desiderative
f.	feminine
IE	Indo-European
impf.	imperfect
impv.	imperative
ind.	indicative
inf.	infinitive
inj.	injunctive
INS	instrumental
intr.	intransitive
I/T	intransitive/transitive
IVS	individual verbal system
loc., LOC	locative
m.	masculine
med.	middle
n.	neuter
nom., NOM	nominative
pass.	passive
pf.	perfect
PIE	Proto-Indo-European
pl.	plural
pr.	present
prec.	precative
proc.	process
part.	participle

quasi-denom.	quasi-denominative
recipr.	reciprocal
refl.	reflexive
sg.	singular
soc.	sociative
st.	state, stative
tr.	transitive
v.l., v.ll.	varia lectio, variae lectiones
voc.	vocative
YAv.	Young Avestan

For bibliographical abbreviations, see p. 923ff.

Part A

INTRODUCTION

I. Vedic -ya-formations: preliminaries

I.0. Introductory remarks

This study concentrates on a particular verbal formation of the Vedic Sanskrit, the language of the Old Indian religious tradition and one of the most ancient attested Indo-European languages. The monograph deals with the Vedic presents with the suffix -ya-, called for short ‘-ya-presents’.

According to the tradition adopted in the Indo-European and Sanskrit (Vedic) studies, the term ‘**present**’ will be used (1) in the broader sense of the word, to denote the set of forms made from the present stem (in our case, the present stem with the suffix -ya-), which includes the present tense, the imperfect, a number of non-indicative forms: injunctive, imperative, subjunctive, and optative, as well as the present participle; (2) in the narrow sense of the word, to denote the present tense forms properly speaking. The part of the paradigm which is relevant for our study can be illustrated with the following two groups of forms, derived from the root *as* ‘throw’ and *han* ‘kill’ (one for the active diathesis and one for the middle):

1) 3sg.pr. *ásyati* ‘he throws’, 3sg.impf. *ásyat* ‘he threw’, 3sg.inj. *ásyat* ‘he throws, threw’, 2sg.impv. *ásya* ‘throw!’, 3sg.subj. *ásyāti* ‘he will throw’, pr.part. *ásyant-* ‘throwing’;

2) 3sg.pr. *hanyáte* ‘he is (being) killed’, 3sg.impf. *áhanyata* ‘he was (being) killed’, 3sg.inj. *hanyáta* ‘he is killed, he was killed’, 2sg.impv. *hanyásva* ‘be killed!’, 3sg.subj. *hanyātai* ‘he will be killed’, pr.part. *hanyámāna-* ‘being killed’.

The Vedic -ya-presents are one of the most solidly attested present classes. They include archaic subtypes, inherited from Proto-Indo-European, on the one hand, and younger subtypes of increasing productivity, rapidly expanding in late periods, on the other.

From the point of view of their function, the class of -ya-presents is not homogenous. It is commonplace in Vedic grammars that their value correlates with the place of the accent. Generally, the -ya-presents with the accent on the suffix (which can only be inflected in the middle) are **passives**;

those which bear the accent on the root and can take both middle and active endings (called in the Indian tradition **class IV presents**) are not. However, there are various exceptions to this rule (one of the parade examples is the non-passive *mriyáte* ‘dies’); besides, a number of *-ya*-presents are attested with fluctuating (both root and suffix) accentuation, so that the border-line between these two main classes is generally said not to be absolute; see below for details. Thus, the main problem to be studied in this monograph is the relationship between form (accent placement, diathesis) and function (passive/non-passive) in the system of the *-ya*-presents. The study of this class is based on the analysis of all *-ya*-presents attested in Vedic texts and aims at a detailed synchronic description of this verbal formation. As for the diachronic aspects of the *-ya*-presents, their historic sources and cognates in other Indo-European languages, they will not be treated systematically.

Since the passive/non-passive distinction is one of the main semantic issues of this study, I will also briefly discuss other means of expression of the passive value – in particular, other present formations attested in the passive usage as well as forms outside the present system (aorists, perfects and statives) which function as passives.

To begin with, it is necessary to give a brief outline of the main morphological patterns operative in this formation.

I.1. *-yá*-passives made from primary roots¹ and *’-ya*-presents (class IV)

I.1.1. The Vedic *-yá*-formations typically function as passives² within the present system (hereafter referred to as *-yá*-passives). They are built with the accented suffix *-yá-* attached to the root in the zero grade, i.e. to the same root grade which is found, e.g., in *-tá/-ná*-participles. The same root grade is also attested, as a rule, in *-ya*-presents with root accentuation, traditionally called class IV presents (known in the Indian tradition as the type *dīvyādi* ‘*dīvyā*[*ti*] and the others’; cf. Pāṇ. 3.1.69³). Unlike *-yá*-passives, class IV presents are inflected in both the active and the middle. Below are some examples:

¹ These include roots, such as *gup*, *dad*, *dhāv*, *prach*, *mād*, etc., which are extracted from present and perfect stems (synchronically regarded as primary roots), but they do not include secondary stems (quasi-roots) such as *-āya*-formations and desideratives; see Chapter I.2.

² For definitions, see below, Chapter II.

³ For a discussion of this rule, see, for instance, SHEFTS 1961: 39f.

• *C(a)RC* roots:⁴

<i>idh</i> ‘kindle’	– <i>idhyá</i> ^{-te}
<i>gup</i> ‘protect’	– <i>gupyá</i> ^{-te}
<i>dīv</i> ‘play’	– <i>dīvyá</i> ^{-ti/te} ⁵
<i>drś</i> ‘see’	– <i>drśyá</i> ^{-te}
<i>nṛt</i> ‘dance’	– <i>nṛtyá</i> ^{-ti}
<i>manth</i> ‘stir; produce [fire]’	– <i>mathyá</i> ^{-te}
<i>yuj</i> ‘yoke, join’	– <i>yujyá</i> ^{-te}
<i>yudh</i> ‘fight’	– <i>yúdhya</i> ^{-ti/te}
<i>hi(m)s</i> ‘injure, harm’	– <i>-hiṃsyá</i> ^{-te}

• *CR(a)C* roots (type *samprasāraṇa*):

<i>gra(b)h</i> ⁱ ‘seize’	– <i>gr̥hyá</i> ^{-te}
<i>yaj</i> ‘perform a sacrifice’	– <i>ijyá</i> ^{-te}
<i>vah</i> ‘carry’	– <i>uhyá</i> ^{-te}
<i>vyadh</i> ‘pierce’	– <i>vidhya</i> ^{-ti}

• *CaN*ⁱ roots ($N = n, m$), specifically, for *Can*ⁱ roots – *ā*, for *Cam*ⁱ roots – *ām* in root-accented presents,⁶ *am* – in suffix-accented presents:

<i>khan</i> ⁱ ‘dig’	– <i>khāyá</i> ^{-te}
<i>jan</i> ⁱ ‘be born’	– <i>jāyá</i> ^{-te}
<i>dham</i> ⁱ ‘blow’	– <i>dhamyá</i> ^{-te}
<i>śram</i> ⁱ ‘be weary’	– <i>śrāmyá</i> ^{-ti}

The zero grade of the *Cam*ⁱ roots (seṭ type) – *am* (as in *dhamyate* etc.) or *ām* (as in *śrāmyati* etc.) – puzzled many scholars. Note that neither *am* nor

⁴ The symbols used in this notation are essentially the same as generally adopted in the literature (see, for instance, GOTŌ 31; KÜMMEL 2000: 5):

C – any consonant, consonant cluster, or zero (usually < IE **H*-) in anlaut;
R – any sonant (*i/y*, *u/v*, *n*, *m*, *r*, *l*);
N – any nasal sonant (*n*, *m*);
H – any laryngeal;
K – any obstruent;
S – any sibilant (*ś*, *ṣ*, *s*).

⁵ For the type *Cīv*-/*Cyū*- (roots *dīv*, *mīv*, *ṣṭhīv*, *sīv*, *srīv*), see WACKERNAGEL 1896 [AiG I]: 91; LUBOTSKY 2011.

⁶ In accordance with Pāṇ. 7.3.74; see SHEFTS 1961: 4, with fn. 10.

$\bar{a}m$ is parallel to the zero grade \bar{a} in Can^i roots (*khāyāte*, *jāyate*). BECHTEL (1892: 217ff.), KRETSCHMER (1892: 409f.), MEILLET (1910-1911) and HIRT (1921 [IdgG II]: 127f.) considered $\bar{a}m$ the regular reflex of the zero grade. On the other hand, WACKERNAGEL (1896 [AiG I]: 16) believed that the regular reflex was the same as in Can^i roots, i.e. \bar{a} , and that the m has been reintroduced analogically; for discussion, see also FORSSMAN 1986: 27. Curiously enough, both assumptions were advocated in terms of *a priori* considerations:

“*A priori*, la réduction à \bar{a} est surprenante, alors que $*\bar{r}$ donne skr. \bar{r} , \bar{u} et iran. ar ; le parallélisme fait attendre pour $*\bar{r}$ et $*\bar{u}$ quelque chose comme skr. $\bar{a}n$, $\bar{a}m$, iran. an , am .” (MEILLET)

“Schon allgemeine Erwägungen führen dazu, die Formen ohne Nasal für lautgesetzlich, die mit Nasal für analogisch beeinflusst zu halten.” (FORSSMAN)

Yet, the latter proposal ($*\bar{r}H$, $*\bar{u}H > \bar{a}$, with the analogical reintroduction of m) seems more likely; see FORSSMAN (ibid.) for an argumentation. On this assumption, the short root vowel in pass. *dhamyate* (as well as in the other passives of the Cam^i roots) is usually considered irregular and secondary as against the supposed $**dhāmyāte$ (borrowed from the class I present (?); cf. GOTŌ 181, fn. 320). By contrast, KURYŁOWICZ (1956: 247f.) suggested, on account of *dhamyate*, *śamyati*, *tanyati*, that the regular reflexes of $*\bar{r}H$, $*\bar{u}H$ before y were am , an , considering $\bar{a}m$ (in $\bar{a}m$ etc.) a secondary replacement (“remaniement morphologique”).

It will be argued below (see Chapter B.I, s.v. *dhām*) that both explanations are unnecessary: the vowel length was dependent on the placement of the accent (long vowel in presents with root accentuation, short vowel in presents with suffix accentuation), according to LUBOTSKY’S (1997b) rule.

• $C\bar{r}$ roots:

$j\bar{r}$ ‘grow old, decay’	– $j\bar{r}ya^{-ti}$ RV; $j\bar{r}ya^{-ti}$ AV +
$st\bar{r}$ ‘strew’	– $st\bar{r}yā^{-te}$

• $C\bar{I}$ roots ($\bar{I} = \bar{i}, \bar{u}$):

$kr\bar{i}$ ‘buy’	– $kr\bar{i}yā^{-te}$
$r\bar{i}$ ‘whirl, swirl’	– $r\bar{i}yā^{-te}$
$^1s\bar{u}$ ‘impel, consecrate’	– $s\bar{u}yā^{-te}$

I.1.2. Some sonant roots (*CaR/CṚ*) show a **non-standard zero grade** in -ya-presents:

I.1.2.1. The *CaN* roots (anīṭ) yield *CaN*, i.e. the zero and full grade merge in the position before y:⁷

<i>man</i> ‘think, respect’	–	<i>mánya-te</i>
<i>yam</i> ‘hold etc.’	–	<i>yamyá-te</i>
<i>han</i> ‘kill’	–	<i>hanyá-te</i> . ⁸

I.1.2.2. The *Cṛ* roots yield *Cri-* before -yá-, cf.:

<i>kṛ</i> ‘make’	–	<i>kriyá-te</i>
<i>bhṛ</i> ‘carry’	–	<i>bhriyá-te</i>

-ri- seems to be the regular reflex of -ṛ before y, cf., e.g., opt. *kriyāma*, *cakriyāḥ*.⁹ The sequence -ṛy-, attested in three forms in the RV (opt. *bibhṛyāt* RV 10.10.9, compounds *pitṛ-yajñá-* RV 10.16.10, *pitṛ-yána-* RV 10.2.7),¹⁰ must be secondary – most likely, analogically restored under the influence of the rest of the paradigm, cf. 3du. *bibhṛtáḥ* etc. (BRUGMANN 1897 [Grundr.² I]; 458, §503.2; LUBOTSKY 1997b: 148, fn. 28).¹¹

A few *Cṛ* roots display the full grade in -yá-passives: *caryá-te*, -*varyá-te* MS^p + (alongside -*vriya-te* GB +) and *smarya-te*. According to Indian grammarians (Pāṇ. 7.4.29), this reflex appears after a consonant cluster (cf. WACKERNAGEL 1896 [AiG I]: 199). This rule is rather dubious, however.

⁷ See BRUGMAN[N] 1879a: 285; 1879b: 210; WACKERNAGEL 1896 [AiG I]: 10f., with bibl.

⁸ Post-Vedic texts (Ep., Cl. Skt.) attest the full grade in seṭ roots as well (doubtlessly due to the influence of the anīṭ roots): *khanyate*; cf. also post-Vedic *janyate*, *tanyate* alongside *jáyate*, *táyate* (RV +). Pāṇ. 6.4.43-44 allows both variants; see KIPARSKY (1979: 136ff.). According to KIPARSKY, *janyate* is mostly attested in the passive usage, while *jáyate* “denotes the simple intransitive senses ‘is born, comes into existence, becomes’”; cf. also BRONKHORST 1982: 279 and Chapter B.I, s.vv.

⁹ See, in particular, BENFEY 1850: 809; J. SCHMIDT 1875: 245 [assuming *mriya-* < **marya-*]; BRUGMAN[N] 1879a: 285; Grundr.² I, 458, §503.2; WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER, AiG I, 199f.; Nachtr. zu I, 110; SCHEFTELOWITZ 1925: 265; TEDESCO 1944: 221.

¹⁰ The ungrammatical *Cṛya-* in -ya-presents sporadically occurs in mss., too (as variant readings) – e.g. *hṛy°* (*√hṛ*) at AV 12.5.29 (see WHITNEY’s translation, comm. ad loc.), MS 4.8.7:115.15, etc. (see Chapter B.I, s.v.).

¹¹ Cf. DEBRUNNER (1957 [Nachtr. zu AiG I]: 110) on the vacillation in the optative stem *jāgṛyā-* (VS, ŚB, KS) / *jāgriyā-* (TS, AB).

The only root with a cluster in anlaut for which a -yá-passive is attested is *smṛ* ‘remember’ (*smarya-te* first appears in the late Vedic TĀ).¹² On the other hand, *ar* occurs in a few roots beginning with a single consonant (*caryá-te*, -*varyá-te*) and the root *kr* ‘make’ does not change °*riya-* to °*arya-* in the -variant with the initial *s-* (-*skriyá-*, not ***-skaryá-*).

I.1.2.3. The roots in -i, -u lengthen the root vowel before the suffix -*ya-* as well as before some other morphemes beginning with *y*, in particular, in non-present optatives (including precatives), intensives and denominatives; cf. opt. *śuśrūyāḥ*, etc. This rule is also operative in *ā* (< **eH*) roots, which regularly yield short *i* in the zero grade (as in *dhā* – *hitá-*, *sthā* – *sthitá-*).¹³ Thus, we have:

<i>mi</i> ‘fix, set up’	–	<i>mīyá-te</i>
<i>śri</i> ‘lay on, fix on’	–	- <i>śrīyá-te</i>
<i>su</i> ‘press out’	–	<i>sūyá-te</i>
<i>dhā</i> ‘put’	–	<i>dhīyá-te</i>
<i>sthā</i> ‘stand’	–	<i>sthīyá-te</i> ¹⁴

This implies, in particular, that the -*ya*-presents of several distinct roots fall together (*Xi* = *Xī* = *Xā*, *Xu* = *Xū*), so that, for instance, pass. *sūyáte* can belong to either of the roots *su* ‘press out’, ¹*sū* ‘impel, consecrate’ or ²*sū* ‘generate’; similarly, *mīyáte* can belong to either of the three roots *mi* ‘fix’, ¹*mī* ‘damage, diminish’ and ²*mā* ‘measure’.¹⁵

There have been several attempts to account for this secondary lengthening:¹⁶

(i) *ī* is introduced from the disyllabic (according to SIEVERS’ law) °*C_iyá-* stems (as in *Criyá-* stems), with analogical extension of this length to *u* roots (LANMAN 1920). This explanation is untenable, since SIEVERS’ law was not operative in -*yá*-passives and their stems do not occur distracted (see below,

¹² The alleged passive -*striyáte* (ŚB) is a ms. error for -*skriyáte*; see s.v. *stṛ*; *jvaryate* (√*jvar* ‘be/become feverish’) is post-Vedic.

¹³ Cf. INSLEY 1971a: 580, fn. 14.

¹⁴ On the secondary short vowel variants (-*śriya-*, -*vliya-*) built on *CRī* roots, see s.vv.

¹⁵ See, in particular, M. LEUMANN 1940: 230ff. [= KL.Schr., 322ff.]; KURYŁOWICZ 1949: 9.

¹⁶ See also OSTHOFF 1880: 277ff. (with bibl.); WACKERNAGEL 1896 [AiG I]: 45f. (with bibl.); MEILLET 1906-1908: 356; 1920: 198 (a metrical explanation); SCHULZE 1912 (-*ūyV* < **-uVyV*); KUIPER 1965: 303.

Chapter I.3).

(ii) KURYŁOWICZ's (1956: 122ff.) explanation is that this lengthening (also in denominatives, intensives and optatives) is parallel to the alleged development *TeRi*, *TeRu* > *TRi*, *TRu* > *TRī*, *TRū* ("sekundäre Dehnung infolge des Silbenverlustes" (HIRT 1921 [IdgG II]: 151)).¹⁷ In my opinion, this is implausible.

(iii) The vowel length in *śrūyāte*, *stūyāte* (as well as in *tāyāte* and *dīryāte*, instead of the expected **tanyāte* and **driyāte*; see s.vv.) is explained as a trace of the laryngeal suffix **-eh₁-*, thus assuming the "Morphemkonglomerat" (GARCÍA RAMÓN) **-h₁-i_o/é-*, consisting of two functionally related suffixes (GARCÍA RAMÓN 1993b: 123, fn. 63 [hesitantly]; RASMUSSEN 1993: 480ff.; HARÐARSON 1998: 332f., with fn. 29; LIV 25 and s.vv., e.g., 627, note 13; cf. also CHRISTOL 1990: 116, fn. 45, 124, fn. 57). This explanation suggests an unmotivated distinction between two groups of -ya-presents and therefore appears to be rather *ad hoc*.

(iv) A possible solution has been suggested by LUBOTSKY (p.c.): the vowel length could have been borrowed from the denominatives with the suffix -yá- made from the stems ending in a short vowel.¹⁸ From denominatives this lengthening could be introduced in other verbal formations before the suffixal y, probably as an additional marker of the morpheme boundary (JAMISON 1988: 215f., 225; HARÐARSON 1993: 142, fn. 182 ["eine die Morphemgrenze verdeutlichende Dehnung"]).

¹⁷ Suggested by FROEHDE (1885: 120), followed by BECHTEL (1892: 200ff.), HIRT (1921 [IdgG II]: 151, 154) and some other scholars to account for the abnormal length of -ī-, -ū- in *bhrīṇāti*, *vārūtha-*, etc.

¹⁸ As for the nature of this lengthening in denominatives, its origin is not quite clear. According to LUBOTSKY (1989: 101f. and 112, note 5), the vowel length has first emerged in denominatives based on -a-stems, like *aśvāyá-*¹⁹ 'desire horses' [← *aśvā-* 'horse'] < **H₁ek_uo-i_o-* (where **o* was regularly lengthened in the open syllable, according to BRUGMANN's law: **o-i_e-* > *°āya-*). From these forms it could easily be extended to denominatives based on other vowel stems (-i-, -u; cf. *ṛjūyāti* 'is straight' < *ṛjū-* 'straight'). A different interpretation of the vowel length in denominatives, in terms of the rhythmic lengthening, has been offered by INSLEER (1997): long vowel after a short syllable (cf. *aghāyá-*²⁰) ~ short vowel after a long syllable (*devayánt-*).

I.1.3. Some root types display **full grade** in -ya-presents:

- all roots in obstruents (*CaK*):¹⁹

<i>ad</i> ‘eat’	– <i>adyá-^{te}</i>
<i>aśⁱ</i> ‘eat’	– <i>aśyá-^{te}</i>
<i>dabh</i> ‘deceive’	– <i>dabhya-^{te}</i>
<i>pad</i> ‘move, fall’	– <i>pádyá-^{te}</i>
<i>bhaj</i> ‘share’	– <i>-bhajya-^{te}</i>
<i>rabh/labh</i> ‘take, seize’	– <i>-rabhyá-^{te}/labhyá-^{te}</i>

- some roots of other types (*CRā*, *C_r* etc.), cf.:

<i>glā</i> ‘be weary’	– <i>glāya-^{ti}</i>
<i>jñā</i> ‘know’	– <i>jñāya-^{te}</i>
<i>trā</i> ‘rescue, protect’	– <i>trāya-^{te}</i>
<i>pyā</i> ‘fill, swell’	– <i>pyāya-^{te}</i>
<i>carⁱ</i> ‘perform’	– <i>caryá-^{te}</i>
<i>smṛ</i> ‘remember’	– <i>smarya-^{te}</i>
<i>harⁱ</i> (² <i>hr</i>) ‘enjoy’	– <i>hárya-^{ti/(te)}</i>
<i>med</i> ‘be fat’	– <i>médya-^{ti}</i>

The full grade can be explained:

(i) as secondarily restored – for *CaK* roots, in order to avoid unpronounceable consonant clusters (*dbhy*, *bhjy*, etc.) or morphologically opaque formations (***dyá-^{te}* [*√ad*], ***śyá-^{te}* [*√aś*] or the like);

(ii) by a tendency to introduce the full grade in all or most forms made from the given root – cf. *caryá-^{te}*, *jñāya-^{te}*, etc.²⁰

I.2. -yá-passives made from secondary stems

-yá-passives built on secondary stems (quasi-roots), i.e. -áya-causatives, non-causative -áya-presents (many of which go back to denominatives) and desideratives, first appear in young mantras and become common in Vedic prose. These ‘tertiary’ (WHITNEY) formations retain the root vowel unchanged, the suffix -áya- (as well as the *a* of the desiderative marker -sa-) is dropped. Examples are:

¹⁹ Except for the *samprasāraṇa* type, which has the regular zero grade: *yaj* – *ijyá-^{te}* etc.; see Chapter I.1.1 above.

²⁰ MEILLET’S (1900: 305) explanation of the full grade in *caryáte* and *smaryáte* as borrowed from class I presents (*cáratī*, *smáratī*) seems *ad hoc* and unconvincing.

caus. <i>vartáya-</i> (<i>vṛt</i> ‘turn’)	– <i>-vartyá-^{te}</i>
caus. <i>sādáyā-</i> (<i>sad</i> ‘sit’)	– <i>sādyá-^{te}</i>
pr. <i>mantráya-</i> ‘address’ (\Leftarrow <i>mántra-</i>)	– <i>-mantryá-^{te}</i>
desid. <i>dítsa-</i> (<i>^ldā</i> ‘give’)	– <i>-ditsya-^{te}</i>
desid. <i>rúrutsa-</i> (<i>rudh</i> ‘obstruct’)	– <i>-rurutsyá-^{te}</i>

I.3. -ya-presents and SIEVERS’ law

An important morphophonological feature shared by all -yá-passives and the great majority of -ya-presents with root accentuation is the non-applicability of SIEVERS’ law: -ya-stems are always disyllabic, i.e. the suffix -ya- never occurs distracted, even after heavy root syllables. Thus, while metrical texts attest, for instance, the nominal stems *ájya-*, *divyá-*, etc. alongside *ájya-*, *divyá-*, etc., we do not find -ya-presents ***dívya-*, ***bhājya-*, ***médya-*, ***śrámya-*, ***sívya-*, etc. (for the RV, see SOMMER 1977a: 38f.; SEEBOLD 1972: 287ff.; ICKLER 1976: 123).

Distracted stems are only attested for *ásya-^{ti}* (a few times in the RV, RVKh. and AV, all in the imperfect: *-āsya-^t*).²¹ The lack of SIEVERS forms of -ya-presents may be due to the fact that this law was only operative in the final syllable (SCHINDLER 1977): all middle forms have at least one extra syllable after the suffix -ya-. By contrast, a number of active forms (2-3sg.impf., 2sg.impv.) meet SCHINDLER’s condition – as is the case with *-āsya-*. Nevertheless, even active presents seem to have generalized the non-distracted stem variant regardless of the quantity of the root syllable; the isolated trisyllabicity of *-āsya-* could be supported by the type *syáti*, which commonly displays the distracted stem (see below and s.v.).

I.4. Accentuation and semantics of -ya-presents

The place of accent is one of the relevant features of -ya-presents. The correlation between accentuation and the passive/non-passive distinction, noticed already by Indian grammarians,²² has been repeatedly debated and called into question by Sanskritists. This issue is of crucial importance for the characterization of the category of passive in Vedic and will therefore be in the spotlight of the present study. The main counter-evidence against the

²¹ See ARNOLD 1905: 95, 100; M. LEUMANN 1968b: 58, with fn. 16; SOMMER 1977a: 39.

²² Pāṇ. 6.1.195 *acaḥ kartṛ yaki* ‘before [the passive suffix] -ya- [in verbs with the roots] in a vowel (aC-) [the root optionally bears the accent if the verb is employed] in the reflexive [usage]’ (as e.g. in *lūyate* / *lūyáte* ‘[the field] is reaped by itself’).

standard correlation (suffix accentuation = passive, root accentuation = non-passive) can be summarized as follows:

(i) Some -ya-presents with suffix accentuation show no passive semantics and syntax. The parade example is *mriyá-te* ‘die’; besides, the grammars often mention *-driyá-te* ‘heed’, *dhriyá-te* ‘stay; decide’, *vacyá-te* ‘move (waveringly)’ (cf. DELBRÜCK 1874 [AiV]: 167f.; WHITNEY 1889 [SktGr]: 277, §773; GELDNER 1896 [VSt II]: 258, fn. 3; MACDONELL 333, §444a; DIELS 1913: 3).

(ii) Some 20 -ya-presents are attested with fluctuating (both root and suffix) accentuation (for short, **-yá-presents**): cf. *kṣīyá-te/kṣīyá-te* ‘perish, disappear’, *múcyá-te/mucyá-te* ‘become free, released’, etc. A clear correlation between the accent placement and meaning is registered only for the verb *pac*: pass. *pacyá-te* ‘be cooked’ vs. non-pass. *pácyá-te* ‘ripen’ (cf. DELBRÜCK 1874 [AiV]: 168; SPEIJER 1896 [VSS]: 50, §169; RENOU 1952b [GrV]: 292; THUMB/HAUSCHILD 335). The accentuation of the other -yá-presents is generally said to fluctuate at random. It will be in place to quote here a few statements from the standard grammars and handbooks of (Vedic) Sanskrit, which express this *communis opinio*.

“... there are in the older language a number of clear cases, in which the accent wavers and changes [...] Thus, \sqrt{muc} forms *múcyate* once or twice, beside the usual *mucyáte*, in RV. and AV.” (WHITNEY 1889 [SktGr]: 273, §761b)

“The accent [...] occasionally fluctuates. [...] there is no appreciable difference of meaning between *kṣīyate* and *kṣīyáte* ‘is destroyed’; *jīyate* and *jīyáte* ‘is overcome’; *pácyate* and *pacyáte* ‘is cooked’; *mīyate* and *mīyáte* (AV.) ‘is infringed’”. (MACDONELL 331, §437)

“... der Akzent ist in der älteren Zeit kein unbedingtes Unterscheidungsmerkmal der beiden Präsensbildungen [-yá-passives as opposed to class IV – LK], da gelegentlich Schwanken herrscht.” (THUMB/HAUSCHILD 333f.)

“La règle n’est pas absolue : *jīyate* (de *JYĀ-*) *kṣīyante* de *Kṣī-* conservent le ton radical tout en s’opposant à *jīnāti kṣīnāti* et en ayant une valeur plus ou moins passive (*jīyate* est voisin de *hanyáte* de *HAN-*). Inversement, *mriyáte*, avec le ton suffixal (AS. [= AV – LK]), de *Mṛ-*, n’a pas d’emploi passif, mais seulement intransitif. De là, le flottement tonique *mucyáte* AS. etc./ *múcyate*

RS. de *MUC*- et quelques autres ...” (RENOU 1952 [GrV]: 292)²³

No wonder, it has become commonplace in Vedic studies that there is no clear-cut distinction between the suffix-accented -yá-passives and root-accented (middle) -ya-presents. Accordingly, the very existence of the category of passive in Vedic has been repeatedly doubted by Sanskritists. To quote a few such statements:

“The difference of accentuation which exists between the verbs of the 4th class and the passives, must not blind us to the incontestable fact of their close connection. [...] Nor is it possible, even in accentuated texts, to draw everywhere with accuracy the boundary-line between them.” (SPEIJER 1886 [SktS]: 240).

“Die Grenze zwischen ‘-ya-Formen und den -yá-Formen ist keine absolute.” (OLDENBERG, Noten ad RV 1.112.18)

Cf. also SPEIJER 1896 [VSS]: 49f.; GELDNER 1896 [VSt II]: 258, fn. 3 (on *vacyáte* » sich schwingen «, » fliegen « “mit der Accentuation des Passiv, worauf im Veda kein allzugrosses Gewicht zu legen ist”); HOCK 1982: 129f.

Abandoning the traditional analysis of -yá-presents as passives, some scholars – above all, J. GONDA in his monograph on the Sanskrit passive (cf. also GONDA 1971: 90f.), – arrived at the conclusion that -yá- (-ya-) should be considered merely as intransitivizer, rather than as a passive marker:

“... the term *passive* is, in my opinion, not adequate. As to the -yá-present, in Vedic prose this category is, in most cases, and often almost exclusively, used in a way which for the sake of brevity I have hitherto called ‘intransitive’: the verb is used without an object, and it would be impossible to add such an element.” (GONDA 1951: 73)²⁴

Contrary to the opinion expressed by GONDA and some other scholars, it will be argued in this study that there are no good reasons to deny the correlation between accentuation and function of -ya-presents.

²³ Cf. also MEILLET 1908-1909: 352.

²⁴ From GONDA’s monograph and Sanskrit grammars this opinion has found its way to general linguistic studies on voice and passive, cf. ROSEN 1984: 56 (“-ya- must be interpreted as a marker of 2-1 Advancement” [≈ anticausative intransitivization – LK]); KLAIMAN 1991: 282, note 29 (“the passive function of ya- may originate in its earlier function as a marker of telic neuter intransitive verb”; for a detailed discussion of KLAIMAN’s analysis of -ya-presents, see Chapter C.VII.2.3, p. 762).

The suffix accentuation of the *Criyá^{-te}* presents must be due to some secondary phonological processes, and the non-passive usages of other *-yá-* presents, such as *drśyá^{-te}*, *vacyá^{-te}*, *srjyá^{-te}*, are secondary as against the passive ones.

As for the *-ya-* presents with fluctuating accentuation, like *múcyá^{-te}*, they represent differences between Vedic schools, as rightly suggested by B. DELBRÜCK in his “Altindische Syntax”:

“Es giebt bekanntlich eine Reihe von Verben, welche ihr Praesens mit *ya* bilden und dabei [nur] oder fast nur im Medium vorkommen [...], z.B.: *rícyate* neben *riṇákti*. Diese Formen, welche medialen, manchmal in’s Passivische hinüberschwankenden Sinn haben, zeigen nicht selten neben dem medialen [= root accentuation – LK] den passivischen [= suffix accentuation – LK] Accent, und zwar so, dass die Verschiedenheit der Accentuierung sich nach Gelehrten-Schulen zu scheiden scheint. So hat TS eine Vorliebe für medialen, MS für passivischen Accent”. (DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 267)

It will be argued below (Chapter B.III and C.II.3.2) that this statement (unfortunately disregarded in later scholarship)²⁵ is perfectly correct.

I.5. *-ya-*formations and related present types

There are some present types with a stems ending in *°ya-* whose (original) morphological structure is unclear and whose synchronic analysis (class IV or not) remains subject of debate.

I.5.1. The type *Cáya-* includes 7 presents:²⁶ *kṣáyā^{-ti}* ‘rule’, *dháyā^{-ti}* ‘suck’, *dáyā^{-te}* ‘distribute, share’, *váyā^{-ti}* ‘weave’, *vyáyā^{-ti}* ‘cover’, *śváyā^{-ti}* ‘swell’, *hváyā^{-ti}* ‘call’. The Indian tradition derived them as class I presents built on “*Ce*” roots: *kṣe*, *dhe*, etc. (cf. DhP I 951, 1055-1057), but this interpretation is mostly rejected in modern scholarship.²⁷ BÖHTLINGK (1845: 280f.), and subsequently some other Sanskritists (DELBRÜCK 1874 [AiV]: 165 [for some roots]; NEGELEIN 1898: 34ff.), grouped the type *Cáya-* with *-ya-* presents, thus assuming the shortening of *ā* before the present suffix, but

²⁵ For a bibliographical survey, see Chapter C.II.3.2.4.

²⁶ Not counting *Cáya-* presents which are regular class I formations of *Cī* roots: *jáyati*, *náyati*, etc.

²⁷ It was adopted only in early European grammars – e.g. by DELBRÜCK (1874 [AiV]: 165) [for *dhā* ‘suck’, ³*vā* (*u*) ‘weave’ and *śvā* ‘swell’, in which DELBRÜCK posited the final *i* (*ī*)], WHITNEY (1889 [SktGr]: 273f., §761f.); cf. also PERSSON 706 [on *vyáyati*]; HAUSCHILD 1954: 444 [on *dháyati*: *√dhāi*].

this analysis was abandoned by the beginning of the 20th century.²⁸ Nowadays, they are most often taken as -áya-presents derived from *Cā* roots (cf., e.g., GOTÖ 44f.; LUBOTSKY 1989: 94f.).²⁹ The *Cáya*- presents are not discussed in this study.

I.5.2. The type *Cyāti* includes 5 presents: -*ch(i)yá-ti* ‘cut [skin], flay’, -*d(i)yá-ti* ‘bind, tie’, -*dýá-ti/(te)* ‘cut’, -*ś(i)yá-ti/(te)* ‘sharpen’, -*s(i)yá-ti/(te)* ‘bind’. Indian grammarians derived them as -ya-presents built on “Co” roots (*so* – *syāti*, etc.); basically the same analysis is most common in the modern Western tradition (*sā* – *syāti*, etc.; cf., e.g., GOTÖ 44). As I argued elsewhere, however, the class VI analysis (i.e. *sy-á-ti*, etc.), first suggested by WHITNEY (1885b [Roots]) and adopted in some standard grammars (e.g. MACDONELL 328; RENOU 1952 [GrV]: 271; THUMB/HAUSCHILD 243f.), is synchronically more attractive for several system-related reasons (see KULIKOV 2000b, with bibl.). Nevertheless, for the sake of completeness, the *Cyāti* presents are discussed in this study as well (Chapter B.VI).

I.5.3. The type *Cāya-* includes 15 presents built on *ā* roots: *kāya-te* ‘long (for), yearn’, *kṣāya-ti* ‘burn’, *gāya-ti/te* ‘sing’, *glāya-ti* ‘be weary’, *trāya-te* ‘rescue, protect’, *dhyāya-ti/(te)* ‘think of’, *pyāya-te* ‘swell’, *mlāya-ti* ‘wither, relax’, *rāya-ti* ‘bark’, *vāya-ti* ‘become extinguished’, *śyāya-ti* ‘congeal, freeze’, *śrāya-ti* ‘become ready’, *(*)stāya-ti* ‘steal’, *-styāya-te* ‘become coagulated’, *sphāya-te* ‘swell’. The Indian tradition derived them as class I presents built on “diphthong” roots: *gai*, *trai*, etc. (cf. DhP I 952ff.); Western scholarship mostly accepts a class IV analysis: *gā-ya-*, *trā-ya-*, etc. (thus already BÖHTLINGK 1845: 280f.; cf. also DELBRÜCK 1897 [VglSynt II]: 26ff.; LIEBERT 1957: 15; GOTÖ 44). Although for most of these verbs a class IV analysis indeed raises no doubts, for a few *Cāya*-presents there are good reasons to treat *y* as part of the root, which implies a class I analysis. This interpretation is most likely for *gāya-ti/te* (*gāy-a-*) and possible for a few other presents (e.g. for *rāya-ti*).³⁰ The original state of affairs could be even further

²⁸ But cf. *hvā-yati* (< **ghuā-ietī*) in THUMB/HAUSCHILD 244, §474.3.

²⁹ LIEBERT (1957: 14f.) and a number of American Indo-Europeanists group this type with class I presents, taking *y* as the intervocalic reflex (trace) of **H* (cf. DIVER 1959: 120 [where *y* in *dhāyati* is supposed to go back to DIVER’s **H*]; INSLEY 1968: 337, fn. 31; 1971: 580, fn. 14); for criticism of this view, see GOTÖ 44f.; LUBOTSKY 1989: 94ff.

³⁰ In fact, the class I analysis originates in the well-known article by SCHULZE (1885)

confused by derivatives with suffixes beginning with vowels, attached to the \bar{a} roots by means of the intermorphemic $-y-$; cf. $-dhy\bar{a}y\bar{i}n-$ (as in $-d\bar{a}-y-\bar{i}n-$; see WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 342, §216b), caus. $py\bar{a}y\bar{a}yati$ ($\sqrt{py\bar{a}}$) etc. Such derivatives could strongly support the reanalysis of the roots as $dhy\bar{a}y$, $py\bar{a}y$, etc., and accordingly the (secondary) class I analysis of the corresponding $C\bar{a}ya$ -presents, so that it has become impossible to draw with accuracy the border-line between the roots with/without the original final i .³¹

I will not enter into a discussion of the nature of y in these formations (part of root or suffix?). All $C\bar{a}ya$ - presents are included into the corpus, except for $g\bar{a}ya^{ti/te}$, for which the class I analysis is more likely than for any other member of this group and, furthermore, can be supported by system-related argumentations (see Chapter B.I, s.v.).³²

on the $\bar{a}i$ -roots. WACKERNAGEL (1896 [AiG I]: 87, §79aα) consistently treats many of the $^o\bar{a}ya$ -formations as class I presents ($g\bar{a}y-ati$, $py\bar{a}y-ate$, $\acute{s}y\bar{a}y-ati$, $\acute{s}r\bar{a}y-ati$, $sty\bar{a}y-ate$; cf. also WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 469f., §287b; likewise SPECHT 1935: 111ff.; cf. also JOACHIM 161f. (for $\acute{s}r\bar{a}ya^{ti}$). DIVER's (1959) class I analysis in terms of the "palatal laryngeal" $*H^y$, which yields y between vowels (thus, $g\bar{a}ya- < *g\acute{e}H^y-a-$) did not receive general approvement among Indo-Europeanists.

³¹ Cf. THUMB/HAUSCHILD 244: "Eine scharfe Scheidung der zur 4. Klasse gehörenden \bar{a} -Wurzeln und der ursprünglichen $\bar{a}y$ -Wurzeln ist nicht mehr mit Sicherheit vorzunehmen [...] (in den meisten Fällen ist aber das y wurzelhaft)."

³² Cf. also in LUBOTSKY (1997a [RVWC]: 484): $\sqrt{g\bar{a}(y)-}$.

II. Syntactic and semantic preliminaries

II.1. Voice and syntactic patterns: a theoretical framework

Since the main syntactic function of the suffix *-yá-* is passivization and the functional opposition between *-ya-* presents with suffix/root accentuation is usually formulated in terms of the passive/non-passive (intransitive) distinction, a few general remarks on voice and syntactic oppositions will be in place here.³³

I will basically follow the theoretical framework of the Leningrad/St.Petersburg typological school, going back to the seminal paper MEL'ČUK & XOLODOVIČ 1970. The most detailed presentation of this approach can be found, for instance, in GENIUŠIENĖ 1987, MEL'ČUK 1993; 1994: 135ff. (with some modifications) and KULIKOV 2011a.

The levels of representation in terms of which the voice is defined are: semantic arguments (actants) and syntactic functions, or grammatical relations (subject [S], direct object [DO], oblique object [Obl], etc.).³⁴ The patterns of mapping of semantic arguments onto syntactic functions are referred to as **diatheses** and the category of **voice** is defined as a diathesis regularly encoded by means of the verbal morphology.³⁵ This terminology cannot be adopted in this study, however, since the term 'diathesis' has a long tradition within Indo-European linguistics, referring to the opposition of the active/middle inflection; instead, I will use the term '**syntactic pattern**'.

The canonical transitive syntactic pattern (Σ_{tr}), as attested, for instance, in RV 2.21.4 *índraḥ ... uṣásaḥ svàr janat* 'Indra generates the dawns, the sun', RV 5.29.1 *árcanti tvā marútaḥ* 'the Maruts praise you', RV 1.103.3

³³ The literature on voice is immense. For a survey of the problem and various approaches, see, e.g., SIEWIERSKA 1984; KLAIMAN 1991; P.K. ANDERSEN 1991; 1994.

³⁴ GENIUŠIENĖ (1987: 53ff.) modifies the semantic part of the scheme by introducing a separate level of referential identity of participants. However, for our purposes, GENIUŠIENĖ's and MEL'ČUK's versions can be considered essentially isomorphic.

³⁵ Similar terminological conventions are accepted in some other traditions; cf., e.g., SERBAT 1975: 130; TOURATIER 1984: 75.

vajrin dásyave hetím asya ‘O vajra-holder, ... throw the weapon at the dasyu’, can be represented by the following table:

	$\Sigma_{tr.}$	
Semantic argument level	X	Y
Syntactic function level	S:NOM	DO:ACC
	(<i>índrah</i>)	(<i>uṣásah, svàr</i>)

Correspondingly, voice alternations can be represented in form of the transformations of the syntactic patterns. In what follows, I will briefly outline the main syntactic patterns relevant for our purposes.

Since tables, like the one given above, are quite space-consuming, I will use a more compact notation in individual lemmata (in Part B), indicating case-marking in the subscript and, in some cases, a typical referent in the superscript, e.g., ‘ $X_{NOM} Y_{ACC}^{weapon} Z_{DAT}^{enemy}$ throw’, ‘ $X_{NOM}^{adept} Y_{ACC}^{deity}$ praise’.

II.2. The main syntactic patterns

II.2.1. Transitive, absolute transitive and transitive-affective

The canonical transitive pattern (see above) does not require special discussion. One should only mention that many transitive verbs can be employed without direct objects, i.e. in the absolute usages – particularly, in the cases of a non-referential direct object,³⁶ as in RV 1.147.2 *píyati tvo ánu tvo grṇāti* ‘One [sacrificer] blames [my speech], another praises’. The common term for this pattern³⁷ is ‘absolute transitive’, or ‘objectless transitive’.³⁸ The absolute transitive usages are common for verbs describing various occupation-related activities (*sing, write*, etc.); see ATKINS et al. 1988: 94ff.

A particular semantic subtype of the transitive pattern, common with middle forms, as opposed to non-marked active forms is often referred to as transitive-affective (GOTŌ 27f.) or transitive with the self-beneficent sense; the standard example is *yájate* ‘he performs sacrifice for himself’.³⁹ The

³⁶ Whence the term ‘Indefinite Object Alternation’ (ATKINS et al. 1988: 93ff.) or ‘Unexpressed (Unspecified) Object Alternation’ (LEVIN 1993: 33) for pairs like *she baked cakes this morning ~ she baked this morning*.

³⁷ Cf. JAMISON 27.

³⁸ LYONS’ (1968: 251, 363ff.) term ‘pseudo-intransitive’ is infelicitous.

³⁹ In typological studies this meaning is often referred to as ‘subjective version’ (the

affective (self-beneficent) meaning has no impact on the syntactic pattern. For a special subclass of transitive-affective usages, where the direct object refers to a property or body part of the agent (as in TS 6.1.1.5 *dākṣiṇaṃ pūrvam āṅkte* ‘he anoints his right [eye] first’), I will use the term ‘possessive-reflexive’.

II.2.2. Passive

II.2.2.1. Passivization typically suggests (i) the promotion of the initial direct object to the subject position (= the subject of the passive construction or passive subject for short) and (ii) the demotion of the initial subject (usually, an agent). The demoted subject either becomes an oblique object (encoded by the instrumental case, as, e.g., in RV 9.86.12d *suvāyudhāḥ sotṛbhiḥ pūyate vṛṣā* ‘[Soma], the well-armed bull, is being purified by pressers’; more rarely by the genitive case (cf. RV 1.61.15a *asmā id u tyād ānu dāyy eṣām* ‘this very thing has been granted just to him by them’)⁴⁰ or, more frequently, remains unexpressed (see GONDA 1951: 77f.),⁴¹ as in RV 9.97.35c *somaḥ sutāḥ pūyate ajyāmānaḥ* ‘Soma, pressed out, is purified, being anointed.’

These syntactic changes can be schematized as follows:

$\Sigma_{tr.}$			$\Sigma_{pass.}$	
X	Y	\Rightarrow	Y	X
S:NOM	DO:ACC		S:NOM	Obl:INS / (GEN) / –

II.2.2.2. Agentless passive⁴² constructions can be illustrated by such examples as RV 10.97.6c *vīpraḥ śa ucyate bhiṣák* ‘This poet is called

term is borrowed from Kartvelian linguistics); see, e.g., MEL’ČUK 1994: 181ff.

⁴⁰ See JAMISON 1979a: 133ff.; P.K. ANDERSEN 1986. On the case of the agent in Vedic, see WENZEL 102ff.; JAMISON 1979a; HETTRICH 1990a.

⁴¹ On the ratio of agentive passives and passives without agent, see JAMISON 1979b: 202ff.

⁴² Other terms used for this type of construction include, for instance, ‘reduced passive’ (see e.g. MATTHEWS 1997: 311) or ‘kvasipassiv’ (WISTRAND 1941: 14, 18). GONDA (1951) labels this type ‘agentless passive’ or ‘Fr.[ench] on-passive’.

healer ...'; RV 10.22.1 *kúha śrutá índraḥ kásminn adyá ' jáne mitró ná śrūyate* 'Where has one heard about Indra? In which community is he known today as a friend?'. In contrast to (canonical) passives without an overtly expressed passive agent (which can be restored, however), the passive agent in such constructions cannot be expressed at all, by virtue of its non-specified status; I use the symbol \emptyset , which can be read as 'someone, people':

$\Sigma_{tr.}$			$\Sigma_{agentless\ pass.}$	
X	Y	\Rightarrow	Y	\emptyset
S:NOM	DO:ACC		S:NOM	–

Agentless passives mostly refer to a particular quality (state) of the (passive) subject, rather than to an event. They are typical, above all, for verbs of perception and knowledge, being based on the following regular semantic relationship: 'Y is (can be) seen (known etc.) by smb.' \rightarrow 'Y is (can be) seen (known etc.) [by smb.]' \rightarrow 'Y is (can be) seen (known etc.) [by \emptyset]' \rightarrow 'Y is visible (famous, etc.)' (see Chapter C.II.1.2.1 and KULIKOV 2011b for further details).

II.2.3. Anticausative

By anticausative⁴³ I mean the intransitive (non-causative) counterpart of

⁴³ The term 'anticausative' has been introduced by NEDJALKOV & SIL'NICKIJ (1969) and adopted in some descriptive and typological studies (cf. MASICA 1976: 40ff. et passim; COMRIE 1981: 161; 1985: 325-328; SIEWIERSKA 1984: 77-79; MILLER 1993: 179-183). Other terms denoting the same or nearly the same syntactic category are: '(simply) intransitive' (cf. JAMISON 31), 'decausative' (cf. esp. MEL'ČUK 1994: 329ff.), 'middle', 'medio-passive' (e.g. DESCLÉS & GUENTCHÉVA 1993: 93f.), 'quasi-passive' (cf. WISTRAND (1941: 14) on Gothic intransitives in *-nan*), 'passif intrinsèque' (as opposed to the canonical 'passif extrinsèque'; see FLOBERT 1975: 91ff.; TOURATIER 1984: 80f.), 'eventive' (GONDA 1951), 'inchoative' (cf. HASPELMATH 1993), 'recessive', 'automative' (KULONEN 1989: 30), 'ergative [intransitive]' (cf. LYONS 1968: 375f., MILLER 1993: 175ff., with bibl.), 'unaccusative' (see LEVIN & RAPOPORT 1995), 'fientive'; for a survey, see HASPELMATH 1987; KULIKOV 1998a: 139ff. The term 'fientive' has become the standard term used to refer to intransitive verbs expressing spontaneous events in Indo-European studies of the last decade written in German – after the influential monograph GOTÖ 1987 (cf. p. 25ff. et passim).

the transitive verb in pairs like *jananta sūryam* (RV 9.23.2) ‘they generated (= gave birth to) Sūrya’ ~ *sūryo ajāyata* (RV 10.90.13) ‘Sūrya was born’; *āriṇāt sapta śindhūn* (RV 4.28.1) ‘he made seven rivers whirl’ ~ *āsmāi rīyante ... śindhavaḥ* (RV 10.40.9) ‘the rivers whirl for him’. The anticausative derivation can be schematized as follows:

$\Sigma_{tr.}$			$\Sigma_{anticaus.}$
X	Y	\Rightarrow	Y
S:NOM	DO:ACC		S:NOM

II.2.4. Reflexive

The term ‘reflexive’ will be used in the narrow sense of the concept,⁴⁴ i.e. to refer to the syntactic pattern which maps the two semantic arguments (usually, Agent and Patient) onto one single syntactic function, the subject, as, e.g., in *sómaḥ pavate* ‘Soma purifies himself’; *mānye revām iva* (RV 8.48.6) ‘I consider myself rich, as it were’. The reflexive derivation can be schematized as follows:

⁴⁴ The term ‘reflexive’ is often used in a broader sense of the concept, i.e. to denote all non-passive intransitive syntactic patterns (which is obviously due to the common polysemy of reflexive markers in Indo-European languages). Furthermore, even when this term is said to be employed in the narrow sense, this usage is not always consistent. For instance, GOTÖ employs the term ‘reflexive’ “im Sinne von gewöhnlichem „direkt-reflexiv“, z.B. ‘ich wasche mich’” (p.27), i.e., obviously, in the cases where agent and patient are referentially identical. Such an analysis is quite appropriate for cases like *pavate* ‘purifies oneself’, *praśāṃsamāno ātithir ná mitrīyaḥ* (RV 8.19.8a) ‘sich ankündigend wie ein im Vertragsverhältnis stehender Gast’ (GOTÖ 303; see Chapter B.I, s.v.), but seems somewhat forced for such cases as *vāhase* (AV 7.4.1 etc.) (GOTÖ 296): ‘you carry yourself’ (?). To be consistent, this syntactic pattern should be treated separately, following GENIUSIENĖ (1987: 86ff., 251ff.), as ‘autocausative’. In contrast to the anticausative, the sole syntactic argument of autocausative bears the semantic role of Agent, not Patient. This terminological distinction is irrelevant for our purposes, however, since anticausative and autocausative are never distinguished by morphological means in Vedic.

$\Sigma_{tr.}$			$\Sigma_{refl.}$	
X	Y	\Rightarrow	X = Y	
S:NOM	DO:ACC		S:NOM	

Quite common are also reflexive constructions with *ātmán-* and *tanú-*, functioning as reflexive pronouns ('oneself'), as in RV 7.86.2a *utá sváyā tanuvā sām vade tát* 'and I discuss it with myself.'⁴⁵

II.2.5. Passive vs. anticausative (reflexive)

Both anticausative and passive derivations entail the promotion of the initial direct object (= Patient) and the demotion of the initial subject (= Agent). This common syntactic feature accounts for their similar morphological marking in many languages (see COMRIE 1985: 328ff.; HASPELMATH 1987: 29ff.). In the cases where the markers of the passive and anticausative (at least partly) overlap, passives without an overtly expressed agent can be distinguished from anticausatives only by semantic criteria. The standard description of this semantic opposition is given as follows:

"Passive and anticausative differ in that, even where the former has no agentive phrase, the existence of some person or thing bringing about the situation is implied, whereas the anticausative is consistent with the situation coming about spontaneously." (COMRIE 1985: 326)⁴⁶

Distinguishing passives without an agent from non-passive intransitives (anticausatives, reflexives) is one of the most important and most complicated problems with which a linguist is confronted when undertaking a syntactic study of the verb. Alongside clear instances of passives, which raise no doubts by virtue of the inherent agentive semantics of the corresponding verb (cf. *kriyáte* 'is made', *hanyáte* 'is killed'), and anticausatives (cf. *pádyate* 'falls', *rīyate* 'flows'), there is an area of uncertainty, i.e. intransitive usages which allow of both passive and anticausative interpretations, cf. *srjyáte* 'is set free (for running etc.) / becomes free, runs', *drśyáte* 'is seen / is visible, appears' (cf., e.g., HOCK 1982: 129). In the case of some *-ya*-presents, the lack of a clear-cut boundary between the passive and non-passive usages finds formal support in accent

⁴⁵ See, e.g., BLOOMFIELD 1895: 421; KULIKOV 2000c; 2007b (with bibl.); 2011c.

⁴⁶ Cf. also HASPELMATH 1987: 6f.; SIEWIERSKA 1984: 78; KULIKOV 1998a.

fluctuation, as in *múcyate* / *mucyáte* ‘escapes, is released’, *kṣ́īyate* / *kṣīyáte* ‘perishes, is destroyed’. The aorist system has special passive forms only for the 3rd person sg./pl. (in *-i/-ran* (*-ram*)), but some *-i/-ran*-aorists correspond to non-passive middle *-ya*-presents with root accentuation (cf. *ápādi* :: *pádya-te* ‘fall’; see Chapter C.V.2.1). Even more complicated is the situation outside the present system where special markers of the passive are lacking and all intransitive derivations (reflexive, anticausative, passive) can only be expressed by the middle – as was probably the case in Proto-Indo-European.⁴⁷

Although in many cases one of the interpretations (passive ~ non-passive) is favoured by the context, this distinction sometimes seems to be (almost) irrelevant for the author of the text, as in RV 3.59.2 *ná hanyate ná jīyate tvótaḥ* ‘the one who is helped by you (sc. Mitra) is neither slain nor robbed (passive) / suffers loss (anticausative)’. Moreover, in some cases the problem of the choice between interpretations goes beyond purely linguistic matters – as in the famous stanza 7 of the cosmogonic hymn RV 10.129: *iyám víśr̥ṣṭīr ... yádi vā dadhé yádi vā ná* ‘this creation ... whether it was established / established itself, or whether not’ (for a survey of suggested translations, see below s.v. *dhā*). Obviously, the interpretation of this sentence in terms of the passive/non-passive (reflexive) opposition depends on how the author of the hymn visualizes the way the world was created – to understand this demands insight into the very heart of the Ancient Indian cosmogonic thought.⁴⁸

⁴⁷ Cf., for instance, EATON 26; DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 263; 1897 [VglSynt II]: 432ff.; BENEDETTI 2006. The same problem is relevant for a syntactic study of middle forms in Greek and some other ancient Indo-European languages, cf. the following notable remark by JANKUHN (1969: 48): “Das Hauptproblem ist ... immer die Unterscheidung zwischen Intransitivum und Passiv. Des sehr fließenden Überganges vom Intransitivum zum Passiv wegen, der in vielen Fällen eine klare Abgrenzung nicht erlaubt, ist es nicht möglich, im Sinne Grosses eine vollständige Liste aller passivisch gebrauchten Medialformen bei Homer zu geben.” On the situation in Latin, see FLOBERT 1975b: 31ff.; cf. also FLOBERT 1970 (with evidence from Mycenaean Greek) for a general discussion of the (Proto-)Indo-European passive.

⁴⁸ Incidentally, some authors are not quite consistent in rendering several forms passively or non-passively, even within the same work, cf. GONDA’s (1963) translations of RV 8.63.1ab *sá pūrvyó mahānāṇī venáḥ krátubhir ānaje* as ‘the first (or, ancient) seer **anointed** (decorated) **himself** with the inventiveness of the great ones’ [reflexive] (p. 72) and ‘that ancient ‘seer’ **was anointed** by the resourcefulness of the great ones’ [passive] (p. 353) [emphasis mine – LK].

II.2.6. Reciprocal and sociative

The term ‘reciprocal’ will be used, *sensu stricto*, in reference to constructions like *vidīvyante* ‘they play with each other’, AV 1.28.4 *mithó vikeśyò ví ghnatām* ‘let the horrid-haired [sorceresses] destroy each other’ – i.e. those which incorporate the meaning ‘mutually’, ‘each other’. Constructions like KB 12.5 [ed. LINDNER] *sarvā devatāḥ saṃ tṛpyante* ‘all the deities rejoice together’, KS 25.6:110.18-19 *te saṃprākampanta* ‘those [worlds] were trembling together’, also called reciprocals by some authors (cf., e.g., HOFFMANN 1965b: 167 [= Aufs. 1, 178], fn. 1; GONDA 1979: 66; KRISCH 1999: 285), will be referred to as sociatives.⁴⁹

The reciprocal meaning is generally expressed in Vedic by middle forms with the preverb *ví* (as noticed already by DELBRÜCK (1897 [VglSynt II]: 431f.; see also GOTÖ 1987: 134, 294 et passim; 1989: 283; 1996a: 7) and/or the adverb *mithāḥ*; see KULIKOV 2007a. The sociative meaning, on the other hand, is expressed by middle forms with the preverb *sám*.

II.3. Transitivity, objecthood and passivization test

The two syntactic issues immediately related to the passive derivation are transitivity and objecthood. Typological studies of the last two decades have paid much attention to transitivity as a syntactico-semantic phenomenon; see esp. the well-known article by HOPPER & THOMPSON (1980). Within this new approach, transitivity is not regarded anymore as a binary opposition (transitive/intransitive), but rather as a continuum (transitivity degree) which can be described in terms of a complex set of features, all of which are concerned with the effectiveness of the action denoted by the verb: the more effective the action, the more transitive the corresponding clause. One of the consequences of the gradual character of the transitivity feature is, in particular, the lack of a clear-cut boundary between (canonical) direct objects (DO) and other accusative nominals.⁵⁰ As is well-known, the accusative case-marking is the most important, but not the only, feature distinguishing DOs from other syntactic arguments. Alongside clear instances of prototypical DOs (which usually bear the semantic role of patient; see examples in Chapters II.1, II.2.1 above), we come across a

⁴⁹ For definitions of the reciprocal and sociative meanings, see NEDJALKOV 2007: 6f., 33.

⁵⁰ See ANDERSON (1988) on Direct and ‘Not-So-Direct’ Objects; for the notion of prototypical transitivity, see also GIVÓN 1984: 96ff.

number of non-DO accusatives as well as several intermediate cases. The main criterion for distinguishing DOs from other accusatives is the passivization test, i.e. susceptibility to passivization.⁵¹ In spite of its obvious shortcomings (see JAMISON 1979b: 197ff.; 1983: 30ff.), it can be quite successfully used for distinguishing various types of accusative arguments according to their objecthood. Usually, constructions with canonical DOs (= prototypical transitives) can readily be passivized, while constructions with accusatives of other types can only be passivized rarely, exceptionally, or never (see GAEDICKE; DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 164ff.; GONDA 1957a; 1957b; JAMISON 27ff.; for Classical Sanskrit, see OSTLER 1979: 242ff.; HOCK 1982: 131). Since a detailed scrutiny of transitivity and objecthood in Vedic goes beyond the scope of the present study, I will limit myself to a short enumeration of non-DO accusative nominals.

Among various types of accusative arguments, accusatives of time (in constructions such as RV 10.161.4a *śatām jīva śarādo vārdhamānaḥ* ‘live hundred autumns in prosperity’; see GAEDICKE 175ff.; GONDA 1957a: 54ff. [= Sel.St. I, 51ff.]; 1957b: 75f. [= Sel.St. I, 66f.]) and accusatives of goal (as in RV 1.110.2 *āgachata savitūr [...] gṛhām* ‘you went to the house of Savitar’; RV 9.56.2a *yāt sómo vājāṃ āṛṣati* ‘when Soma runs to the prize...’; see GAEDICKE 125ff., 144ff.; WECKER 4ff.; GONDA 1957a: 52ff. [= Sel.St. I, 49ff.])⁵² show the lowest degree of objecthood and never promote to passive subjects.

I have not found reliable examples of passive counterparts of constructions with the accusative of relation/scope/parameter,⁵³ which denote, generally, the scope of application of the given (intransitive) activity and/or its result (cf. RV 9.49.3 *ghṛtām pavasva* ‘purify yourself [into] ghee’; RV 2.2.6 *rayīm asmāsu dīdihi* (lit.) ‘shine wealth for us’; RV 9.97.50a *abhī vástrā suvasanāny arṣa* ‘flow (for) well-fitting (lit. well-clothing) clothes’; RV 7.56.5 *śā vīt ... pūṣyantī nṛmṇām* ‘this tribe, ... prospering in manliness’). On this type, see GAEDICKE 88ff.; DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 175f.; OLDENBERG, Noten ad RV 10.96.8; OERTEL 1926: 31ff. (with a rich collection of examples and detailed discussion);⁵⁴ HAUDRY 195ff.; JAMISON

⁵¹ Cf., e.g., DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 104f.; HAUDRY 149. For a general discussion of this criterion, see, for instance, ANDERSON 1988: 300ff.

⁵² GOTÖ 26f. calls this usage “facientiv mit affiziertem Objekt”.

⁵³ Also called ‘accusative of result’.

⁵⁴ OERTEL rightly argues that the accusative is to be regarded in such constructions “as

29, fn. 9; KULIKOV 1999a: 236ff.; see also this book, Ch. B.IV, s.v. As to passive counterparts of constructions with the content accusative (= Inhaltsakkusativ),⁵⁵ typically derived from the same root as the governing verb (e.g. in RV 6.2.1 *puṣṭīm ... puṣyasi* (lit.) ‘you prosper prosperity’; AV 11.3.56 *nā ca sarvajyānīm jīyāte* ‘if he is not deprived of the whole property...’),⁵⁶ we only find a few examples in Vedic, such as TS 1.7.6.2 *viṣṇukramāḥ kramyānte* ‘the strides of Viṣṇu are stridden’.

Between the prototypical DOs and clear instances of non-DO accusatives (accusatives of time, goal, relation), there is an intermediary type of accusative governed by preverbs.⁵⁷ Although intransitive verbs are generally said to become transitive in several compounds, it will be argued that this *communis opinio* is not supported by the passivization test: passives derived from intransitives with preverbs are few and mostly late; for details, see Chapter C.II.1.3.2.

II.4. ‘Two pattern’ transitive verbs (ditransitives)

The passivization test will also be used to determine a particular subtype of transitives which will be called ‘two pattern’ verbs. This subclass comprises the verbs which can be constructed with two kinds of accusative objects (hereafter referred to as first [proximate] and second [distant] objects). The second object (‘recipient’ or locative direct object; see GIVÓN 1984: 98ff.) typically denotes the goal or addressee⁵⁸ – as, e.g., is the case with *yuj* ‘yoke, join’, constructed with the accusative of horses (as in RV 8.98.9 *yuñjānti hārī ... ráthe* ‘they yoke two fallow [horses] to the chariot’) or with the accusative of ‘chariot’ (as in RV 7.23.3 *yujé rátham ... háribhyām* ‘in order to yoke the chariot ... with two fallow [horses] ...’). Usually, only one of these two participants surfaces in the accusative; the first object can

an accusative of content or reference [...] rather than as accusative of the direct object”.

⁵⁵ Other terms are: cognate object, *figura etymologica*, etymologischer Akkusativ.

⁵⁶ On this type, see GAEDICKE 156ff.; S. SEN 1927: 360ff.; JAMISON 29, with fn. 9.

⁵⁷ For a rich collection of examples, see GAEDICKE 91ff; S. SEN 1927: 368ff.; cf. also GONDA 1957a: 61ff. [= Sel.St. I, 58ff.]; 1957b: 78f. [= Sel.St. I, 69f.]; OSTLER 1979: 344f.

⁵⁸ The Indian tradition uses the terms *pradhāna-karman* ‘principal object’ and *apradhāna-karman* ‘non-principal, secondary object’; see DESHPANDE 1991: 21ff.

alternatively appear in the instrumental and the second object in the dative or locative.⁵⁹ The passivization test is necessary to determine whether both types of accusative nominals behave as DOs or not and thus to distinguish ‘two pattern’ verbs (also labelled ‘ditransitives’) from other verbs with multiple accusatives.⁶⁰

The two main semantic groups of ‘two pattern’ verbs in Vedic are verbs of speech (with the accusative of speech or with the accusative of the addressee of the speech [= second object]: ‘X_{NOM} sings Y^{prayer}_{ACC}’ or ‘X_{NOM} praises Z^{deity}_{ACC}’) and verbs of putting / spraying (with the accusative of movable things or substances or with the accusative of the goal: ‘X_{NOM} sprinkles Y^{oblation}_{ACC}’ or ‘X_{NOM} besprinkles Z^{altar}_{ACC}’);⁶¹ for a list of these verbs, see Chapter C.II.1.3.1.

II.5. To conclude these syntactic preliminaries, I will mention a few other relevant syntactic notions. The term ‘**intransitive/transitive**’ (I/T), introduced by JAMISON (1983: 31ff.), refers to verbs which can be constructed either with the accusative or with some other oblique cases (locative, genitive, etc.). The term ‘**labile**’ (borrowed by typologists from Caucasian linguistics)⁶² refers to the forms which can be employed both intransitively and transitively with no formal change. I will primarily use this term to denote pairs where the object of the transitive usage corresponds to the subject of the intransitive,⁶³ cf. *rīṣya-*^{ti} ‘be hurt; harm’; *rudrā ... vāvṛdhuḥ* (RV 2.34.13) ‘the Rudras ... have grown’ ~ *īndram ukthāni vāvṛdhuḥ* (RV 8.6.35) ‘the hymns have increased Indra’.⁶⁴

⁵⁹ On this syntactic phenomenon, see already DELBRÜCK (1897 [VglSynt II]: 438f.). The ‘two pattern’ verbs have been the subject of the monograph HAUDRY (1977: Chapter 3, esp. p. 175ff.); see also JAMISON 1979a: 135, fn. 11; HOCK 1982: 135, note 5; HETTRICH 1990b: 83f.; 2007, *passim*. For criticism of HAUDRY’s ‘théorie de deux modèles’, see CARDONA 1978; for evidence from post-Vedic Skt. and grammarians, see OSTLER 1979: 337ff.

⁶⁰ On the passivization of ditransitives, see esp. DESHPANDE 1991.

⁶¹ On this semantic class (also called ‘verbs of filling and emptying’), see, in particular, MORAVCSIK 1978: 254ff.; DIK 1981: 99ff.; LEVIN 1993: 50ff. (with *bibl.*).

⁶² Other terms include, in particular, ‘ambitransitive’ (DIXON), ‘voice-neutral’, ‘optionally transitive’; for a survey, see KULIKOV 1999a.

⁶³ Such pairs are sometimes said to exemplify the ‘causative/inchoative’ alternation; see, e.g., SMITH 1978; ATKINS et al. 1988; HASPELMATH 1993; LEVIN 1993.

⁶⁴ Cf. HOFFMANN 1976d; GOTÖ 236, fn. 519.

II.6. Some relevant semantic types and oppositions

To conclude this chapter, I will list and briefly comment upon some semantic types and oppositions which will be used in the present study.

The main opposition within the class of middle *-ya*-presents is that between passives and non-passives (anticausatives, reflexives), as outlined above. A more detailed classification of the middle non-passive *-ya*-presents into thematic classes, or semantic fields⁶⁵ (changes of state; motion and body posture; mental activities; speech/sound), will be presented in Chapter C.II.2.2.

Among intransitive active *-ya*-presents, I will distinguish between the following taxonomic categories (cf. PADUČEVA 1998: 4): **activities**, i.e. verbs expressing the situations controllable by the subject (= Agent), such as *dīya-ti* ‘fly’, *nṛtya-ti* ‘dance’, *yúdhya-ti/te* ‘fight’, and verbs expressing non-controllable situations, which further divide into **processes** (*júrya-ti*, *jṛya-ti* ‘grow old, decay’, *násya-ti* ‘perish’) and **states** (cf. *krúdhya-ti* ‘be angry’, *kṣúdhya-ti* ‘be hungry’); see Chapter C.II.5. The latter term requires a short comment. The verbs of this class can express both being in a certain (mostly, emotional or physical) state and entering into this state: ‘be/become glad’, ‘be/become angry’, ‘be/become lean’, ‘be/become hungry’, etc. In other words, they can be employed in both the stative and inchoative usages⁶⁶ (cf., for instance, PW III, 526 (s.v. *darp*) and DELBRÜCK 1897 [VglSynt II]: 30 on *dṛṣyati* ‘toll, verrückt werden/sein’, and see examples s.v. *med* ‘be/become fat’). Some contexts favour one of the interpretations, in others both interpretations are equally possible. Thus, strictly speaking, we should use the complex term ‘**stative/inchoative**’; for brevity, such verbs will be referred to as **states**.

⁶⁵ Cf. MEL’ČUK 1988: 170; PADUČEVA 1998: 4.

⁶⁶ For a typology of inchoative verbs and relations between inchoatives and statives, see NEDJALKOV 1987; 2002; on the stative/inchoative polysemy, see also TALMY 1985: 85ff.

II.7. Simple Present and Present Continuous in English translations of -yá-passives

As is well-known, the English *be*-passive of the type *the house is/was built* [by John] is ambiguous between the dynamic and stative readings – in contrast to its German and Dutch parallels (cf. *Das Haus wird/ist gebaut*, *Het huis wordt/is gebouwd*; cf. also Russ. *Дом строится / построен*).⁶⁷ In order to distinguish the meaning of the present -yá-passives (which typically corresponds to the dynamic reading) from that of the -tá/-ná-participles and statives in -e/(i)re (which usually corresponds to the stative reading; see Chapter III.2 below), I will mostly use English progressive tenses in translation of -yá-passives (pr. *kriyáte* ‘is being made’, impf. *ákriyata* ‘was being made’, etc.) – even in spite of the fact that such English forms suggest a much stronger emphasis of the progressive aspect than Vedic -yá-passives may express.

⁶⁷ See, e.g., VERNAY 1980: 120ff.; VERHAGEN 1992: 305ff.

III. Corpus of texts and evaluation of evidence

III.1. The Vedic corpus

I will basically follow the traditional chronological scheme, which arranges the texts roughly as follows (with minor modifications):⁶⁸

Mantra language

- the early RV (family maṇḍalas)
- the late RV (maṇḍalas I, X, Vākhilya = 8.49-59)
- SV, RVKh., AV (in two recensions: AV(Ś), AVP⁶⁹)
- mantras of the YV (YV^m), i.e. VS (in two recensions: VS(M) and VSK), TS^m, TB^m, MS^m, KS^m,⁷⁰ KpS^m

Vedic prose

- Saṃhitā prose (YV^p), i.e. TS^p, MS^p, (A/U)KS^p, KpS^p
- (older) Brāhmaṇas: AB, KB, ŚB (in two recensions: ŚB(M) and ŚBK), TB^(p), PB, JB, Lost-Br.⁷¹
- late Brāhmaṇas (GB, ŚB, Kāth-Saṃk.⁷²), Āraṇyakas (AĀ, ŚĀ, TĀ, KaṭhĀ) and Vedic Upaniṣads (BĀU [in two recensions: BĀUM and BĀUK] = ŚB 14.4-9), ChU, JUB⁷³)

Other texts included into the Vedic corpus by the Indian tradition are

⁶⁸ For the chronology of Vedic texts, see, in particular, NARTEN 1968a: 115f. [= Kl.Schr. 1, 77f.], fn. 13; WITZEL 1989: 120ff.; 1995: 96ff. (with bibl.).

⁶⁹ Although VIŚVA BANDHU's *Word Concordance* only includes those forms which are attested in the Kashmir manuscript, many of the Orissa readings can be located by means of VWC – unless the Kashmir readings are corrupt and/or differ beyond recognition.

⁷⁰ In some cases it will be indicated whether a form occurs in an accented (A^hKS^m) or unaccented (U^hKS^m) part of the Kāṭhaka (ed. SCHROEDER).

⁷¹ Mostly ŚātyB, closely related to the JB.

⁷² Which also contains parts of older Brāhmaṇas.

⁷³ Sometimes regarded as an Āraṇyaka (cf. RENOU 1943 [KenaU, ed. RENOU]: 3; 1947b: 106, §94).

usually not regarded as Vedic, although the oldest among them (e.g. the oldest Śrauta-Sūtras: BaudhŚS, VādhS)⁷⁴ can hardly be younger than the late Brāhmaṇas, such as GB or even JB. These (**early**) **post-Vedic** texts are:

- principal Upaniṣads, six of which are parts of the texts included into the Vedic corpus: TaiU (= TĀ 7-9), MNU (= TĀ 10), AitU (= AĀ 2.4-6), KauṣU (= ŚĀ 3-6), KenaU (= JUB 4.18-21), ĪsU (= VS 40), as well as KaṭhU, KaṭhŚiU, MaitrU and MaitrāyaṇyU, MāṇḍU, MuṇḍU, PraśU, ŚvetU and probably a few other minor Upaniṣads, such as ĀrṣU, ChāgU
- the six post-Vedic “Brāhmaṇas” (Anubrāhmaṇas) of the Sāmaveda (SVB, ManB, etc.)⁷⁵
- Sūtras:
 - Śrauta-Sūtras [ŚrSū.] (ĀpŚS, BaudhŚS, ŚSS, etc.)
 - Gṛhya-Sūtras [GṛSū.] (ĀśGS, MānGS, ŚGS, etc.)
 - Piṭṛmedha-Sūtras
 - Dharma-Sūtras [DhSū.] (ĀpDhS, VāsDhS, etc.)
 - some other texts (APrāyaśc., etc.)

For the sake of completeness, I will sometimes quote and briefly comment upon some forms attested in these (early) post-Vedic texts, using a smaller font. Evidence from other post-Vedic texts – Smṛtis (ViṣṇuSmṛ., ManuSmṛ., etc.), ancillary literature (AVPariś., Pāṇini’s Aṣṭādhyāyī, etc.), Ep. and Cl. Skt. texts, very late (up to the last centuries) Upaniṣads – will only be used exceptionally.

III.2. Forms under discussion and their sources

The present study is based upon evidence from all Vedic texts. The occurrences of -ya-presents have been located by means of VIŚVA BANDHU’s *Vedic Word Concordance* (VWC) as well as concordances, word-indices and verbal dictionaries for individual texts, such as GRASSMANN 1873 [Wb. zum RV] and LUBOTSKY 1997a [RVWC] for the RV, WHITNEY’s *Index verborum* for the AV (1881), SIMON’s *Index verborum* for the Kāthaka (1912), verbal dictionary by FRENZ (1966) for the JB, the word concordance for the Śulba-Sūtras (MICHAELS 1983) etc. -ya-presents from the KaṭhĀ, KaṭhŚiU (both in ed. WITZEL), books 6-10 of the MānŚS and VādhŚS [1.1-1.4] (in eds. SPARREBOOM/HEESTERMAN and IKARI), which are not covered by VWC,

⁷⁴ See e.g. GONDA 1977: 514, 522ff.

⁷⁵ See, e.g., RENOU 1947b: 107ff.

have been excerpted by myself.

An analysis of *-yá*-passives would be incomplete without at least a short discussion of other forms attested in the passive usage. These are, above all, ‘medio-passive’ aorists (which have a defective paradigm, consisting of the 3sg. form in *-i*, 3pl. form in *-ran/-ram*, and participle with the suffix *-āna*-only) and statives (supplying the perfect system with passives, also with a defective paradigm, consisting of 3sg. form in *-e*, 3pl. form in *-re*, and participle with the suffix *-āna*-),⁷⁶ as well as relatively rare and isolated middle forms of the aorist (mainly 3pl. forms of sigmatic aorists) and present systems.

I will not bring into discussion the productive non-finite formations – (passive) perfect participles in *-tá/-ná*- and future passive participles (gerundives), which can be derived from nearly all transitive verbs in Vedic (*-tá/-ná*-participles also from most intransitives).

It should be borne in mind that it was not my intention to trace all forms attested in the passive usage; rather, I will give only a representative selection of such passive occurrences. Foremost, I have enumerated those attestations which are mentioned and discussed in studies on Vedic verb and verbal syntax, such as WENZEL 1879; EATON 1884; DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]; RENOU 1925; GONDA 1951; 1979; NARTEN 1964; GOTÖ 1987; 1990, 1991, 1993, 1997a (“Materialien zu einer Liste altindischer Verbalformen” 1-29); KÜMMEL 1996; 2000; HETTRICH 2007/(in progress).

III.3. Statistic evaluation: hapaxes, nonce formations and ‘passive-rich’ mantras

As is well-known, forms which occur only a few times, i.e. (quasi-)hapaxes, can represent nonce formations. Of course, the statistics by themselves cannot prove the nonce character: the given form (in our case, a *-ya*-present) may be unattested elsewhere merely by chance. There are, however, a few Vedic mantras which reveal an unusually high concentration of *-yá*-passives. Those forms which do not occur outside these texts (which I will call, for the lack of better term, ‘passive-rich [mantras]’) may be nonce formations, emerging in linguistic and poetic experiments. Below I will briefly characterize such fragments.

⁷⁶ On these two formations, see KÜMMEL 1996 and KULIKOV 2006a; 2006b (especially on participles of passive aorists and statives); for *-i*-aorists, see also MIGRON 1975.

• AV 5.19.4-6 and, especially, 12.5 (“The Brahman’s cow”). The first fragment attests 7 -*ya*-presents; AV 12.5 has some 20 forms in stanzas 15-45. Most forms are nom.sg. participles of -*yá*-passives; the syntactic pattern in which they appear can be schematized as $X_{\text{NOM.SG}} V\text{-}yá\text{-}mānā$ (where X stands for a negative notion, such as death, mishap, etc., V is a verbal root) ‘[the Brahman’s cow is] X when being V-ed’. A few stanzas (23, 29, 32-37) attest a more complex variant of this pattern: $X_{\text{NOM.SG}} V\text{-}yá\text{-}mānā$, $Y_{\text{NOM.SG}} W\text{-}tā\text{-}nā$ ‘[the Brahman’s cow is] X when being V-ed, Y when W-ed’. Cf.:

(AV 12.5.28-29)

[28] *vāiraṃ vikṛtyāmānā, páutrādyaṃ vibhājyāmānā*

[29] *devahetír hriyāmānā, vyṛddhir hṛtā*

[28] ‘[The Brahman’s cow is] hostility when being cut up, the eating of one’s children when being shared out; [29] a divine missile when being taken, perdition when taken.’

Cf. also examples s.vv. *aś*, *kṛ*, *jyā* (*jī*), *pac*, *piś*, etc.

• VS 8.54-59 (10 forms) ~ TS^m 4.4.9 (7 forms) ~ KS^m 34.14-16 (20 forms). These are sacrificial formulae accompanying setting down the bricks called Yajñatanū in the ceremony of *agnicayana* (the piling of the fire-altar) to rectify and expiate any neglect, error or mishap in the sacrificial performance.⁷⁷ Most forms are nom.sg.f. participles employed in construction $X_{\text{NOM.SG}} V\text{-}yá\text{-}mānaḥ$ ‘[you are] X when being V-ed’ (where X refers to a deity), as in TS 4.4.9.1 *apūtapá ādhūyāmānaḥ* ‘[you are] the drinker of unpurified [Soma], when being cleansed [by shaking].’

• VS 39.5 (5 forms) ~ TS^m 7.1.19 (4 forms) = KS-Aśvamedha^m 5.1.10 (4 forms). These are dat.sg.m. participles related to the horse in the Aśvamedha rite, which appear (in the TS and KS) in construction $V\text{-}yá\text{-}mānāya svāhā$ ‘to him, being V-ed, hail!’ – as in TS^m 7.1.19.1 = ^UKS-Aśvamedha^m 5.1.10:154.3 *vicṛtyāmānāya svāhā* ‘to him, being untied, hail!’

⁷⁷ On these mantras (“Soma’s metamorphoses”) and the rite, see, in particular, CALAND & HENRY 127; GONDA 1983c.

IV. The structure of the survey of *-ya*-presents

IV.1. The formal classes of *-ya*-presents

The preliminary classification of *-ya*-presents, which determines the structure of the survey of *-ya*-presents (Part B), is based upon two formal features: diathesis and accentuation. The major division holds between active and middle *-ya*-presents. Middle *-ya*-presents are further divided according to the place of accent: formations with the accent on the suffix (Chapter B.I), on the root (Chapter B.II) and fluctuating on either the suffix or root (Chapter B.III).

Those forms with the accent on the suffix or on the root, which are thus the main evidence for characterization of a given *-ya*-present in terms of its accentuation, will be called **unambiguously accented**, or (in some cases) **accented** for short.

There are, however, a number of *-ya*-presents which do not occur unambiguously accented, i.e., they either (i) do not occur accented at all,⁷⁸ or (ii) are attested in forms with the accent on the augment *a-* and/or on the negative prefix *a-* (in participles, cf. RV 1.141.5 *āhimṣyamāna-* ‘unharméd’). Although in many cases such *-ya*-presents can easily be distinguished in terms of the passive/non-passive distinction, I will follow purely formal features and present all such formations in Chapter B.IV (Unaccented middle *-ya*-presents); in Part C, on the basis of a systematic analysis and classification of *-ya*-presents, I will tentatively restore their accentuation.

The remaining *-ya*-presents are presented in Chapter B.V. While Chapters B.I-IV deal with *-ya*-presents which never or exceptionally (mostly in late texts) occur with the active inflection (i.e. *media tantum* or *quasi-tantum*), a good deal of formations which I call ‘active *-ya*-presents’ are quite common with middle endings (although active forms are more frequent and unmarked). In other words, it should be borne in mind that the classificational division between active and middle *-ya*-presents lacks

⁷⁸ Here I also reckon *-ya*-presents which occur accented only in texts which often attest corrupt accentuation, such as RVKh. and books 1-3, 7-10 of the TĀ.

symmetry (see also Chapter C.VI).

The last Chapter of Part B discusses presents of the type *Cyáti*.

IV.2. The structure of the individual lemmata

Within each Chapter *-ya*-presents are arranged according to the alphabetical order of their roots; in the numbering of homonymous roots I basically follow MAYRHOFER's EWAia. The heading of an **individual lemma** contains the following information:

- the basic meaning(s) of the corresponding verbal root and the attestations of its *-ya*-present(s) in the texts (for simplex and compounds with preverbs); semantic subdivisions are marked by Greek characters (α , β , ...), whereas syntactic patterns are distinguished by small Roman numerals in square brackets [i, ii, ...];
- (unambiguously) accented occurrences are listed in full, if they are rare; full lists are also given for *-ya*-presents with fluctuating accentuation and the forms with abnormal accentuation (e.g., active *-ya*-presents with suffix accentuation) will likewise be mentioned;
- (after •) relevant syntactic and semantic categories; for middle *-ya*-presents the main syntacto-semantic types attested (pass.[ive], anticaus.[ative], refl.[exive], recipr.[ocal], tr.[ansitive]) will be given and for active *-ya*-presents their taxonomic category (state, process, etc.; see Chapter II.6 above);
 - occurrences with exceptional (or marked) diathesis;
 - occurrences of *-yá*-passives built on secondary stems (causatives, non-causative *-áya*-presents and desideratives) as well as passives derived from quasi-denominatives (see Appendix II).

The main part of the lemma gives typical examples of the usages and discusses at length semantics and syntax of the corresponding *-ya*-present. Some relevant subjects, such as passives made from secondary derivatives, the inventory of non-present formations attested in the passive usage or forms with the abnormal diathesis are discussed at the end of the lemma, under cut-in headings on a grey background:

- | | |
|----------------|--|
| Other passives | – other formations attested in the passive usage (passive aorists, statives, non-characterized middle forms) |
| -i-aorist | – -i-aorists (for middle <i>-ya</i> -presents) |

Active forms	– forms with the abnormal active inflection (for middle <i>-ya</i> -presents)
Middle forms	– forms with the abnormal middle inflection (for predominantly active <i>-ya</i> -presents)
Caus. pass.	– passives derived from causative stems
Desid. pass.	– passives derived from desiderative stems;
Quasi-denom. passives	s– passives derived from quasi-denominatives.

Part B

A SURVEY OF VEDIC *-ya-*PRESENTS

I. Middle -ya-presents with suffix accentuation

(*aj* ‘drive’: *ajyá-^{te}*)

(RV 5.30.14, 6.2.8, 9.76.2, 9.66.9, 9.72.1, 9.78.2: → ¹*añj* ‘anoint’;
RV 8.51.9 (= Vāl. 3.9): → ¹*añj* or ²*añj* ‘manifest’)

The existence of a -yá-passive of the root *aj* ‘drive’ is dubious. All occurrences of the present *ajyá-^{te}* either belong to the root ¹*añj* ‘anoint’, or, at best, are ambiguous; for discussion, see s.v. *añj*.

It is interesting to note that the passive of *aj*, absent from (Vedic) Sanskrit, appears in Pāli, cf. *samhā raṭṭhā niraṇṇati* ‘he is driven out of his kingdom’ (see VON HINÜBER 1979 for references and discussion). Theoretically, this might be indirect evidence for a hypothetical Vedic passive *-*ajyate* ‘is driven’ (> Pā. -*ajjati*). However, Pā. *ajjati* might equally result from an independent development in Middle Indo-Aryan (note, especially, VON HINÜBER’s remark on the “revival” of the use of *aj* in the Jātaka prose) or, perhaps, in the Old Indo-Aryan dialect underlying Pāli.

²*añc* ‘bail [water]’: -*acyá-^{te}*

+ *úd* AVP 16.102.1, ŚB^v 14.8.1.1 (= BĀU^v 5.1.1) (≈ AV 10.8.29);
+ *ví* AV 18.4.36 = {VS 13.49 (= ŚB 7.5.2.34) = MS^m 2.7.17:102.14 =
^KS^m 16.17:241.7 = KpS^m 25.8:101.9} = {TS^m 4.2.10.2 = TĀ^m 6.6.1}, MS^p
4.2.8:29.15
accented: AV–YV–ŚB, MS
• pass.

In contrast to the non-passive present of ¹*añc* ‘bend’, which does not occur accented (see Chapter IV, s.v.), pr. -*acyá-^{te}* of the verb ²*añc* ‘bail [water]’ functions as a passive. The relevant passages are discussed in detail by HOFFMANN (1965b: 171ff. [= Aufs. 1, 162ff.]); see also GOTÖ 1999: 132, with fn. 22.

One of the two occurrences attested in the mantras (in the AV and all Saṃhitās of the YV) was interpreted by all translators (WHITNEY, EGGELING, etc.) as belonging to ¹*añc* ‘expand, extend’. As HOFFMANN (op.cit., 173 [= Aufs. 1, 164]) convincingly demonstrated, the form in question means ‘being bailed’:

(AV 18.4.36ab)

*sahásradhāraṃ śatádadhāram útsam ákṣitaṃ ' vyacyámānaṃ salilásya
prṣṭhé*

‘... the thousand-streamed, hundred-streamed inexhaustible well at the
back of the sea, albeit **being bailed**...’⁷⁹

There are two more occurrences in the Saṃhitās:

(MS 4.2.8:29.15-16)

*samudrá iva ha vā asya vyacyámāno*⁸⁰ *ná kṣīyate, yá evāṃ veda*

‘[W]ie das Meer (nicht dahinschwindet, wenn aus ihm geschöpft wird,
ebenso) schwindet, wenn aus ihr geschöpft wird, (die Quelle) dessen nicht
dahin, der so weiß.’ (HOFFMANN, op.cit., 174 [= Aufs. 1, 165])

(AVP 16.102.1ab ≈ AVŚ 10.8.29ab)

*ūnāt pūrṇam ud acati ' pūrṇād ūnam ud acyate*⁸¹

‘[A]us dem Leeren schöpft er das Volle, aus dem Vollen wird das Leere
geschöpft.’ (HOFFMANN, op.cit., 171 [= Aufs. 1, 162])

Beside this Paippalāda attestation, a very similar mystic verse occurs in
the BĀU:

(ŚB 14.8.1.1 (= BĀU 5.1.1) ≈ AVŚ 10.8.29ab)

pūrṇám adāḥ pūrṇám idám ' pūrṇāt pūrṇám +úd acyate [ms. *udácyate*]⁸²

⁷⁹ Variants in the repetitions are:

(VS 13.49.a[ab] (= ŚB 7.5.2.34) = MS 2.7.17:102.14-15 = ^AKS 16.17:241.7 = KpS
25.8:101.9)

imāṃ sāhasráṃ śatádadhāram útsam ' vyacyámānaṃ sarirásya [MS *salilásya*]
mádhye

‘[D]iese tausendfache, hundertströmige Quelle, die geschöpft wird (d.h. aus der
geschöpft wird) in der Mitte des Salzmeeres.’ (HOFFMANN)

Texts of the Taittirīya school attest the following version of the mantra:

(TS 4.2.10.2f = TĀ 6.6.1 (= BaudhŚS 1.17:26.12-13))

imāṃ samudráṃ śatádadhāram útsam ' vyacyámānaṃ bhúvanasya mádhye

⁸⁰ ROTH’s conjecture ⁺*vyácyā māno* (ed. SCHROEDER, Bd. IV, p. 312) is unnecessary,
see HOFFMANN, op.cit., 174 [= Aufs. 1, 165]; MITTWEDE 1986 [Textkr. zur MS]: 161.

⁸¹ Thus in Orissa ms.; Kashm. ms. reads *ud īcyate*, correctly emended by HOFFMANN.
Śaunakīya has *pūrṇād pūrṇám úd acati ' pūrṇám pūrṇéna sicyate*; see s.v. *sic*.

⁸² The root accentuation attested in mss. [ed. WEBER’s AM; see crit.app.] is
erroneous; cf. other corrupt accents (for instance, in *pūrṇam*) in the same passage.

‘Full is that, full is this; from the Full the Full is bailed.’

^(1/2)*añj* ‘anooint; manifest’: *ajyá*-^{te}

(¹*añj*) α ‘anooint’:

Simplex RV, ŚB 3.7.1.10, AB 1.19.6, KB 10.3.1 [ed. LINDNER 10.2],
*KāṭhĀ^p 3.233:98.8 (*aj[yá]m[ā]ne*) +;

+ *abhi* Sū.+;

+ *sám* RV, VS 12.70 (= ŚB 7.2.2.10) = MS^m 2.7.12:92.7 = ^UKS^m
16.12:235.1 = KpS^m 25.3:96.14 *sám-ajyatām* (≈ AV 3.17.9 – TS^m 4.2.5.6a
samaktā);

β ‘anooint with semen, impregnate’:

Simplex RV 10.31.10, PB 7.2.6, JB 3.24:5 [ed. CALAND §171] (*ajyate*,
v.l. *ājyate*);

+ *ví* RV 10.85.28 = AV 14.1.26

(²*añj*) ‘manifest, reveal’:

Simplex RV 8.51.9 (= Vāl. 3.9) (?);

+ *vi* PB 20.14.4 (*vy-ajyante* ≈ JB 2.245:5 *ni-yujyante*), AĀ 2.3.6
(*vy-ajyamānā*)

accented: RV

• pass.

¹*añj* ‘anooint’

The semantics of the root *añj* and its derivatives has been discussed at length by KUIPER (1952), who has demonstrated that all secondary meanings, such as ‘adorn’, ‘decorate’,⁸³ ‘worship’ etc., can be easily derived from the original meaning ‘anooint, grease’.

Active forms (pr. *ánakti*, perfect) are constructed with the goal accusative of the object to which ointment or any other substance is applied and with the instrumental of the ointment (or its ritual equivalent: prayer, religious thought, etc.): X_{NOM} anooint Y_{ACC} with Z^{ointment}_{INS} *añj*- (see, in particular, HETTRICH 2007: 6ff.). Cf.:

⁸³ On this meaning of *añj*, see, in particular, JACKSON 2002: 30ff.

(RV 9.45.3ab)

utá tvám aruṇám vayám ' góbhīr añjmo mādāya kām

‘And we anoint you, the reddish one (= Soma), with milk, for exhilaration.’

Only the second object (the recipient of ointment), but not the first object (the ointment), can surface as the accusative object. A seeming exception to this regularity is the constructions of the middle present (*añkte* etc.) with the noun *añjī-* ‘ointment’ (always in the sandhi form *añjy* before a vowel), which, at first glance, could be an accusative object,⁸⁴ cf., for instance:

(RV 1.124.8cd)

viyucchántī raśmībhiḥ sūryasyañjy añkte samanagá iva vrāḥ

The Pp. takes *añjy* as an accusative (*añjī*) in such cases, but this analysis seems to rely on the late and secondary reinterpretation of the instrumental form *añjī*⁸⁵ (in sandhi form), with the subsequent shortening of the final long vowel. Most likely, the originally feminine noun has been assessed, after shortening of the final vowel, as an accusative of a neuter *añjī-* (perhaps, under the influence of constructions with content accusatives); cf. HAUDRY 232f. and LUBOTSKY (1988: 31, fn. 8) for a detailed discussion. Thus, the correct translation of the above passage is:

‘Shining forth with Sūrya’s rays, [Uṣas] anoints herself with ointment (= make-up), like girls (?) going to a meeting place.’⁸⁶

The majority of occurrences of *ajyá*^{te} are found in book IX, the Soma-maṇḍala, constructed with the passive subject typically referring to Soma anointed with milk. There is only one clear instance of a construction with a passive agent in the instrumental in the RV (*manīṣībhiḥ* ‘by the wise ones (= the fingers)’ in RV 9.76.2; see below). In other cases the instrumental noun (in the plural form) is a word for ‘cow’ (*gó-*, *dhenú-*) (thus, literally: ‘[anointed] with (milch) cows’).⁸⁷ This process can be considered either (i) as an action brought about by a priest – in this case the instrumental nominal referring to the cow is “Instrumental des Mittels” (cf. WENZEL 23, 68 [III.c]),

⁸⁴ Thus, for instance, GONDA (1979: 25): “an accusative of the ‘internal object’”.

⁸⁵ Cf. esp. similar constructions with the plural form, e.g. *añjībhir ... vy añjate* (RV 1.64.4a) ‘they anoint themselves with ointments’.

⁸⁶ See SCARLATA 105.

⁸⁷ For the metonymy ‘anoint with cows’ = ‘anoint with milk’, see already BERGAIGNE 1881: 124ff.; 1883: 488f. [15f.].

SPEYER 1896 [VSS]: 11, §35) – or, (ii) metaphorically, by the milch cows themselves. In the latter analysis, the instrumental noun should be taken as a passive agent, and the whole construction as a passive. Cf.:

(RV 9.85.5a)

kānikradat kalāše góbhir ajyase

‘Roaring, you are anointed with milk / by cows in the jar.’

The compounds with *sám* are employed in nearly the same usage as simplex, though often with the additional meaning ‘(sexually) unite with’, cf.:

(RV 9.72.1ab)

hárīm mṛjantīy aruśó ná yujyate ' sám dhenúbhiḥ kalāše sómo ajyate

‘They adorn the fallow [courser]; like a reddish [courser], he is being yoked. In the jar Soma is anointed with milk / by milch cows.’

GELDNER comments: “‘wird gesalbt’ [...] und zugleich: ‘wird vereinigt, verschmolzen, kopuliert’”; RENOU (EVP IX: 21, 83) mentions only the first interpretation: ‘le soma est oint avec (le lait des) vaches-laitières’. As KUIPER (1952: 88ff. [= Sel.Wr., 273ff.]) has pointed out, this compound always has the meaning ‘anoint’, from which the secondary senses (‘adorn, unite, mix’) can be derived. See also RONZITTI 2001: 78f. After the RV, *sám-ajya^{-te}* occurs only once in a Yajurvedic mantra (VS 12.70 = MS 2.7.12:92.7 = KS 16.12:235.1 = KpS 25.3:96.14) and disappears in Vedic prose, being replaced by other verbs.⁸⁸

Besides the aforementioned usages, a particular submeaning of *ajyá^{-te}*, (β) ‘be anointed [with semen], be impregnated’,⁸⁹ is attested once or twice in the RV:

(RV 10.31.10a)

starīr yāt sūta sadyó ajyámānā

‘When a cow with no calf, being anointed (= impregnated),⁹⁰ bore

⁸⁸ Cf., for instance, the repetition of the RVic verse *ghṛténāgnīḥ sám ajyate* (10.118.4a) in the KpS (6.2:61.9) with *sam idhyate* for *sám ajyate*; see OERTEL 1934a: 20 [= Kl.Schr. I, 651].

⁸⁹ In my opinion, this submeaning may also underlie the nominal derivative *añjī-* ‘penis’; for a discussion of possible sources of this semantics, see KUIPER 1952: 78ff. [= Sel.Wr., 263ff.].

⁹⁰ Another interpretation, suggested by RENOU (EVP XVI, 130: “*ajyámānā* « poussée (en avant) », double sens, à côté d’*ajyámāna* « oint » [RV 10.31.19]”), is less plausible.

immediately...'

Most likely, the difficult stanza RV 10.85.28 (*kṛtyāsaktīr viy ājyate*) attests the same usage.⁹¹

The same meaning is also attested in the two Brāhmaṇas of the Sāmaveda, in the PB and JB:

(PB 7.2.6)

grāmyebhyo vā etat paśubhyaḥ stuvanti yad ājyaiḥ. punar amyāvarttaṁ stuvanti; tasmāt parāñcaḥ prājyante, pratyañcaḥ prajāyante

'In view of the domestic animals they chant the ājya[-laud]s. They chant [them] constantly returning; therefore [the animals] are anointed [with semen] thitherwards and are born hitherwards.'

(JB 3.24:5 [ed. CALAND §171])

ajyata iti paśuṁ pravīyamāṇam āhuḥ

'“It is anointed” – thus they say of cattle that is impregnated.’⁹²

¹*añj* ‘anoint’ and *aj* ‘drive’

It is commonplace in Vedic studies to assume that the passive *ajyá-^{te}* is homonymous and can belong to either of the roots *añj* ‘anoint’ and *aj* ‘drive’.⁹³ For some half-dozen RVic occurrences of this passive both senses suit the context, indeed. This is especially the case for stanzas devoted to Soma. Soma is **anointed** with (= mixed with) milk and, at the same time, he can be regarded as a courser being **driven**, which might suggest a deliberate word play ‘is anointed’/‘is driven’, as in the following passages:

(RV 9.76.2cd)

indrasya śúṣmam īráyann apasyúbhiríndur hinvānó ajyate manīṣībhiḥ

'Exciting Indra's energy, impelled by the active ones (= the fingers), the sap is being anointed / driven by the wise ones.'

(RV 9.78.2ab)

indrāya soma pári śicyase nṛbhir ' nṛcákṣā ūrmīḥ kavír ajyase váne

⁹¹ The meaning of the pāda can tentatively be rendered as ‘female genitals (?) are wondrously impregnated’; on the meaning of *kṛtyā*, see GOUDRIAAN 1986. I am going to return to the discussion of this passage elsewhere.

⁹² Contra CALAND's interpretation (‘„Es wird herbeigetrieben” – sagt man vom Tier, wenn es belegt wird’).

⁹³ See, in particular, RONZITTI 2001: 78f.

‘For Indra you, O Soma, are being poured around by men; the one who watches over men,⁹⁴ you, the wave, the poet, are being anointed / driven in a wooden [vessel].’

GELDNER considers both passages ambiguous; likewise RÖNNOW (1932-33: 37f.), ELIZARENKOVA (‘смазывается / погоняется’); cf. ELIZARENKOVA’s (1999: 389) note ad RV 9.76.2d. RENOÜ admits only the first interpretation in both cases: ‘le suc-de-soma est oint par (les poètes) détenteurs-du-sens’ (EVP IX, 25); ‘tu es oint dans (la cuve de) bois’ (EVP IX, 26).⁹⁵

The same ambiguity is possible for an Agni stanza, too:

(RV 6.2.8ab)

krátvā hí dróṇe ajyásé ' ' agne vājī ná kṛtvīyaḥ

‘You are driven / anointed in a wooden [vessel] with power, like a strong courser.’

GELDNER considers both interpretations acceptable (‘Mit Umsicht wirst du ja im Holz(gefäß) gesalbt (zum Laufe getrieben)’). Likewise, ELIZARENKOVA 1995: 574, note ad loc. GRASSMANN (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 19), LUDWIG (1876 [RV übers.]: I, 388) and OLDENBERG (1901: 279f. [= Kl.Schr. I, 738f.]) reckon this occurrence to *aj*, above all because of the comparison with the *vājī* ‘race-horse’. RÖNNOW (1932-33: 37) follows OLDENBERG’s interpretation. By contrast, RENOÜ connects the form in question with *añj* (‘Grâce au pouvoir-spirituel (des hommes) tu es oint dans (la cuve de) bois, ô Agni, comme un (cheval) gagnant (est poussé en avant, étant) apte à (emporter) la décision’, EVP XIII: 37), though commenting further: “*aj*- est primairement « pousser en avant »” (ibid., 121). The same interpretation is also adopted by JACKSON (2002: 34f.) (‘you are greased’).

For a few occurrences, both interpretations are theoretically possible, but the meaning ‘drive’ seems less appropriate, cf.:

(RV 9.97.35c)

sómaḥ sutáḥ pūyate ajyámānaḥ

‘The Soma, pressed out, is purified, being anointed / driven (?).’

⁹⁴ On the meaning of *nṛcákṣas-*, see GRIFFITHS (2009: 111) ad AVP 6.9.1.

⁹⁵ For 9.78.2, cf. also LÜDERS 1951: 205 (‘du wirst in dem Holze gesalbt’) and LOMMEL 1955: 82 (‘Für Indra [...] wirst du im Holzbottich gesalbt’). See also RONZITTI 2001: 78f., with fn. 21.

For RV 9.32.3, the translation ‘is driven’, at first glance imposed by the comparison *átyo ná* ‘like a courser’ (see GELDNER, ad loc.), is odd and hardly possible (‘driven with milk / by cows, like a courser?’):

(RV 9.32.3c)

átyo ná góbhīr ajyate

‘He is anointed with milk, like a courser.’

GELDNER points out that the interpretation ‘is driven’ is unnecessary (see also RENOU, EVP VIII, 19; JACKSON 2002: 34; OBERLIES 1999: 161), for a courser is anointed and purified with milk before the race, cf.:

(RV 9.43.1ab)

yó átya iva mṛjyáte ' góbhīr mādāya haryatāḥ

‘[Soma], which is anointed with milk, like a courser, for the exhilaration, the enjoyable one ...’⁹⁶

Likewise, in the passage RV 9.72.1 quoted above, in spite of comparison with a courser in *pāda a*, *sám...ajyate* seems to belong to *añj* ‘anoint’, and the semantic ambiguity, suggested by PINAULT (1985: 134f.) (*aj* ‘mener’/*añj* ‘oindre’; i.e. ‘Soma is driven together with milk / with milch cows’?), is unlikely.

Finally, the meaning of the participle *ajyámāna-* in RV 5.30.14cd *átyo ná vājī raghūr ajyámāno ' babhrúś catvāry asanat sahásrā* is rendered by nearly all translators as ‘being driven’, with no mention of its (potential) ambiguity, cf. GELDNER’s translation: ‘Wie ein siegreiches, rasches Rennpferd, wenn es (zum Wettkampf) **getrieben wird** ...’.⁹⁷ Yet, bearing in mind what has been said above about anointing a courser before a race, the meaning ‘being anointed’ cannot be ruled out either, and I do not see any good reasons to treat RV 5.30.14 separately from the aforementioned attestations in maṇḍala IX (RV 9.32.3, 9.43.1, 9.72.1):

⁹⁶ Cf. also JACKSON’s (2002: 34) translation: ‘(he) who is polished (\sqrt{mrj}) as a courser (Soma), with cows (= milk) (he becomes) coveted for the intoxication’. On the syntactic analysis of this passage see also OBERLIES 1999: 251, fn. 157.

⁹⁷ Likewise, GRASSMANN (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 19); LUDWIG (1876 [RV übers. II]: 111); ELIZARENKOVA (‘Словно быстрый, победоносный скакун, погоняемый (на ристалище) ...’); EDS II, 830 (‘being urged or driven’); VELANKAR (2003: 73); KRISCH 2006 [RIVELEX 1]: 66f. The only exception is, to my knowledge, JACKSON’s (2002: 34) translation: ‘rapid courser when **being greased**’.

‘Like a rapid victorious courser, being anointed (for a competition),
Babhru won four thousand.’⁹⁸

To sum up, all occurrences of *ajyá-te* discussed above either undoubtedly belong to *añj* ‘anoint’ or are ambiguous (*añj* ‘anoint’ / *aj* ‘drive’). There is not a single occurrence of *ajyá-te* for which the meaning ‘be anointed’ is impossible. On the other hand, none of the usages particularly typical of *aj*, such as *gām / gā -aja-ti* ‘drive a cow/cows’ (cf. RV 1.161.10, 2.14.3, 2.24.14, 8.3.19, 10.138.2, etc.), *dásyūn (spṛdhaḥ etc.) -aja-ti* ‘drive enemies, dasyus, etc.’ (cf. RV 6.25.9, 7.5.6), is attested in a passive construction. This fact puts into doubt the very existence of the supposed passive *ajyá-te* of the verb *aj*. Of course, we cannot rule out that in some cases, when using the passive *ajyá-te*, Vedic poets may have hinted at the fact that the courser (or Soma regarded as a courser) was anointed for a competition before being driven (see, in particular, OBERLIES 1999: 251f.), playing on the phonological similarity of the two verbs. In order to render this hypothetical ambiguity and (potential) hints, one might use a special notation, like ‘be anointed [for a competition before being driven]’. However, given the lack of positive evidence for an independent passive *ajyá-te* ‘be driven’, we exclude it from the list of Vedic -yá-passives.⁹⁹

²*añj* ‘**manifest, reveal**’ should be treated as a (synchronically) separate verbal root from the late Vedic (and, particularly, post-Vedic) Sanskrit onwards, where it is attested in compounds with *ví*. In early Vedic, however, the boundary-line between ¹*añj* and ²*añj* (which can hardly derive from different sources; see MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 54, in spite of KUIPER’s (1991c: 107f.) criticism) cannot yet be drawn with accuracy. For the sake of convenience (and in spite of the lack of accented occurrences of the passive of ²*añj*), I discuss both roots within one lemma.

The earliest reliable attestations the passive of ²*añj* appear in the Brāhmaṇas:

⁹⁸ Such a translation has been proposed by GRASSMANN (1876 [RV übers.]: I, 183), contra his interpretation given in Wb. zum RV, 19: ‘Gleich kräft’gem Renner der zum Lauf **geschmückt wird** ...’ Much freer, but rather in the vein of GRASSMANN’s (1876) interpretation, is HILLEBRANDT’s (1913: 49) translation: ‘Wie ein siegreiches, schnelles, **gepflegtes** Rennpferd ...’

⁹⁹ This solution is actually adopted in LUBOTSKY 1997a [RVWC]: 27, 31f., where all forms derived from the passive stem *ajyá-* are grouped together s.v. *añj* ‘anoint’. See also KRISCH 2006 [RIVELEX 1]: 66f., with note 5 and 88.

(PB 20.14.4 ≈ JB 2.245:4-5)

*yad etāni rūpāṇy anvahaṃ vyajyante, mukhata eva tad vācaṃ vi sṛjante,
mukhato yajñīyaṃ karma*

‘In that these forms are revealed day after day, they, thereby, emit the voice
at the beginning, the sacrificial work at the beginning.’¹⁰⁰

In early Vedic the meaning ‘manifest’ can be expressed by the simplex (see GONDA 1948: 173 [Sel.St. III, 186] and, especially, KUIPER 1952: 60ff. [= Sel.Wr., 245ff.]). The only attestation of the simplex passive *ajya-te* which may belong here appears in a rather unclear passage in the late RV:

(RV 8.51.9d (= Vāl. 3.9d))

túbhyét só ajyate rayīḥ

GELDNER, on the basis of Mahīdhāra’s commentary on the repetition in VS 33.82, connects this form with ²*añj* ‘manifest’ (‘für dich nur wird ... dieser Reichtum **zur Schau gestellt**’). It cannot be ruled out, however, that this occurrence belongs to ¹*añj* ‘anoint’; thus THIEME (1938: 71 [= Op.Mai. I, 77]): ‘Bei dem *aryá* Ruśama Pavīru **wird** dir dieser Reichtum (= reiche Gabe) **gesalbt** (= geschmückt) ...’. According to KUIPER (ibid., 85 [= Sel.Wr., 270], fn. 40), this form is ambiguous and can belong to either of the roots ¹*añj* and ²*añj*. Less plausible is GRASSMANN’s (1877 [RV übers.]: II, 502) interpretation: ‘Der Reichtum [...] **wird** heimlich von dir [dem treuen Ruśama Pavīru] **zugeführt**’ (i.e. *√aj* ‘drive’). EDS inconsistently groups this occurrence with forms of *√aj* (‘to be driven (towards), to be brought near’, EDS II, 721), while its repetition in VS 33.82 is mentioned s.v. *añj*, sub Cī ‘to make manifest, to reveal, to show’, (EDS II, 838). ELIZARENKOVA’s translation (‘Только для тебя **готовится** [is prepared] это богатство’), leaves open the question to which root the form in question belongs.

Other passives

Class VII nasal presents with middle inflection are often employed intransitively, apparently in the same (or nearly same) usages as the corresponding -yá-passives. For many of such occurrences both passive (‘be anointed’) and anticausative/reflexive (‘become anointed [by oneself], anoint oneself’) interpretations are possible. The latter may be more likely for

¹⁰⁰ The parallel JB passage has another verb instead (*etāni rūpāṇy ... ni yujyante*), but its meaning (‘these forms ... are yoked down’?) makes little sense in the context. The reading attested in the JB is likely to be secondary.

system-related reasons, by virtue of the exceptional character of the passive usage of non-characterized middle forms in early Vedic (see KULIKOV 2006a). Cf.:

(RV 9.10.3ab)

rājāno ná prásastibhiḥ ' sómāso góbhir añjate

‘Soma streams are anointed (/become anointed) with milk, like kings with praises.’¹⁰¹

(RV 5.1.3b)

... añkte súcibhir góbhir agnīḥ

‘Agni is anointed¹⁰² (/anoints himself) with bright cows (= milk).’

(RV 3.10.4bc)

agnīr devébhir ā gamat

añjānāḥ sapta hótṛbhir havīṣmate

‘Agni comes with the gods, anointed by seven priests, to the sacrificer.’¹⁰³

(RV 1.108.4)

sámiddheṣu agníṣu ānajānā ... éndrāgnī ... yātam

‘O Indra and Agni, having been anointed among the kindled fires, come...!’

The form *ānajé* attested in the passive usage in RV 1.102.1 (probably a 3sg. stative derived from the perfect stem; see KULIKOV 2006a: 67f.) may belong with ²*añj* ‘manifest’, but the meaning ‘is anointed, is adorned’ cannot be ruled out either:

(RV 1.102.1ab)

imāṃ te dhīyam prá bhare mahó mahīm ' asyá stotrē dhiṣaṇā yát ta ānajé

‘I offer this great prayer¹⁰⁴ to you, the important one, since in the eulogy of this [man] your Dhiṣaṇā has been manifested¹⁰⁵ / anointed¹⁰⁶.’

¹⁰¹ On comparison of the soma drinks to kings, see JAMISON 2007: 147.

¹⁰² GONDA (1979: 23): ‘agentless passive’. A passive interpretation of this passage is also advocated by JACKSON (2002: 34, fn. 43).

¹⁰³ WENZEL 102; EATON 25; DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 264.

¹⁰⁴ GONDA (1963: 116): ‘product of vision’.

¹⁰⁵ Thus GELDNER (‘... da in dem Loblied dieses (Sängers) deine Tatkraft **herausgestrichen wird**’), RENOU (‘puisque dans le panégyrique de ce (chantre) ta marque-d’inspiration **s’est gravée**’, EVP XVII, 36), GONDA 1963: 116; ELIZARENKOVA (‘так как в восхвалении этого (певца) **оттенён** твой разум’).

Beside passive usages, middle forms occur in reflexive (‘X anoints him/herself’) and reciprocal (with the preverb *vi*) constructions, cf.:

(RV 9.86.43ab)

añjáte viy añjate sám añjate ‘*krátuṃ rihanti mádhunābhiy añjate*
 ‘[The waters] anoint themselves, they anoint each other (?), they mix together by anointing;¹⁰⁷ they lick [Soma’s] mental power, they anoint themselves with (his) sweetness.’

(TS 2.5.1.7)

yábhyañté, tásyai duścármā
 ‘[The son] of [a woman] who anoints herself has a skin disease.’

Finally, middle forms can also be employed in transitive-affective and possessive-reflexive usages: ‘X_{NOM} anoints Y_{ACC} for his/her (X’s) interest, for his/her sake’, X_{NOM} anoints his/her Y_{ACC}’, cf.:

(TS 6.1.1.5 = MS 3.6.3:62.6 = ^AKS 23.1:73.13 = KpS 35.7:183.2)

dákṣiṇam púrvam āñkte
 ‘He anoints his right [eye] first.’

ad ‘eat’: *adyá-^{te}*

Simplex YV^p +¹⁰⁸

accented: +

• pass.

The passive *adyá-^{te}* occurs from Vedic prose onwards. Examples are:

¹⁰⁶ Thus e.g. BENFEY 1866: 130 (‘ward geschmückt’); JOHANSSON 1917: 15 (‘... da bei deinem preislied die Dhiṣaṇā **gesalbt worden ist**’); GOTÖ in WITZEL et al. 2007: 180 (‘... da in dem Loblied dieses (Sängers) deine Dhiṣaṇā **geschmückt ist**’).

PISCHEL’s (1897 [VSt II]: 83f.) absolute (objectless) transitive analysis (‘« » ... da Dhiṣaṇā bei einem Loblied auf dich hier (mich) ‚geschmiert‘ hat« d. h. da Dhiṣaṇā mich bisher reichlich für Loblieder auf Indra belohnt hat’) is unlikely.

¹⁰⁷ For the reciprocal interpretation of the verbal forms in this passage, see KULIKOV 2007a: 717f., with fn. 10.

¹⁰⁸ Kāṭh-Saṃk. p. 70, 1.4 [Annaprāśa-Br.] *ādyate* is likely to be an erroneous reading for ⁺*adyate*.

(TS 5.6.3.2)

śīṛṣatò 'bhí śiñcati, śīṛṣató hy ánnam adyáte

‘He pours down from the head, for from the head the food is eaten.’

(TS 5.6.2.3)

pátre vá ánnam adyate

‘Verily, the food is eaten in a vessel.’

Other passives

The isolated participle *adāná-* (RVic hapax) is attested in the passive usage and must belong to the paradigm of the unattested (medio-)passive aorist **ádi* (see Kulikov 2006b: 55):

(RV 4.19.9ab)

vamrībhiḥ putráṃ agrúvo adānám ' nivéśanād [...] ā jabhartha

‘You [o Indra] have carried out of a hole the son of a virgin, being eaten by ants.’

***aś* ‘eat’: *aśyá-^{te}* (AV mostly *asyá-^{te}*)**

AVŚ 5.19.5 (ed. ¹ROTH/WHITNEY, ²ROTH/WHITNEY/LINDENAU *asyate*, ZIMMER 1879a: 201, WHITNEY’s translation, ad loc. ⁺*aśyate*), AVŚ 12.5.37 ≈ AVP 16.144.5 [Kashm. 16.144.9], AVP(-Or.) 5.40.1 = 6.22.9 = 16.71.5 (Or. *asyamāna-* ≈ Kashm. *iṣyamāṇa-*), ŚB 2.5.2.23, ChU 6.6.2, 6.6.4, VādhAnv [ed. IKAR] 1.19 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 3.16:3 (CALAND 1926: 16f. [= Kl.Schr., 318f.]))

accented: AV+

• pass.

The passive *aśyá-^{te}*, nearly synonymous with *adyá-^{te}*,¹⁰⁹ is of rarer occurrence than the latter, but first appears already in the mantras (AV). Only one of the three AVic occurrences (AVŚ) has the palatal *ś* in the stem:

¹⁰⁹ For a semantic difference between these two roots (*ad* was probably a general term for consuming any kind of food, while *aś* referred, above all, to eating hard food), see WEBER-BROSAMER 1988: 8, fn.14.

(AVŚ 12.5.37 ≈ AVP 16.144.5 [Kashm. 16.144.9])

āvartir aśyāmānā,¹¹⁰ nīrtir aśitā

‘[The Brahman’s cow is] ruin when being eaten, perdition when eaten up.’

The two other AVic occurrences of this passive attest the stem variant *asya-*:

(AVŚ 5.19.5ab)

krūrām asyā āśāsanam¹ tṛṣṭām piśitām asyate

‘Cruel is the cutting up of her (sc. the Brahman’s cow); harsh to eat (?) is her prepared meat.’

(AVP 5.40.1d = 6.22.9c [= Kashm. 6.22.8] = 16.71.5c [≈ Kashm. 16.71.6c] ≈ AVŚ 4.34.8c¹¹¹)

sa me mā kṣeṣṭa sadam asyamānaḥ¹¹²

‘May this [rice-gruel] of mine, [albeit] being constantly¹¹³ eaten, not waste.’

For AV 5.19.5, WHITNEY has adopted the emendation ⁺*asyate* suggested by ZIMMER (1879a: 201).¹¹⁴ Yet, bearing in mind that the phonetic change *ś* → *s* was very common before *y/i* in the AV, probably representing a dialect feature (see WACKERNAGEL 1896 [AiG I]: 225f. and Chapter II, s.v. *vāś*), this emendation may be unnecessary.

The passive *aśyá-te* is rare in Vedic prose. The meaning ‘is eaten’ is typically rendered by *adyá-te*, while *aśyá-te* appears in the Brāhmaṇas only once, probably due to the adjacent *āśanam*:

¹¹⁰ AVP-Or. mss. *ārtir asa°*, *ārtir aśa°*, Kashm. ms. *ārtir asya°*; ed. BHATTACHARYA edits *asya°*.

¹¹¹ The end of the pāda in the corresponding Śaunakīya mantra is different:

(AVŚ 4.34.8c)

sá me má kṣeṣya svadháya pínvamānaḥ

‘Let this [rice-mess] not perish, swelling with svadhā.’

¹¹² The form *asyamānaḥ*, apparently unclear to BHATTACHARYA, is underlined in his edition. The Kashmir ms. consistently reads *iṣyamānaḥ* for all the three attestations. Albeit possible in the context (‘may this [rice-mess], always being desirable ...’; see Chapter IV, s.v. ¹*iṣ* ‘seek, wish, desire’), this reading is likely to be secondary. See also LUBOTSKY 2002: 179 and GRIFFITHS 2009: 239ff.

¹¹³ Conjecture ⁺*madam* (BARRET, EDGERTON) for AVP-Kashm. *sadam* is thus unnecessary.

¹¹⁴ Not mentioned by LINDENAU in his Introduction to ed. ²ROTH/WHITNEY/LINDENAU.

(ŚB 2.5.2.23)

pâtṛeṣu hy áśanam aśyáte ...

‘Since food is eaten in dishes ...’

Cf. *pâtṛe vā ánnam adyate* (TS 5.6.2.3) in a similar context, quoted above, s.v. *ad.*¹¹⁵

After the Brāhmaṇas, *aśyate* occurs only in the ChU and VādhS (VādhAnv).

āp ‘obtain, gain, complete’: *āpyá-te*

Simplex YV^m +;

(+ *ava* KB 23.1.10 (ed. SARMA *āpyate*, ed. LINDNER [22.6], ed. ĀnSS *avāpyate*), LāṭyŚS 10.9.2 +);

+ *upa* KB 2.2.24 (ed. SARMA, ed. LINDNER [*kāmā*] *upāpyante*, ed. ĀnSS *upāpyante*), 15.6.17 [ed. LINDNER 15.5], JB 1.323:9;

+ *pra* KaṭhU 2.10, MaitrU, BaudhŚS^v 29.8:380.4 +;¹¹⁶ + *saṃ-pra* MaitrU [ed. VAN BUITENEN] 4.3/4.2 = [ed. “108 Up.”] 4.3 = MaitrāyaṇyU 1.4.2 +;

+ *sám* VS 19.17, VaikhŚS 20.4:301.3 +

accented: TS 2.5.11.4, MS 3.1.4:5.13, TB 1.2.5.1

• pass.

The passive *āpyá-te* is attested from the YVic mantras (VS) onwards. Examples are:

(VS 19.30cd)

dákṣiṇā śraddhām āpnoti ' śraddháyā satyám āpyate

‘He gains the faith by means of the Dakṣiṇā (gift); by means of faith the truth is gained.’

(TS 2.5.11.4)

mánasāghārayati, mánasā hy ánāptam āpyáte

‘He sprinkles [repeating the verse] in mind, for what is not obtained [in

¹¹⁵ For constructions with the instrumental or locative of the vessel, cf. OERTEL 1927: 119f. [= Kl.Schr. I, 578f.]; 1937: 65f. [= Kl.Schr. II, 926f.].

¹¹⁶ The verse is quoted in Chapter V, s.v. *śu(n)dh*.

reality] is obtained in mind.’¹¹⁷

Other passives

Beside -yá-passives, the passive usage is attested for the -i-aorist and middle conditional in the following ŚB passage (see KÜMMEL 1996: 22f.):

(ŚB 10.4.1.10)

*yád vái ma idám kárma samápsyata, mámaivá prajā sálvānām rājānó
'bhaviṣyan, máma brāhmaṇá, máma váiśyā. yát tú ma etávat kármaṇaḥ
samápi, téna ma ubhayáthā salvān prajātīreksyate*

‘Verily, if this my [sacrificial] performance were to be completed, my offspring would become the kings, brāhmaṇas and peasants of the Salvas. But now by as much of my [sacrificial] performance as has been completed, thereby my offspring will surpass the Salvas in both ways.’

An unclear form which may be an -i-aorist of *āp* occurs in an obscure TĀ passage:

(TĀ^m 4.40 [ed. SASTRI/RANGACARYA 7.40])

*bhúvo 'dhāyi. bhúvo 'dhāyi. bhúvo 'dhāyi /
nṛmṇāyi nṛmṇám. nṛmṇāyi nṛmṇám. nṛmṇāyi nṛmṇám /
nidhāyyo 'vāpi [v.l. °vāyi]. nidhāyyo 'vāpi [v.l. °vāyi]. nidhāyyo 'vāpi [v.l. °vāyi]*

The meaning of the passage, which contains a number of sacrificial exclamations, can be rendered only tentatively:

‘ “*bhuvah!*” – [with this exclamation] [the desired wealth (?)] was established (3x);

“*nṛmṇāyi!*” – [with this] the manliness (= abundance in men and heroes) (3x); [the share] which is to be set down (?)¹¹⁸ **was obtained** (?) (3x).’

The morphological analysis of the form [a]vāpi / [a]vāyi is unclear. Only *editio princeps* (= ed. MITRA) reads ‘vāpi; ed. ĀnSS has ‘vāyi (mentioning ‘vāpi as a variant reading), this reading is also adopted in ed. SASTRI. VWC-Br. I, 259b quotes *avāpi* (with a question mark) as a separate lexical item, thus abstaining from any morphological analysis. Sāyaṇa glosses *avāpi* as *prāptam*, thus

¹¹⁷ Cf. KEITH: ‘...for what is imperfect is made perfect by mind’.

¹¹⁸ Sāyaṇa: *nitarāṇ samṣādānīyo bhagaḥ* ‘the share which is to be procured downwards’.

obviously taking it as an *-i*-aorist of *āp* (with the preverb *áva*); the same analysis is accepted by NEISSER (1902: 12 [= Kl.Schr., 180]). From the formal point of view, it might equally be an *-i*-aorist of the root *vap* ‘sow’ (i.e. ‘was sown’?). This interpretation could have underlain WHITNEY’s (1885b [Roots]: 154) record “[pass.aor.] *avāpi* B[r].” (s.v. *vap*), which KÜMMEL (1996: 97) was unable to locate. Although the passage is obscure, the latter analysis seems unlikely: the meaning ‘was sown’ makes little sense in the context, and the *-i*-aorist of *vap* is not attested elsewhere, while the *-i*-aorist of *āp* does occur (in the ŚB) and the compound *áva-āp* is common in Vedic. The reading [*a*]vāyi is likely to be erroneous, perhaps triggered by the adjacent *’dhāyi* and *nṛmṇāyi*.

idh ‘kindle’: *idhyá-^{te}*

Simplex RV, KS^m 1.12:7.14 (= 31.11:14.11) = KpS^m 1.12:9.9
(= 47.11:295.12) (*idhyamāna-* ≈ VS 2.17 (= ŚB 1.8.3.22) *guhyāmāna-* ≈ MS^m
4.1.14:20.5 = TS^m 1.1.13.2 = TB^m 3.3.9.6 *vīyāmāna-*), KS^m 18.16:277.5 =
KpS^m 29.4, GrSū.^m;
+ *abhí* ŚBK 2.1.4.19, KaṭhĀ 3.233:98.13;
+ *sám* RV +
accented: RV +
• pass. / (anticaus.)

The accusative object of the transitive *idh* and the subject of the corresponding passive constructions counterparts typically refer to Agni (sacrificial fire) or some of his aspects.¹¹⁹ The passive *idhyá-^{te}* is quite common with an overtly expressed passive in the instrumental, cf.:

(RV 5.3.8)

agne ... devó mártair vásubhīr idhyāmānaḥ

‘You, O Agni, are the god, being kindled by mortals, by Vasus.’

Compounds with *sám* are employed in the same usage as the simplex:

(RV 3.26.3a)

ásvo ná krándañ jánibhiḥ sám idhyate

‘Neighing like a horse, [Agni is] kindled by the wives.’

¹¹⁹ Cf. THIEME 1958 :150 [= Kl.Schr. I, 161].

(AV 13.1.50b)

aps_uv ànyáḥ sám idhyate

‘One [fire] is being kindled in the waters.’

From the AV onwards, this passive is attested in the imperative, as in:

(AV 11.1.4a)

sámiddho agne samídhā sám idhyasva

‘Having been kindled, O Agni, be kindled by means of fuel.’¹²⁰

After the RV, *idhyá^{-te}* is practically unattested without preverbs (except for a few occurrences of the participle *idhyamāna-* in the mantras of the KS and KpS as well as in a GṛSū. mantra,¹²¹ surviving only with preverbs (mainly with *sám*).

Other passives

Beside the -yá-passive *idhyá^{-te}*, the participle *idhāná-* is common in the passive usage in early Vedic (especially in the RV); see NEISSER 1902: 12f. [= KL.Schr., 180f.]; JAMISON 2007: 70.¹²² *idhāná-* is quite consistently opposed to the middle participle derived from the nasal present stem *índhāna-*, which is employed transitively in five of its eight occurrences. Examples are:

(RV 1.79.5)

sá idhānó vásuṣ kavír ' agnír ṛlén_{yo} girá

revád asmábhyam [...] dīdīhi

‘You there, Agni, the Vasu, the seer, being kindled, to be praised with

¹²⁰ Such imperatives are often translated with non-passive forms, cf. BLOOMFIELD (1897: 180): ‘**Burn**, O Agni, after having been kindled by the firewood’; WHITNEY: ‘Kindled, O Agni, **be** thou **kindled** with kindling’; ELIZARENKOVA (2007: 127): ‘Зажженный, о Агни, **пламеней** от дров’; HENRY’s (1896: 97) translation goes even further: ‘Une fois enflammé, ô Agni, **vois** la bûche **activer ta flamme**’.

I see no good reasons to avoid passive translations of such forms, however. The syntax of constructions with the passive agent in the instrumental, quoted above, clearly shows that *idhyá^{-te}* primarily functions as passive and should be translated as such, while the non-passive meaning ‘burn’ or the like is expressed by other verbs, such as *dáhyá^{-te}* (see Chapter III, s.v.).

¹²¹ *tenedhyasva vardhasva ceddha ...* [with minor modifications] (ĀśGS 1.10.12 ≈ HirGS 1.2.11 ≈ JGS 1.3:3.19 etc.) ‘with this fuel be kindled and grow, O kindled one ...’

¹²² “Agni Idhāna (“Fire being kindled”)”.

song, shine wealth¹²³ for us.’ (i.e. shine so as to make us obtain wealth)

(RV 2.25.1a)

índhāno agnīm vanavad vanuṣyatāḥ

‘The one who kindles Agni will overpower those who envy [us].’

There are also a few attestations of *índhāna-* in intransitive (passive) usages¹²⁴ and relatively rare instances of *idhāná-* in transitive usages, cf.:

(RV 4.12.2)

idhmām yás te jabhārat [...] agne [...]

sá idhānáḥ [...] rayīm sacate

‘Who brings fuel for you, O Agni, kindling [you], attains wealth.’

(RV 1.143.7)

índhāno [...] vidátheṣu dīdyat [...] úd u no yaṁsate dhíyam

‘Being kindled, shining during the sacrifices, may [Agni] raise our prayer.’

The ratio of usages in early Vedic is as follows:

	RV		AV	
	intransitive	transitive	intransitive	transitive
<i>índhāna-</i>	3× ¹²⁵	5×	–	2×
<i>idhāná-</i>	44×	4× ¹²⁶	1×	–

Besides, there are two more middle forms attested in the passive usage in

¹²³ For the analysis of *revát* (substantive or adverb?), see esp. RENOUE, EVP XII, 95, with argumentation in favour of the latter interpretation.

¹²⁴ See, in particular, RENOUE, EVP XIV, 63.

¹²⁵ RV 1.143.7, 8.19.31, 8.23.11. NEISSER (1902: 12 [= Kl.Schr., 180]) reckons here RV 10.3.4 *asyá yāmāso brható ná vagnūn ' índhānā agnéḥ ...* as well, contra all translations (GRASSMANN 1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 211; LUDWIG 1876 [RV übers. II]: 448; GELDNER; RENOUE, EVP XIV, 3; ELIZARENKOVA). In spite of the difficult syntax and comparison (see RENOUE, EVP XIV, 63; GELDNER, ad. loc.; ELIZARENKOVA, ad. loc.), its transitive interpretation can hardly be doubted: ‘his movements, inflaming loud sounds of Agni, as it were ...’

¹²⁶ RV 1.143.7b, 4.12.2c, 5.14.1b, 7.9.6a. NEISSER (1902: 13 [= Kl.Schr., 181]) admits non-passive (transitive) interpretations only for the two last occurrences.

the RV: 3sg. forms *indhé* (RV 7.8.1) and *édhe* (RV 7.36.1) (cf. NEISSER 1902: 12 [= Kl.Schr., 180]). The relevant passages read as follows:

(RV 7.36.1d)

prthú prátīkam ádhīy édhe agnīḥ
 ‘Agni has been kindled over the wide surface [of the earth].’

(RV 7.8.1ab)

indhé rájā sám arīyó námobhir' yásya prátīkam āhutaṃ ghr̥téna
 ‘With reverence the king, the noble [Lord] is kindled, whose face is anointed with ghee.’¹²⁷

indhé is usually considered a 3sg. middle present, with the secondary simplification of the consonantal cluster (*indhé* ← **inddhé*; thus, for instance, MACDONELL 344, §464; see also OETTINGER 1976: 145, fn. 32; OBERLIES 2000: 144). More likely is the analysis of this form as 3sg. stative built on the nasal present stem (KÜMMEL 2000: 125f., fn. 80), which makes unnecessary the conjecture **inddhé*. The stative interpretation is indirectly supported by the fact that middle presents of *idh* do not occur in the passive usage elsewhere. Accordingly, passive occurrences of *indhāna-* can be taken as the participle belonging to the paradigm of this stative (see KULIKOV 2006b: 52ff.).

Likewise, the isolated passive form *édhe* (*ā́ idhe*) may instantiate a stative derived from the perfect stem.

Finally, *idhāná-* can be taken as the participle of the unattested passive aorist **áidhi* (see KULIKOV 2006a; 2006b).

ṛc ‘recite, praise’: *ṛcyá-*^{te}

Simplex:

[i_{pass.}] ‘Y^[prayer]_{NOM} is recited’ RV 6.38.2, 7.70.6, 8.38.10;

[ii_{pass.}] ‘Z^[deity]_{NOM} is praised’ RV 6.49.3, SV 2.210 [= 2.2.2.10.2];

(+ *abhi* ŚĀ 4.6 (= KauṣU 2.6) (?) *-arcyante* (thus ed. COWELL, ed. BHIM DEV, ed. ĀnSS; GOTÖ 98, fn. 21), v.l. *-arcante* (thus most eds. of the KauṣU: ed. FRENZ, ed. RENOU (cf. p. 35, note 5))

accented: RV

• pass.

¹²⁷ THIEME (1938: 97, 156 [= Op.Mai. I, 103, 162]): ‘es wird entzündet mit Verneigungen der König, der fremdlingbeschützende’.

The passive *ṛcyá-te* ‘be recited, praised’ occurs almost exclusively in the RV. The corresponding transitive present is a ‘two pattern’ verb of speech, constructed with the accusative of the prayer or (more rarely) with the accusative of the deity (addressee of the prayer).¹²⁸ The latter type (‘X_{NOM} Z^{deity}_{ACC} praise’) is more common for compounds (with *abhí* and *abhi-prá*), but is also attested for the simplex (contra HAUDRY 332), cf. RV 5.29.1 *árcanti tvā marútaḥ* ‘the Maruts praise you (sc. Indra)’. Note also that both occurrences of the passive of the latter type [ii_{pass.}] are simplex.

Three of the four RVic attestations of the passive *ṛcyá-te* instantiate type [i_{pass.}] ‘Y^[prayer]_{NOM} is recited’:

(RV 7.70.6d)

imā bráhmāṇy ṛcyante yuvábhyaṃ

‘These sacred words are recited for you two, [o Nāsatyas].’

(RV 8.38.10)

áhám sárasvatīvator ’indrāgnīyór ávo vṛṇe

yábhyaṃ gāyatrām ṛcyáte

‘I choose the protection of Indra and Agni, accompanied by Sarasvatī, for who two the Gāyatrī-stanza is being recited.’

(RV 6.38.2cd)

éyám enaṃ deváhūtir vavṛtyān ’madrīyāg índram iyám ṛcyámānā

‘May this recited invocation of gods turn him, Indra, towards me.’

Pattern [ii_{pass.}] ‘Z^[deity]_{NOM} is praised’ is attested in the RV only once:

(RV 6.49.3)

... pāvaké mánma śrutām nakṣata ṛcyámāne

‘The two clear ones (sc. night and morning dawn) come to the prayer, which is heard, while being praised.’

One more occurrence of type [ii_{pass.}] is attested in the SVic stanza 2.210 [= 2.2.2.10.2], which repeats RV 9.97.35, with some modifications in pāda c (in the RV: *sómaḥ sutáḥ pūyate ajyámānaḥ* ‘The Soma, pressed out, is purified, being anointed’):

¹²⁸ See, in particular, KRISCH 2006 [*RIVELEX* 1]: 494ff.; HETTRICH 2007: 9ff. For constructions of the type *máhi nṛmṇám arcata* (RV 5.54.1) ‘praise (for) the great manliness’, see HAUDRY 332f. (HAUDRY translates: ‘conférez par votre chant une grande force ...’).

(SV 2.210 [= 2.2.2.10.2])

sómaḥ sutá ṛcyate pūyámānaḥ

‘The Soma, pressed out, is praised, being purified.’

After the RV this -yá-passive disappears. The late Vedic -ya-present -*arcyate*¹²⁹ (ŚĀ), which might belong to the root *ṛc* (*arc*), is a nonce formation. The relevant passage runs as follows:

(ŚĀ 4.6 (= KauṣU 2.6))

*ukthaṁ brahmeti ha smāha śuṣkabhr̥ṅgāraḥ | tad ṛg ity upāsīta | sarvāṇi
hāsmāi bhūtāni śraiṣṭhyāyābhyarcyante* [v.l. °*arcante*] | *tad yajur ity
upāsīta | sarvāṇi hāsmāi bhūtāni śraiṣṭhyāya yujyante | tat sāmā ity
upāsīta | sarvāṇi hāsmāi bhūtāni śraiṣṭhyāya saṁnamante*

‘“The hymn is Brahman” – so says Śuṣkabhr̥ṅgāra. May he worship it as Ṛc. All beings, indeed, [*abhyarc(y)ante*] unto his supremacy. May he worship it as Yajus. All beings, indeed, are yoked¹²⁹ unto his supremacy. May he worship it as Sāman. All beings, indeed, bow to him unto his supremacy.’

The verbal form in question clearly belongs to the root *ṛc* (*ṛc*- ‘hymn’), but its morphological analysis is unclear. According to GOTÖ 98, fn. 21, the reading °*arcyante* (i.e. passive to the -āya-present *arcaya-ti* ‘praise’¹³⁰) is preferable, because the middle class I present *arca-te* is not attested elsewhere; but the passive *arcyate* does not occur elsewhere in Vedic, so that this argument does not actually work. From the purely semantic point of view, both passive and non-passive translations are possible.¹³¹ Correspondingly, the suggested translations fall into two classes, depending on which of the two readings is adopted:

(1) °*arcyante*

DEUSSEN (1897: 32): ‘... ihm zu seiner Oberhoheit **werden** alle Wesen **zujauchzen gemacht**.’ (causative passive)

KEITH (1908: 23): ‘all beings, indeed, **are won** by worship for his excellence.’

GOTÖ 98, fn. 21: ‘alle Wesen **werden** fürwahr für ihn für seine

¹²⁹ The form *yujyante* is rendered by most translators as non-passive: ‘se joignent’ (RENOU 1948: 34); ‘exert themselves’ (BODEWITZ 2002b: 27, with fn. 81); etc.

¹³⁰ DEUSSEN takes the form as a passive to causative ‘make praise’; see his translation below.

¹³¹ Notwithstanding GOTÖ’s remark (ibid.) that the former yields a better syntax.

Oberherrschaft **geehrt**.’

(2) °*arcante*

F.M. MÜLLER (1879: 283): ‘all beings **will praise** him as the best.’

WECKER (1908: 25): ‘alle wesen **erweisen** ihm zu seiner ehre ihre huldigung’ (thus in accordance with comm. *pūjāṃ kurvanti*).

HUME (1931: 311): ‘... unto such a one indeed all beings **sing praise** (ṛc) for his supremacy.’

RENOU (1948: 34; cf. also p. 35, note 5): ‘... car tous les êtres **chantent** pour lui, pour son excellence.’

FRENZ (1968-69: 89): ‘[dann] **jubeln** alle Wesen seine Oberherrschaft zu.’

DELLA CASA (1976: 322): ‘... poiché tutte le creature **acclamano** lui, la sua eccellenza.’

OLIVELLE (1998: 337): ‘then, for the sake of his preeminent prosperity, all beings **will recite praises** (*abhi-arc-*) for him.’

JEŽIĆ (1999: 199): ‘Sva će mu bića **klicati** radi najveće odličnosti.’ (see also *ibid.*, fn. 86a)

BODEWITZ (2002b: 27, with fn. 79): ‘(and) all beings **praise** (*abhyarc*) for his superior position.’

Whatever the exact meaning of the form in question, it cannot belong, as a regular passive, with the RVic *ṛcyá-^{le}*, being an isolated and artificial nonce formation. Obviously, the author of this passage has quibbled over the words *ṛc-*, *yajus-* and *sāman-* and thus in analogy with the adjacent *yujyante* and *saṃnamante* the form *-arc[y]ante* was built.

Other passives

A passive interpretation is most probable for the form *sám āṇṛce* (probably 3sg. stative derived from the perfect stem; see KULIKOV 2006a: 67f.), attested in RV 1.160.4cd:

(RV 1.160.4cd)

ví yó mamé rájasī sukratūyáya ājārebhi skāmbhanebhiḥ sám āṇṛce

‘He who with insight has measured out the two spaces (and upheld them) with unaging supports, **has been universally praised**.’ (MACDONELL 1917: 40)¹³²

¹³² Thus also LUDWIG, OLDENBERG, *Noten ad.loc.*, GOTÖ 99, fn. 26 (‘er ist zusammen (gemeinsam) besungen worden’); KÜMMEL 2000: 106.

Some interpreters translate this form as an absolute transitive,¹³³ others even see here a different (homonymous) verbal root;¹³⁴ for discussion, see GOTÖ, *ibid.*; KÜMMEL, *ibid.*

kr ‘make, prepare, accomplish’: *kriyá-^{te}*

RV + (also with preverbs: AV 12.5, YV^p +)¹³⁵

accented: RV +¹³⁶

• pass.

The passive *kriyá-^{te}* is well-attested from the RV onwards, cf.:

(RV 9.70.8d)

tridhātu mādhu kriyate sukārmabhiḥ

‘The sweet [Soma] of three ingredients is being prepared by the skilful [fingers].’¹³⁷

(AV 3.29.3cde)

sá nākam abhyā rohati ' yātra śulkó ná kriyāte ' abaléna bālīyase

‘He ascends unto the firmament, where a tax is not paid (lit.: done) by a weak one to a stronger one.’

Compounds with preverbs are exceptional in the mantras (only one occurrence in the passive-rich hymn AV 12.5), but become more common in Vedic prose, sometimes with idiomatic meaning changes,¹³⁸ cf.:

¹³³ RENOÜ (‘il les a assujettis-comme-en-chantant’, EVP XV, 117) and ELIZARENKOVA (‘Он почтил (их) нестареющими опорами’; cf. also ELIZARENKOVA’s comments ad loc.: “Буквальный перевод: «вместе воспел» или «укрепил, воспевая»”).

¹³⁴ Cf. HILLEBRANDT 1913: 97, with fn. 4 (‘er hat die beiden Räume ... umwehrt’); GELDNER (‘[e]r hält sie ... zusammen’) and, subsequently, KUPFER 2002: 110.

¹³⁵ On the passives of quasi-denominatives *vāṣaṭ-kr* ŚB, TĀ 5.7.5 ‘make the exclamation *vāṣaṭ*’; *hiṃ-kr* Br. ‘pronounce the sound *hiṃ*’, see Appendix II.

¹³⁶ On the participle *hiṃ-kriyamāṇá*- ŚB 14.9.3.9 (= BĀUM 6.3.9 = BĀUK 6.3.4) with the abnormal final accentuation, see Appendix II.

¹³⁷ I would like to thank W. KNOBL for his comments on the sense of this passage.

¹³⁸ Cf., e.g., KAPANI 1992: 53ff. et passim on the compound *sām-s-kr* ‘restore’ etc.

- with *pary-ā*:

(AV 12.5.33)

mūlabārhaṇī paryākriyāmāṇā, kṣītiḥ paryākṛtā

‘[The Brahman’s cow is] uprooting when being turned about (?),¹³⁹
destruction when turned about.’ (WHITNEY)

- with *vī*:

(TS^p 5.2.10.1 ≈ ^AKS^p 20.9:28.4 = KpS^p 31.11:158.16)

*paśúr vā eṣā yád agnír. yóniḥ khálu vā eṣā paśór vī kriyate yát prācīnam
aiṣṭakād yájuḥ kriyáte*

‘Verily, this fire [altar] is an animal. This formula, which is pronounced
before the laying down of the bricks, surely is changed into the womb of
the animal.’¹⁴⁰

Other passives

The passive -i-aorist *ākāri* is well-attested from the RV onwards (see INSLEER 1968a: 326; KÜMMEL 1996: 27f.). According to KÜMMEL, no other middle forms of *kṛ* beside these two formations occur in the passive usage. There is at least one more form, however, which may belong here: the much debated RVic participle *krāṇā-* (see PISCHEL 1889 [VSt I]: 67; OLDENBERG 1903: 33ff. [= Kl.Schr. 2, 1111ff.], with bibl. (ibid., 33 [= Kl.Schr. 2, 1111], fn. 1); BRADKE 1885: 35ff.; WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 272, §162ay). Without entering into a detailed discussion, I subscribe to the opinion shared by JOHANSSON (1894: 89) and OLDENBERG, *ibid.* (cf. also MACDONELL 370, §506) that at least some of its occurrences can be interpreted as passives, thus instantiating participles of the passive aorist *ākāri* (see KULIKOV 2006a; 2006b), as in the following passage:

(RV 1.134.2abc)

*māndantu tvā mandíno vāyav índavo ' ' smát krāṇāsaḥ sūkṛtā abhídyavaḥ
góbhiḥ krāṇā abhídyavaḥ*

‘Let the exhilarating [Soma] drops, **prepared** [as a gift] from us,
well-prepared, directed to heaven, **prepared** with cow [milk], directed to

¹³⁹ HENRY (1896: 212): ‘Éradication totale lorsqu’on la retourne [sur le feu] ...’

¹⁴⁰ I am thankful to W. KNOBL for valuable clarifications on the meaning of this passage.

heaven, exhilarate you, O Vāyu.¹⁴¹

Note that the ablative form of the pronoun (*asmát*) can hardly encode a passive agent. Although most translators render it as a passive agent,¹⁴² it could rather instantiate an ablative of origin, cf. GOTÖ's rendering in WITZEL et al. 2007: 250, which conveys this idea by bracketing part of translation: 'die von uns(erem Ort) wohlbereitet so gemacht werden ...'.¹⁴³

Another instance of a passive usage of *krāṇā-* may be its attestation at RV 1.139.1, quoted below, s.v. ²*dā* 'bind'.

Middle perfects are generally employed transitively, but at least for the following occurrence of 3sg. *cakre* a passive interpretation is probable (cf. OLDENBERG, op.cit.):

(RV 3.27.9a)

dhiyā cakre vāreṇyāḥ

'The one to be chosen (sc. Agni) has been produced with a prayer.'¹⁴⁴

Accordingly, the form *cakre* attested in RV 3.27.9a should probably be qualified as a stative derived from the perfect stem (see KULIKOV 2006a: 67f.).

kṛt 'cut': *kṛtyá-*^{te}

Simplex TB^m 3.7.5.6 (= ĀpŚS^m 3.1.2 = BhārŚS^m 3.2.7) (+);
 + *ud* 'be cut off, perish' AB 6.23.7^{2x} (+);
 + *pári* AVŚ 4.16.7 (≈ AVP 5.32.8) = ^AKS^m 4.16:43.22;
 + *ví* AV 12.5.28 (+)
 accented: AV, KS
 • pass.

The passive *kṛtyá-*^{te} occurs only twice in the mantras:

¹⁴¹ Cf. BRADKE, op.cit., 37; OLDENBERG 1903: 33f. [= Kl.Schr. 2, 1111f.].

¹⁴² Thus RENOU, EVP XV, 99 ('préparés par nous'); GELDNER ('von uns angemacht'; note, however, the polysemy of the German preposition *von*, which can be used both for encoding a passive agent and in the ablative sense).

¹⁴³ Or is the original instrumental replaced by the ablative because of an *instrumentalis sociativus* ('instrumental of ingredient') in the following pāda c (*góbhiḥ*)?

¹⁴⁴ On this stanza, see also GONDA 1963: 140f.

(AVŚ 4.16.7cd = AVP 5.32.8cd = ^AKS^m 4.16:43.22)

āstām jālmā udāraṃ śraṃsayitvā ' kóśa 'vābandhrāḥ parikṛtyāmānaḥ

‘Let the villain sit, when his belly was made fall apart, like a bucket without hoops, being cut round about.’¹⁴⁵

Another early Vedic occurrence is met in the passive-rich hymn AV 12.5:

(AV 12.5.28)

vāiraṃ vikṛtyāmānā

‘[The Brahman’s cow is] hostility when being cut up.’

In younger texts, this passive remains rare. We find an imperative form in a Taittirīya mantra and two optatives in the AB:

(TB^m 3.7.5.6)

ājyāyo yavamātrād ' āvyādhāt kṛtyatām idām

‘Let this offering be cut off from the struck place of the size of a barley corn.’¹⁴⁶

(AB 6.23.7)

atha yad ahīnaparidhānīyābhiḥ paridadhyur, yathā śrānto 'vimucyamāna utkṛtyetaivaṃ yajamānā ut kṛtyeran

‘And if they were to conclude [the rite] with the concluding verses of the Ahīna [sacrifice], the sacrificers would perish (lit.: cut up), just as the one who is wearied, without being released, perishes.’

kṛṣ ‘drag, plough’: *kṛṣyá-*^{te}

α ‘drag’:

Simplex ŚBM 3.8.2.17^{2x} ≈ ŚBK 4.8.2.12^{2x} (+);

+ *ut* ŚŚS 15.1.28 +;

+ *vi* VaitS 29.13

¹⁴⁵ *-kṛtyāmāna-* in this passage is rightly connected with ¹*kṛt* ‘cut’, not with ²*kṛt* ‘spin’ (contra PW II, Sp. 130 and ZIMMER 1879: 392), already by WEBER (1898a: 72, fn. 1). For this mantra, see also LÜDERS 1951: 30; OBERLIES 1992c: 122; LUBOTSKY 2002: 146f.

¹⁴⁶ See CALAND (1921: 76f.) ad ĀpŚS 3.1.2.

β ‘plough’:

Simplex MS^p 3.1.5:6.22, ĀpŚS 14.8.5;

+ *vi* NārSmṛ. 11.21

accented: +

• pass.

The two transitive presents of the root *kṛṣ*, viz. the class I present *kārṣa*-^{ti/te} RV + and class VI pres. *kṛṣá*-^{ti} RV +, differ in meaning (see GOTÖ 112f.). The former denotes a more general activity ‘drag, draw’. The latter is employed in a more technical sense of the word, ‘plough’, and belongs to the ‘two pattern’ verbs, i.e. can be constructed with the accusative of the plough or the accusative of the earth.

Passive counterparts are attested for both (α) *kārṣa*-^{ti/te} and (β) *kṛṣá*-^{ti}. To the former type belongs the following ŚB occurrence:

(ŚBM 3.8.2.17 ≈ ŚBK 4.8.2.12)

yátṛa vāi devā ágre paśúm ālebhírē, tát údīcaḥ kṛṣyámāṇasyā́vān médhah papāta

‘Verily, when the gods in the beginning seized a victim, then, as it was being drawn upwards, its sacrificial essence fell down.’

The passive counterpart of *kṛṣá*-^{ti} (with the passive subject corresponding to the accusative of the earth being ploughed in the transitive construction) occurs in the MS:

(MS 3.1.5:6.22-7.1)

sám te vāyúr mātariśvā dadhātv íti. tásmād etáśyā yát kṛṣyáte, yát khāyáte, tát sám dhīyate

‘“May Vāyu Mātariśvan heal [lit.: unite] your [wound]”. Therefore, what of this [earth] is being ploughed, what is being dug, this is being united.’

Both usages are attested in the Sūtras as well, where the meaning α ‘drag’ occurs with compounds and β ‘plough’ with the simplex.¹⁴⁷ Cf., for instance, (α) ŚŚS 15.1.28 *vanaspatiprabhṛtīny aṅgāny utkṛṣyeran* ‘the secondary parts of the sacrifice from the rite of Vanaśpati should be taken out’; (β) ĀpŚS 14.8.5 *agnau mīyamāne kṛṣyamāṇa opyamāne ...* ‘... while the fire-place is being measured, ploughed and sown’.

¹⁴⁷ In the NārSmṛ. also with the preverb *vi*.

kṛ̥ ‘scatter, spill (semen)’: *-kīryá-^{te}*

- + *abhí* ‘pour over’ TĀ 5.11.4;
- + *áva* KS^p 8.1:83.7 = KpS^p 6.6:64.11 ≈ TB 1.1.2.5^{2x}, JB 1.362:1, 2;
- + *úpa* ‘sow’ ŚBK 1.4.1.7 (*úpa-kīryate* ≈ ŚB 2.3.4.9 *úpopyate*);
- + *ní* ŚBK 4.6.2.11 (*ní-kīryante* ≈ ŚBM 3.6.2.21 *ny-úpyante*);
- + *pra* ‘fall out’ (of hairs) ĀpŚS 22.28.7 = HirŚS 23.4.47
- accented: TĀ 5.11.4
- pass. / anticaus.

The passive *-kīryá-^{te}* first appears in Vedic prose, in particular, in a YVic legend (discussed at length by BLOOMFIELD (1893: 164f.) and KRICK (1982: 35f.)).¹⁴⁸

(KS 8.1:83.5-7 = KpS 6.6:64.9-11)

kālakāñjā vai nāmāsura āsaṁs. ta iṣṭakā acinvata. tad indra iṣṭakām apy upādhatta. teṣāṁ mithunau divam ākrametām. tatas tām āvṛhat. te ’vākīryanta

‘There were Asuras called Kālakāñjas. They piled bricks. Then Indra put an additional brick upon. They climbed up to heaven in pairs. Then he (sc. Indra) tore off this [brick]. They (sc. these asuras) were thrown / fell down.’

Cf. also the parallel passage in the TB:

(TB 1.1.2.5)

sá indra iṣṭakām āvṛhat. té ’vākīryanta. yè ’vākīryanta tá ūrṇāvabhayo ’bhavan

‘... Indra tore off the brick. They were scattered / fell down. Those which were scattered down became spiders.’

Although both passive and non-passive (anticausative) translations are possible,¹⁴⁹ the context favours the latter.

The following two occurrences in the JB exemplify an idiomatic

¹⁴⁸ I would like to thank Ch. H. WERBA for valuable comments on this passage (letter of 7.05.1998).

¹⁴⁹ KRICK renders the form as anticausative (‘da fielen (purzelten) sie hinunter’; likewise Ch. H. WERBA (p.c.). BLOOMFIELD inconsistently gives both non-passive (for TB: ‘they tumbled down’) and passive (for KS: ‘they were thrown down’) translations.

(metonymic) semantic shift: ‘my semen is spilt’ → ‘I am spilt [in form of my semen]’:

(JB 1.362:1-3, 5-6 [ed. CALAND §116])

tad āhuḥ: katidhāvakīryamāṇaḥ praviśatīti | caturdheti brūyāt | caturdhā ha vā eṣa praviśati yo ’vakīryate | indraṃ balena marutaḥ prāṇena bṛhaspatiṃ brahmavarcasenāgnim evetareṇa sarveṇa. [...] kāmāvakīrṇo ’smy, avakīrṇo ’smi, kāma, kāmāya svāhā!

‘They say: “How manifold is the transition of [the powers of] someone who **is being spilt** [in form of his semen] (in spite of the sacrificial vow)?” One should say: “Fourfold”. Indeed, he who *is being spilt* [in form of his semen] has a fourfold transition. He enters Indra with his force, the Maruts with his breath, Bṛhaspati with his splendour of a Brahmin scholar, Agni with everything else. [...] [When his semen remains, after having performed certain rituals, he should recite:] “I have spilt my semen through passion, **I have been spilt** [in form of semen]; become spilt, O Desire; to Desire – svāhā!”’¹⁵⁰

The only unambiguously accented form (with suffix accentuation), attested in the TĀ, is employed in the passive usage:

(TĀ 5.11.4)

sómo ’bhikīryámāṇaḥ

‘[The name of Pravargya is] Soma [when it is] being poured over [with ghee].’¹⁵¹

The meaning of the passive of the compound with *pra* (ŚrSū. +), ‘fall out’ (of hairs), belongs to the anticausative type, cf. ĀpŚS 22.28.7 = HirŚS 23.4.47 ... *keśān prakīryamāṇān anumantrayate* ‘to the [hairs] falling out he addresses the mantra ...’

The position of *-kīryá-^{te}* among middle -ya-presents is problematic. Although the only accented form occurs in the TĀ, which often gives wrong accents, especially in its younger parts (see Chapter C.II.3.8), book 5 belongs to its oldest layer and mostly preserves correct accentuation – which in our case is supported by the passive semantics of the form (‘being poured’, not ‘flowing’). Passive interpretations are also preferable for the two occurrences in the ŚBK (ŚBK 1.4.1.7 *úpa-kīryate*, ŚBK 4.6.2.11 *ní-kīryante*),

¹⁵⁰ The same usage is attested for the passive *avakīryata* in Epic Skt., in Rām. 1.36.13; see OBERLIES 2003: 244, fn. 3.

¹⁵¹ See HOUBEN 115, note 52 (b).

corresponding to the verb *-upyate*, *-upyante* (with the same preverbs) in the Mādhyaṇdina recension – which clearly belongs to the passive class.

As for the non-passive semantics of *avākīryanta* (KS–KpS–TB) ‘fell down’ and *prakīryamāṇa-* (ĀpŚS–HirŚS) ‘falling out’, the meaning of these forms can readily be explained as resulting from the depassivization of the original passives, particularly, typical for the verbs of motion (see Chapter C.II.1.2), such as *srjyá-te* ‘be set free, emitted, run’.

kram ‘stride, advance’: *kramyá-te*

Simplex TS^p 1.7.6.2

accented: +

- pass. of intransitive with content acc.

pass. of caus. (?) *-kramya-te*:

+ *pra* ‘start to carry’ (?) GB 1.3.11^{2x}:77.4-5, 10, 1.3.12^{2x}:78.12-13, 79.3-4;

+ *ā* ‘cause to step on’ MānŚS 6.1.1.17

pass. of quasi-denom. [*nikramaṇa* ⇒ *ni-krāmati* ‘perform *nikramaṇa*’] (?):

nikramyamāṇa- ĀpŚS 10.22.12 = VaikhŚS 12.16:146.19

The present *krāma-ti/krāma-te* is fundamentally intransitive and therefore, generally, does not passivize. The only occurrence of *kramyá-te* in the Saṃhitās (TS) is a very rare instance of a passive built to a content accusative construction, probably a nonce formation:

(TS 1.7.6.1-2)

prá vā eṣò ’smāl lokāc cyavate, yó ||1|| viṣṇukramān krāmate, suvargāya hí lokāya viṣṇukramāḥ kramyānte

‘Verily, the one who strides the steps of Viṣṇu, falls out of this world, since to the heavenly world¹⁵² the strides of Viṣṇu are stridden’.

Besides, the present *kramya-te* occurs in the late GB in a passage which describes manipulations with milk during the Agnihotra ritual:

¹⁵² KEITH’s translation of *suvargāya* as an ablative (‘from the world of heaven’) is erroneous; see CALAND 1924: 24 [= Kl.Schr., 544].

(GB 1.3.11:76.15, 77.4-5)¹⁵³

prcchāmi: gautameti [...] kiṃdevatyam duhyamānam? kiṃdevatyam dugdham? kiṃdevatyam prakramyamānam? kiṃdevatyam hriyamānam?
 ‘I am asking: “O Gautama! [...] To which deity [does the milk belong] when being obtained by milking? To which deity [does the milk belong] when it has been obtained by milking? To which deity [does the milk belong] when [prakramyamānam]? To which deity [does the milk belong] when being brought [from the stable]?”’

The parallel ŚB passage has no direct pendant of *prakramyamānam* (the place where this form might be expected is marked with asterisks):

(ŚB 11.5.3.2)

sá hovāca: gautama [...] kīṃ duhyāmānam? kīṃ dugdhām? [* *] kīṃ āhriyamānam?*

Obviously, *prakramyamānam* refers to manipulations between milking and bringing milk, i.e., most likely, to the starting moment of carrying milk.¹⁵⁴ The syntactic analysis of the form poses some problems as well. As said above, the intransitive *krāma*^{-ti}/*krāma*^{-te} does not passivize; nor can *prakramyamānam* be based on a content accusative construction. Passivization is possible, however, on the basis of the causative ‘make advance, move’. Causatives from *kram* attest both short and long root vowel variants,¹⁵⁵ and *-kramya*^{-te} could, at least from the formal point of view, be based on the causative *kramayati*. Thus, the meaning of *prakramyamānam* can be tentatively rendered as ‘[when] the process of carrying milk begins’.

Both causative and non-causative passives occur in the Sūtras. The former is attested in the MānŚS, adjacent to the corresponding causative *ākramayati*:

(MānŚS 6.1.1.16-17)

[16] [...] *aśvam ākramayati*. [17] *ākramyamāṇe yajamāno, yaṃ d[v]iṣyāt*¹⁵⁶ *taṃ brūyāt* ...

‘He makes the horse step on [the pit]. While [it] is caused to step [thereon], the

¹⁵³ Cf. also GB 1.3.12.

¹⁵⁴ This meaning may be based on the secondary meaning of *prakrama*- ‘beginning, commencement’ (attested in the Sūtras, for instance, in KātyŚS 7.1.32, 24.3.26; see PW IV, 910), rather than on the primary meaning of *prá-kram* ‘step forward’.

¹⁵⁵ *kramayati* is the regular form (attested in the TS, MS, KS, KpS, ŚB, TB, AB, PB, JB); the secondary long vowel stem *-krāmayati* is rare (MS^{2x}, ŚB^{1x}, GB^{1x}).

¹⁵⁶ Ed. VAN GELDER *diṣyāt* (a misprint).

sacrificer should speak to the one whom he hates...'

Two Taittirīya Śrauta-Sūtras attest a non-causative passive:

(ĀpŚS 10.22.12-23.1 = VaikhŚS 12.16:146.19)

nikramyamāṇeṣu yajamāno [...] japati

'While the [ritual] footsteps are being made, the sacrificer [...] whispers [the formulae].'

The lack of an overtly expressed passive subject (with which *nikramyamāṇeṣu* would be attributively connected) is typical for passives of quasi-denominatives (see Appendix II). Thus pass. *ni-kramya-te* may belong with the quasi-denominative of the technical term *nikramaṇa-* '[ritual] footstep'.

It is interesting to note that *kram* is the only Vedic verb whose non-causative and causative passive are formally identical.

krī 'buy, purchase': *krīyá-te*

Simplex AVP-Kashm. 20.4.7 – YV^m, TS^m 4.4.9.1, YV^p, ŚB, AB, KB +;
+ *abhí* ŚB 3.3.2.6, 3.4.1.7
accented: TS^m 4.4.9.1, ŚB
• pass.

The passive *krīyá-te* first appears in the passive-rich mantras of the Yajurveda (one of which is also found in book 20 of the AVP):

(AVP 20.4.7 = VS 4.26.d = ^AKS 2.6:12.3-4 (= ^UKS 24.6:95.18-19) = KpS 1.19:14.4 (= KpS 37.7:200.22))

paraméṇa paśúnā krīyase

'You (sc. Soma) are purchased with the best animal.'¹⁵⁷

(TS 4.4.9.1)

ásuraḥ krīyámāṇo, mitráḥ krītáḥ

'[You are] Asura when being bought, Mitra when bought.'

The present passive participle *krīyamāṇā-*, given in VWC-Samh. II, 1182b s.v. *krī*, belongs to another root. The passage runs as follows:

¹⁵⁷ On the variants in the Samhitās of the YV, see GONDA 1983c: 9f.

(AVP 19.3.1)

⁺*śaśvad*¹⁵⁸ ⁺*didyut*¹⁵⁹ *krīyamāṇā*¹⁶⁰ ' *pratīcī nahi paptata*¹⁶¹
pratyak kartāram ṛchatu

The meaning 'buy, purchase' clearly does not suit the context. *kartāram* in pāda c clearly indicates that *krīya-* is derived from the root *kṛ*, with the secondary lengthening of *i* (probably, in analogy with the type *śrīya-*; see s.v. *śri*), and the form in question should be emended to ⁺*kriyamāṇā*:¹⁶²

'A missile, while **being prepared**, certainly does not fall back; let it strike back to the maker' (see GRIFFITHS 1997).

*khan*ⁱ 'dig': *khāyá*^{-te}
 (*khanya*^{-te} Ep. +)

Simplex MS^p 3.1.4:5.17, 3.1.5:7.1, ŚBM 3.5.4.9 = ŚBK 4.5.4.6 = 4.5.4.15, ŚBK 4.5.4.3, VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 4.10 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 4.26:26 (CALAND 1928: 127f. [= KL.Schr., 427f.]), MānŚS 8.13.5 +;

+ *abhi* ŚBM 3.5.4.1 *abhy* ... *khāyante*, v.l. *khyāyante* (≈ ŚBK 4.5.4.1 *abhy* ... *khāyante*, with no v.l.)

accented: MS, ŚB

• pass.

The passive *khāyá*^{-te}, relatively rare in Vedic, first appears in prose texts. Examples are:

(MS 3.1.4:5.16-17)¹⁶³

dvābhyām khanati dvipād yajamānaḥ prātiṣṭhityai. śúg vā átra prajā

¹⁵⁸ BARRET's conjecture; Kashm. ms. reads *aśvat*, Or. mss. *saśvat*.

¹⁵⁹ Conjecture by GRIFFITHS.

¹⁶⁰ Ed. BARRET ⁺*krīyamāṇām*.

¹⁶¹ Kashm. *paprat*.

¹⁶² The long root vowel variant sporadically occurs also in some other texts (mss.); cf. e.g. MS 3.9.5:121.17 *krīyate* (in mss.), for which ed. SCHROEDER (with fn. 14 ad loc.) reads ⁺*kriyate*.

¹⁶³ Another occurrence of *khāyá*^{-te} in the MS (3.1.5:7.1) is quoted and translated s.v. *kṛṣ*.

ṛchati, yátrāgnīḥ khāyáte cīyáte vā

‘The sacrificer, [being] biped, digs with two [verses], for support. The heat goes towards creatures there, where Agni is being dug or piled up.’

(ŚBM 3.5.4.9 = ŚBK 4.5.4.6 = 4.5.4.15)

rākṣasāṃ hy èté valagānām badhāya khāyānte

‘For it is indeed for killing the charms of the Rakṣases that these [holes] are being dug.’

(ŚBM 3.5.4.1 ≈ ŚBK 4.5.4.1)

dvayām vā abhy ùparavāḥ khāyante [v.1. *khyāya*^o]

‘Verily, it is for a twofold [reason] that the sounding-holes are being dug.’¹⁶⁴

The stem variant *khanya-*, allowed by Pāṇ. 6.4.43 beside *khāya-* (cf. KIPARSKY 1979: 136f.; BRONKHORST 1982: 279), is post-Vedic, attested in Ep.¹⁶⁵ and, particularly, in Cl. Skt. (see KIPARSKY, *ibid.*, fn. 65).

khyā (kśā) ‘see, consider, know’: *khyāyá*^{te}

Simplex KB 25.11.21 [ed. LINDNER 25.12] (+);

+ *ā* ‘recite, call’ Br. +; + *ātamām* (superl. of *ā*) ŚB 10.1.2.5; + *abhy-ā* ‘calumniate’ JB 2.134:13 [ed. CALAND §140], 2.137:8; + *vy-ā* ‘explain’ ŚB, TB 1.3.2.6;

+ *abhi* AĀ 3.2.4;

+ *ūpa* ‘distinguish, discern’ ŚB 4.1.2.13 (*ūpa ... khyāyate* ≈ ŚBK 5.1.2.8 *nīr-jñāyate*);

+ *pari* ChU 8.7.4^{2x};

+ *pra* AB 2.13.6;

+ *sām* ‘see together (with), consider together (with), associate’ ŚĀ 2.17 (= ŚŚS 18.21.1); + *upa-sam* VādhŚS 11.10 [ed. IKARI] 4.10 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 3.76:15 (= CALAND 1926: 181 [= Kl.Schr., 364]))

accented: ŚB

• agentless pass. / anticaus.

¹⁶⁴ The reading *khāyante* is supported by *khāyānte* in the same chapter (3.5.4.9, quoted above); note also that the Kāṇva recension has no variant readings. The meaning of *abhī-khyāyante* (‘appear, look’? see below, s.v. *khyā*) makes little sense in this context.

¹⁶⁵ For the Mbh., see e.g. SIL 1958: 206.

future pass. -khyāyīṣya-^{te}:

+ ā JB 1.321:12, 13

pass. of caus. -kṣāpyā-^{te}:+ sám MS^p 4.5.4:68.5 (ed. SCHROEDER + *saṃkṣāpyāmāṇaḥ*, mss. °*khyāpyā*°, °*kṣāpyā*°, °*kṣyāpyā*°, °*k(ś)yāpya*°¹⁶⁶)

The passive *khyāyā-^{te}* ‘is seen, known, etc.’,¹⁶⁷ attested from the Brāhmaṇas onwards, occurs in agentless passive constructions, typical for verbs of perception and knowledge (see Chapters A.II.2.2.2 and C.II.1.2.1). *khyāyā-^{te}* is attested almost exclusively in compounds with preverbs, particularly often with *ā*. Examples are:

(ŚB 9.1.1.44)

ātha yā aśītāyaḥ, sàivāśītānām āptir; aśītābhīr hí mahād ukthām ākhyāyāte
 ‘And what are the eighties [of formulas], thereby indeed the
 [corresponding] eighties [of the Great Litany] are obtained; for by eighties
 the Great Litany is recited.’

(ŚB 10.5.4.4)

yād dīśa iti ca raśmāya iti cākhyāyāte tál lokampṛṇā
 ‘That what is called both ‘regions’ and ‘rays’ is the *lokam-pṛṇā*¹⁶⁸ [brick].’

- with *vy-ā*:

(ŚB 1.6.3.7)

tāsyām tād vyākhyāyate yāthainam devā ābhiṣajyan
 ‘On the occasion of that [ceremony] it is explained how the gods healed
 him (sc. Indra).’

- with *abhi*:

(AĀ 3.2.4)

*athāpi yatra chidra ivādityo dṛśyate, rathanābhīr ivābhikhyāyeta [...], tad
 apy evam eva vidyāt*

¹⁶⁶ Cf. SCHROEDER 1879: 689; ed. SCHROEDER, Einleitung, XI.

¹⁶⁷ On the original meaning of *khyā* (*kṣā*) (~ Av. *xsā*), see, in particular, INSLEER 1975a [Gāthās]: 264. Improbable is the explanation of this passive as “Denominativpräsens zu Nomen actionis **k^hk-éh₂*- > ved. *abhi-khyā*- f. ‘Anblick’ [...], d.h. ved. *khyā-yā*- ‘wahrgenommen werden’ < *‘einen Anblick bieten’ ” (LIV 385, note 17).

¹⁶⁸ Lit.: ‘filling the space’, i.e. the brick set up with the formula *lokam pṛṇa* ‘fill the world!’.

‘And when the sun is seen pierced, as it were, and looks like the nave of a chart-wheel [...], he should know thus.’

- with *úpa*:

(ŚB 4.1.2.13)

tásmād ápi sūtamiśrāyām úpaivá kíñcit khyāyate

‘Therefore even in the deepest darkness something can be discerned.’

- with *sám*:

(ŚĀ 2.17 (= ŚŚS 18.21.1))

tad etat sakṛc chastāyām sūdadohasi [...] saṃkhyāyamānāyām [...] bṛhatīśahasraṃ saṃpadyate

‘[Even if] the Sūdadohas [verse] is counted, recited once [...], that is equal to thousand of Bṛhatīs.’

The only simplex occurrence is encountered in the KB:

(KB 25.11.21 [ed. LINDNER 25.12])

na vā antareṇātmānaṃ prāṇāḥ khyāyante

‘The breaths are not known without the body.’

The second occurrence reckoned in VWC-Br. I, 584c to the simplex (ŚB) belongs in fact with compounds with *ā*:

(ŚB 10.1.2.5)

tásmād yátraitāni sárvaṇi sahá kriyānte, mahád evòkthám ātamām khyāyate

‘Hence, whenever all these are performed together, the Great Litany, indeed, is considered the highest one.’

As EGGELING (ad loc.) explains, *ātamām khyāyate* is a superlative built on *ā-khyāyate*; see also ROMANOV 2010: 33.

Other passives

Non-present middle forms of *khyā*, first attested already in the mantras, are relatively rare. Beside the late middle future (2x in the Brāhmaṇas), for which see below, we find the thematic aorist *-akhya-^{ta}* (only with the preverb *sám*). It is attested in an intransitive usage, meaning ‘appear together (with smb./smth.)’, in some contexts with the additional semantic nuance ‘appear together, and, by virtue of that, be considered / become associated (with smb./smth.)’. This intransitive usage can only be based on the original agentless passive (‘be considered together (with smb./smth.)’), and this

semantics still shimmers through the actually attested meanings. *sam-ākhyā*¹⁶⁹ typically denotes a particular spiritual (sacral) contact or connection between deities or between a deity and his/her adepts. This meaning is attested for the following three occurrences (for a detailed analysis of this usage and the relevant passages, see KULIKOV 2008):

(RV 9.61.7c)

sām ādityébhir akhyata

‘[Soma] has appeared together (and, by virtue of that, has become associated) with the Ādityas.’¹⁶⁹

(KS^P 2.5:11.7 = KpS^P 1.18:13.14)

*sām devī devyórváśyākhyata*¹⁷⁰

‘The heavenly [cow] has appeared together (and, by virtue of that, has become associated) with heavenly Urvaśī.’

(VS 4.23 (≈ ŚB 3.3.1.12))

sām akhye devyā dhiyā sām dākṣiṇayorúcakṣasā

mā ma āyuh prā moṣīr mó ahām táva

vīrām videya táva devī samdṛśi

‘I have appeared together (≈ I have been considered together ≈ I have become associated) with the heavenly insight, with the far-seeing Dakṣiṇā: take not my life from me, neither will I take yours; may I obtain a hero in your sight.’

Middle futures (2× in the Brāhmaṇas) are derived from the stem *-khyāyīṣya-*. One of the occurrences, in the JB, occurs in a passive construction:

(JB 1.321:11-12 = 12-13)

chandāṃsy atra prativapsyāmi. chandobhir etā ākhyāyīṣyante

‘I shall insert the metres here. They will be called after the metres.’¹⁷¹

Another occurrence, attested in the KB, is transitive:

¹⁶⁹ Cf. GELDNER: ‘Er wurde den Āditya’s gleich gerechnet’; RENOU: ‘on l’a compté au nombre des Āditya’ (EVP VIII, 31, 89); ELIZARENKOVA: ‘Он был причислен к Адитьям.’ Cf. also GONDA 1979: 21, with fn. 55; HETTRICH 2007: 36.

¹⁷⁰ = *devyā-urvāśyā-akhyata*, erroneously segmented by SIMON (1912 [Index verborum zu KS]: 99, 176) as *devyór váśyā-akhyata*.

¹⁷¹ For this passage, see BODEWITZ 1990: 183.

(KB 17.2.9 [ed. LINDNER 17.1])

apriya enaṃ bhrātṛvyah pratyākhyāyisyate

‘The rival who is hateful will reject him.’ (KEITH)

Active futures (Br.+) are derived from the stem *khyāsyā-*. The stem *-khyāyisyā-* is thus the only Vedic example of a future formation with the special passive marker *-y-*, opposed to the non-passive future without *y-*. *-khyāyisyate* belongs with non-present formations of clearly artificial nature (and unattested in Vedic), such as aor. *adāyīṣi*, fut. *dāyīṣye*, taught by grammarians (Pāṇ. 6.4.62) as morphological passives outside the present system. WHITNEY (1885b [Roots]: 33) groups *[-]khyāyisyate* with *-yā-*passives; for these forms, see also WHITNEY 1884: 289 [Sel.Wr., 297]; 1889 [SktGr]: 362, §998e-f; LIEBICH 1891: 56f.; RENOU 1930 [GrS]: 466 and esp. KIPARSKY 1979: 138ff.; see also below, Chapter C.V. Such forms are usually considered as secondarily built on the basis of the passive *-i-*aorist (*adāyi* etc.),¹⁷² but, in my view, such formations are rather connected with the more productive *-yā-*passives. Some *ā* roots can build futures both in *-syā-* and *-yīṣya-*, cf. *hū* (*hvā*) ‘call’: *hvāsyā-^{te}* Sū., *hvāyīṣya-^{ti/te}* Br. (see WHITNEY 1896 [SktGr]: 332, §935c). The stem *khyāyisyā-* could be assessed as incorporating *-y-* of the passive suffix *-yā-*, as opposed to the stem *khyāsyā-*; then *khyāyisyā-* has been associated with the passive function and accordingly with the middle flexion (contrasting with *khyāsyā-* inflected in the active).

Caus. pass.

The only Vedic occurrence of the causative passive, participle *saṃkṣāpyāmāna-* (built on the root variant *kṣā*),¹⁷³ is attested in the MS:

(MS 4.5.4:68.5)

⁺*saṃkṣāpyāmāno*¹⁷⁴ *vā udgātā pátnyā rétā á dhatte*¹⁷⁵

¹⁷² Note, however, that *-i-*aor. *akhyāyi* is not attested in Vedic.

¹⁷³ *khyā* is likely to result from the secondary development of *kṣā*, which is preserved in the Maitrāyaṇī and Kāṭhaka traditions (see, in particular, CHARPENTIER 1932-33: 168, fn. 4; LUBOTSKY 1983: 176; WITZEL 1989: 163ff.; WERBA 280). Less plausible is WACKERNAGEL’s (1896 [AiG I]: 209) explanation of these roots as going back to different sources. Synchronically they clearly represent one single root in Vedic prose, with no difference in use between the compounds *sām-khyā* and *sām-kṣā*.

¹⁷⁴ Thus emended in ed. SCHROEDER (see SCHROEDER 1879: 689; ed. SCHROEDER, Einleitung, p. XI); mss. read °*khyāpyā*°, °*kṣāpyā*°, °*kṣyāpyā*°, °*k(ṣ)yāpyā*°.

¹⁷⁵ The reading *ádhatte* is attested in one of the mss.; ed. SCHROEDER reads *ádatte*.

The causative *saṃ-khyāpāya*-^{ti}, solidly attested in the Saṃhitā prose, Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras is employed in a technical sense, denoting a particular event during the sattra (a kind of Soma sacrifice), when the sacrificer's wife participates in the performance together with the Udgātar priest, for the sake of progeny.¹⁷⁶ It is translated by all scholars with 'cause to look at' or 'exchange looks with'.¹⁷⁷ As I argued elsewhere (KULIKOV 2008), this causative should

Unlikely is OERTEL's (1926: 329; see also MITTWEDE 1986: 170) hesitantly suggested reading of the passage, which requires as many as five (!) emendations: **saṃkśāpyāmānā vā *udgātrā *pātny *ā *réto datte*. — I have greatly benefited from discussing this and several other relevant Vedic passages with W. KNOBL. Of course all responsibility for possible mistakes and misinterpretations is mine.

¹⁷⁶ For this rite, see, in particular, JAMISON 1996: 136ff.

¹⁷⁷ To quote a few examples:

(MS^P 3.7.7:84.8)

*yāt somakráyaṇyā pātñīm *saṃkśāpayati ...*

'In that he makes the Wife exchange views [sic!] with the Soma-cow.' (HOCK 1991: 89, note 2)

(TS 6.5.8.6 ≈ KS 26.1:122.4-5 = KpS 40.4:228.5-7)

udgātrā saṃ khyāpayati. prajāpatir vā eṣā yád udgātā. prajānām prajānanāya

'He [sc. the Neṣṭṛ] causes the Udgātr to look (at the wife); the Udgātr is Prajāpati; (verily it serves) for the production of offspring.' (KEITH 1914: 544; likewise GONDA 1989c: 27)

'He makes the Udgātar look at (her). The Udgātar is really Prajāpati. (The looking is) for the procreation of offspring.' (JAMISON 1996: 140)

'(Der Neṣṭṛ) veranlaßt (die Gattin des Opfernden), mit dem Udgātr Blicke zu wechseln.' (NARTEN 1965: 57 [= Kl.Schr. 1, 47])

(ŚB 3.3.1.11)

tāsmād enāñ somakráyaṇyā saṃ khyāpayati

'... this is why he [sc. the Neshtri] causes her [sc. the sacrificer's wife] to be looked at by the Soma-cow.' (EGGELING)

(JB 1.173:11-12)

tām saṃkhyāpayanti retodheyāya

'They cause her to be looked at (by the Udgātr) for the sake of impregnation.' (BODEWITZ 1990: 98; cf. also *ibid.*, 269, note 3 ad loc.)

See also CALAND 1924a: 342; OERTEL 1926: 329. According to GONDA's (1969: 21) explanation of the technical meaning of *sām-khyā*, the Udgātr is identified with Prajāpati in the sacrifice, and looking at the sacrificer's wife symbolically represents impregnating her (cf. also BODEWITZ 1990: 269, note 3 ad JB 1.173).

rather be rendered as ‘cause [the wife] to appear (/ to be considered) together [with the Udgātar]’ ≈ ‘establish a (sacral) connection between [the wife and the Udgātar]’; ‘he associates the wife with the Udgātar’ (for the relevant passages and a detailed discussion of this usage, see KULIKOV 2008). Accordingly, the passive construction in should be translated as follows:

‘The Udgātar, being caused to appear together (≈ to be considered / to become associated) with the wife, places his semen [into her].’

To conclude, one should emphasize that the revised interpretation of *saṃ-khyāpāya*^{-ti} / *saṃ-kśāpāya*^{-ti} as ‘cause to appear, cause to be considered, make associated with’ does not rule out possible erotic and sexual connotations implied by the traditional translations (‘cause to be looked at’ etc.), such as increasing fertility, rich progeny etc. These meanings may show similar developments (‘he makes the wife reckoned / associated / (sexually) united with the Udgātar’; etc.), with similar or same symbolic and mythological implications.

gam ‘go’: -*gamyá*^{-te}

+ *ádhi* ‘find, know, understand’ AV 7.101.1, AB 6.27.2 (= GB 2.6.7:253.10-11), 6.27.3 (*adhi-gamyate* ≈ GB 2.6.7:253.12 *saṃ-adhi-gamyate*), JB, AĀ 2.3.3,¹⁷⁸ JUB, MuṇḍU 1.1.5, ŚŚS 13.6.3+;

+ *ānu* ‘extinguish’ ŚBK 3.1.10.2; ‘follow, accompany’ ViṣṇuSmṛ. 94.3 (+);

+ *abhí* ‘gain, obtain’ ŚB 3.2.4.13, 3.8.3.35 = ŚBK 4.8.3.23

accented: AV

• pass.

(pass. of caus. (?): *gamyá*^{-te})

KauṣU 4.15 (ed. RENOU *gamyate*; most other eds.¹⁷⁹ read *yamyate* (≈ ŚĀ 6.15 *yamyate*))

The fundamentally intransitive verb *gam* can be passivized in some compounds with preverbs. In particular, the AVic passive *adhi-gamyáte* is the earliest Vedic passive formed from a secondary transitive¹⁸⁰ (= intransitive

¹⁷⁸ Not mentioned in VWC-Br.

¹⁷⁹ Ed. COWELL, ed. “108 Up.”, ed. LIMAYE & VADEKAR [“18 Up.”], ed. FRENZ.

¹⁸⁰ Cf. HOCK 1985-86: 93, fn. 7.

with transitivizing preverb) and the only one in the mantras:

(AV 7.101.1)

yát svápne ánnam aśnāmi ' ná prātár adhigamyáte

sárvaṃ tād astu me śívāṃ ' nahí tād drśyáte dívā

‘If I eat food in my dream,¹⁸¹ [and it] is not found in the morning, be all that propitious to me, for that is not seen by day.’¹⁸²

In Vedic prose, this -yá-passive becomes quite common. Examples are:

(ŚB 3.2.4.13)

tán ná manúṣyeṣu hiraṇyam abhí gamyeta

‘No gold would then be obtained among men.’

(JUB 1.12.5.4 [ed. OERTEL 1.39.4])

yo vai sāmnaḥ suvarṇaṃ vidvān sāmnaṛtvijyaṃ karoty, adhy asya gr̥he suvarṇaṃ gamyate

‘He who knowing the gold of the *sāman* performs the priestly office with the *sāman*, in his house gold is found.’ (OERTEL)

The only simplex occurrence of this -ya-present, attested in an Upaniṣadic passage, poses some difficulties. The passage runs:

(KauṣU 4.15 (≈ ŚĀ 6.15))

yamo rājeti vā aham etam upāsa iti. sa yo haitam evam upāste, sarvaṃ hāsmā idaṃ śreṣṭhyāya gamyate

Most likely, the original reading is *yamyate* (as attested in the corresponding passage of the ŚĀ), while *gamyate* is a late and secondary variant. The reading *yamyate* is also supported by the word play (*Yama-/yamyate*).¹⁸³ Yet, the reading *gamyate* (thus ed. RENOU) cannot be completely ruled out. Morphologically, *gamyate* could be a passive of the causative *gamayati*,¹⁸⁴ replacing the more archaic and unfamiliar *yamyate*. The passage can be

¹⁸¹ Thus PISCHEL (1903: 117): ‘Wenn die Speise, die ich im Traum esse ...’; otherwise WHITNEY: ‘What food I eat in dream...’

¹⁸² According to CALAND (1902c: 556 [= Kl.Schr., 91]), eating in dream is a bad omen, whereas PISCHEL (1903) regards this as a good omen. As PISCHEL explains, the fact that the one having dreamed about food does not discover it after awakening is not bad by itself, but merely that this was nothing other than a dream.

¹⁸³ See RENOU, transl. KauṣU, ad loc; JEŽIĆ 1999: 245, with fn. 256.

¹⁸⁴ The stem *gāmaya-* (with the long root vowel) occurs only in RV 5.5.10; see JAMISON 172, with fn. 138.

tentatively translated as follows:

‘“He is king Yama”, thus I reverence him. For the one who reverences him (sc. Yama) thus, everything here is indeed subdued to his supremacy.’¹⁸⁵

-i-aorist

The *-i*-aorist *-agāmi* occurs once in the RV:

(RV 6.16.19a)

āgnīr agāmi bhārataḥ

The most likely interpretation, suggested by GRASSMANN (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 384) and followed by KÜMMEL (1996: 32), is ‘Agni of the Bharatas has come here’. A passive translation ‘Agni was approached’¹⁸⁶ is not supported by other attestations of this compound; for a discussion, see KÜMMEL 1996: 32, fn. 31. This form is isolated in the syntactic system of *gam*, since *-ya*-presents (with which *-i*-aorists are typically associated in the verbal system) are attested only in the passive usage.

gā* ‘sing, chant’: *gīyá-te

Simplex RV 6.69.2, 8.2.14, 8.81.5, AVP-Or. 14.2.2 = AVP-Kashm. 14.1.12, MS^p 2.4.5:43.8, 3.7.3:78.5 +;

+ *abhi* AB, JB +;

+ *upa* BaudhŚS 16.22:268.4 +;

+ *vi* ‘sing on different metres’ JB

accented: RV, ŚB

• pass.

¹⁸⁵ FRENZ: ‘Wer ihn als solchen verehrt, dem ordnet sich alles dieses zur Vorherrschaft unter’; BODEWITZ (2002b: 65): ‘He who regards him as such, for him everything here becomes subdued to his supremacy’.

¹⁸⁶ Thus GRASSMANN elsewhere (1876 [RV übers.]: I, 244): ‘Verehrt wird Agni ...’; GELDNER (‘Agni ... ward jetzt angegangen’); RENOU (‘Agni des Bharata vient d’être abordé’, EVP XIII, 50); ELIZARENKOVA (‘К Агни [...] приступили (жрецы) ...’). The analysis of this form as a passive derived from causative suggested by LUDWIG (1876 [RV übers.]: I, 403) (‘Agni ward komen gemacht’) is impossible.

pass. of quasi-denom. [*udgīthá-* ⇒ *ud-gā́ya-*ⁱⁱ ‘sing [the udgītha]’]:
 ŚB 14.9.3.9 (= BĀUM 6.3.9 = BĀUK 6.3.4) *udgīyamāná-*¹⁸⁷

The passive *gīyá-^{ie}*, quite common in the Brāhmaṇas, is relatively rare in early Vedic. An example is:

(RV 8.81.5b)

śrávat sā́ma gīyámānam

‘May he hear the Sāman which is being sung.’

gā is a ‘two pattern’ verb (cf. HAUDRY 334f.), i.e. can be constructed [i] with the accusative of the hymn, *sāman*, etc. (first object), or [ii] with the accusative of the deity, the addressee of singing. The latter pattern is common with preverbs *abhí* and *abhi-prá*, but occurs with simplex too, cf.:

(RV 8.32.13c)

tám índram abhí gāyata

‘Chant (of) this Indra!’

(RV 1.10.1a)

gā́yanti tvā gāyatríṇaḥ

‘The singers sing of you.’

This holds for the mantra language only, however; I was unable to find instances of pattern [ii] in Vedic prose. Even compounds with *abhí* are attested with pattern [i], meaning ‘sing Sāman’ etc. (cf. ŚB 4.6.9.11, JB 1.322:9).

The -yá-passive *gīyá-^{ie}* never shows pattern [ii_{pass.}] (of the type **índro gīyate* ‘Indra is (being) chanted’). Nor is it attested for compounds with *abhí* (which appear in the Brāhmaṇas, cf. AB 3.43.5, 5.30.2, JB 1.336:7, etc.). Evidence from the mantra language (three attestations in the RV and one in the AVP) is scant, but, judging by the -ta-participle met once in the RV (*abhiḡṭa índuḥ* RV 9.96.23 ‘the praised sap’), one may assume that this pattern could be possible in early Vedic with -yá-passives, too.

To conclude this lemma, we have to discuss in brief the morphological analysis of the transitive present *gā́ya-^{ii/ie}*. Although this formation is analyzed as a class IV present (*gā́ya-*) in several grammars and dictionaries (WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]: 35; MACDONELL 331, §438, GOTÖ 44), there is strong evidence for taking -*ī-* as part of the root (IE **geh₂-ī-*, cf. MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 482f.,

¹⁸⁷ For this form and its abnormal accentuation, see Appendix II.

with bibl.),¹⁸⁸ which suggests a class I analysis *gāy-a-*, adopted already by Indian grammarians (in the indigenous notation, built on the root *gai*) as well as by WACKERNAGEL (1896 [AiG I]: 87; 1928: 108 [= Kl.Schr. I, 335], fn. 1), DELBRÜCK (1897 [VglSynt II]: 26, hesitantly), THUMB/HAUSCHILD 244 (cf. also THUMB 1900: 197) and BURROW (1979: 96f.).¹⁸⁹ Since *-yá*-passives and transitive *-ya*-presents only exceptionally co-exist within one IVS in Vedic, especially in the mantra language (see Chapter C.III.4), the class I analysis is also preferable for paradigmatic reasons.

gup* ‘protect, guard’: *gupyá-^{te}

ŚB 1.6.1.12, 1.6.1.15, TB 2.5.1.1

accented: ŚB

• pass.

The secondary root *gup* is extracted from the denominative *gopáyati* (← *gopá-* ‘protector’). It was early interpreted as an autonomous root, whence forms with the zero grade, including e.g. pf. *jugupuh* etc. (cf. HOFFMANN 1966: 69f. [= Aufs. 2, 463]). The passive *gupyá-^{te}*, derived from this secondary root *gup*,¹⁹⁰ occurs only in the Brāhmaṇas. An example is:

(ŚB 1.6.1.15)

sá evāñ sarváto ’gníbhīr gupyámānaḥ, svargám lokáñ sám aśnute

‘Being thus guarded on every side by the fires, he attains the heavenly world.’

gūh* ‘hide’: *guhyámāna-

RV 4.58.4, (AVP-Kashm. 16.67.8 [*guhyamāno*; read with Or. mss. and AVŚ *kavīyámānaḥ*]), VS 2.17 (= ŚB 1.8.3.22) (≈ MS^m 4.1.14:20.5 = TS^m 1.1.13.2 = TB^m 3.3.9.6 *vīyámāna-* ≈ KS^m 1.12:7.14 (= 31.11:14.11) = KpS^m 1.12:9.9 (= 47.11:295.12) *idhyamāna-*)

¹⁸⁸ Historically, *-ī-* could be extracted from the *īe*-present; see LIV 183, note 1 s.v.

¹⁸⁹ BURROW explains *-y-* as a root enlargement.

¹⁹⁰ A direct derivative from the denominative stem would yield **gopyáte*.

accented: RV, VS

• pass.

The passive of the root *gūh* is attested only in participles. Two of the occurrences are met with the instrumental agentive nominal *pañibhiḥ* in the myth of goods hidden by the Paṇis:

(RV 4.58.4ab)

trídhā hitám pañibhir guhyámānaḥ ' *gávi devāso ghṛtám ánv avindan*
'The gods found again in the cow the ghee, put in three parts, hidden by the Paṇis.'

(VS 2.17.a[b] = ŚB 1.8.3.22)

ágne deva pañibhir guhyámānaḥ
'O god Agni, hidden by the Paṇis...' (for other variants of this mantra, see s.v. *vyā*)

The third alleged occurrence of this present, in the Kashmir ms. of the AVP (AVP-Kashm. 16.67.8c *gūhyamāno guhya*¹⁹¹ *pra vocad* 'The one who is being hidden (?) shall proclaim [the knowledge] which is to be hidden'?) must be a secondary replacement of *kavīyamāna-* (note also the corrupt metre in the Kashm. version), attested both in the RV and AV (Śaunakīya and Orissa mss. of the AVP): RV 1.164.18cd = AVŚ 9.9.18cd = AVP-Or. 16.67.8c *kavīyamānaḥ ká ihá prá vocad* ' *devám mánaḥ kúto ádhi prájātam* 'Who, acting as a poet, shall proclaim here where the divine mind is born from?'

gra(b)hⁱ 'seize, take, draw': *grhyá-^{te}*

Simplex AVP 6.9.1 ≈ TB 2.4.7.1, YV^p +;

+ *ánu* KS^p 27.3:141.4 = KpS^p 42.3:249.11, KS^p 27.10:151.10;

+ *ápi* TS^p, KS^p-KpS^p,¹⁹²

+ *abhi* ĀpŚS 4.5.3 ≈ BhārŚS 4.6.6;

+ *áva* AV 20.131.12 (ed. ¹ROTH/WHITNEY *áva grhyate*, ed. VISHVA BANDHU [20.131.9] *°grhyánti*, v.ll. *°grhyáti*, *°grhyáte* ≈ RVKh. 5.15.13a *upá*

¹⁹¹ Ed. BARRET *guhyamāno guhyā*.

¹⁹² *ápi-grhyatām* at TĀ 5.1.7, quoted in VWC-Br. I, 175b as a compound, is in fact a simplex; *ápi* functions as a particle 'too', not as a preverb: *grāha evá nāv áytāpi grhyatām* 'a ladleful must be taken for us too in this (sacrifice)' (HOUBEN 47).

[sic!] *nṛtyati*), ĀpŚS 12.27.5 (+);
 + *sam-úd* ŚB 6.4.3.6;
 + *nír* TS^P 6.5.6.3, MS^P;
 + *pári* ‘enclose’ ŚB 7.1.1.12 +;
 + *prāti* AVP-Or. 16.54.2 = AVP-Kashm. 16.54.8 (*prati grhyate* ≈ AVŚ 11.3.15 *párigṛhītā*), MS^P 2.1.2:2.10, 2.3.3:29.18 (+);
 + *vi* JUB 3.4.5.1 +
 accented: AV +¹⁹³
 • pass.

The passive *grhyá-te* of the verb *gra(b)h*ⁱ ¹⁹⁴ first appears in the AV. The only occurrence in the Śaunakīya recension is met in a Kuntāpa hymn (book 20):

(AVŚ 20.131.11-12 [ed. VISHVA BANDHU 20.131.9] (≈ RVKh. 5.15.12c-13a))
 [11] *āyávanena tedanī*
 [12] *vániṣṭhau náva grhyate*¹⁹⁵
 ‘The clotted blood is not taken out of the entrails with a spoon.’

The two other mantra occurrences appear in the Paippalāda recension:

(AVP 6.9.1a ≈ TB^m 2.4.7.1¹⁹⁶)
vṛṣāyam aṁśúr vṛṣabhāya grhyate
 ‘This [Soma-]stalk is a bull. It is being drawn for the bull (sc. Indra).’¹⁹⁷

For the third AVic attestation (AVP-Or. 16.54.2 = AVP-Kashm. 16.54.8), see Chapter B.V, s.v. ²*iṣ*.

In Vedic prose, the passive *grhyá-te* becomes more common. Examples

¹⁹³ The erroneous root accentuation is attested in mss. [WEBER’s AM.] in ŚB 14.6.9.28 (= BĀU 3.9.28) = 14.6.11.16 (= BĀU 4.2.6) = 14.7.2.27 (= BĀU 4.4.27) *grhyaté* (see ŚB, ed. WEBER crit.app.); ed. WEBER emends ⁺*grhyáte*, and so reads ed. BÖHTLINGK (BĀU), with no mention of different ms. readings. For this form, see also Chapter III, s.v. *śṛ*.

¹⁹⁴ < PIE **g^hrebh₂*- (?); see MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 5055f.; LIV 201. On the variants *grabhⁱ/grahⁱ*, see LUBOTSKY 1995b: 127f. et passim; LIV 201, note 2.

¹⁹⁵ Thus ed. ¹ROTH/WHITNEY; ed. VISHVA BANDHU [20.131.9] reads °*grhyánti*, v.ll. °*grhyāti*, °*grhyáte*; the RVKh. (5.15.13a) has the meaningless *vániṣṭhunopá nṛtyati*.

¹⁹⁶ The corresponding TB sentence is put in the 2nd person: *vṛṣāsy aṁśúr vṛṣabhāya grhyase*.

¹⁹⁷ For a discussion of this passage, see GRIFFITHS 2009: 110f.

are:

(TS 6.5.1.2-3)

*yád ukthyò gṛhyáta, indriyám evá ||2|| tád vīryàṁ yájamāno bhrátr̥vyasya
vr̥ñkte*

‘When the Ukthya draft is being drawn, then verily the sacrificer bends the
power and the strength of [his] rival.’

(TS 7.5.4.1)

vaiśvakarmaṇó gṛhyate, víśvāny evá téna kármāṇi yájamānā áva rundhate
‘The Viśvakarman draft is being drawn; verily, therewith the sacrificers
achieve all rites.’

(ŚB 7.1.1.12)

tásmād yónyā rétaḥ siktáṁ pári gṛhyate

‘Therefore the semen which is poured is being seized by the womb.’

Other passives

For pass.aor. (pl.) *agr̥bhran* (RV 5.2.4), see KÜMMEL 1996: 36f.
(according to KÜMMEL, this is a “Neubildung”).

ghṛ ‘drip’: *ghriya*^{te}

MS^m 2.3.4:31.2 = 2.3.5:32.20 *ághriyata* ≈ KS^m 11.7:153.4 *ághriyathāḥ*,
v.l. *apriya*^o (≈ TS^m 2.3.10.1 *ádhiyata*)
unaccented
• anticaus.

pass. of caus.: *-ghāryá*^{te}

+ *á* [i] ‘pour’ TB 3.3.7.8, ŚrSū.;
+ *vy-á* [ii] ‘besprinkle’ MS^p 3.8.10:109.16, 110.18-111.1, 110.16 ≈
+KpS^p 40.4:227.15 (ms. *vāghārayati*, ed. RAGHU VIRA ⁺*vyāghāryante*, as in
the MS), KS^p 25.6:110.17 = KpS^p 39.4:216.15, ⁺MānŚS 6.2.6.30 (ed. VAN GELDER
vyāghāramāṇa-, read with JAMISON 2000b: 115, fn. 7 ⁺*vyāghāryamāṇa*-)
accented: MS, TB

The -ya-present *ghriya*^{te} is a nonce formation met in a Yajurvedic
mantra, attested in the MS and KS:

(MS 2.3.4:31.1-2 = 2.3.5:32.19-20)

yán návam áit, tán návanītam abhavad

yád ásarpat, tát sarpīḥ

yád ághriyata, tát ghṛtám

‘What went as the new one, that became fresh butter; what crept, that became clarified butter; what [*ághriyata*], that became ghee.’

In the Kāṭhaka, all the three sentences are put in the second person:

(KS 11.7:153.3-4)

yád ásarpat, tát sarpír abhavo; yán návam áis, tán návanītam abhavo; yád ághriyathās, tát ghṛtám abhavaḥ

The Taittirīya version of the mantra reads *ádhrīyata* instead of *ághriyata*:

(TS 2.3.10.1.a)

yán návam áit, tán návanītam abhavad; yád ásarpat, tát sarpír abhavad; yád ádhrīyata, tát ghṛtám abhavad

The last sentence can be translated as ‘that which became firm became ghee’ (KEITH). KEITH (1914: 171, fn. 3) suggested that the TS has preserved the original version of the mantra; his assumption was followed by HOFFMANN (1969a: 63 [= Aufs. 2, 511], note 6). HOFFMANN, followed by MITTWEDE (1989 [Textkr. zur MS]: 77), believes that *ághriyata*, albeit being an authentic reading of the MS and KS which does not require emendations, is an analogical nonce formation built on the morphological model *dhṛ : dhṛtá- : dhriyáte = ghṛ : ghṛtá- : [ghriyate]* and triggered by the parallelism *návam : návanītam ; ásarpat : sarpír ; ághriyata : ghṛtám*.

ághriyata could be a nonce formation indeed, but, in my view, this fact does not imply that *ághriyata* replaced the supposedly original *ádhrīyata* (TS). Quite on the contrary, one may assume that redactors of the TS considered *ághriyata* in the original version of the mantra (supposedly attested in the MS) as an impossible formation and replaced it with the more familiar *ádhrīyata*, even to the detriment of the formal parallelism with the two other sentences.¹⁹⁸

The form *ághriyata*, albeit a nonce formation, should not be considered meaningless. Compare the -ya-present *dhriyá-^{te}* ‘stay’, which is the anticausative counterpart of the transitive *dhārāya-^{ti/te}* ‘hold’ (see below s.v.); likewise, *ghriya-^{te}* could be built as an anticausative to *ghārāya-^{ti}* ‘pour’ (for

¹⁹⁸ Note, incidentally, that the reverse replacement, i.e. *adhriyata* → *aghriyata*, is also attested in some mss. of the TS (e.g. at 6.5.9.1, Pp.); see s.v. *dhṛ*.

which see below), and accordingly its meaning might be tentatively determined as anticausative of ‘pour’, i.e. ‘drip, flow’. This meaning suits the context perfectly and the concluding part of the mantra in question can be translated as ‘what dripped that became ghee.’

Bearing in mind that all -ya-presents of *C_r* roots (the type *mriyá-^{te}*) have suffix accentuation, regardless of their meaning (passive/non-passive; see Chapter C.II.2.3 and KULIKOV 1997), we can safely restore suffix accentuation in **ghriyá-^{te}*.

Caus. pass.

The causative *ghārāya-^{ti}* (YV^p +) is a ‘two pattern’ verb, constructed either [i] with the accusative of the libation or [ii] with the accusative of the besprinkled objects. The only occurrence of its passive with *ā* (in the TB) belongs to the former type:

(TB 3.3.7.8)

*āghārām āghāryāmānam ānu samārābhya | etāsmīn kālē devāḥ suvargān
lokām āyan*

‘Having taken the libation of butter, which is being poured, the gods went to the heavenly world at that moment.’

Compounds with *vy-ā*, attested in the texts of the YV (MS, KS, KpS, MānŚS), belong to type [ii]_{pass.}, cf.:

(MS 3.8.10:110.15-16 – KpS 40.4:227.15)

yāt ... pratyāñco dhiṣṇyā vyāghāryānte [KpS ms. *vāghārayati*]

‘When ... the dhiṣṇyā-altars are being besprinkled westwards ...’

carⁱ ‘move; perform’: *caryá-^{te}* (*-cārya-^{te}*)

Simplex TS^p 1.7.6.4, ŚB, JB 2.69:4, 10, VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 4.47 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 4.74:7 (?) (CALAND 1928: 188 and 190 [= Kl.Schr., 488 and 490], fn. 1)) +;

+ *abhí* ‘act wrongly towards smb., bewitch’ YV^p, JB, PB 2.10.5 +:

abhicaryá-^{te} YV^p, JB 1.93:7, 2.322:1, 5, PB 2.10.5, Sū.;

abhicārya-^{te} PB 22.17.3, JB 1.248:8 [ed. CALAND §90], KātyŚS 15.2.9 (ed.

VIDYĀDHARA ŚARMĀ (1928) °*cārya*°, ed. WEBER, ed. THITE °*cary*°¹⁹⁹);

¹⁹⁹ In ed. VIDYĀDHARA ŚARMĀ (1936) and ed. RANADE the corresponding sūtra is

- + *pra* JB 2.69:3 (*pra-caryate*, v.l. *pra-cāryate*)
 accented: +
 • pass.

In its primary sense ‘move’, the verb *carⁱ* is intransitive, but passive derivation is possible on the basis of the secondary transitive usage ‘perform’,²⁰⁰ attested in Vedic prose.

The simplex passive occurs only once in the Saṃhitās, but becomes more common in the Brāhmaṇas. Examples are:

(TS 1.7.6.4)

bahú vāi gārhapatyasyānte miśrām iva caryate

‘Within the Gārhapatya much variegated work is performed.’ (KEITH)

(ŚBM 4.6.7.9 ≈ ŚBK 5.8.4.9)

tirá ivedām mithunām caryātai

‘This copulation should be performed secretly.’²⁰¹

(JB 2.69:2-4 [ed. CALAND §128])

*tad yad yajñe stūyate, yac chasyate yat pracaryate,²⁰² sā prajāpates senāsa
 / atha yad vīṇāyām gīyate, yan nṛtyate, yad vṛthā caryate²⁰³, sā mṛtyos
 senāsa*

‘What in the sacrifice is sung [as stotra], what is recited [as śastra], what is performed [as adhvaryu’s task], that were Prajāpati’s army; and what is sung with a vīṇā, what is danced, what is performed uselessly (i.e. without a sacrificial goal), that was the army of Death.’ (a description of the mythical sacrifice performed by Prajāpati and Death)

Like some other verbs employed with the preverb *abhí*, *carⁱ* denotes a hostile activity:²⁰⁴ ‘perform a hostile magic activity (sorcery) against smb., practise *abhicāra*’ (often translated as ‘bewitch’; for details, cf. GONDA 1982b: 28 [= Sel.St. VI/2, 82]). Passives of this compound are well-attested in the YV

omitted.

²⁰⁰ GOTÖ 135, fn. 172: “ein besonderer Gebrauch”.

²⁰¹ That is, ‘not publicly’; see SCHRAPEL 1970: 32 for the meaning of *tirá iva*.

²⁰² V.l. *pracāryate*.

²⁰³ Written in one word (*vṛthācaryate*) both in ed. CALAND and ed. RAGHU VIRA/LOKESH CHANDRA.

²⁰⁴ Cf. HAUDRY 352.

and in two Brāhmaṇas of the Sāmaveda (PB and JB) as well as in the Sūtras. Examples are:

(TS 2.2.3.2)

agnāye yāviṣṭhāya puroḍāśam aṣṭākapālaṃ nīr vaped abhicaryāmāṇaḥ
‘He, against whom witchcraft is practised, should offer a cake on eight
potsherds to Agni, the youngest one.’

(PB 2.10.5)

etām evābhicaryamāṇāya kuryāt
‘This same (viṣṭuti) he should apply for one against whom witchcraft is
being exercised.’ (CALAND)

Beside the regular *-carya-*, we find the stem *abhicārya-* with the long root vowel (in the PB and JB) in the same usage as *abhicarya-^{te}*:

(PB 22.17.3)

abhicāryamāṇaṃ yājayet
‘He should perform (it) [= the sacrifice – LK] for one against whom
abhicāra is being practised.’ (CALAND)

(JB 1.248:8)

kiṃ so ’bhicaret, kiṃ vābhicāryamāṇa ādriyeta
‘Why should he [...] bewitch or mind being bewitched [?]’ (BODEWITZ
1990: 138 and 290f., note 31).

From the formal point of view, this stem might be taken as a passive built to the causative **abhicārayati* (thus OERTEL (1941: 97 [= Kl.Schr. II, 1466], fn. 1), who calls this form “kausativ”), but such an analysis suggests a forced translation (‘the one who is being caused to perform witchcraft’? ‘the one against whom someone is being caused to perform witchcraft’?). Both CALAND and OERTEL correctly translated it as a simple (non-causative) passive.²⁰⁵ The long vowel may have been taken from the noun *abhicārā-* ‘witchcraft, black magic, sorcery’, well-attested as a technical term in the Brāhmaṇas.²⁰⁶ By analogy, the long root vowel could be expanded to some other compounds, cf. *pracāryate* (attested as a variant reading in JB 2.69:3, quoted above).

²⁰⁵ Note also that the supposed causative *abhicārayati* is not attested in Vedic; causative passives (*cāryate*) are post-Vedic (e.g. *uccāryate* ‘is pronounced, uttered’ in PrāṇavU [ed. Adyar Libr., Unpubl. Up.], p. 34, 1.1 (≈ GB 1.1.23:16.8 *ucyate*)).

²⁰⁶ On *abhicāra*, see TÜRSTIG 1985.

ci ‘pile, build, gather’: *cīyá-^{te}*

Simplex YV^m +;
 + *ádhi* ŚB;
 + *sam-ud* VaikhŚS 20.1:298.8;
 + *ví* ‘separate, select’ YV^p
 accented: YV^m +
 • pass.

The passive *cīyá-^{te}* typically refers to piling up the fire place, as in the following examples:

(VS 13.41d)

śatāyusaṃ kṛṇuhi cīyāmānaḥ

‘Give [the sacrificer] hundred years of life, while being built.’

(TS^p 5.2.5.6)

uttaravedīm úpa vapaty, uttaravedyāṃ hy àgníś cīyáte

‘He scatters over the high altar, for on the high altar the fire is piled.’

cṛt ‘bind, tie, snare’: *-cṛtyá-^{te}*

+ *ví* ‘loosen, untie’ AVP 1.70.4 = 19.33.10 (*vi...cṛtyantām* ≈ AVŚ 6.112.3 *ví...muñcantām*), TS^m 7.1.19.1 = ^UKS-Aśvamedha^m 5.1.10:154.3
 accented: TS
 • pass.

The poorly attested passive *-cṛtyá-^{te}* occurs twice in the post-RVic mantras. The earliest attestation is found in the AVP:

(AVP 1.70.4a,c = 19.33.10a,c)

yebhiḥ pāśair didhiṣūpatir vibaddhaḥ [...]

ví te cṛtyantām²⁰⁷ vicṛto hi santi

²⁰⁷ The parallel Śaunakīya passage (6.112.3) has another verb: *ví té mucyantām* [thus ed. VISHVA BANDHU] / *ví te muñcantām* [thus ed. ROTH/WHITNEY] *vimúco hí sánti* ‘let them be released, since they are releasers’. The former reading, with the -ya-present *-mucyantām*, appears to be more likely.

‘Let the bonds be untied, with which the husband of a *didhiṣū*-woman²⁰⁸ is bound; for these are releasers.’²⁰⁹

(TS^m 7.1.19.1 = ^UKS-Aśvamedha^m 5.1.10:154.3)

vicṛtyāmānāya svāhā

‘To the one being untied hail!’

jīv ‘live’: *-jīvyá-*^{te}

+ *úpa* ‘live upon’ ŚB 7.5.2.34

accented: +

• pass.

The fundamentally intransitive verb *jīv* can be passivized in some compounds with preverbs (cf. Chapter C.II.1.3.2). The only attestation of this passive occurs in the ŚB:

(ŚB 7.5.2.34)

imé vái lokāḥ sarirām upajīvyāmānam eṣú lokéṣu

‘The sea, which is being lived upon (i.e. which is the source of life) in these worlds is, verily, these worlds here.’

jñā ‘know, recognize, distinguish’: *jñāyá-*^{te}

Simplex KB 8.9.23 [ed. LINDNER 8.8] +;

+ *nír* KB 18.4.13 [ed. LINDNER 18.5], ŚBK 5.1.2.8 (*nír-jñāyate* ≈ ŚB 4.1.2.13 *úpa...khyāyate*), JB 1.341:4; + *vi-nír* ŚB 14.7.1.5 (= BĀU 4.3.5);

+ *prá* TS^p 6.3.4.8, ⁺KS^p 8.1:82.12²¹⁰ = KpS^p 6.6:63.21 +;

+ *ví* RV 4.51.6, KS^p 6.2:50.11 (*vi-jñāyete*, v.l. *vi-jñāyate*) = KpS^p

²⁰⁸ A remarried widow or an older sister married before the younger one(s).

²⁰⁹ For this invocation and the corresponding rite, see GONDA 1985a: 98f.

²¹⁰ KS, ed. VON SCHROEDER *prājñāyanta*; read with the KpS *prājñāyanta* (conjecture by RAGHU VIRA, ed. KpS, Introd., p. 27 and ad loc.; VWC-Saṃh. IV, 2122, fn. k; see also MITTWEDE 1989 [Textkr. zur KS]: 61).

4.1:37.3 (ms. *vi-jñāyate*, ed. RAGHU VIRA ⁺*vi-jñāyete*) +;²¹¹
 + *sám* ⁺AV 20.129.12 (ed. ¹ROTH/WHITNEY ⁺*sám jñāyate*, ed. VISHVA
 BANDHU *sághāghate*)

accented:

jñāyá- TS 6.3.4.8, ŚB 4.5.3.1;

-jñāya- ŚB (BĀU):

ŚB 14.9.1.10 *vi-jñāyate* (mss. AM., see ed. WEBER crit.app.; ed.
 WEBER ⁺*vi-jñāyate* (≈ BĀUM 6.1.10, ed. BÖHTLINGK *vi-jñāyáte*)),

ŚB 14.7.1.5 *vi-nir-jñāyate* (thus ed. WEBER) (≈ BĀU 4.3.5, ed.
 BÖHTLINGK *vi-jñāyate*)²¹²

• agentless pass.

pass. of caus.: -jñāpyá-^{te}

+ *sám* ‘slaughter’ (lit.: ‘make agree, pacify’) [of a sacrificial animal] ŚB,
 TB 3.9.6.1 +

accented: +

The passive *jñāyá-^{te}* is attested in the agentless passive usages, typical for
 -yá-passives of the verbs of perception and knowledge (cf. Chapter A.II.2.2.2).
 The only simplex occurrence appears in the Brāhmaṇas:

(KB 8.9.23 [ed. LINDNER 8.8])

te vā ubhe eva rūpe yaj jñāyete

‘Since only these both symbols are recognized...’

By contrast, compounds are attested from the late RV onwards.
 Examples are:

- with *prá*:

(TS 6.3.4.8)

*yád yūpam minóti, suvargásya lokásya prájñātyai. purástān minoti,
 purástād dhí yajñásya prajñāyáte*

‘In that he sets up the sacrificial post, [it is] to recognize the heavenly
 world. He puts [it] up to the east [of the fire], for before the sacrifice it is

²¹¹ On the usage of this compound (in the collocation (*iti*) *vi-jñāya(n)te*) in the KauśS,
 “to refer to Śruti sources”, see GRIFFITHS 2004b: 49, fn. 1.

²¹² For these and a few other cases of the irregular root accentuation in -yá-passives
 attested in the late Upaniṣadic part of the ŚB (= BĀU), see Chapter C.II.3.8.

recognized.²¹³

(ŚB 4.5.1.3)

vācā hí mugdhām prajñāyáte

‘... for by speech becomes known what is confused.’

- with *ví*:

(RV 4.51.6cd)

śúbham yác chubhrā uśásaś cáranti ' ná ví jñāyante sadṛśīr ajuryāḥ

‘When the splendid dawns go splendidly, they cannot be distinguished (from each other),²¹⁴ looking alike, unaging.’

- with *vi-nír*:

(ŚB 14.7.1.5 (= BĀU 4.3.5))

tásmād vái, samrāḍ, ápi yátra sváḥ pāñīr ná vinirjñāyáté,²¹⁵ 'tha yátra vāg uccáraty, úpaivá táttra ny²¹⁶ èti

‘Therefore, verily, O Supreme King, where even one’s [own] hand cannot be discerned, when a voice rises, then one goes towards it.’

- with *sám*:

(AV 20.129.11-12)

[11] *ayám ihāgato árvā*

[12] *sá íc chaknā sám jñāyate²¹⁷*

‘This stallion has come here; only he is known together with power.’²¹⁸

²¹³ *purástāt* is employed in two different senses in this passage, ‘to the east’ and ‘before’ (cf. KEITH 1914 [TS transl., ad loc.]: 519, fn. 4). The passive *prajñāyáte* semantically belongs together with *prajñātyai* of the preceding sentence, and *prá* may emphasize the meaning ‘before’. KEITH translated this form as ‘is proclaimed’ (perhaps, in order to render the meaning of *prá*).

²¹⁴ *ví* expresses here the reciprocal meaning; see KULIKOV 2007a: 716ff.

²¹⁵ Thus ed. WEBER; BĀUM, ed. BÖHTLINGK reads *ví-jñāyate*.

²¹⁶ BĀU *ny°*.

²¹⁷ I follow the reading adopted in ed. ¹ROTH/WHITNEY. Ed. VISHVA BANDHU reads with mss. *sá íc chákaṁ sághāghate*, which makes no sense.

²¹⁸ I.e., ≈ ‘only he is identified with power’; *sám* (on the assumption that ROTH/WHITNEY’s conjecture is correct) is likely to express the meaning opposite to *ví* in *ví-jñāyate* ‘is distinguished from smth.’.

Other passives

Alongside with the -yá-passives and the -i-aorist (RV 6.65.1 *ājñāyi*, see KÜMMEL 1996: 47f.), the middle present participle *jānāna-* is attested in the passive usage (in the JB):

(JB 2.204:10-11)

*tad yad ete pratilomā[h] stomā bhavanti, nihnavānā evaitad apavijānānāh
punar arvāñca[h] stomā āyanti*

‘Then, if these irregular stomas (prayers) come to being, these stomas, being amended and thus recognizable, come hither again.’

(JB 2.110:3)

⁺*diśo* ⁺*prajānānās*.²¹⁹ *te akāmayanta: diśaḥ prajānīyāmeti*

‘The quarters were undistinguished. They wished: “Let us distinguish quarters”.’

Caus. pass.

Passives of the causative *sam-jñapáyati* ‘kill, slaughter’²²⁰ are attested from the Brāhmaṇas onwards. An example is:

(ŚB 3.7.4.9)

idāṃ vāi paśóḥ samjñapyámānasya prāṇó vātam āpi padyate

‘Verily, the breath of the victim which is being slain passes into the wind.’

***jyut* ‘shine’**

pass. of caus.: -*jyotyá-*^{te}

+ *áva* ‘light up’ ŚB 11.5.3.2, 11.5.3.5 (≈ GB -*javālya-*^{te})

accented: +

The passive built of the causative *jyotáyati* occurs only in the ŚB:

²¹⁹ Conjectures by HOFFMANN (1960a: 15f. [= Aufs. 1, 91f.]); see also EHLERS 25.

²²⁰ Originally, ‘make agree’ (see JAMISON 172) → ‘pacify’, euphemistically used to refer to killing sacrificial animals which ought not to be led forcibly to their death but made to resign themselves. Cf. also *ā-labh* ‘id.’, q.v. For these and other euphemistic verbs of killing, see OERTEL 1926: 282; 1942: 6ff. [= Kl.Schr. II, 1506ff.]; MINARD 1949: 80, [§]221, fn. a.

(ŚB 11.5.3.2)

sá hovāca: gāutama, ká te 'gnihotrí? [...] kím duhyámānam? [...] kím avajyotyámānam?

'He said: "O Gautama! What is your Agnihotra cow like? [...] What is [the milk] like when being obtained by milking? [...] What is [the milk] like when being lighted up?"'

¹*tan*⁽ⁱ⁾ 'stretch': *tāyá-te* (VS also *-tāyyá-*)
(*tanya-te* late Up. +; *-tāya-* ĀpŚS)

α 'stretch, spread, extend':

+ *ā* AVŚ 10.2.17 = AVP-Or. 16.60.6ab (= AVP-Kashm. 16.60.5ab);

+ *abhy-áva* ŚB 2.3.3.7;

+ *pra* ChU 8.6.2^{2x};

+ *ví* TB 1.4.6.1, PB 10.5.6, JB 1.84:12;

+ *sám* 'be extended so as to form a continuity, propagate' VS 39.5 (*santāyyámāne*), TB 3.2.4.1, PB 8.4.10, JB, VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 4.47 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 4.38^{7x} (CALAND 1928: 150f. [= Kl.Schr., 450f.]))

β 'perform, accomplish [a rite, sacrifice]':

Simplex RV 1.110.1, 10.17.7 + ;

+ *prá* PB 23.2.2, JB 3.6:10, AĀ 2.1.5, TĀ 2.10.1 (= Kāṭh-Saṃk. p. 78. 1.5-6 [Svādhyāya-Br. 10]), 2.13.1 [ed. MALAMOUD 2.13.3] +;

+ *ví* AV 17.1.18

accented: RV+

• pass., (anticaus.)

Evidence for the phonological type (seṭ/aniṭ) of the PIE source of the Vedic root ¹*tan* is controversial. Forms like adj. *uttāná*-²²¹ (< **ud-tṇH-nó*-, see BEEKES 1982/83: 206f., fn. 2; 1985), pass. *tāyáte*, point to the final laryngeal (**tenH*-).²²² Some others (which make up the majority of attested formations), such as *-ta*-participle *tatá*-, caus. *tānáyati* AV, pres. *tanóti*, etc., belong to the

²²¹ For the meaning, see FALK 1994a: 7ff.

²²² For the explanation of *tāyáte* as going back to **tṇ-h₁-ié/ó*- (RASMUSSEN, HARÐARSON, KÜMMEL in LIV 627), see Chapter A.I.1.2.3.

aniṭ type.²²³ Both analyses can be supported by evidence from other Indo-European languages (see BEEKES, op.cit.; MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 619; LIV 626f., with note 1). The aniṭ analysis prevails in IE and, especially, Sanskrit studies.²²⁴ Accordingly, the seṭ passive *tāyá-^{te}* (RV +) is usually explained as derived from the quasi-root *tā*, extracted from forms like *uttāná-²²⁵* (thus, e.g., already BRUGMANN 1879b: 210f.).²²⁶

The present *tanó-^{ti}* and other derivatives of the root ¹*tan* occur in two main usages: (α) ‘stretch, extend, propagate’ (metaphorically also said of light, rays, offspring), and (β) ‘perform, accomplish [a rite, sacrifice]’. Examples are:²²⁷

²²³ The post-Vedic stem variant *tanya-*, taught by grammarians (Pāṇ. 6.4.44) as the preferred variant beside the marginal *tāya-* (see KIPARSKY 1979: 137f.; cf. also s.v. *khan*), attested e.g. in late Upaniṣads (for instance, at Mahā-Up. 4.47, 49, 50; Cūlikā-Up. 4 [ed. WEBER (1865a: 12)]; cf. also WERBA [VIA I] 348), is a secondary and very late formation and has no significance for the Indo-European reconstruction.

Another secondary passive stem, *-tatyā-*, occurs once in the Sūtras (*vitatyamānam* ĀpŚS 12.12.13 ‘[the strainer] being stretched’). CALAND (1902b: 552 [= Kl.Schr., 87]) conjectures ⁺*vitanyamānam*, but, as just pointed out, the stem *tanya-* is very late and can hardly underlie the actually attested reading (cf. OERTEL 1931: 289 [= Kl.Schr. I, 596]). GARBE (1896: 36) saw here the influence of the *-ta*-participle *vitata-*, attested in the same sūtra. In my view, the secondary root *tat* should rather be explained as extracted from the absolutive *vi-tatyā* (reanalyzed as *vi-tat-ya*), which is frequent in the ĀpŚS.

²²⁴ Thus, e.g., MAYRHOFER in EWAia, hesitantly in 1988, s.v. *uttāná-* (“Seṭ-Bildungen von **ten-* sind nicht zweifelhaft, wiewohl aia. *TAN¹* vorwiegend Aniṭ-Charakter hat”, EWAia I, 213), more negatively in 1990, s.v. *TAN¹* (“Seṭ-Nebenformen sind selten ..., vielfach nur scheinbar”, EWAia I, 619); see also LIV 626f.

²²⁵ According to GOTÖ (1996a: 3), originally an action nominal (‘Aufspannung, Aufdehnung’), interpreted as a verbal adjective.

²²⁶ According to BRUGMANN (1879a: 275ff.), *tan* and *tā* are root variants (“doppelwurzel” *tan* // *tā*), and the *ā* variant was created in analogy with pairs like *gam* // *gā*, *jan* // *jā* (as in *jāyate*), etc.

²²⁷ Here I am primarily concerned with forms belonging to the present system. Perfect forms most often occur in non-passive intransitive (anticausative) usages, regardless of the diathesis, as in:

(RV 6.12.1d)

dūrāt sūryo ná śociṣā tatāna

‘From afar [Agni] has stretched, like the sun, with [his] flame.’

For details, see KULIKOV 1999b: 27f.; KÜMMEL 2000: 208ff.; HETTRICH 2007: 64ff.

(RV 6.59.7ab)

... *ā hí tanvaté ' náro dhánvāni bāh_vóḥ*
 '... since the men string bows in their arms.'

(RV 1.170.4cd)

tātrāmṛtasya cétanam ' yajñām te tanavāvahai
 'There we will both perform the remarkable sacrifice for you, the immortal one.'

The latter use is secondary, probably relying upon the image of a sacrifice regarded as a stretched web which is being woven.²²⁸ The following Kāthaka passage nicely illustrates this parallelism:

(KS^P 26.6:129.14-15 = KpS^P 41.4:239.22-23)

yathā vai mayūkhāt tantraṃ tāyata, evam ato yajñas tāyate
 'Like the thread is being stretched from the peg, so the sacrifice is being performed from here.'²²⁹

There may also be a more straightforward (and less poetic) account for the secondary usage β. As MINKOWSKI (1991: 25) explains, in several rites the sacrificial enclosure is expanded by moving the *āhavanīya* (sacrificial fire), to include a larger area. Given this explanation, it hardly makes sense to insist on a clear-cut opposition between usages α and β. Nevertheless, I will try to formulate some rough correlations between the usage and types of compounds, at least for -yá-passives.

The passive *tāyá^{-te}* is most common in the secondary usage β '[the rite] is performed'. Here belong all of its mantra attestations (except for one occurrence in the AV), cf.:

(RV 1.110.1a)

tatām me āpas tād u tāyate púnah
 'My [poetic] work is performed, and it is being performed again.'²³⁰

(RV 10.17.7ab)

sárasvatīm devayánto havante ' sárasvatīm adhvaré tāyámāne
 'The ones longing for gods call Sarasvatī; [they call] Sarasvatī when the

²²⁸ On this metaphor see, for instance, GELDNER 1889 [VSt I]: 147; LINDENAU 1925: 266; MINARD 1956: 55, [§]131, fn. a; GONDA 1963: 197; OGUIBÉNINE 1988: 134.

²²⁹ On this passage, see RAU 1971b: 20.

²³⁰ GONDA (1963: 197): 'my work has-been-undertaken-and-is-continued.'

ritual is being performed.'

(AV 10.8.10cd)

yáyā yajñāḥ prāñ tāyāte ' tāṃ tvā pṛcchāmi katamā́ sá ṛcām

'I am asking you: which one of the stanzas is that with which the sacrifice is extended forward?'

The primary usage α 'stretch', rare with passives, occurs only in compounds.²³¹ Examples are:

1) with *ā́*:

(AVŚ 10.2.17ab \approx AVP-Or. 16.60.6ab (= AVP-Kashm. 16.60.5ab))

kó 'smin réto nṃ ā́dadhāt ' tántur ā́ tāyatām íti

'Who put in him (sc. man) semen, saying "let his line be extended"?' (WHITNEY)²³²

2) with *abhy-áva*:

(ŚB 2.3.3.7)

tāsyemāḥ sárvāḥ prajā́ raśmībhiḥ prāṇéṣv abhíhitās, tásmād u raśmāyaḥ prāṇān abhyávatāyante

'It is by the rays²³³ of that [sun] that all these creatures are attached to the vital airs (breaths of life), and therefore rays are extended down to the vital airs.'

3) The compound with *pra* is generally employed in usage β and occurs only twice (in a ChU passage) in the sense 'stretch':

(ChU 8.6.2)

amuṣmād ādityāt pratāyante, tā́²³⁴ āsu nāḍīṣu śṛptāḥ

'From yonder sun they [sc. the rays] are extended, creeping into these channels.'

4) The only occurrence with the preverb *ví* attested in the mantras (AV 17.1.18 *ví tāyate*) belongs to type β ('[the sacrifice] is performed [for you, O Indra]'), but in the Brāhmaṇas this compound occurs only in the primary usage

²³¹ In KS 26.6 *tantram tāyate* 'the thread is being spread', quoted above, the simplex passive in the usage α could be triggered by the adjacent *yajñas tāyate* (type β).

²³² See also GONDA 1965: 313.

²³³ Or: reins, thongs (EGGELING).

²³⁴ Ed. BÖHTLINGK, ed. SENART, ed. MORGENROTH *ta* (sandhi form for *te*).

α (although the semantic connection with β is obvious in many cases), cf.:

(TB 1.4.6.1)

prajā́patir vá eṣá ví tā́yate

‘This Prajāpati is being extended²³⁵ [as a sacrifice].’

(JB 1.84:12)

devapā́śā vā ete ví tā́yante, yad dhiṣṇyā agnayo vihriyante

‘When the Dhiṣṇyā fires are disposed, they are extended as divine (i.e. symbolic or magic) snares.’

5) Compounds with *sám*, meaning ‘be extended so as to form a continuity, propagate’, can be taken either as passives or as anticausatives. Examples are:

(TB 3.2.4.1)

yajñāsya vái sám̐tatim ánu prajā́ḥ paśávo yájamānasya sám̐ tā́yante

‘Verily, it is in consequence of the continuity of the sacrifice that the offspring and cattle of the sacrificer continuously propagate.’

(JB 1.111:8-9 = 3.119:15)

sam asmā ime lokās tā́yante, ya evaṃ veda

‘For him who knows thus these [three] worlds form a continuity.’²³⁶

The only attestation of this compound is in the mantra language (VS) reveals the irregular stem *-tā́yyá-*:

(VS 39.5)

maitráḥ śárasī saṃtā́yyámāne

‘[The oblation is offered] to Mitra, when the milk’s skin is spreading’.

The stem *-tā́yyá-* could only be derived from the secondary root variant *tā́y* (cf. WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]: 62). Most likely, this stem is a nonce formation built in analogy with the causative passive *-pyā́yyámāna-* (see below, s.v. *pyā́*), which is also attested only in the VS (also as a participle and with a preverb).

***-i*-aorist**

The medio-passive *-i*-aorist *prātā́yi* (not mentioned in KÜMMEL 1996), derived from the secondary root variant *tā́*, is attested only once, in the AĀ. It

²³⁵ Glossed by Sāyaṇa as *vistā́ryate*.

²³⁶ I.e. the way to heaven is open after death; see BODEWITZ 1990: 64, 238, note 9.

must be conditioned by the adjacent -ya-present (probably passive) *prātāyata*. Both forms are employed for an “etymological explanation” of *prātar* ‘early in the morning’:²³⁷

(AĀ 2.1.5)

taṃ devāḥ prāṇayanta. sa praṇītaḥ prātāyata. prātāyītūṃ3. tat prātar abhavat

‘The gods led him (sc. the *prāṇa* = the out-breathing breath) forward / to the east. Having been led forward / to the east, he was extended²³⁸ [forth / further to the east]. [The gods said:] He has extended [forth / further to the east]. Then it became early in the morning.’²³⁹

The root variant *tā*, probably extracted from the passive *tāyá-te* (WACKERNAGEL 1935-1937: 827 [= Kl.Schr. I, 409]), is also attested in 3sg.pf.med. *tate* (RV 1.83.5). This form is built on the model *pā* ‘drink’ – *pape*, replacing the regular form *tame* (attested in RV 10.130.2); see BEEKES 1985: 48. Yet another form based on this secondary root is the periphrastic perfect *anusamītāyayāṃ cakre* ‘he has extended’ (JB 3.177:5; see OERTEL 1934: 157 [= Kl.Schr. I, 318], FRENZ 18).²⁴⁰

tuj ‘set in (vehement) motion, put to panic (flight)’: *tujyá-te*

Simplex RV 1.11.5, 1.84.17, (1.61.14 *tujete*, for **tuj[y]ete* ?)

accented: +

• pass.

The verb *tuj* is attested only in the RV. Athematic nasal presents (*tuñjáte*, *tuñjāná-*, etc.) are employed transitively (‘set in (vehement) motion’), while the thematic participle (*tuñjamāna-* RV 3.1.16, a hapax) and thematic class VI presents (only in the active participle *tujánt-*) are intransitive (JOACHIM 84f.); cf.:

²³⁷ Cf. GONDA 1959: 236.

²³⁸ Or: he extended (non-passive?).

²³⁹ I am much indebted to W. KNOBL for discussing with me the interpretation of this passage.

²⁴⁰ Also in periphrastic fut. *tāyitā*, abs. *-tāya* (both in the BhāgP); see MEIER 1931: 55.

(RV 9.87.6d)

rayīm tūñjāno abhí vājān arṣa

‘Setting the wealth in motion, flow to the prize [in race].’

(RV 1.61.6)

*asmā́ id u tvāṣṭā takṣad vājram [...]**vṛtrāsya cid vidād yēna mārma tujān [...] tujatā́*‘Tvaṣṭar fashioned for him (sc. Indra) the vajra, with which he, moving vehemently, found Vṛtra’s mortal spot, with [the vajra], moving vehemently.’²⁴¹

Furthermore, the intransitive usage is attested for the *-áya*-present (participle *tujáyant-* RV 7.104.7, probably a nonce formation, see JAMISON 58) and perfect middle participles (9x); for a general survey of the IVS, see now KÜMMEL 2000: 221f.; PLATH 2000.

The present *tujyá-^{te}* is attested in the passive usage. In contrast to the non-passive intransitive participles *tujánt-*, *tútujāna-*, typically functioning as epithets of Indra, the passive *tujyá-^{te}* is constructed with the subject of gods or other beings terrified by Indra and fleeing in panic (cf. RENOU 1958: 64f.). This passive twice occurs in maṇḍala I of the RV:

(RV 1.84.17ab)

ká īṣate tujyáte kó bibhāya ' kó maṁsate sántam índram kó ánti

‘Who flees, [who] is put to panic flight, who becomes scared? Who believes Indra to exist, who [believes him to be] near?’

(RV 1.11.5cd)

tuvām devā́ ábibhyuṣas ' tujyámānāsa āviṣuḥ‘The gods helped you (sc. Indra), being put to flight because of/from [you], the fearless one.’²⁴²

²⁴¹ The exact meaning of this present is not unproblematic. PLATH (2000: 412) renders it as ‘vorandringen’, GELDNER has ‘losfahren’, ELIZARENKOVA – ‘нападать’ [‘attack’] (intransitive?). This and, perhaps, some other occurrences of *tujá-^{ti}*, traditionally translated intransitively, could also be taken as objectless transitives, i.e.: ‘[Indra], putting [everybody] to panic flight’, or: ‘throwing [the vajra], ... with [the vajra] that puts [everybody] to panic flight’, etc. JAMISON’s (2007: 62) recent translation seems to follow this latter opportunity: ‘he thrust with the thrusting (mace)’; cf. also DÖYAMA in WITZEL et al. 2007: 114: ‘... indem er als Herrscher mit dem vorwärtsstoßenden (Vajra) (ihn) vorwärtsstößt’.

²⁴² For a discussion of the syntactically difficult *ábibhyuṣas*, see OLDENBERG, *Noten*

These two occurrences are often translated as non-passives²⁴³ and quoted by scholars among parade examples of the non-passive usage of Vedic -yá-passives.²⁴⁴ I see no good reasons to treat these occurrences differently from prototypical passives. Although the agent is not overtly expressed in both passages, it cannot be anyone but Indra. In my view, the correct translation of *tujyá-^{te}* is ‘be terrified, put to panic flight [by Indra]’.²⁴⁵

Beside -yá-passives, we find one more form attested in precisely the same usage (also expressing the fear caused by Indra), namely the thematic middle present *tujete*:

(RV 1.61.14ab)

asyéd u bhiyá giráyaś ca dṛṣṭhā́ dyāvā ca bhūmā janúśas tujete

‘Because of the fear of his (sc. Indra’s) birth, both firm mountains and heaven and earth are put to panic.’

Most scholars offered non-passive translations.²⁴⁶ However, the undoubted parallelism between this occurrence and the usage of pass. *tujyá-^{te}* was noticed

ad loc. and ELIZARENKOVA 1989: 550. I essentially follow RENOU (EVP XVII, 8) and ELIZARENKOVA, taking *ábibhyuśas* as an epithet of Indra, contra GELDNER (‘Dir haben die Götter beigestanden vor dem Furchtlosen [= Vala] erschreckend’). In my view, however, this noun can hardly be a passive agent (thus LUDWIG (1876 [RV übers.]: II, 11): ‘... die weggeschlagen wurden von dem, der sich nicht fürchtete’; RENOU: ‘pressés par le dieu sans peur’; ELIZARENKOVA: ‘(Тобой) бесстрашным вдохновляемые’), since the ablative is unusual in this function. Rather this is an *abl. causae* or an *abl. separativus*: ‘go away from smth./smb.’

²⁴³ For RV 1.84.17, cf. BENFEY 1864: 246: ‘Wer flieht, wer **zittert**, fürchtet ...?’; GELDNER: ‘Wer weicht, (wer) **flieht**, wer hat Furcht?’; ELIZARENKOVA: ‘Кто бросается прочь, **мучается** [suffers]? Кто боится?’ (which is still further from the basic meaning of *tuj*). Passive translations are given by LUDWIG (1876 [RV übers.]: II, 28) (‘wer ... **wird geschädigt**...?’); RENOU (‘(qui) **est harcelé**’, EVP XVII, 33); ETTER (1985) (‘(wer) **wird gestoßen**’, on p. 67; ‘(wer) **wird vertrieben**’ on p. 137); DŌYAMA in WITZEL et al. 2007: 150 (‘(wer) **wird vorgestoßen**’).

²⁴⁴ Cf. e.g. GONDA 1951: 48 and, recently, PLATH 1997.

²⁴⁵ Rather than GONDA’s (1976b: 226; 1979: 84) ‘to flee frightened’.

²⁴⁶ Cf. BENFEY (1862: 585): ‘aus Furcht vor ihm bebten die festen Berge ...’; LUDWIG (1876 [RV übers.]: II, 20): ‘erleiden einen stosz’; BERGAIGNE (1894: 22): ‘s’ ébranlent’; GELDNER: ‘fahren ... erschrocken zusammen’; ELIZARENKOVA: ‘дрожат’; DŌYAMA in WITZEL et al. 2007: 115: ‘stoßen sich’.

already by RENO (1958: 64f.).²⁴⁷ Note, incidentally, that all three occurrences are met in maṇḍala I. However, the passive usage is extremely unusual for class VI presents (this would be the only RVic example) and, furthermore, the present *tujá-^{ti}* is unattested with middle inflection elsewhere. Most probably, the form *tujete* can be explained phonologically, as a replacement of the original **tujyete* (see PLATH 2000: 417; KÜMMEL in LIV 286, note 4),²⁴⁸ resulting from the loss of *y* after a palatal before *e* (see Chapter C.IV.1 and KULIKOV 2005a: 305 for a discussion of this process).

tṛh ‘crush, shatter, kill’: *tṛhyá-^{te}*

Simplex AV 10.4.18

• pass.

pass. of recipr. ‘shatter, kill each other’:

Simplex (with *mitháh*) AVŚ 5.17.7 (*tṛhyánte*, v.ll. *tṛhyáte*, *nṛtyánte*, *nūhyante* ≈ AVP 9.15.7 *hanyante*);

+ *ví* AV 1.28.4

accented: AVŚ 5.17.7

The present *tṛhyá-^{te}* occurs only in the AV. One of the occurrences is an ordinary passive, which does not require any comments:

(AVŚ 10.4.18cd ≈ AVP 16.16.8cd)

téṣām u²⁴⁹ tṛhyámāñānāṃ ' káḥ svit téṣām asad rásaḥ

‘When they (sc. snakes) are being crushed, what sap, verily, will remain of them?’

The two other occurrences deserve a special discussion. Consider the relevant passages, together with WHITNEY’s translations:

²⁴⁷ RENO (1958: 64f.) translated, hesitantly: “se laissent enfoncer” (‘se reploient ou fuient’?); a different (and, in my opinion, less exact) translation is offered in EVP XVII, 25: ‘s’agitent’. Cf. also JAMISON (2007: 63): ‘in fear of his birth both the firmly fixed mountains and heaven and earth stay thrust together’.

²⁴⁸ HILL’s (2007: 167f.) objections against this analysis are unconvincing.

²⁴⁹ AVP *teṣām vas*.

(AV 1.28.4)

putráṃ attu yātudhānīḥ ' svāsāram utá naptiṃyām
ádḥā mithó vikeśyò3 ' ví ghnatām yātudhānīyò3 ' ví tṛhyantām arāyiyàḥ
 'Let the sorceress eat [her own] son, sister, and daughter (?); then let the
 horrid-haired sorceresses mutually destroy one another; let the hags **be**
shattered asunder.' (WHITNEY)

(AVŚ 5.17.7 ≈ AVP 9.15.7)

yé gárbhā avapādyante ' jágad yác cāpalupyáte
vīrá yé tṛhyānte [AVP hanyante] mithó ' brahmajāyā hinasti tāt
 'What embryos are aborted, what leaving creatures are torn away,²⁵⁰ what
 heroes **are mutually shattered** – them the Brahman's wife injures.'
 (WHITNEY)²⁵¹

mithó ... ví ghnatām in AV 1.28.4, exemplifying the reciprocal usage of compounds with the preverb *ví* and middle non-singular (dual or plural) endings (see Chapter A.II.2.6 for details and examples), is rightly translated by WHITNEY as 'let [the sorceresses] mutually destroy one another'. Although *ví* can also be used in several other meanings, such as '[split] in parts, asunder' etc., the co-occurrence of *ví* and *mitháḥ* (which cannot mean anything but 'mutually') leaves no doubt that *ví* is yet another marker of reciprocity; thus, the reciprocal meaning is expressed twice in this sentence (probably for emphasis). In my opinion, the reciprocal context of pādas cd strongly imposes a reciprocal interpretation of the verbal form in pāda e, misunderstood by WHITNEY ('let [the hags] be shattered asunder'). The stanza in question is a counter magic spell which must cause the hostile forces to destroy each other, in particular, by eating their relatives (pādas ab), by killing one another (pādas cd) and, finally, by shattering each other (pāda d). This interpretation immediately raises the question as to how the reciprocal (*ví*) and passive (-yá-) functions are related to each other. Since a reciprocal of passive is impossible by definition (only transitives can be reciprocalized), it must be the passive of a reciprocal, and the form *ví tṛhyantām* is to be translated as 'let them be shattered (killed) by each other'.

The 'reciprocal passive' interpretation of *ví tṛhyantām* is supported by *tṛhyānte mitháḥ* in AVŚ 5.17.7 (*hanyante mitháḥ* in the parallel Paippalāda

²⁵⁰ Or rather: 'what leaving creatures get disposed of'. HILL's (2007: 66ff.) translation of this present as 'geraubt werden' is implausible.

²⁵¹ For this passage, see also Chapter B.III, s.v. *lup*.

passage 9.15.7), where the reciprocal (*mitháḥ*) and passive (*-ya-*) markers co-occur again, and the pāda in question should be translated as ‘which heroes are shattered/killed by each other’ (which, in my opinion, is a more exact translation of the Vedic construction than WHITNEY’s ‘what heroes are mutually shattered’).²⁵²

dad ‘hold, keep, offer’: *-dadyá-^{te}*

+ *úpa* RV 6.49.13

accented: RV

• pass.

The secondary root *dad* is extracted from the reduplicated present or perfect of ¹*dā* ‘give’ (cf. 1sg.med. pres. *dade* and 3sg.pf. *dadé*).²⁵³ Synchronically, forms derived from *dad* (class I pr. *dáda-^{te}* ‘holds’ RV +) do not belong to the IVS of the source root ¹*dā*.²⁵⁴ The passive *-dadyá-^{te}* is a RVic hapax.²⁵⁵

(RV 6.49.13cd)

tásya te śármann upadadyámāne ‘*rāyā madema tan_uvā tánā ca*

‘Under this protection, which is being offered by you, may we ourselves and [our] offspring enjoy the wealth.’

²⁵² For a discussion of the reciprocal verbs with the preverb *ví* in Vedic, see KULIKOV 2002; 2007a: 716ff. Here it will be in place to mention that the reciprocal meaning can be combined not only with passives, but also with causatives, as in:

(AVP 2.58.1cd)

vidveṣaṇam kilāśitha ‘⁺*yathainau vṛy adidviṣaḥ*

‘You (sc. the magic tool) were indeed [a tool] which produces mutual hatred, since you **made** both of them (sc. two cows and draught-animals) **hate each other**’ (cf. HOFFMANN (1976c: 567): ‘weil du die beiden hast sich verfeinden lassen’).

²⁵³ See GOTŌ 171f.

²⁵⁴ See WACKERNAGEL 1942: 163f. [= Kl.Schr. I, 379f.]; JOACHIM 91ff.; GOTŌ 171f.; MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 715.

²⁵⁵ See GOTŌ 172, fn. 282.

¹*dā* ‘give’: *dīyá-^{te}*

Simplex AV +;

+ *ā* ‘take’ (AV 12.5.15 (?)),²⁵⁶ MS^p 4.8.4^{2x}:111.15, 16, KS^p 10.5:129.16, 25.6:109.20 = KpS^p 39.4:215.20, ŚB 14.4.2.22 (= BĀUM 1.4.22 = BĀUK 1.4.10) +;

+ *pārā* SV 1.291 [= 1.3.2.5.9] (*pārā...dīyase* ≈ RV 8.1.5 *pārā...deyām*);

+ *prā* AV, YV^p,²⁵⁷ JB 2.1:11 +;

āpunardīyamāna- ‘not being given back’ AV 12.5.44

accented: AV +

• pass.

pass. of desid.: *-ditsya-^{te}*:

+ *ā* JB 3.117:3 [ed. CALAND §185]

pass. of caus.: *dāpya-^{te}*

Simplex NārSmṛ. 19.26 (*dāpyamāna-* ‘being caused to pay’)

pass. of quasi-denom. [*ādi-* ⇒ *ā-datte* ‘perform ādi’]:

ādīyate JB 1.112:8

The passive *dīyá-^{te}* is attested from the AV onwards, but the early age of the corresponding passive aorist (*a*)*dāyi* (RV +; see KÜMMEL 1996: 51f.) suggests that it can be dated as early as the language of the RV. An example is:

(AV 9.5.10cd)

pāñcaudano brahmāṇe dīyāmāno ‘*viśvārūpā dhenúḥ kāmādúghāsy ékā*
‘Being given together with five rice dishes to a Brahman, you are a single
splendid milch-cow,’²⁵⁸ fulfilling wishes.’

Passives of the compound *ā-dā* ‘take’ are attested in Saṃhitā prose and in the BĀU (1×), but do not occur in the Brāhmaṇas proper. An example is:

²⁵⁶ For this occurrence, which probably belongs with ^{3/4}*dā* ‘destroy, cut’, see Chapter VI, s.v.

²⁵⁷ Note the difference between the readings attested in three Saṃhitās of the YV: KS^p 28.6:161.10 *pra-dīyamānānām* ‘[when pieces of cattle are] being given away’ ≈ KpS^p 44.6:262.20, ed. RAGHU VIRA *pra-dīya*^o [ms. *pra-vīrya*^o, probably ms. error for *pra-dīya*^o] ≈ MS^p 4.6.9:93.5 *pra-dhīyā*^o; for this passage, see GONDA 1969: 35.

²⁵⁸ For the meaning of *viśvārūpa-*, see BODEWITZ 1985: 15ff., with fn. 42.

(ŚB 14.4.2.22 (= BĀUM 1.4.22 = BĀUK 1.4.10))

yáthā ha vái bahávaḥ paśávo manuṣyàṇi bhuñjyúr, evám ekáikaḥ púruṣo devān bhunakti. ékasminn evá paśáv ādīyámāné, 'priyaṃ bhávati

‘Verily, as many animals would be of service for man, even so each single person serves the gods. Even if one animal is taken [away], it is not pleasant.’

ādīyate in JB 1.112:8 is a passive of the quasi-denominative ‘perform ādi (the opening part of a sāman)’; for this class of verbs, see Appendix II.

Another compound worthy of a short discussion is SV *pārā ... dīyase*:

(SV 1.291 [= 1.3.2.5.9])

mahé caná tvādrivaḥ ' pārā śulkāya dīyase

This distich repeats RV 8.1.5ab *mahé caná tvām adrivaḥ ' pārā śulkāya deyām* ‘even for a high price I would not give you away, O Lord of the pressing stones’. The root aorist optative *deyām*, being probably unfamiliar at the time of editing the SVic hymn in question, was replaced with a present form. The passivization of the original construction was not consistent, however: the accusative *tvām* was not replaced with the nominative *tvám* (see BRUNE 1909: 36). Another inconsistency is that the passive form is in the indicative, not in the optative (**dīyethāḥ*): optatives of -yá-passives first appear in Vedic prose (see Chapter C.IV for details).

Desid. pass.

A passive built on the desiderative stem *-ditsa-* (one of the few Vedic instances of this tertiary formation) is met in the JB:

(JB 3.117:3-4 [ed. CALAND §185])

tad āditsyamānam [v.l. āditsamānam] apsu praveśayan: ned idam asurā vindāntā iti

‘They placed this, what is desired for taking (lit.: what is desired to be taken)²⁵⁹ in the waters, [thinking]: “Lest the asuras find it”.’

Although some mss. read *āditsamānam* instead, the non-passive meaning (‘what desires to take’) badly suits the context, which favours the reading *āditsyamānam*.

²⁵⁹ For a general discussion of desiderative passives, see Chapter C.II.1.2.3.

Other passives

Beside the *-yá-* passives and *-i-* aorist (*a*)*dāyi* (RV +; see KÜMMEL 1996: 51f.), the passive usage is attested in the RV for the 3sg. and pl. forms *dadé* and *dadrīre*,²⁶⁰ which should probably be qualified as statives derived from perfect stems (see KULIKOV 2006a: 67f.), cf.:

(RV 4.34.4cd)

pībata vājā ṛbhavo dadé vo ' máhi tṛtīyaṃ sávanam mādāya

‘Drink, O Ṛbhus, O Vājas, the great third pressing is given to you for intoxication.’

²*dā* ‘bind, tie, connect’: *-dīyá-^{te}*

+ *ni* MānŚS, VārŚS;

+ *sám* TS^m 7.1.19.1 = ^UKS-Aśvamedha^m 5.1.10:154.2

accented: TS

• pass.

The passive *-dīyá-^{te}* ‘be bound’ occurs in Vedic only in a Yajurvedic mantra:

(TS 7.1.19.1 = ^UKS-Aśvamedha 5.1.10:154.2)

saṃdīyámānāya svāhā

‘To the one being tied hail!’

Later on, this passive appears in the Śrauta-Sūtras of the Maitrāyaṇī school (MānŚS, VārŚS).

Other passives

In spite of the scantiness of the Vedic evidence, the antiquity of the passive *-dīyá-^{te}* is supported by the *-i-* aorist, attested already in the RV, also with the preverb *sám* (see KÜMMEL 1996: 52):

(RV 1.139.1de)

yád dha krāṇā vivásvati ' nābhā saṃdāyi návyasī

‘If the [relationship], produced at Vivasvat, was connected with the

²⁶⁰ See DELBRÜCK 1897 [VglSynt II]: 205f.; KÜMMEL 2000: 239.

[earlier] relationship (lit. navel-string),²⁶¹ as a newer one...²⁶²

The perfect middle form *saṃ ... dadé*²⁶³ in the following passage may also belong to this same passive usage (cf. KÜMMEL, *ibid.*):

(RV 4.44.5cd)

mā vām anyé ní yaman devayántaḥ ' sām yád dadé nābhiḥ pūrvyā vām

‘May the others who are longing for gods not hold you (sc. Āsvins) back, since a relationship has been established with you earlier.’²⁶⁴

For the transitive present *-dyá-*^{ti} ‘bind, tie’ and relationship between the IVSs of the homonymous roots ²*dā* and ³*dā* ‘cut’, see Chapter VI, s.v.

^{3/4}*dā* (*dī* ?) ‘destroy, cut (in pieces); divide’: *-dīyá-*^{te}

Simplex AVŚ 12.4.3 (*dīyate* ≈ AVP-Kashm. 17.16.3 *jīyate*);

(+ *ā* AV 12.5.15 *ādīyāmānā*?);

+ *āva* ‘cut, make sacrificial cuttings, divide’ TS^m 6.3.10.3 ≈ AB^m 2.10^{3x} ≈ ŚBK^m 4.8.3.9, KS^p 9.14:117.2

²⁶¹ For the ‘earlier relationship (navel-string)’ (*pūrvyā nābhiḥ*), cf. also below RV 4.44.5.

²⁶² This passage is difficult. I essentially follow the interpretations given by GELDNER, KÜMMEL’s and GOTŌ (in WITZEL et al. 2007: 257); cf. GELDNER: ‘Wenn die bei Vivasva[n]t geschlossene (Verwandtschaft) aufs neue an unsere Verwandtschaft angeknüpft wird [KÜMMEL: angeknüpft ist] ...’ Differently RENO, EVP V, 7 (‘Depuis qu’une (inspiration) toute nouvelle a été activement connectée à Vivasvant, (comme) par son nombril...’) and ELIZARENKOVA (‘А поскольку на Вивасвате как на сердцеvine / Деятельно сосредоточилась новая (молитва) ...’); cf. also EHNI 1890: 29 (‘... an Vivasvat als Nabel angeknüpft ist’).

²⁶³ And, most likely, *ā-dadé* (though with a different preverb and perhaps for that reason not mentioned in KÜMMEL 1996) in RV 9.79.4a *diví te nābhā paramó yá ādadé* ‘your (sc. Soma’s) supreme [navel-string], which has been connected to our navel-string, is on heaven’ (thus RENO, EVP IX, 27 [‘Au ciel est ton (nombril) suprême qui a été relié à (notre) nombril (, ô soma)’], XVI, 36 and ELIZARENKOVA; with a somewhat different syntax GELDNER [‘du, dessen höchster (Nabel) an den Nabel im Himmel geknüpft ist’] and RENO, EVP VIII, 60).

²⁶⁴ For RV 4.44.5, 9.79.4 and related passages, see also OGUIBÉNINE 1983: 269f. [= Essais, 126f.]; 1985 [= Essais]: 139, fn. 19.

accented: AV (?) +
• pass.

As will be argued below (Chapter VI, s.v. ^{3/4}*dā* ‘cut (off/in pieces), destroy’), a number of present formations, traditionally regarded as derived from distinct roots (*-dyá-^{ti}* ‘cut (in pieces), destroy’, *ava-dyá-^{ti}* ‘divide, distribute’, *dāti* ‘mow, cut’), can be tentatively grouped together within one single lexical unit ^{3/4}*dā* (²*day*) ‘destroy, cut (in pieces); divide, distribute’, in spite of semantic differences between them.

To the same root must also belong the passive attested at AVŚ 12.4.3, which preserves one of the older meanings of the root. The relevant passage describes negative consequences of giving ṛṣis defective cows:

(AVŚ 12.4.3cd ≈ AVP 17.16.3cd)

vaṇḍáyā dahyante grhāḥ ' kṇáyā dīyate s_uvām

WHITNEY conjectured ⁺*kṇáyā* (i.e. *kṇáyā* + *ā-dīyate*), thus regarding the form in question as pass. of *ā-¹dā*.²⁶⁵ ‘by [giving] a crippled [cow to a ṛṣi] his houses are burned; by a one-eyed his possessions are taken away’; likewise GONDA (1965: 103, 355) and ELIZARENKOVA (2007: 192). However, the meaning of *ā-¹dā* is ‘take (for oneself)’, not ‘take away’, which invalidates WHITNEY’s interpretation.²⁶⁶

By contrast, GOTŌ 174, and, subsequently, MAYRHOFFER, EWAia I, 699f., 717, connected this form with the root *day/dī* (< IE **deǵh-* (?); see KUIPER 1974: 126ff. [= Sel.Wr., 411ff.]) ‘destroy’: ‘durch [die Gabe von einer] ... einäugigen [Kuh] wird sein Besitztum zerstört’. In spite of KUIPER’s (op.cit., 127 [= Sel.Wr., 412]) objections that *dīyate* “has no evidential value”, since the parallel Paippalāda passage (17.16.3) reads *jīyate* instead,²⁶⁷ GOTŌ’s analysis seems more probable.

The same root (^{3/4}*dā* ‘destroy, cut’) may underlie the passive participle *ādīyāmānā* in AV 12.5.15, but the context is ambiguous (‘[the Brahman’s cow], when being cut in pieces? being taken for oneself?’); for discussion of

²⁶⁵ See WHITNEY 1892: 302 and WHITNEY’s translation, ad loc.

²⁶⁶ HENRY’s (1896a: 203) and BLOOMFIELD (1897: 174) translations (HENRY: ‘sa fortune est donnée [à un autre]’; BLOOMFIELD: ‘his property is given away’; likewise, LUDWIG 1878: 449), albeit requiring no conjecture, seem forced.

²⁶⁷ BLOOMFIELD (1897: 657) takes this reading as preferable (‘his property is wrung (from him)’).

this passage, see Chapter VI, s.v. ^{3/4}*dā*.

From the Saṃhitās of the YV onwards, the present -*dyá-ti* (with the preverb *áva*) appears in the technical sense ‘cut, make sacrificial cuttings, divide etc.’ (see Chapter VI, s.v.), in particular, a young mantra attested in texts of both the RVic (AB) and YVic (Taittirīya and White Yajurveda) traditions (cf. RANADE 1981: 98):

(TS 6.3.10.3 = AB 2.10.1 ≈ ŚBK 4.8.3.9)

manótāyai havīṣo ’vadīyāmānasyānu brūhīty āha

‘“Perform the anuvākyā (= invitation)²⁶⁸ to Manotā for the oblation which is being cut,”²⁶⁹ he says.’ (the hotar is made to recite the hymn RV 6.1, which contains the word *manotā*, said of Agni).

duh ‘milk’: *duhyá-^{te}*

Simplex RV 9.74.4 +

[α .i_{pass.}] ‘Z^{animal, udder}_{NOM} is milked’ RV 9.74.4 (with Acc. materiae), AVŚ 7.73.2, AVP 6.15.7, MS^P 1.8.4:119.11, 1.8.3:118.5 ≈ KS^P 6.3:52.2 = KpS^P 4.2:39.4, AB 5.27.1 = 7.3.1 ≈ JB 1.58:1 (*duhyamāna-*) ≈ ŚB 12.4.1.9 (*dohyamāna-*), AB 5.27.6 (*duhyamāna-*) = 7.3.3 (≈ APṛāyaśc. 2.4) ≈ ŚB 12.4.1.12 (*dohyamāna-*), AB 5.27.7 = 7.3.4 +;

[α .ii_{pass.}] ‘Y^{substance}_{NOM} is obtained [by milking]’ AV 7.73.1, KS^P 31.2:3.6 = KpS^P 47.2:286.2, TB 1.4.3.3, 2.1.7.1 = 2.1.8.2, ŚB 11.5.3.2 = GB 1.3.11:77.4, ŚB 11.5.3.5, ŚB 12.4.1.6 (*dohyamāna-*) ≈ JB 1.53:1 (*duhyamāna-*), ŚB 12.4.2.2 (*dohyamāna-*), JB 1.60:4, KaṭhĀ 2.115:44.14, 16 +;

+ *upa* PiṭṛmSū.–Gr̥Sū. [α .ii_{pass.}] ‘Y^{substance}_{NOM} is obtained [by milking]’

accented: AV +

• pass.

pass. of caus.: *dohyamāna-*

[α .i/ii_{pass.}] ŚB (in expiation contexts), BaudhŚS

The inventory of forms of the verb *duh* ‘milk’ as well as its syntax and

²⁶⁸ See RENOU 1954b: 12.

²⁶⁹ KEITH inconsistently translates *avadīyāmāna-* in the TS as ‘being divided’, in the AB as ‘being cut off’.

semantics were repeatedly discussed in the literature.²⁷⁰ Here I will only briefly summarize the features relevant for our discussion of passive forms. *duh* occurs in various syntactic patterns. It can be constructed (α) with the subject of the milker and the direct object which refers (i) to the animal being milked (cow or cow substitute) or to the relevant body part (udder), or (ii) to the substance obtained by milking (milk or milk substitute, in particular, Soma);²⁷¹ (β) with the subject of the cow (or cow substitute) and the accusative of milk etc.; cf. JAMISON 1982: 259, 266. Correspondingly, there are three main usages attested for *duh*: (α) [i] ‘milk (out) [a cow etc.] (of milk etc.)’; [ii] ‘obtain [milk etc.] (by milking)’ and (β) ‘give [milk etc.]’; in usage α *duh* behaves as a ‘two pattern’ verb (i/ii). The general rule is as follows: active forms occur in usage α , sometimes with double accusative (cow + milk or the like); middle forms are attested in both usages α and β . Below are some illustrations:

(α .i) ‘ X_{NOM} milks $Y^{\text{animal}}_{\text{ACC}}$ ’:

(RV 2.34.10b)

pṛśnyā yád ūdhar āpṛy āpáyo duhúḥ

‘... when the friends milk the udder of Pṛśni.’

(α .ii) ‘ X_{NOM} milks $Z^{\text{substance}}_{\text{ACC}}$ ’:

(RV 9.34.3c)

duhánti śákmanā páyaḥ

‘They obtain milk [by milking] with strength.’

(α .i+ii) ‘ X_{NOM} milks $Y^{\text{animal}}_{\text{ACC}}$ (for) $Z^{\text{substance}}_{\text{ACC}}$ ’, ‘ X_{NOM} milks out $Y^{\text{animal}}_{\text{ACC}}$ of $Z^{\text{substance}}_{\text{ACC}}$ ’ (double acc. construction):

(RV 9.85.10ab)

divó náke mádhujihvā asaścáto 'vená duhantṛy ukṣáṇaṃ giriṣṭhām

‘On the firmament of the heaven the sweet-tongued Venas²⁷² milk the bull living in the mountains [for] inexhaustible streams.’

²⁷⁰ See already WACKERNAGEL (1907: 310 [= Kl.Schr. I, 499]); cf. also NARTEN 143f.; JOACHIM 95. For a comprehensive treatment of the IVS and syntactic patterns, see GOTÖ 1991: 681ff. and KÜMMEL 1996: 52ff.

²⁷¹ ‘Acc. materiae’ (WECKER 1906: 9).

²⁷² The authors of the hymn.

(RV 6.66.1d)

sakṛc chukráṃ duduhe pṛśnir údhaḥ

‘Pṛśni has milked out her udder of its bright [milk] all at once.’

(β) ‘give + Z^{substance (milk etc.)}_{ACC}’

(RV 3.31.11d)

mádhu svādma duduhe jén;yā gáuḥ

‘The noble cow has given sweet honey.’

As in the case with many other ‘two pattern’ verbs, both transitive constructions (α.i) and (α.ii) can be passivized, yielding two passive patterns: (α.i_{pass.}) ‘Y^{animal}_{NOM} is milked’ and (α.ii_{pass.}) ‘Z^{substance}_{ACC} is obtained [by milking]’.

Theoretically, the latter pattern (α.ii_{pass.}) might equally be taken as the passive counterpart of pattern β: ‘milk is given [by a cow]’. Since constructions with an overtly expressed passive agent are not attested for pattern α.ii_{pass.}, this dilemma appears unsolvable. However, there are some system-related considerations in favour of the former analysis. Under the assumption that constructions of the type β ‘give + Z^{substance}_{ACC}’ can passivize and, hence, are transitive, we would arrive at a rather unusual opposition of syntactic patterns with the alternative analysis, i.e. that α.ii_{pass.} is the passive of β: both active and middle forms would be employed transitively, but would differ with respect to the type of subject (milker vs. cow, respectively). Such a distinction between active and middle forms has no parallels among the regular syntactic oppositions between active and middle forms in Vedic. Rather one might expect a transitivity opposition “active : transitive-causative²⁷³ vs. middle : non-passive intransitive (anticausative)”, cf. *várdhati* ‘makes grow, increases’ ~ *várdhate* ‘grows’, *códati* ‘makes move, impels’ ~ *códate* ‘moves’, etc. (cf. e.g. GOTÖ 52f.).

In my opinion, the verb *duh* exemplifies the same type of opposition (act. *dógdhi* ‘milks’ = ‘makes give milk’ ~ med. *duhé* ‘gives [milk]’ etc.) and, hence, the usage α ‘milk’ is opposed to β ‘give [milk]’ as transitive-causative to intransitive.²⁷⁴ Correspondingly, the accusative argument (milk, soma, etc.)

²⁷³ Often along with middle forms in the transitive-affective usage.

²⁷⁴ The English morphology is deceptive in this case, leaving ‘milk’ and ‘give [milk]’ formally unrelated; but cf. German *melken* ~ *milchen* and, especially, Russian *doimʹ* – *doimʹ-cʹa* (with the intransitive marker *-cʹa*).

For additional evidence for the causative/anticausative analysis, furnished by the

in usage β is not a true direct object accusative, but an accusative of scope/parameter (see Chapter A.II.3).²⁷⁵ In other words, *acc. materiae* with *duh* in usage β can be grouped with accusatives in constructions such as *púṣyantī nṛmṇám* RV (7.56.5) ‘prospering in manliness’, *ghṛtám pavasva* (RV 9.49.3) ‘purify yourself [to become] ghee’, *rayím asmāsu dīdhi* (RV 2.2.6) (lit.) ‘shine wealth on us’, *abhí vástrā suvasanā́ṇy arṣa* (RV 9.97.50a) ‘flow (for) well-clothing clothes’, etc. (for examples and discussion, see KULIKOV 1999a: 236ff., with bibl., and Chapter A.II.3).

Constructions with the *acc. of parameter* behave intransitively in Vedic, i.e., they cannot passivize, and, correspondingly, the *acc. of parameter* cannot become a passive subject. Thus, *duhyá-^{te}* can only be the passive counterpart of usage α .

Below I will quote the attested occurrences of Vedic *duhyá-^{te}*, arranged in accordance with their syntactic types.

(α .i._{pass.}) ‘Y^{animal}_{NOM} is milked’:

(RV 9.74.4a)

ātmanván nábho duhyate ghṛtám páyaḥ

‘The animated cloud is milked [for] ghee [and] milk.’

This is the only RVic attestation of *duhyá-^{te}*. Although *ghṛtám* and *páyaḥ* are morphologically ambiguous (accusative or nominative), taking them as nominatives and, hence, as “second subjects” (beside *ātmanván nábhaḥ*, which can only be the nominative subject) is impossible for syntactic reasons. This RVic construction is thus the only instance of the passive construction with *duhyá-^{te}* which preserves an *accusativum materiae* (i.e. α .i+ii_{pass.}).²⁷⁶

(AVŚ 7.73.2c)

duhyánte nūnám vṛṣaṇehá dhenávaḥ

Brāhmaṇa material, see below.

²⁷⁵ Cf. also KÜMMEL (1996: 54f.): “[*duh*] mit effiziertem (ursprünglich innerem) Objekt”.

²⁷⁶ Thus, translating *ghṛtám* and *páyaḥ* as passive subjects (thus DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 269): ‘der belebten Wolke wird Butter und Milch entzogen’; GELDNER: ‘Aus der lebendigen Wolke wird Schmalz und Milch gemolken’; similarly, GRASSMANN 1877 [RV übers.]: II, 243; KÜMMEL 1996: 58) is not quite correct. A more adequate rendering is proposed by RENO (EVP IX, 24): ‘(Le *soma*,) nuée douée-de-vie, donne-en-se-laissant-traire le beurre-fondu, le lait.’ An entirely correct translation is offered by ELIZARENKOVA: ‘Наделенное жизнью облако доится жиром, молоком’.

‘Now, O two bulls, the milch cows are milked here.’

(AVP 6.15.7cd)

ūrjāṃ te duhyamānasya_aorjāṃ dugdhāt ta ā dade

‘I am taking the strength of yours, who is being milked, the strength from the one who has been milked.’

(MS 1.8.4:119.10-11)

nímrukte sūrye, vāg yantavyātho duhyāmānāyām ...

‘When the sun has set, speech should be restrained, and also while [the cow] is being milked...’²⁷⁷

(MS 1.8.3:118.1, 5-6 ≈ KS 6.3:52.1-3 = KpS 4.2:39.3-5)

sthālyā⁺ duhanty. ²⁷⁸ *anāyā vā etād ūpa sīdanti.* [...] *yādi duhyāmānāvabhidyād, anyāyā sthālyā nirñījya dohyā²⁷⁹*

‘They milk [the milk] with a vessel. With this they sit down thus [near the cow in order to milk it].’²⁸⁰ [...] If [the cow], when being milked, breaks [the vessel], [it] is to be milked with another vessel, after one has cleansed [it].’

(ŚB 12.4.1.9 ≈ AB 5.27.1 = 7.3.1 ≈ JB 1.58:1-2)

tād āhuḥ | yāsyāgnihotrī dohyāmānopaviśēt [AB, JB *duhya^o*], *kīṃ tātṛa kārma, kā prāyaścittir iti*

‘Then they say: “If anyone’s Agnihotra cow were to lie down while being milked, what rite and what expiation [would there be] in that case?”’

(ŚB 12.4.1.12 ≈ AB 5.27.6 = 7.3.3 ≈ APṛayaśc. 2.4)

yāsyāgnihotrī dohyāmānā [AB *duhya^o*] *vāśyeta, kīṃ tātṛa kārma, kā prāyaścittir?*

‘If anyone’s Agnihotra cow were to bellow while being milked, what rite and what expiation [would there be] in that case?’

The participle *dohyāmāna-*, attested in the ŚB, will be discussed below.

Pattern (**a.ii_{pass.}**) ‘**Z^{substance}_{NOM}** is obtained [by milking]’ is attested from

²⁷⁷ Cf. OERTEL 1926: 283.

²⁷⁸ Conjecture by CALAND (1918: 7 [= Kl.Schr., 243]); see MITTWEDE 1986 [Textkr. zur MS]: 60, with bibl.

²⁷⁹ The parallel Kāthaka passage runs: *mithunam āpaś ca payaśca yadi duhyamānāvabhidyād anyayā sthālyā duhyāt.*

²⁸⁰ For the interpretation of *ūpa-sīdanti* in this passage, see BODEWITZ 1976: 55f. and note 3.

the AV onwards. The relevant passages are:

(AV 7.73.1b)

taptó gharmó duhyate vām iṣé mādhu

‘The heated hot beverage, the honey is obtained by milking for you, for food.’²⁸¹

(KS 31.2:3.6-7 = KpS 47.2:286.1-2)

bahu vā etasya duhyamānasya skandati

‘... much of this [milk] spills, when it is being obtained by milking.’

(ŚB 11.5.3.2 ≈ GB 1.3.11:77.1-4)

sá hovāca: gautama, ká te ’gnihotrī [...] kīm duhyámānam

‘He said: “O Gautama! What is your Agnihotra cow like? [...] What is [the milk] like when being obtained [by milking]?”’

(TB 1.4.3.3)

prthivīm vā etasya páyaḥ prá viśati, yásyāgnihotrām duhyámānaṁ skāndati

‘Verily, the milk of this [sacrificer] whose Agnihotra [milk] is spilled, when being obtained [by milking], enters the earth.’

(TB 2.1.7.1 = 2.1.8.2 = ŚB 11.5.3.5)

āśvinām duhyámānam

‘[The Agnihotra milk] belongs to the Aśvins while being obtained [by milking].’ (see SAKAMOTO-GOTŌ 2000b: 244)

(ŚB 12.4.1.6²⁸² ≈ JB 1.53:1-2)

tád āhuḥ / yásyāgnihotrām dohyámānaṁ [JB duhya°] skāndet, kīm tátra kárma, ká práyaścittir íti

‘Then they say: “If anyone’s Agnihotra [milk] were to be spilled while being obtained [by milking], what rite and what expiation [would there be] in that case?”’

(JB 1.60:4)

no vā eva[m]vīdo ’gnihotraṁ duhyamānaṁ skandati

‘The Agnihotra [milk] of the one knowing thus does not spill when being obtained by milking.’

²⁸¹ Thus KÜMMEL 1996: 59, with fn. 92.

²⁸² Cf. also ŚB 12.4.2.2.

(KāṭhĀ 2.115:44.14-16)

tā abrūtām: āvāyor āgre duhyatām, āvāyor āgre hūyatām iti. tasmād etāyor evāgre duhyaté, 'gre hūyate

'They (sc. the Aśvins) said: "It should be obtained [by milking] for us at the beginning [of the Pravargya-sacrifice], it should be sacrificed for us at the beginning!". Therefore, for both of them it is obtained [by milking] at the beginning [of the Pravargya] [and] is sacrificed at the beginning.'

For impv. *upaduhyatām*, -ntām 'let [this water] flow towards' (lit. 'will be obtained by milking'), attested in pattern [α.ii_{pass.}] in a number of related Pitr̥mSū. and Gṛ̥Sū. mantras (e.g. VaikhGS 5.5:77.9, GautPS 1.3.4-6), see CALAND 1893: 25f. and 259, with fn. 2; RÖNNOW 1927: 148.

Caus. pass.

The majority of occurrences of *duhyá-te* in Vedic prose are participles (*duhyámāna-*). In the ŚB, we also find *dohyámāna-* and the -ta-participle *dohitá-* (beside *duhyámāna-* and *dugdhá-*). From the formal point of view, *dohyá-te* is the passive of the causative *doháya-ti* (also attested in the ŚB). However, many of these occurrences lack any causative semantics,²⁸³ and the parallel or similar passages in other Brāhmaṇas (AB, JB) have the non-causative participle *duhyamāna-* instead, which puts into question causative translations of *doháya-ti* given by some scholars.²⁸⁴ Most probably, the causative morphology of *dohyámāna-* should be accounted for as secondary. Active class II presents (*dógdhi* etc.) forms in usage (α.i) 'milk (out) [a cow etc.]' could be reassessed as causative counterparts of middle forms, including statives (such as *duhé* etc.), employed in usage (β) 'give [milk etc.]': 'milk [a cow]' ~ 'give [milk]' → 'make [a cow] give [milk]' ~ 'give [milk etc.]'. Accordingly, the class II active presents (*dógdhi* etc.) were partly replaced in some texts (in particular, in the ŚB) with the morphological -áya-causative *doháya-ti*. Thus, *doháyati* should be translated as *dógdhi*

²⁸³ Cf. GOTÖ's (1991: 686, fn. 62) hesitant remark: "Obwohl es nicht immer klar aus dem Kontext hervorgeht, ist natürlich und wahrscheinlich anzunehmen, daß das Kaus. für das Faktitivum zu α diene..."

²⁸⁴ For instance, EGGELING usually translates forms derived from the stem *doháya-* as causatives: 'cause [the cow] to be milked' (for *dohayati* at ŚB 12.5.1.6), 'get [the cow] milked' (for *dohayati* at ŚB 12.4.1.6), 'have [the cow] milked' (for *dohayitvá* at ŚB 1.7.1.18), 'have [the teats] milked out' (for *doháyet* at ŚB 3.4.4.27); likewise, for the participle *dohitá-*: 'after he has had it (sc. the milk) milked' (ŚB 12.4.2.3).

‘milks’, *dohyamāna-* – as ‘being milked’, *dohitá-* as ‘milked’. The relationship between the better characterized and less characterized causatives (*doháyati* // *dógdhi*), on the one hand, and middle forms like *duhé*, on the other, instantiates the same type as that between *vardháyati*, *várdhati* and *várdhate*, *codáyati*, *códati* and *códate*, etc. (cf. JAMISON 153ff.).

To conclude this discussion, a short remark concerning the usage of *dohyamāna-* and *dohitá-* will be in order. In the ŚB, both occur in contexts dealing with the expiations applied in the cases where something went wrong during the milking.²⁸⁵ Although this can be merely a coincidence, one may assume that *dohyamāna-* and *dohitá-* secondarily replaced their “non-causative” pendants, above all, in the expiation contexts of the ŚB,²⁸⁶ while in other uses the non-marked *duhyamāna-* and *dugdhá-* were retained.

In the BaudhŚS, *dohyamāna-* (3x) has completely replaced *duhyamāna-*. Note that this is not the case for *dohitá-*, which does not occur in the Sūtras.

In the Sūtras, pattern (α.ii)_{pass.} ‘Z_{substance}_{ACC} is obtained [by milking]’ is somewhat more common, while (α.i)_{pass.} ‘Y_{animal}_{NOM} is milked’ occurs only a few times. To the former pattern also belong a few occurrences of the participle form *duhyamāne* in the loc. abs. construction with no overtly expressed passive subject (e.g. at BhārŚS 1.13.4, JŚS 23:30.3), since the non-feminine form can hardly refer to a cow and, hence, must mean (literally) ‘while [the milk] is being obtained [by milking]’, not ‘while [the cow] is being milked’. Correspondingly, translations by KASHIKAR (1964: II, 18) for BhārŚS 1.13.4 (‘while the cow is being milked ...’) and by GAASTRA for JŚS [ed. PARPOLA] 1.24.13 [= ed. GAASTRA 23:30.3-4 = ed. SHASTRI 1.24:87.7] (*duhyamāne dohādohīyam, payasy āhriyamāne payaḥ* ‘terwijl de koe gemolken wordt, het dohādonīyam; terwijl de melk gebracht wordt, het payas’) are to be corrected.²⁸⁷

²⁸⁵ The passages with *dohyamāna-* are quoted above. For *dohitá-*, cf. e.g. ŚB 12.4.2.3: *yasyāgnihotrām dohitām amedhyām āpādyeta, kim tātra kārma, ká prāyaścittih?*

‘If anyone’s Agnihotra [milk] obtained [by milking] were to become impure, what rite and what expiation [would there be] in that case?’

²⁸⁶ Beside the ŚB, *dohitá-* occurs in the KB (4.2.7, 4.2.10), but not in the expiation contexts. Evidence is too scant (*dohitá-*: 2x; *dugdhá-*: 1x at KB 4.10.8 [ed. LINDNER 4.14]) to uncover any non-random distribution.

²⁸⁷ Since both English *milk* and Dutch *melken* can only be constructed with the direct objects of the animal (cow etc.), not of the milk, the most adequate translation of pattern (α.ii) would be ‘obtain milk [by milking]’ and, in the passive, ‘be obtained [by milking]’.

Other passives

It is unclear whether middle forms of *duh* could be employed in the passive usage. Two occurrences of stative forms (-*duhe*, -*duhré*) translated by GELDNER as passives are assigned by GOTŌ (1991: 682, fn. 9, 16) to usage β, though hesitantly. The passages in question run as follows:

(RV 9.10.8c)

kavér ápatyam á duhe

‘The offspring of the seer gives milk / is milked.’²⁸⁸

(RV 6.66.4c)

nír yád duhré śúcayó ’anu jóṣam

‘... because they, the clear ones (sc. the Maruts) give milk²⁸⁹ / are milked²⁹⁰ at will.’

For one of the two RVic occurrences of the participle *duduhāná-* a passive interpretation is more likely (type α.ii_{pass.}, with the passive subject of the substance obtained by milking):

(RV 9.96.10b)

mṛjānó apsú duduhānó ádrau

‘Cleansed in the waters, obtained [by milking]²⁹¹ on the stone²⁹² ...’

duduhāná- may represent a participle of the stative built on the perfect stem (see KULIKOV 2006: 67f.).

²⁸⁸ Thus GELDNER (‘wird herausgemolken’); RENOU, EVP VIII, 8 (‘La descendance du Poète (sômique) a été traite’); ELIZARENKOVA (‘выдоено потомство поэта’). The passive analysis is more likely under the assumption that the offspring of the seer metaphorically refers to the Soma sap being pressed out (cf. GELDNER, ad loc.).

²⁸⁹ Thus GRASSMANN 1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 620; KÜMMEL 1996: 53 (‘wenn sie ... Milch heraus geben’). The non-passive analysis seems more likely: the Maruts bring rain according to their wish, rather than being “milked” by adepts.

²⁹⁰ Thus GELDNER (‘da sie ... ausgemolken werden’), RENOU, EVP X, 40 (‘ils furent sortis-comme-s’ils-étaient-traités (du sein de Pṛṣni, ces dieux)’; cf. also ibid., p. 99); ELIZARENKOVA (‘Когда они выдаивались ...’).

²⁹¹ Thus GELDNER, LÜDERS 1951: 226, RENOU (EVP IX, 44), GOTŌ 1991: 685 (with a question mark), ELIZARENKOVA. GRASSMANN (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 622): β or passive. Differently KÜMMEL (2000: 249): ‘[Soma], der in den Wassern geputzt wird, im Stein Milch gegeben hat’ (an absolute transitive construction).

²⁹² Or ‘under the stone’ (SCARLATA 300)?

The middle future participle *dhokṣ[y]amāṇa-*, attested in the AVP, is likely to belong to usage β:

(AVP 5.31.1ab (= KauśS 62.21))

atyāśarat [Kashm. *abhyā°*] *prathamā dhokṣ[y]amāṇā*²⁹³

sarvān yajñān bibhratī vaiśvadevī

‘The [cow] which will give milk has run over here as the first, supporting all sacrifices, sacred to the All-Gods.’ (LUBOTSKY 2002: 137)

Although GONDA (1965: 85) translated the form in question as passive (‘She has run ... in order to be milked’),²⁹⁴ a passive interpretation is less likely, since middle forms of *duh* are employed in the usage (β) (‘give [milk etc.]’); see LUBOTSKY, *ibid.*

Likewise, the middle future form at TS 7.5.3.1 (*dhokṣyate*, corresponding to the active future *dhokṣyati* in the parallel KS passage, see GOTŌ 1991: 685) belongs to usage (β) and cannot be translated as passive (contra KEITH 1914: cxlix, 621):

(TS^p 7.5.3.1 ≈ KS^p 33.5:30.16)

yām vai trīr ekasyāhna upasīdanti dahrām vai sāparābhyām dōhābhyām duhé. ’tha kútaḥ sá dhokṣyate yām dvādaśa kṛtva upasīdanti

‘The [cow] which they approach (for milking) three times a day gives milk sparingly at the two (latter) milkings. Then how the [cow] which they approach (for milking) twelve times will give milk?’²⁹⁵

dr̥ ‘heed, care’: *-driyá-^{te}*

+ *ā* Br. +

(Simplex KB 25.12.12 [ed. LINDNER 25.13] [*ced*] *driyeta* (ed. ĀnSS *ceṃdriyeta*, ed. LINDNER, v.l. *cedriyeta*), read ⁺*dhriyeta*)

accented: ŚB 2.3.3.8

²⁹³ Kashm. *dhokṣyamāṇā*, Or. *dhokṣamāṇā*. Likewise, in the corresponding passage of the KauśS: *dhokṣamāṇā* in all mss. except one which reads *dhokṣyamāṇā*. The loss of *y* may result from the simplification of the cluster CCy, probably parallel to the change *ścy* → *śc* in the passive *vṛśc[y]á-^{te}*, also attested in the AV, see s.v.

²⁹⁴ This interpretation is not ruled out by GOTŌ (1991: 685): “β bzw. patientiv”.

²⁹⁵ KEITH: ‘how then can she be milked ...’.

• tr.

The anīṭ root *dṛ* is likely to be genetically related to *dṝ* ‘split’, which could have developed as the secondary root variant of the former, but, synchronically, it is a separate root in Vedic (see Chapter B.III, s.v.); cf. MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 701ff., with bibl. The meaning ‘heed, care’ may be due to a semantic development of ‘split, break’.²⁹⁶

The only accented occurrence of *-driyá-^{te}* is encountered in the ŚB:

(ŚB 2.3.3.8)

sá yó haitāṃ mṛtyúm ánatimucyáthāmúm lokám éti, yáthā háivāsmiṃl loké ná saṃyátam ādriyáte, yadā yádaivá kāmáyaté 'tha māráyaty, evám u háivāsmiṃl loké púnah-punar evá prá māráyati

‘As one does not heed but makes die whenever one wishes, the one who is fettered in this world,²⁹⁷ so he makes die again and again in yonder world the one who goes to yonder world not having escaped that Death.’²⁹⁸

Although traditionally (in accordance with its suffix accentuation) *-driyá-^{te}* is termed ‘passive’ (or ‘medio-passive’; cf. e.g. WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]: 77; MAYRHOFER, *ibid.*), it is never employed in the passive usage. Quite on the contrary, it is either constructed with an accusative²⁹⁹ (as in the ŚB passages quoted above and below) or in objectless constructions, as in:

(JB 1.220:13)

anādriyamāṇaivaitam abravīt

‘Without heeding, [she] said to him ...’

ā-driyá-^{te} is attested from the Brāhmaṇas onwards (especially frequent in the ŚB³⁰⁰). It always occurs with the preverb *ā*, most commonly with the negation (cf. SCHRAPEL 1970: 5), meaning ‘neglect, omit’, cf.:

²⁹⁶ Thus already WEBER (1865: 377, fn. 1): ‘um etwas zerspalten werden [→] sich worum abmühen, aufreiben, sorgen, es beachten’. Somewhat differently MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 703: ‘aufbrechen, öffnen, erschließen, zugänglich machen’ ... > med. ‘sich öffnen, zugänglich werden’ > ‘beachten’.

²⁹⁷ I.e., nobody care about a prisoner; see RAU 1957: 99.

²⁹⁸ For this passage and the Av. cognate of *ā-dṛ*, see INSLEER 1975a [Gāthās]: 266f.; cf. also GONDA 1966b: 143.

²⁹⁹ Cf. JAMISON 1991a: 151, with fn. 17.

³⁰⁰ RENOUE 1937b: 38.

(ŚB 1.2.5.21)

sá yádi kāmáyeta bruyád etád; yády u kāmáyetápi nádriyeta

‘He (sc. *adhvaryu*) may pronounce it, if he wishes; or, if he wishes, he may omit [it].’

The only supposedly simplex occurrence appears in the KB:

(KB 25.12.11-12 [ed. LINDNER 25.13])

tasya tīrṣṣu ny ūñkhayati / nyūñkhayitum ced driyeta

In view of the isolated character of the simplex, KEITH (1920: 494, fn. 2 ad loc.) hesitantly conjectures ‘*dhriyeta*’ (“*dṛ* is unique, read perhaps *dhriyeta*”), translating ‘he should do [it]’. This conjecture is adopted by RENOU (1937b: 36) and WERBA (p.c. in a letter of 19.5.97), who points out that *ā-driyeta* would be constructed with an accusative (*nyūñkhanam*), while *dhriyate* typically occurs with infinitives.³⁰¹ I follow WERBA’s translation:³⁰²

‘In three [verses] of it [sc. hymn] he inserts the sound *o*; if he decides to insert the sound *o* ...’

By virtue of its non-passive semantics and constructions with accusative (impossible with *-yá*-passives) and in spite of suffix accentuation, *-driyáte* belongs with middle ‘*-ya*’-presents (class IV), specifically with verbs of mental activities (*mánya-te* ‘think’, *mṛṣya-te* ‘not heed, forget’); see KULIKOV 1997 and Chapter C.II.2.2.

dṛś ‘see’: *dṛśyá-te*

Simplex RV 10.146.3, RVKh. 5.22.4, AV, TS^p 5.3.8.3, KS^p 7.8:69.19 +;

with preverbs Br. +:

+ *úpa* TĀ^m 1.2.3, 1.3.3 +;

+ *pari* ‘be visible all round’ JB 3.73:9 (*pary-adṛśyata*, v.l. *paśyaduśyata*), 3.74:1 [ed. CALAND §176],³⁰³ ĀpŚS 18.13.11 ≈ HirŚS 13.5.14 ≈ VārŚS

³⁰¹ RENOU (1937b: 36): “un régime inf. inusité”; though *ā-driya-te* also occurs with infinitives (in the ŚB), cf. OERTEL 1941: 97 [= Kl.Schr. II, 1466]. RENOU, *ibid.*, 38 suggests that such infinitive constructions may have emerged in analogy with *dhriyate*.

³⁰² ‘Wenn er sich anschickt den *o*-Laut einzufügen...’

³⁰³ On these two attestations in the JB, see KNOBL 2007b: 43.

3.3.2.19³⁰⁴ +;

+ *pra* (KB 18.3.13, ed. ĀnSS, ed. LINDNER *pra-dṛśyate*, read with ed. SARMA *pra-diśyate*)³⁰⁵, TĀ^m 1.2.3^{2x}, 1.6.1 +; + *vi-pra* ‘be visible separately’ ŚĀ 8.6;

+ *prāti* AB 2.20.4 (*pratidṛśyamānāsu* ≈ KB 12.2.4 [ed. LINDNER 12.1] *pratikhyaṭāsu*)³⁰⁶, TĀ^m 1.6.1 +;

+ *sām* ŚB 6.1.1.12, 6.5.1.2, 13.8.4.12 +

accented: AV 7.101.1, ŚB

• agentless pass.

The present *dṛśyá-te* occurs in the agentless passive usage, typical of the -yá-passives of the verbs of perception and knowledge. In fact, its meaning wavers between (agentless) passive (‘is seen’, ‘can be seen’) and non-passive (‘appears, is visible’); see Chapter A.II.2.2.2 and HETTRICH 2007: 80f. as well as KULIKOV 2011b for a discussion of this phenomenon in a typological perspective. Examples are:

(AV 7.101.1)

yát svápne ánnam aśnāmi ' ná prātár adhigamyáte

sárvam tád astu me śívam ' nahí tád dṛśyáte dívā

‘If I eat food in my dream, [and it] is not found in the morning, be all that propitious to me, for that is not seen by day.’³⁰⁷

(AV 10.8.25ab)

bālād ékam aṇīyaskám ' utáikaṃ néva dṛśyate

‘One [thing] is minuter than a child, and another one is as if it were invisible.’

The participle *dṛśyámāna-* (and, with the negative prefix, *ádṛśyamāna-*) functions as an adjective, meaning ‘(in)visible’, as in:

(ŚB 3.6.2.26)

té ha smaitá ubháye devamānuṣyāḥ pitáraḥ sám pibante, sàṣṭā sampá; té

ha sma dṛśyámānā evá purā sám pibanta, utàitárhya ádṛśyamānāḥ

³⁰⁴ VārSS 3.3.2.19 ms. first hand *pari-dṛśyati*, later emended to *°dṛśyamte* after ĀpSS 18.13.11 (*pari-dṛśyante*); ed. CALAND / RAGHU VIRA *°dṛśyate* (cf. fn. ad loc.).

³⁰⁵ For a discussion, see Chapter B.IV, s.v. *diś*.

³⁰⁶ Cf. OERTEL 1926: 283.

³⁰⁷ For this passage, see also s.v. *gam*.

‘And, verily, these both, the gods and men, [as well as] the fathers used to drink together, that is this symposium; formerly they used to drink together [with us] quite visibly, but now [they do so] invisibly.’ (see DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 502)

Other passives

Passive aorists (sg. *ádarśi*, pl. *ádṛśran/-ram* and the corresponding participles *dṛśāna-* RV^{1x} and *dṛśāná-* RV^{2x}) are well-attested from the RV onwards (see KÜMMEL 1996: 63ff.; KULIKOV 2006b: 49). Alongside present and aorist passives, we find in the agentless passive usage, from the early Vedic period onwards,³⁰⁸ 3sg. statives / middle perfects (see KULIKOV 2006a: 67f.) *dádṛśe/dadṛśé*³⁰⁹ and the middle sigmatic aorist *adr̥kṣata*,³¹⁰ as, for instance, in:

(RV 8.82.8ab)

yó apsú candrá mā iva ' sōmaś camūṣu dádṛśe

‘Soma, who appears in the camū-vessels, like the moon in the waters...’

dhamⁱ (dhmā) ‘blow, inflate’: *dhamya^{-te}*, *dhmāyá^{-te}*

dhamyate :

RV 10.135.7

dhmāyá^{-te} :

Simplex ŚB 14.5.4.9 (= BĀUM 2.4.9 = BĀUK 2.4.8) = ŚB 14.7.3.10 (= BĀUM 4.5.10 = BĀUK 4.5.9) (+);

+ *ā* JB 1.109^{2x}:5, 6-7;

+ *pra* ChU 6.14.1 *pra-dhmāyīta* (?) (ed. BÖHTLINGK ⁺*pra-dhāveta*; BÖHTLINGK 1897: ⁺*pra-hvayīta*; HOFFMANN 1952b [1957]: ⁺*pra-dhyāyīta*;

³⁰⁸ Also in late Vedic and post-Vedic texts; for Epic Sanskrit, see e.g. HOLTZMANN 1884: 17f.

³⁰⁹ With the final accentuation only in RV 7.76.3, AVŚ 10.8.8 and in the ŚB (see KÜMMEL 2000: 233f.).

³¹⁰ See EATON 25 (“all the middle forms of this root are passives, except [RV] 8. 57. 2 which is apparently active”); NARTEN 146f.; KÜMMEL 1996: 66f.

HAMM 1968/69: ⁺*pra-dhmāyeta*)

-dhmāya^{-ti} :

+ ā BĀUM 3.2.12 ≈ BĀUK 3.2.11

accented: ŚB

• pass., (anticaus.)

The passive *dhamyate* is a RVic hapax attested in maṇḍala X:

(RV 10.135.7c)

iyám asya dhamyate nālīḥ

‘This flute of his (sc. Yama) is being blown [by Yama].’³¹¹

Since *dhām*ⁱ is a seṭ root (cf. MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 775; WERBA [VIA I] 297f.), *dhamyate* is traditionally considered irregular because of the short root vowel (instead of the supposed ***dhāmyáte*). In order to account for the root vocalism, GOTŌ 181, fn. 320 assumes that *dhamyate* has been secondarily built from the class I present stem *dhāma-*. GOTŌ’s explanation does not seem convincing, however, since *-yá*-passives can only be derived from primary roots, or, at best, from quasi-roots (e.g. built upon causatives or desideratives), but not from present stems.

In fact, however, there are no good reasons to treat *dhamyate* as an irregular formation. Obviously, the traditional analysis rests upon the assumption that *Cam*ⁱ roots lengthen the root vowel in *-yá*-passives, as it is observed in active *-ya*-presents (*dāmyati*, *śāmyati*, *śrāmyati*). However, I am dubious whether the morphophonological rule operative in active *-ya*-presents can be simply expanded to *-yá*-passives. The two other Vedic passives derived from *Cam*ⁱ roots, viz. *-amya*^{-te} (*√am*ⁱ ‘swear’) and *kramyá*^{-te} (*√kram*ⁱ ‘stride’) display the short root vowel and thus do not support the hypothetical ***dhāmyáte*, but, quite on the contrary, furnish evidence for the regular character of *dhamyate*. The difference in the root vowel length between *dāmya*^{-ti}, *śāmya*^{-ti}, *śrāmya*^{-ti}, on the one hand, and *-amya*^{-te}, *kramyá*^{-te} and *dhamyá*^{-te}, on the other, can be readily explained by LUBOTSKY’s (1997b) rule on the reflexes of long sonants before *i*, *u*: long vowels under accent, short

³¹¹ Cf. GELDNER: ‘Diese seine Flöte wird geblasen’; VELANKAR (1968: 765) ‘the flute being sounded’ and, a few pages later, ‘here is the trumpet blowing for him’ (ibid., p. 768). RENOU (1947: 19) supplies a subject (‘Voilà la flûte où (le dieu) souffle’), but in a later translation (1956: 130) he renders this sentence with a construction with *on*: ‘On souffle dans le chalumeau de (Yama)’.

vowels otherwise, cf. *tūrvati*, -*tūryā*, etc. vs. *turyāma*, *turvāne*, etc.

Instead of *dhamyate*, in the late Vedic prose (JB, Up.), we find pass. *dhmāyā-te*, derived from the secondary root variant *dhmā* (cf. GOTÖ, ibid.). The relevant passages are:

(ŚB 14.5.4.9 (= BĀUM 2.4.9 = BĀUK 2.4.8) = ŚB 14.7.3.10 (= BĀUM 4.5.10 = BĀUK 4.5.9))

*sá yáthā śaṅkhāsya dhmāyāmānasya,*³¹² *ná bāhyāñ chābdāñ chaknuyād grāhañāya*

‘It (sc. the Brahma) is [so] as one is unable to grasp the external sounds when a shell is being blown.’³¹³

Less clear is the semantics of the participle *ā-dhmāyamāna-* met twice in the JB:

(JB 1.109:5 [ed. CALAND §17])

te paśavo ’prāṇanta ādhmāyamānā aśerata

Both CALAND and BODEWITZ render the form in question as non-passive (‘Die Tiere lagen da, nicht **atmend**, nach Luft schnappend’ (CALAND); ‘The animals were lying down, not **breathing**, but puffing and blowing’ (BODEWITZ 1990: 63)), but these translations are inconsistent with the passive morphology (suffix -*ya-*). I presume the animals are described as blown (inflated) because of the air they were unable to breath out. Accordingly, one might translate the form under discussion as ‘[not breathing, but] being inflated (because of the air being obstructed within their body)’, or the like.

The optative -*dhmāyīta* (ChU), both morphologically and semantically unclear, has been much discussed in Vedic studies. The relevant passage runs as follows:

(ChU 6.14.1)

*yathā somya puruṣaṃ gandhārebhyo ’bhinaddhākṣam ānīya taṃ tato ’tijane viṣṭjet, sa yathā tatra prāñ vodāñ vādharāñ vā*³¹⁴
pradhmyātābhinaddhākṣa ānīto ’bhinaddhākṣo viṣṭṣtaḥ

The late optatives in -*īta* (instead of the regular -*eta*) appear in the paradigm of

³¹² For the genitive absolute construction in this passage, see OERTEL 1926: 104.

³¹³ For a philosophical interpretation of this passage, see HANEFELD 1976: 76f., 93f.

³¹⁴ Ed. BÖHTLINGK and subsequently ed. SENART insert here *pratyañ vā* ‘or westward’. This may be unnecessary, since, as EDGERTON (1915: 243) explains, the land Gandhāras was the western limit of the Indian civilization.

several thematic presents, mainly with stems in °aya- (-áya-presents, class I presents of *i* roots, cf. *nayīta*, *hwayīta*, etc.; see WHITNEY 1896 [SktGr]: 266, §738b; HOFFMANN 1952b [1957]: 136f. [= Aufs. 2, 371]), but there are no other examples of this formation derived from a -ya-stem.³¹⁵ The suggested conjectures and interpretations can be synopsized as follows.

(1) BÖHTLINGK conjectured ⁺*pra-dhāveta* and translated ‘da er [...] nach Osten, nach Norden, nach Westen oder nach Süden **sich aufmachen würde**’. This emendation is too drastic and hardly makes better sense (cf. WHITNEY 1890: 413; see also BÖHTLINGK’s (1891: 76f.) response).

(2) Later on, BÖHTLINGK (1897: 128f.) gave up his earlier conjecture, emending instead ⁺*prahvayīta*: ‘[Wie ein Mann] nach Osten, nach Norden, nach Westen oder nach Süden [...] **hin rufen würde**...’ BÖHTLINGK assumed that this reading could have underlain Śaṃkara’s gloss *śābdam kuryād, vikrośet*, which could not be a comment on *pradhmayīta*. Incidentally, Śaṃkara’s interpretation was adopted even before BÖHTLINGK (and without emendations), by F.M. MÜLLER (1879: 106) (‘[that person] would [...] shout’) and HILLEBRANDT (1885b: 96; 1921: 86 = 1977: 117) (‘laut (aus)rufen’); it is also followed by HAYOT (1996) (‘de même qu’il **s’y exclamerait** vers l’Est, ou le Nord, ou le Sud, ou l’Ouest: on m’a amené les yeux bandés, on m’a abandonné les yeux bandés’).

(3) Less drastic is HOFFMANN’s (1952b [1957]: 137 [= Aufs. 2, 371]) conjecture ⁺*pradhyāyīta*: ‘wie er dort nach Osten, Norden, Westen oder Süden gewendet **überlegen dürfte**, da er mit verbundenen Augen herbeigeführt, mit verbundenen Augen losgelassen wurde.’ This emendation is both graphically and morphologically attractive, but the compound *pra-dhyāya^{ti}* appears only in the late (post-Vedic) ManB (2.2.5) and does not occur with middle inflection (see Chapter V, s.v. *dhyā*).

(4) SENART rejects BÖHTLINGK’s conjectures and translates (without suggesting alternative emendations, relying essentially upon guess-work on what the passage in question might mean rather than on the actually attested reading): ‘cet homme **errerait** au hasard soit vers l’est soit vers le nord, vers l’occident ou vers le sud’.

(5) Other scholars stick to the actually attested reading, taking -y- as a

³¹⁵ Except for post-Vedic *dhyāyīta* (pr. *dhyāya^{ti/(te)}*), which can be explained as built on the secondary root *dhyāy*; see Chapter V, s.v.

part of the passive suffix -ya-;³¹⁶ cf. DEUSSEN's (1897: 168f.) passive translation 'wird verschlagen'. Most explicit was EDGERTON (1915: 242f.), considering the form in question as a passive of *prá-dham* 'blow away' (which is attested, for instance, in AV 3.2.2, 18.2.28) and translating:

'As if, my dear, one should bring hither a man from the land of Gandhâra, with eyes bound tight, and should then turn him loose in a desert place; as he **would be** then **drift** about (lit.: be blown forth, be made to drift helplessly), eastward, or northward, or southward, having been brot³¹⁷ hither blindfold, and having been turned loose blindfold.'

EDGERTON's interpretation does not require any emendation and therefore appears preferable. Passive translations were also adopted by HUME (²1931: 249), MORGENROTH (1958: 333 and 497f. ['umhergetrieben werden, in die Irre gehen']; somewhat differently in more recent papers: 1963: 229f.; 1970: 42f.; 1984: 496f. ['er dürfte (wie ein Baumbblatt) dahingebblasen werden']), HANEFELD (1976: 133) ['wie er [...] umherirren würde'], GOTÔ 181, fn. 320 and HOFFMANN (1982: 92 [= Aufs. 3, 798]) (who abandoned his earlier (1952b [1957]) conjecture).

(6) HAMM (1968/69: 158, fn. 76) conjectures a more regular passive optative form, ⁺*pradhmayeta*, following, essentially, EDGERTON's interpretation ('wie dieser dort nach Osten oder Norden oder Süden **verscheucht würde...**').

Active forms

The only active form is attested in the BĀU:³¹⁸

(BĀUM 3.2.12 (≈ ŚBM 14.6.2.12, BĀUK 3.2.11))

yājñavalkyēti hovāca: yātrāyām pūruṣo mriyāte, úd asmāt prāṇāḥ kṛāmanty āho nēti. nēti hovāca yājñavalkyaḥ, ātraivā samāvanīyante. sā úc chūyati [ŚBM, BĀUK *úc chvayati*], *ādhmāyati. ādhmāto mṛtāḥ śete*
 "Yājñavalkya", said he, "when a man dies, do the breaths go out of him or not?" "No", said Yājñavalkya, "they are gathered together right here. He swells up, he is being inflated. The dead man lies inflated".'

³¹⁶ Unclear is WHITNEY's (1896 [SktGr]: 266, §738b) analysis. WHITNEY quotes *-dhmāyīta* along with *-īta*-passives derived from class I present stems and *-āya*-stems, such as *nayīta*, *dhayīta*, without offering any interpretation, however.

³¹⁷ = brought (thus in EDGERTON's orthography).

³¹⁸ Cf. FÜRST 1916: 27f.

LIEBICH (1891: 29) and GOTŌ 181, fn. 320 account for the active ending as resulting from the anticausative (“fientiv”) reinterpretation of the form in question (‘er bläst sich auf’); likewise SAKAMOTO-GOTŌ 1985: 172 and 185, note 5. In my view, this explanation is *ad hoc*. Leaving aside two or three unclear (and probably corrupt) forms,³¹⁹ there are no reliable examples of the opposition “-*yá*-passive with the middle inflection vs. anticausative (fientive) -*ya*-present with the active inflection”.³²⁰ Thus, there is no morphological pattern on which *ádhmāyati* could have been built. Most likely, the irregular diathesis is due to the adjacent active form *úcchūyati/ucchvayati* (also derived from an *ā* root, *śvā*).

dhā ‘put, place; create’: *dhīyá-^{te}*

RV + (also with preverbs)

accented:

dhīyá-^{te}: RV +

nī-dhīyate ŚB 14.6.2.13 (= BĀUM 3.2.13 ed. BÖHTLINGK
nī-dhīyate)

• pass.

caus. pass.: *-dhāpyamāna-*

+ *nī* (caus. pass.) VaitS 5.17; + *pari* (pass.) VaitS 10.6

The passive *dhīyá-^{te}*³²¹ is well-attested in Vedic from the RV onwards,

³¹⁹ Such as *ud-rudhyati* JB 2.383:10, for which read probably ⁺*-rudhyate*; see s.v.

³²⁰ Most often, this semantic opposition remains formally unexpressed, i.e. -*yá*-passives (with the middle inflection) occasionally occur in the non-passive usage (cf. examples, for instance, s.v. *tan*, *pṛc*); or, at best, it can be expressed by the accent shift (suffix → root), as in the case of *pacyá-^{te}* ‘be cooked’ – *pácyā-^{te}* ‘ripen’ and, perhaps, *dahyá-^{te}* ‘be burned’ – *dáhya-^{te}* (?) ‘burn’ (see Chapter B.III, s.vv.), but these pairs are isolated and could not serve as a morphological model; see also discussion in Chapter B.IV, s.v. *yabh*.

³²¹ Active inflection is unattested. *pratidhīyantīti* at JB 1.360:3 (thus ed. RAGHU VIRA/LOKESH CHANDRA) is a ms. error; read ⁺*dhīyanta iti* (cf. RAGHU VIRA & LOKESH CHANDRA 1955 [Fs. Kirfel]: 276 = [AO 22]: 74; FRENZ 22; BODEWITZ 1990: 206 and 321, note 4 ad loc.). For a discussion of the relevant passage, see Chapter B.IV, s.v. *dabh*.

both as a simplex and in compounds. Examples are:

(RV 9.62.15ab)

girā jātā ihā stutā ' indur indrāya dhīyate

‘Born on the mountain, praised here, the sap is put for Indra.’

- with *ní* (‘put down’):

(RV 10.32.6ab)

nidhīyāmānam āpagūlham apsú ' prā me devānām vratapā uvāca

‘The protector of the vow of the gods proclaimed me about the one who is being put down, hidden in the waters (sc. Agni).’

- with *pāri* (‘put around’):

(TS 2.3.9.3)

*dhruvò 'si, dhruvò 'hām sajātēṣu bhūyāsam iti paridhīn pāri dadhāti [...]
átho etád evá sārvañ sajātēṣv ádhi bhavati, yāsyai váṃ vidúṣa eté
paridháyaḥ paridhīyānte*

‘“You are fixed, may I be fixed among my kinsmen”, [with these words] he puts the paridhis³²² round. [...] Then all this is prosperous in his kinsmen, of the one knowing thus, whose paridhis are being laid around.’ (see GONDA 1989b: 31)

Beside its primary usage, *dhā* is well-attested in the secondary sense ‘establish, create’, as in:

(VS 14.28.a)

... prajā adhīyanta; prajāpatir ádhipatir āsīt

‘... the creatures were created; Prajāpati was the supreme lord.’

The root accentuation is once attested in the Upaniṣadic part of the ŚB (= BĀU):

(ŚB 14.6.2.13 (= BĀU 3.2.13))

*yātrāśya pūruṣasya mṛtāsya ... apsú lóhitam ca rétaś ca nidhīyate*³²³

‘When the blood and semen of a dead man are placed in the waters ...’

The erroneous root accentuation, hardly surprising in this late text (where corrupt accents are not rare), may have emerged in analogy with *Cīya*-presents with fluctuating accentuation, such as *kṣīyá-te*, *mīyá-te*, *hīyá-te*; see Chapter C.II.3.6.

³²² Fresh sticks laid down round the sacrificial fire.

³²³ Thus ed. WEBER; BĀU, ed. BÖHTLINGK reads *ni-dhīyate*.

Caus. pass.

Of the two occurrences of the causative passive *-dhāpya^{-te}* attested in the VaitS, only one shows the causative meaning properly speaking:

(VaitS 5.17)

aśvapādaṃ lakṣaṇe nidhāpyamānam adhvarāyety anumantrayate

‘Along with (*anu*) the horse’s foot which is being caused to be put down on the (demarcation) line [of the āhavanīya-fire] he (sc. the adhvaryu-priest) pronounces the mantra *sam adhvarāya*... “To the sacrifice...” (AV 3.16.6)’ (see CALAND 1910: 15).³²⁴

Note that it is the initial object, not the causee (= initial subject), which becomes the subject of the passive construction; for a general discussion, see Chapter C.II.1.2.2.

The second attestation of *-dhāpyamāna-* seems to lack the causative meaning:

(VaitS 10.6)

yat te vāsa iti paridhāpyamānam

‘[With the stanza] “What garment for you ... [AV 8.2.16]” [the priest addresses] to the [sacrificial post] being covered [with garments].’

Here the causative morphology may have been triggered by the causative passive participle in the next sūtra (VaitS 10.7): *vanaspate stīrṇam iti barhiṣy āsādyamānam* ‘[with the stanza] “O forest tree, sit on the [barhis] being strewn ... [AV 12.3.33]” [the priest addresses] the [sacrificial post] being laid on the barhis.’

Other passives

Beside *-yá*-passives and the *-i*-aorist *ádihāyi* (see KÜMMEL 1996: 67ff.), the passive usage is attested for 3sg. and pl. forms *dadhé* and *dadhiré*,³²⁵ as well as for the participle *dádihāna-* (at RV 10.15.10), which should probably be qualified as statives derived from perfect stems (see KULIKOV 2006a: 67f.). An example is:

(RV 1.59.3ab)

ā sūrye ná raśmāyo dhruvāso ' vaiśvānaré dadhire 'gnā vásūni

‘Like the firm rays at the sun, goods are placed in Agni Vaiśvānara.’

Some of the reduplicated middle forms (*dadhé*, *dádihāna*³²⁶) are

³²⁴ I am thankful to W. KNOBL for valuable clarifications on the meaning of this passage.

³²⁵ See DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 264f., 1897 [VglSynt II]: 206 (on RV 3.51.6); KÜMMEL 2000: 273.

³²⁶ See e.g. GRASSMANN 1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 665ff.; LUBOTSKY 1997a [RVWC]: 743ff.; against the 3sg.pr. analysis of *dadhé* see KÜMMEL 1996: 67.

morphologically ambiguous and might belong either to the perfect/stative, or to the reduplicated present. However, the exceptional character of the passive usage of the middle present forms (other than *-yá*-passives) serves as an indirect evidence for qualifying all occurrences of *dadhé* and *dádhāna*-attested in passive constructions as forms of the perfect/stative system.

In some cases it is almost impossible to choose between the passive and non-passive (anticausative, reflexive) interpretation, at least on the basis of purely linguistic features. This is, for instance, the case of pf. *dadhé* attested at the end of the famous cosmogonic hymn RV 10.129:

(RV 10.129.7ab)

iyáṃ víśṛṣṭir yáta ābabhúva ' yádi vā dadhé yádi vā ná

This hymn is included in virtually all Vedic anthologies. It is interesting to compare the suggested translations, wavering between passive ('has been established') and non-passive ('has established itself'); for a comprehensive survey and comparative analysis of interpretations, see now KNOBL 2008. Some translators use heavy periphrastic constructions to combine both meanings; some others take this construction as absolute transitive. Note especially most explicit remarks by THIEME and EDGERTON:

(absolute) transitive:

'... sei's dasz er sie **gegründet**, sei's dasz er sie nicht gegründet ...'
(LUDWIG 1876 [RV übers.]: II, 573; cf. also LUDWIG 1895: 6);

'Whence this creation has arisen; whether he **founded** it or did not ...'
(MACDONELL 1917: 211);

'Woraus diese Schöpfung sich entwickelt hat, ob er sie **gemacht hat** oder nicht ...' (GELDNER).³²⁷

passive:

'Von wannen diese Schöpfung sei gekommen, / ob sie **geschaffen** oder unerschaffen ...' (GRASSMANN 1877 [RV übers.]: II, 406);

'Cette création sécondaire, d'où elle est issue, si elle **a fait l'objet** ou non **d'une institution** ...' (RENOU 1956 [HS]: 126);

'Woher diese Emanation geworden (,gekeimt') ist, ob sie **getätigt worden ist** [von einem Agens] oder ob nicht ...' (THIEME 1964: 67);

³²⁷ Likewise, HILLEBRANDT 1913: 134; LOMMEL 1955: 120; AMBROSINI 1969: 100; SANI 2000: 65.

‘This creation, whence it came into being, whether it **was established**, or whether not ...’, with a footnote: “i.e. created; or perhaps, ‘established itself’ (the verb may be understood as passive or middle)” (EDGERTON 1965: 74);

‘... this creation (emanation)-in-differentiation ..., whether it **is the result of an act of founding (establishing)** or not ...’ (GONDA 1979: 12),³²⁸

‘... se è **stata fatta** o no ...’ (AMBROSINI 1981: 127)

‘... if it **was produced** or (it was) not produced.’ (BRERETON 1999: 249, fn. 7);

‘... ob sie **geschaffen worden ist** oder nicht?’ (KÜMMEL 2000: 273);

‘Откуда это творение возникло, / **Было** ли оно **создано** или же нет ...’ (ELIZARENKOVA).

non-passive intransitive (reflexive, anticausative):

‘... whether it **made itself**, or whether not’ [or absolute transitive: ‘he set (or made) it for himself’] (WHITNEY 1882: cx);

‘This creation, whether it **came into being spontaneously** or not ...’ (BROWN 1941: 80 [= 1978: 18]).

The suggested interpretations are discussed at length by W. KNOBL (2008). KNOBL convincingly argues that this occurrence cannot be taken as passive, and that the intention of the poet was to express the following idea: “There was no agent — and therefore no action — of founding. All that can be said is that this universe ‘has come into being’, *ā babhūva*, from somewhere, but not through *someone*.”

dhū ‘shake’: *-dhūyá-^{te}*

+ *ā* TS^m 4.4.9.1;

+ *ní* AVŚ 1.14.2 (*ní dhūyatām*) ≈ AVP-Or. 1.15.2 (*ni dhūyate* [Kashm. *vi dhūyate*])

accented: TS

³²⁸ Likewise, GONDA (1966a: 693 [= Sel.St. III, 430]): ‘deze schepping ... of ze **object (resultaat) van een instelling (inzetting, fundatie)** is of niet ...’

- pass.

The -yá-passive -*dhūyá-te* is attested twice in Vedic (only in compounds). The relevant passages are:

- with *ā́*:

(TS 4.4.9.1)

apūtapā́ ādhūyámānaḥ

‘[You are] drinker of the unpurified [Soma], when being cleansed [by shaking].’³²⁹

- with *ní*:

(AVŚ 1.14.2ab ≈ AVP 1.15.2ab)

*eṣā́ te rājan kanṣā́ vadhūr ní dhūyatām*³³⁰ *yama*

‘Let this girl, O King, be shaken down to thee [as] bride, O Yama.’

(WHITNEY)³³¹

According to GOTÖ 186ff., these two forms are passives of the two synchronically distinct (albeit etymologically related) transitive verbs, ‘shake’ (pr. *dhūnóti*) and ‘fan’ [‘befächeln’] (pr. *dhūvāti*). Both are derived from the root *dhū* going back to IE **dʰeǵH-*, the meaning of which GOTÖ determines as ‘schnell auf kleinem Raum hin- und herbewegen’ (cf. GOTÖ 185ff.; MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 782f.).

The third passive which historically belongs to the same IE root, -*dhāvya-te*, will be discussed in Chapter B.IV, s.v. *dhāv*.

dhūp ‘smoke, fumigate’: *dhūpyá-te*

‘be fumigated’ KS^p 19.7:8.20 = KpS^p 30.5:143.15 *dhūpyate*

unaccented

- pass.

³²⁹ For this mantra, see GONDA 1983c: 18.

³³⁰ AVP-Or. *ni dhūyate*; AVP-Kashm. *vi dhūyate* (probably an error).

³³¹ The verb in question refers to a motion directed downwards, but the exact character of the motion is unclear. GOTÖ 188 delineates it as ‘befächelt werden’; H.-P. SCHMIDT (1996: 401) translates this form merely as ‘throw down’: ‘This girl shall **be thrown down** to you as your wife, King Yama’.

‘smoke’ ŚB 2.3.2.9 (= KātyŚS 4.15.15 [ed. WEBER 4.15.16]) *dhūpyáte*
(secondary replacement for *dhūpāyāti?*)

accented: ŚB

• anticaus.

The denominative present *dhūpāyá-^{ti}* / *dhūpāya-^{ti}* ‘fumigate’,³³² is employed transitively. This transitive usage underlies the passive *dhūpyate* attested in the KS and KpS:

(KS 19.7:8.19-20 = KpS 30.5:143.14-16)

vasavas tvācchṇdantu gāyatrena cchandaseti; cchandobhir vā eṣā kriyate, chandobhir dhūpyate, chandobhiḥ pacyate

‘Let the Vasus fill you (sc. the ukhā-vessel) with the metre gāyatrī; verily, with the metres it is being made, with the metres its is being fumigated, with the metres it cooks.’³³³

Another Vedic attestation of *dhūpyáte* appears in a ŚB passage that contains identifications of fire with deities (Varuṇa, Rudra, etc.) at various stages of kindling. This occurrence exemplifies a different usage:

(ŚB 2.3.2.9)

tād yātraitāt prathamāñ sámiddho bhāvati dhūpyāta iva, tárhi haiṣā bhavati rudrāḥ

All translators render the form in question as a non-passive intransitive, cf. EGDELING: ‘Now when it [sc. the fire] is first kindled, and there **is** as yet nothing but **smoke**, then indeed that (fire) is Rudra’; SCHRAPEL (1970: 38): ‘Wenn es sodann gerade entzündet ist [und] noch **qualmt** ...’³³⁴ The translations suggested for KātyŚS 4.15.15, which comments on ŚB 2.3.2.9 (*prathamamasamiddhe dhūpyamāne* ...) are similar, cf. DUMONT (1939: 6): ‘un feu qui vient d’être allumé et qui fume encore (c’est-à-dire avant qu’il ne

³³² Derived from *dhūpa-* on the semantic model $X \Rightarrow$ ‘apply X to Y’, i.e. ‘apply smoke to smth., affect smth. with smoke’ = ‘fumigate’; for its origin, see HOFFMANN 1966: 69 [= Aufs. 2, 462f.], MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 794f. Accent retraction on the model of -āya-causatives could be due to the transitive syntax (and/or factitive meaning), as, for instance, in the case of *mantrāya-te* ‘recite spell, address’; see NARTEN 1981: 6f. [= Kl.Schr. 1, 238f.]; JAMISON 86.

³³³ Cf. RAU 1972: 29ff. I am thankful to A. LUBOTSKY for his comments on the interpretation of this passage.

³³⁴ For the meaning of *iva* in this passage, see SCHRAPEL, *ibid.*, 37f.

flambe)’; RANADE: ‘when the first flame of the fire has shone and **the smoke is** (yet) **present**’); THITE: ‘in the (fire) which has got the first inflammation (but still somewhat) smoking’. Cf. also Sāyaṇa’s gloss *dhūmā[yamā]na-iva bhavati* (thus quoted in ed. WEBER).

The parallel passage in the Kāṇva recension has the absolutive *-dhūpya* instead:

(ŚBK 3.1.1.1)

sá yātra ha vā eṣā prathamāṁ sampradhūpya prajvālati, tād dha váruṇo bhavati

‘When the fire, first **having smoked**, flames up, then it becomes Varuṇa.’

Obviously, both *dhūpyāte* (ŚBM) and *-dhūpya* (ŚBK) belong with the denominative *dhūpāyá-^{ti}*. Unlike the transitive denominative *dhūpāya-^{ti}*, also derived from *dhūpa-* ‘smoke’, *dhūpāyá-^{ti}* is intransitive, meaning ‘produce smoke’, as, for instance, in:

(TB 2.1.10.1)

nīhito dhūpāyāñ chete. rudrās tárhy agnīḥ

‘Having been established, [the fire] stays smoking.³³⁵ Then the fire [is identified with] the Rudras.’³³⁶

The same usage is attested for *dhūpyāte* at ŚBM 2.3.2.9. This form (semantically, a nonce formation), unless mere error (the loss of *ā* in *dhūpāyá-?*), may result from contamination of the expected *dhūpāyāti* with pass. *dhūpyate* (discussed above). It could have emerged on the model of the class IV present *dīpya-^{te}* ‘shine, blaze’ (very common in the ŚB; see Chapter II, s.v.). *dīpya-^{te}* is derived from the secondary root *dīp*, extracted from the causative *dīpāyati* ‘make shine’. Originally, *dīpya-^{te}* could be a causative passive, reinterpreted as an anticausative: ‘is made shine’ → ‘shines’. The phonologically similar *dhūpyāte* (which also belongs to the verbs of fire kindling), could have developed its secondary meaning on this pattern (‘is made smoke’ → ‘smokes’), preserving the suffix accentuation of the *dhūpyate* ‘is fumigated’.

³³⁵ Comm. *sthapito ... dhūmaṁ kurvan*.

³³⁶ Cf. the corresponding Sūtra passage (ĀpŚS 6.9.1) and see DUMONT 1939: 57f.

dhṛ* α ‘stay’; β ‘decide’: *dhriyá-te

Simplex:

α ‘stay, withstand, be firm’ RV 5.34.7 +;

β ‘determine, decide’ YV^p ++ *sám* β TS^p 6.1.5.1

accented: ŚB

• (α) anticaus., (β) tr.

pass. of *-áya*-pres. (caus.).*dhāráyā-ti/te* ‘hold’ (= caus. to α): *dhāryá-te* ‘be held’Simplex MS^p 3.7.8:87.10, 11, ŚB, KB 8.1.17 +;+ *sam* JŚS-Kār. 102

accented: MS

As repeatedly noticed in Vedic scholarship (cf. WHITNEY 1896: 277, §773; MACDONELL 333, §444a; GONDA 1951: 23; MINARD 1956: 243, [§]665, fn. c), *dhriyá-te* has no passive meaning, in spite of its suffix (“passive”) accentuation, cf.:

(RV 5.34.7cd)

durgé caná dhriyate víśva á purú ' jáno yó asya táviṣīm ácukrudhat

‘A whole tribe which has made angry his (sc. Indra’s) power cannot withstand for a long time even in an inaccessible place.’

(AV 9.1.11cd = 16cd)

evā me áśvinā vārca ' ātmāni dhriyatām

‘Verily, O Áśvins, let splendor stay in myself.’

Unlike the transitive present *dhāráyā-ti* ‘uphold’, well-attested from the early Vedic period onwards, *dhriyá-te* occurs in the RV only once and may be the secondarily built as the intransitive (anticausative) counterpart of *dhāráyā-ti* (JAMISON 96).

Beside the primary usage α ‘stay, withstand’, from Vedic prose onwards, *dhriyá-te* is attested with the secondary meaning β ‘determine, decide’ (see KÜMMEL 2000: 642f.; LIV 145f., note 6), often constructed with an infinitive, cf.:

(TS^p 6.5.9.1)*tām adhriyata hótum*

‘He decided to offer it.’

(ŚB 2.2.3.20)

svāhāgnīm pāvamānam iti, yādi pāvamānāya dhriyérant; svāhāgnīm indumantam iti, yādy agnāya indumate dhriyéran

‘[Then he says]: [...] “Svāhā to Agni Pavamāna!” – if they decide to [offer to] Agni Pavamāna; “Svāhā to Agni Indumat!” – if they decide to [offer to] Agni Indumat.’

(ŚB 14.4.3.34 (= BĀUM 1.5.34 = BĀUK 1.5.23))

yād vā etē ’múrhy ádhriyanta, tād evāpy adyā kurvanti

‘What they decided [to do] of old, the same they still do today.’

In the VādhS *dhriya-te* occurs constructed with a content accusative (*figura etymologica*):

(VādhŚS [ed. IKARI] 11.4 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 3.71:7 (CALAND 1926: 177f. [= Kl.Schr., 360f.]))

yām va eṣa dhṛtiṃ dhriyātai ...

‘The decision which he would take (lit.: which he would decide) ...’

Obviously, meaning β has developed from α: ‘stay’ → ‘stick [to the opinion]’ → ‘decide’. A few occurrences can be regarded as intermediate between these two usages, cf.:

(ŚB 14.7.1.19 (= BĀU 4.3.19))

yāthāsmínn ākāśé śyenó vā suparṇó vā viparipátya śrāntāḥ, saṃhátya pakṣáu, sallayāyaivá dhriyáte

‘As a falcon or an eagle in this sky, having flown in different directions, being tired, folds his wings and decides³³⁷ to sit down ...’

It is important to note that both α and β belong to the main semantic subclasses of the middle class IV presents, namely, motion and body posture and mental activities (cf. *mānya-te* ‘think’, *mṛṣya-te* ‘forget’), respectively; see Chapter C.II.2.2. Thus, from the semantic point of view, *dhriyá-te* can be grouped with the middle -ya-presents with root accentuation both in its primary and secondary usages.

³³⁷ The suggested translations vacillate between α and β, cf. SENART: ‘se porte vers son nid’; BÖHTLINGK: ‘sich ausschickt zum Niederhocken’, DEUSSEN (1897: 470): ‘sich zur Niederkauierung begiebt’; OLIVELLE (1998: 115): ‘swoops down into its nest’. F.M. MÜLLER (1884: 167) (‘is carried [to his nest]’) and, after him, HUME (²1931: 136) (‘is borne [down to its nest]’) apparently attempted to render the suffix (passive) accentuation of *dhriyáte*, translating it by means of passive forms, which is of course unnecessary.

Caus. pass.

Passives built to the *-áya*-present *dhārāya*⁻ⁱⁱ are attested from the Saṃhitā prose (MS) onwards. Examples are:

(MS 3.7.8:87.10)

tád yá eṣá paśúr dhāryáte, tám evá bhāgadhéyam abhisám̐bhavataḥ
 ‘Thus [Agni and Soma] obtain as their share the cattle which is being kept.’

(ŚB 1.2.5.20)

sá vā upáry-upary evá prókṣaṇīṣu dhāryámāñāsv átha sphyám úd yachati
 ‘While the sprinkling-water is being held close above [the wooden spade],
 he takes up the wooden spade (sphya).’

***nah* ‘tie, bind’: *-nahyá*^{-te}**

+ *ápi* AV 12.5.25 (*apinahyámāna*-), KauśS 65.1

accented: AV

• pass.

➔ Chapter V, s.v.

***nid* ‘revile, blame, mock’: *nidyámāna*-**

(*nindya*^{-te} DhSū.+)

nidyámāna- RV 6.52.3

nindya^{-te} ‘blame, condemn’ BaudhDhS 1.19.8 [ed. ŚASTRI 1.19.10] (*nindyate*, v.l. *hanyate*) +

accented: RV

• pass.

The passive *nidyá*^{-te} derived from the root *nid* ‘revile, blame, mock’³³⁸ is a RVic hapax:

(RV 6.52.3c)

kīm aṅgá naḥ paśyasi nidyámānān

³³⁸ For the meaning of *nid* and its IE cognates, see FENART & MANESSY-GUITTON 1974: 127ff.

‘Why then are you looking at us [indifferently], while we are being blamed?’

The reduplicated thematic present *nīnda*^{ti} has been early reanalysed as a class I present derived from the quasi-root *nind* (cf. e.g. the -ta-participle *nindita*- RV +), and in the post-Vedic period (from the Dharma-Sūtras onwards) the new passive *nindya*^{te} replaces the extinct RVic *nidyá*^{te} (cf. MEILLET 1918: 211).

Other passives

The only middle form attested beside the -yá-passive is the participle *nidāná*-. It occurs in the passive usage and might belong to the paradigm of the unattested (medio-)passive aorist **ānedi* (see KULIKOV 2006b: 61):

(RV 4.5.12d)

rēku padāṃ ná nidāná āganma

‘... [where] we went, as the blamed ones, the wrong way.’³³⁹

nī ‘lead, conduct, pour’: *nīyá*^{te}

Simplex RV +;

+ *ādhi* RV 10.89.6, AVP 16.54.8;

+ *áva* KB 12.2.6 [ed. LINDNER 12.1]; + *abhy-áva* ŚBM 5.1.4.5; + *sam-áva* ŚBM 14.6.2.12 = BĀUM 3.2.12 = BĀUK 3.2.11, ŚB 14.7.2.8 = BĀUM 4.4.8,³⁴⁰ AB 2.20.9 +;

+ *ā* AVP 16.142.4, VS 39.5, MS^P 3.9.7:126.5-6, ŚB 1.7.1.6, 14.3.1.30, ŚBK 2.2.1.1, TĀ 5.11.4 +; + *ud-ā* TS^P 6.3.8.3;

+ *úd* RV 3.8.9, YV^P +; + *abhy-ud* BaudhŚS 23.8:161.16 (ed. CALAND ⁺*abhyunnīyeraṇ*, mss. *abhyunniran*, *abhyupanīra*^o);

+ *upa* ŚŚS 15.15.14;

+ *ni* GṛSū.;

³³⁹ RENOU (EVP XIII, 10): ‘(l’endroit) où nous sommes allés comme (vont) vers une piste inane (des gens) sujets à blâme’ (i.e., as RENOU, *ibid.*, p. 97 explains, “les concurrents malchanceux”); GELDNER: ‘(ob) wir als die Getadelten gleichsam die falsche Fährte gegangen sind’; cf. also GONDA 1979: 19. The meaning of *nidāná*- is clearly passive, contra HILL 43.

³⁴⁰ Missing in the Kāṇva recension.

- + *pári* RV +;
- + *prá* RV +;
- + *prāti* MS^p 1.8.10:130.16;
- + *ví* RV, KS^m 31.14:16.18, JB^v 3.86:7
- accented: RV +
- pass., (anticaus.)

The passive *nīyá-^{te}* is solidly attested from the RV onwards, both as a simplex and with preverbs. Examples are:

(RV 1.162.3ab)

eṣá chágaḥ puró áśvena vājínā ' pūṣṇó bhāgó nīyate viśvādevyaḥ
 ‘This goat, [appointed] to the All-Gods, is being brought forward by the
 victorious horse as Pūṣan’s share.’³⁴¹

- with *ádhi*:

(RV 10.89.6cd)

yád asya manyúr adhinīyámānaḥ ' śṛṇāti vīlú rujāti sthirāṇi
 ‘... when his (sc. Indra’s) rage, being enhanced, crushes the stronghold,
 breaks the firm [fortresses]’.

- with *úd*:

(RV 3.8.9cd)

unnīyámānāḥ kavībhiḥ purástād ' devā devānām āpi yanti páthaḥ
 ‘Being erected by the poets in the east, the gods (= sacrificial posts) enter
 the path of the gods.’³⁴²

- with *prá*:³⁴³

(RV 10.176.3ab)

ayám u śyá prá devayúr ' hótā yajñāya nīyate
 ‘This Hotar, devoted to the gods, is being lead for a sacrifice.’

It is worth mentioning that *nīyá-^{te}* is the only Vedic passive for which an imperfect form is attested in early Vedic (though in a late Vāṅkhilya hymn):³⁴⁴

³⁴¹ See GONDA 1985a: 89f.

³⁴² For this passage, see H.-P. SCHMIDT 1973: 25f.

³⁴³ On the ritual meaning of this compound, see, in particular, RENOU 1955a: 423.

³⁴⁴ Passive imperfects remain rare until Vedic prose; see Chapter C.IV.1 for discussion.

(RV 8.56.4ab (= Vāl. 8.4ab))

tátro ápi prāṇīyata' pūtákratāyai v_iyàktā

‘Here also the anointed Pūtakrata’s wife was brought forward...’

(Other passives)

Middle forms do not occur in intransitive usages. Two RVic occurrences of the middle present *náya-te* translated by GELDNER as passive (*náyamānaḥ* RV 1.173.3 ‘während [das Roß] geführt wird’)³⁴⁵ and reflexive (*anayanta* RV 6.24.6 ‘[sie] gingen’) are likely to instantiate the objectless transitive usage (GRASSMANN 1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 740, GOTŌ 197: ‘[das Roß], das [den Wagen] mit sich führt’; ‘sie führten [die Schätze, Reichtümer]’).³⁴⁶

pañ ‘bargain (for)’: *paṇyámāna-*

VS 8.55 (≈ ŚB 12.6.1.10) ≈ ^UKS^m 34.14:46.4 (≈ APrāyaśc. 3.1)

accented: VS, ŚB

• pass.

The passive participle *paṇyámāna-* occurs only in young mantras (YV^m):

(VS 8.55.bc (≈ ŚB 12.6.1.10) ≈ ^UKS^m 34.14:46.4 ≈ APrāyaśc. 3.1)

*ásuraḥ paṇyámānaḥ | mitráḥ krītāḥ*³⁴⁷

‘[Soma is] Asura when being bargained for, Mitra when bought.’³⁴⁸

pañⁱ ‘admire, glorify’: *-panyá-te*

+ *ví* RV 1.180.7 (?)

accented: RV

• pass. (of recipr.?)

³⁴⁵ Thus also RENOUE EVP XVII, 49; ELIZARENKOVA.

³⁴⁶ For a criticism of GOTŌ’s interpretation, see HETTRICH 1989: 304.

³⁴⁷ KS and APrāyaśc. *bhagaḥ paṇyamāno; ’suraḥ krītāḥ*.

³⁴⁸ For this mantra, see GONDA 1983c: 10.

Not counting a few occurrences in late Vedic, all forms of the root *panⁱ* occur only in the RV. Non-present middle forms (pf. *papné*, aor.inj. *paniṣṭa*) are employed in the passive usage (GOTÖ 206, fn. 413; KÜMMEL 2000: 297f.). The relevant passages are:

(RV 6.60.4ab)

tā huve yāyor idām 'papné víśvam purā kṛtām

‘I call them both (sc. Indra and Agni), whose every deed [which has been done by them] before is admired.’

(RV 7.45.2c)

nūnām só asya mahimā paniṣṭa

‘Now this greatness of his is glorified.’³⁴⁹

It is unclear whether a -yá-passive has existed beside these medio-passive forms.³⁵⁰ The only form which may instantiate this passive is the RVic hapax *vipanyāmahe*, attested in a difficult context. The relevant passage runs as follows:

(RV 1.180.7ab)

vayām cid dhī vām jaritārah satyā 'vipanyāmahe ví pañír hitāvān

‘Since only we, the true praisers of yours (sc. Áśvins), *vipanyāmahe*; [may stay] away the Pañi, the possessor of the hidden [goods].’³⁵¹

The form *vipanyāmahe* has been much discussed in the literature. The suggested interpretations are summarized below:

³⁴⁹ See NARTEN 168.

³⁵⁰ The following paradigmatic considerations may serve as indirect evidence for the existence of a -yá-passive of *panⁱ*. Middle sigmatic aorists are relatively rare in the passive usage, we find some half-dozen such forms (*dṛkṣata*, *ayukṣata*, *asṛkṣata*, etc.; see Chapter C.V.2.1). All these forms co-exist with (and partly replace) passive -i/-ran-aorists (*dṛkṣata* // *ádarśi*, *asṛkṣata* // *ásṛjran* etc.). Thus, there are good reasons to assume that the passive aorist **ápani* ‘has been glorified, admired’ could have existed alongside the sigmatic aorist *paniṣṭa* (as INSLEY (1995: 94) suggested). On the other hand, -i-aorists typically co-exist with middle -ya-presents (either with -yá-passives or with the non-passive middle presents with root accentuation, such as *jāya^{-te}*; see Chapter C.V.2.1), and the hypothetical **ápani* could be the aorist counterpart of the present passive *(*)panyá^{-te}*.

³⁵¹ The second part of pāda b according to THIEME (1986: 165 [= Kl.Schr. II, 945]); see also GOTÖ 1989: 282ff., with note 8.

(1) Traditionally, *vipanyámahe* is held for a passive from *panⁱ* ‘admire, glorify, praise’ and correspondingly translated as ‘we are glorified [as genuine praisers]’.³⁵² However, *panⁱ* does not occur with *ví*, and it is unclear from the suggested translations which semantics this preverb might contribute to the meaning of *panⁱ*.

(2) According to THIEME (1986: 165 [= Kl.Schr. II, 945]), the form in question belongs to another root, ²*pan* ‘sich abmühen’ (IE **pen-*), meaning ‘wir wetteifern’; this analysis is followed by OBERLIES (1992). The meaning ‘toil’ hardly makes better sense, however,³⁵³ and, besides, leaves the suffix (“passive”) accentuation unexplained.

(3) GOTŌ (1987: 206, fn. 413) considered the formation a denominative from *vipanyá-* ‘glory’ in the reflexive usage, ‘wir rühmen uns’ (thus, semantically, returning to the translations proposed by GRASSMANN [RV übers.] and HILLEBRANDT. Later, GOTŌ (1989) has reconsidered his 1987 interpretation.

(4) Finally, a completely different morphological analysis was suggested already by WEBER in his 1845 dissertation; later, it was advocated by RENOU (EVP VIII, 50) (cf. also MINARD 1963: 61) and, more recently, by GOTŌ (1989) and DUNKEL (1987), and adopted, in particular, by FALK 1994a: 2f. (with bibl.), MAYRHOFFER, EWAia II, 81 and WERBA [VIA I] 234. According to GOTŌ et al., *vipanyámahe* and nouns *vipanyá-*, *vipanyú-* belong together, as derivatives of the root *vip* ‘be/become (mentally) excited’. Correspondingly, *vipanyámahe* is regarded as an -*anyá*-present, not a -*yá*-passive, meaning ‘wir erregen uns, wir sind in geistiger Erregung (so daß wir jetzt richtig die Dichtung “erschauen” können)’ (GOTŌ, op.cit., 282; see also GOTŌ in WITZEL et al. 2007: 329 and 768f.).

Although the meaning ‘be/become (mentally) excited’ is possible in the context of RV 1.180, this analysis is not impeccable either. Note, in particular, that the -*anyá*-presents does not occur with middle inflection (cf. OETTINGER

³⁵² Thus GRASSMANN 1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 772; GELDNER (‘wir werden ... anerkannt’), ELIZARENKOVA (‘мы славимся’). LUDWIG (1876 [RV übers.]: I, 45) connected *vipanyámahe* with the root *panⁱ*, but took it as transitive (‘wir preisen euch’; cf. also LUDWIG 1881 [Comm. zu RV übers. I]: 46), which is improbable for a -*ya*-present with suffix accentuation. Hardly possible is also a reflexive interpretation ‘wir rühmen uns’ (GRASSMANN 1877 [RV übers.]: II, 173; HILLEBRANDT 1891 [VMyth. II]: 87; 1916: 513 [= Kl.Schr., 198]).

³⁵³ Cf. FALK 1994a: 3.

1992 [1994]).

Whatever the morphological analysis of *vipanyāmahe*, it seems to be a nonce formation, triggered by the word play (*vī-pan ... vī pañí-*). Incidentally, this word play may also account for the shape of the root syllable (*pan-*, instead of *pā-*, which might be expected for a -yá-passive derived from a set root). The traditional passive interpretation (1) seems to me quite plausible, with the following minor modification: *vī* may have the reciprocal value, and the form in question could be a passive of reciprocal (**vī-panante* ‘they glorify each other’):³⁵⁴ ‘We, the true praisers of yours (sc. Ásvins), are glorified by each other ...’

²*pā* ‘drink’: *pīyá-^{te}*

AV 5.19.5, TS^p 6.4.3.4, ^UKS^p 12.3:165.1-2, ŚBK 4.8.3.19, JB 2.254^{2x}:13, 15, ChU 6.6.3, VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 4.31 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 4.52^{2x}:7, 8 (CALAND 1928: 163 [= Kl.Schr., 463]))

accented: AV +

• pass.

pass. of caus.: *-pāyya-^{te}*

+ *upa* ĀpŚS 9.18.11, 20.17.2 = HirŚS 14.3.53

The passive *pīyá-^{te}* first appears in the hymn AV 5.19 (very rich in -yá-passives):

(AV 5.19.5cd)

kṣīrām yád asyāḥ pīyáte ' tād vái pitṛṣu kílbīṣam

‘When her milk (sc. the milk of the Brahman’s cow) is being drunk, that is verily an offence against the fathers.’

pīyá-^{te} becomes more frequent in Vedic prose. The only finite form occurs in the Kāṭhaka:

(KS 12.3:165.1-2)

tasmā́d udare somaḥ pīyate

‘Therefore Soma is being drunk into the belly.’

Other attestations are participles employed in the formulaic expressions built

³⁵⁴ For this type of formation, see also s.v. *tṛh* and KULIKOV 2007a: 721ff.

on the pattern *X adyámānaḥ* (-āḥ) *pīyámānaḥ* (-āḥ) *ná kṣīyate* (-nte) ‘[Even] being eaten and drunk, X do(es) not waste’ (where *X* stands for Soma, waters, etc.), as in:

(TS 6.4.3.4)

tásmād adyámānāḥ pīyámānā ápo ná kṣīyante

‘Therefore the waters, [albeit] being eaten and drunk, do not waste.’

Other passives

Beside the -yá-passive and -i-aorist (RV, see KÜMMEL 1996: 71), the passive usage is attested for two forms, traditionally regarded as belonging to the paradigm of the middle perfect: RV 8.32.16 *pape* and RV 6.44.7 *papāná-* (see DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 265; 1897 [VglSynt II]: 206; KÜMMEL 2000: 309), cf.:

(RV 8.32.16c)

ná sómo apratā pape

‘Soma has not been drunk without recompense.’

These two forms may represent 3sg. stative and stative participle derived from the perfect stem (see KULIKOV 2006a: 67f.).

Caus. pass.

The passive -pāyya-^{ie}, built to the causative *pāyaya-*^{ti} ‘make drink, water’, is attested in two Śrauta-Sūtras of the Taittirīya tradition. As in the case of most other (relatively few) passives based on the causatives derived from transitives, the subject of the passive construction refers to the causee (i.e. to the one who is caused to drink), not to the liquid being drunk, cf. ĀpŚS 9.18.11 *yady upapāyyamāno na pibet ...* ‘if [the sacrificial animal], though being [respectfully?] caused to drink, does not drink ...’³⁵⁵

pīś ‘adorn, dress’: *pīśyámānā-*

AV 12.5.36

accented: AV

• pass.

³⁵⁵ I follow the interpretation of this passage suggested by W. KNOBL (p.c.); see KULIKOV 2008: 250, fn. 13.

The passive participle *piśyāmānā-* (AVic hapax) is attested in the passive-rich hymn 12.5:

(AV 12.5.36)

śarvāḥ kruddhāḥ piśyāmānā, śimidā piśitā

‘[The Brahman’s cow is] the angry Śarva when being dressed, Śimidā when dressed.’

Other passives

3sg. and 3pl. forms *pipiśé* and *pipiśre* (traditionally regarded as middle perfects in all occurrences) appear in transitive-affective (*pipiśre* RV 5.60.4, with the direct object *tanvāḥ* ‘bodies’) and reflexive (*pipiśe* RV 2.33.9)³⁵⁶ usages, as well in passive constructions (*pipiśé* RV 5.57.6, 6.49.3,³⁵⁷ 9.68.4), cf.:

(RV 9.68.4c)

añśur yávena pipiśe yató nṛbhiḥ

‘The filament is adorned with barley, held by the men.’

(RV 6.49.3ab)

aruśásya duhitārā vírūpe ' stṛbhir anyā pipiśé súro anyā

‘The two daughters³⁵⁸ of the reddish one³⁵⁹ are different: one is adorned³⁶⁰ with stars, another with the rays of the sun.’

The passive occurrences of the form *pipiśé* must represent 3sg. stative derived from the perfect stem, rather than a middle perfect form properly speaking; see KULIKOV 2006a: 67f.

³⁵⁶ This occurrence can also be taken as passive; see KÜMMEL 2000: 311.

³⁵⁷ For this occurrence, a reflexive interpretation is also possible; see KÜMMEL 2000: 311.

³⁵⁸ The Night and the Dawn.

³⁵⁹ Probably, Agni or Sūrya; see GELDNER ad loc.

³⁶⁰ Thus DELBRÜCK (1897 [VglSynt II]: 206), GELDNER, RENOU (EVP V, 32), GONDA (1979: 22), ELIZARENKOVA. GRASSMANN (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 818) suggests a reflexive interpretation.

piṣ ‘crush, grind’: *piṣyá-te*

AVP-Or. 6.15.5 (≈ AVP-Kashm. 6.15.6), ŚB(K), KātyŚS 2.5.9 +
 accented: ŚB(K)

• pass.

The passive *piṣyá-te* first appears in the AVP:

(AVP-Or. 6.15.5-6)

[5] *ūrjā yā te niruptasya_a orjā yāvahatasya te*
ūrjāṃ te piṣyamānasya_a orjāṃ piṣṭāt ta ā dade

[6] [*ūrjā yā*] *te niruptasya_a orjā yāvahatasya te*
*ūrjāṃ te pacyamānasya_a orjāṃ pakvāt te [ā dade]*³⁶¹

‘[5] I am taking your nourishment which belongs to what has been scattered, your nourishment which belongs to what has been threshed, your nourishment which belongs to what is being ground, your nourishment which belongs to what has been ground. [6] I am taking your nourishment which belongs to what has been scattered, your nourishment which belongs to what has been threshed, your nourishment which belongs to what is being cooked, your nourishment which belongs to what has been cooked.’³⁶²

Accented forms occur only in the ŚB, for instance, in ŚB 5.2.3.2 (quoted in Chapter B.III, s.v. *śī*).

Other passives

A passive interpretation is most likely for the form *-pipiṣe* (probably stative built on the perfect stem) attested in the Indra hymn RV 1.32:

(RV 1.32.6d)

sám [...] pipiṣa índraśatruḥ

³⁶¹ The Kashmir ms. reading *paśyamāna°* ... *piṣṭā°* in stanza 5 and *pihyamāna°* ... *pakvā°* in 6 (for which EDGERTON [JAOS 34: 401] conjectures **pacyamāna°* ... *piṣṭā°* and **piṣyamāna°* ... *pakvā°*, i.e. ‘... the strength of yours, who is being cooked ... from the crushed one; ... the strength of yours, who is being crushed ... from the cooked one’ (??) is corrupt.

³⁶² I essentially follow the interpretation suggested by GRIFFITHS (2009: 186f.).

‘He (sc. Vṛtra), who had Indra as his enemy, has been crushed.’³⁶³

¹*pū* ‘purify, cleanse’: *pūyá-^{te}*

Simplex RV, VS 8.57 ≈ TS^m 4.4.9.1, ŚB, JB 3.240:10, TĀ 1.8.7, TĀ-Āndhra 40, ŚĀ 12.1, DhSū. +;

+ *ud* ŚrSū. +

accented: RV +

• pass.

pass. of caus. *pāváyá-^{ti/te}* ‘purify’: *pāvya-^{te}* ‘be purified’

Simplex ŚrSū.;

+ *ati* VārŚS 3.1.1.15

The verbal system of the verb *pū* is a good illustration of the tripartite opposition of syntactic patterns: passive (‘be purified’), expressed by the *-yá*-present *pūyá-^{te}* ~ non-passive intransitive (anticausative ‘become clear’, reflexive ‘purify oneself’), rendered by the class I middle present *páva-^{te}* ~ transitive (‘purify [smth.]’), expressed by the class IX present *punāti*, *punīte* etc. (see RENO 1957c: 118ff. [= Choix II, 756ff.]; JOACHIM 107f.; GOTÖ 207f.).

The *-yá*-passive *pūyá-^{te}* is solidly attested in the RV (20x), especially in maṇḍala IX (purification of the Soma),³⁶⁴ but becomes relatively rare in later texts. Examples are:

(RV 9.96.16ab)

suvāyudhāḥ sotṛbhiḥ pūyámāno ‘*’_abh_iy āṛṣa gúh_iyam cáru náma*
‘Well-armed, being purified by pressers, flow [o Soma] towards [your]
beloved secret name.’

(RV 9.86.12d)

suvāyudhāḥ sotṛbhiḥ pūyate vṛṣā
‘[Soma], the well-armed bull, is being purified by pressers.’

³⁶³ A transitive analysis of *-pipiṣe* suggested by GRASSMANN (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 819) and LUDWIG (1876 [RV übers.]: II, 596) is impossible; for discussion, see especially BLOOMFIELD 1896: 412ff.

³⁶⁴ Most of the attested forms are participles (17x); finite forms occur only three times.

Note that *pūyá-te* occurs constructed with the agentive instrumentals (cf. examples above), while the class I present *páva-te* never does.³⁶⁵ This syntactic feature is indirect evidence for the consistent passive translation of *pūyá-te* ('Soma is being purified') and for rendering *páva-te* as an anticausative or reflexive ('Soma becomes clean / purifies himself'), even in spite of the fact that in some contexts both passive and non-passive intransitive (anticausative, reflexive) interpretations might be semantically appropriate.

Other passives

The middle participle derived from the nasal pres. stem *punāná-* (stative participle? see KULIKOV 2006a) occurs both in transitive and intransitive (anticausative, reflexive, passive) constructions; see RENOU 1957c: 120f. [= Choix II, 758f.]; GOTŌ 208. An example of the passive usage is:

(RV 9.87.1b)

nṛbhiḥ punānó abhí vájam arṣa
'Purified by the men, flow to the prize.'³⁶⁶

The rare and late middle perfect, attested in Vedic prose (part. *ati-pupuvāná-* MS^p, 3sg. *pupuve* PB), is also employed in the passive usage; see KÜMMEL 2000: 307.

Caus. pass.

The -áya-causative *pāváyā-ti/te* 'purify, make clean', attested from the AVP onwards,³⁶⁷ is employed in the same usage as the transitive nasal present *punāti*, and does not function as the causative of *punāti*. Thus, it functions as a new causative of the intransitive *páva-te*, gradually ousting the older *punāti*. Accordingly, its passive *pāvya-te*, first attested in the Śrauta-Sūtras, partly replaces the "non-causative" passive *pūyá-te*. An example is:

(ĀpŚS 10.7.12)

citpatir mā punātu, vākpatir mā punātu, devo mā savitā punātv iti pāvyamāno japati
'[The sacrificer] whispers, being purified: "May the master of thought purify me, may the master of speech purify me, may the god Savitar purify me!"'

³⁶⁵ Cf. also GOTŌ 207f.

³⁶⁶ Cf. WENZEL 102; DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 264.

³⁶⁷ For the distribution of the two stem variants in the texts (*pāváyā-* in the MS, KS, KpS, etc.; *paváyā-* in the TS, TB, TĀ, etc.), see GOTŌ 208.

pr̥c α ‘fill’; β ‘unite, mix’: *pr̥cyá^{te}*

Simplex β VS 10.4 (= ŚB 5.3.4.27) ≈ KS^m 1.8:4.3 (*pr̥cyantām* ≈ TS^m 1.8.12.1 = TB^m 1.7.6.1 *saṃ ... sr̥jyadhvam*), VS 20.27 = TS^m 1.2.6.1, ŚB^m 5.3.4.27;

+ *úpa* α ‘fill; increase; impregnate’ RV 6.28.8, 8.51.7 (= Vāl. 3.7), 9.69.2;

+ *sám* ‘unite, mix, join’ RV 1.103.1, 1.110.4, AV 6.64.1, 6.74.1, YV^m (–ŚB, TB), ŚB^m 1.2.2.2,³⁶⁸ JB^m 1.39:4

accented: RV 9.69.2, ŚB 1.2.2.2

• anticaus., pass.

The use of the -yá-present *pr̥cyá^{te}* is essentially limited to the mantra language: it occurs, above all, in the RV (5×) and YV^m (only two times in the AV). The two main meanings attested are: α ‘fill; increase; impregnate’ and β ‘unite, mix’ (cf. RENOU 1958: 65ff.). The former is only attested in compounds with *úpa*,³⁶⁹ which are encountered exclusively in the RV (3×). The relevant passages are quoted below:

(RV 8.51.7cd (= Vāl. 3.7cd))

úpopén nú maghavan bhūya ín nú te ' dānam devásya pr̥cyate

‘Over and over again now,³⁷⁰ O liberal one, the gift of yours, the heavenly one, is further now increased.’³⁷¹

More difficult are the two other occurrences. RV 9.69.2 attests a particular submeaning of α, ‘be impregnated’:

(RV 9.69.2a)

úpo matīḥ pr̥cyáte sicyáte mādhu

‘[While] the religious thought is being impregnated, the honey is being poured out.’³⁷²

³⁶⁸ One of the mantras quoted in this passage is missing in the VS; see below.

³⁶⁹ For *úpa-pr̥c* and the root noun *upap̥c-* (*upap̥k*), see also H.-P. SCHMIDT 1963b: 298, with fn. 1.

³⁷⁰ On the iteration of the preverbs and its function, see DUNKEL 1981: 215; KLEIN 2008: 169 and passim.

³⁷¹ For this stanza and its repetitions in later texts, see GONDA 1980a: 43.

³⁷² Thus GELDNER (‘Während die Dichtung befruchtet wird, wird der Süßtrank eingegossen’), RENOU, EVP IX, 18 (‘Tandis que le poème est fécondé, le miel

The increase and, probably, impregnation is also the theme of RV 6.28.8:

(RV 6.28.8 (≈ AV 9.4.23))

úpedám upapárcanam ' āsú góṣṭúpa pṛ
úpa ṛṣabhásya rétasṛ ' úpendra táva vīryè

The analysis of the construction with the *figura etymologica*, i.e. *upapárcanam* ... *úpa pṛcyatām*, poses some difficulties. The verbal form is usually translated as 'be mixed', 'be filled' or 'be added'.³⁷³ However, the meaning 'mix' is most commonly attested for the simplex and for compounds with *sám* (see below). The context (cf. especially *rétas-* 'semen' and *vīryà-* '(manly) strength' in *pādas* cd) rather favours the meaning 'increase' = 'be/become impregnated':³⁷⁴

'Let this increase increase in these cows; increase in the semen of the bull, increase in your strength, O Indra.'

The meaning β 'mix, unite' is attested in the RV for compounds with *sám* (two occurrences in *maṇḍala* I):

(RV 1.103.1acd)

tāt ta indriyám paramám parācāḥ [...]
kṣamédám anyád divy anyád asya ' sám ī pṛcyate samanéva ketúḥ
 'This your highest [nature] of Indra is far away. [...] It [is represented] [by] one [aspect] on the earth, [by] another in heaven. [This double aspect] is

(sômique) se déverse'), KLEIN 1992: 63 ('The (poetic) thought is brought to fruition') and ELIZARENKOVA. BHAWE (1962: 154) argues that "G[E]LD[NER]'s meaning 'is fertilized' (*befruchtet*) is too heavy for the wording. The ritual of *upapárcana* (fertilizing the cows by giving them salty water etc.) is prescribed by later texts for AV 4.21 = RV 6.25; but even in these passages the meaning 'bring near or to mix' is always present". The meaning 'bring near' is unattested for *úpa-pṛc*, however, and BHAWE's translation ('The song is brought near (i.e. offered); and the mead is poured out'; *ibid.*, p. 151) is impossible.

For the intonational type of this sentence, see KLEIN 1992: 60ff.

³⁷³ LUDWIG (1876 [RV übers.]: II, 135): 'dise beimischung soll disen kühlen zugemischt werden'; GRASSMANN (1876 [RV übers.]: I, 547): 'es werde diese Zumischung dieser Milch zugefüllt'; PISCHEL (1897 [VSt II]: 206f.): 'diese Mischung [...] werde für die Kühe gemischt'; GELDNER: 'Dieses Befruchtungsmittel soll bei diesen Kühen sich fruchtbar zeigen'; HAUDRY (1977: 238): 'Que cet *upapárcana* se réalise dans les vaches'; DUNKEL (1979: 74): 'This mixture should be mixed with these cows'; ELIZARENKOVA: 'Это (оплодотворяющее) добавление / Пусть добавится к этим коровам'.

³⁷⁴ Thus GRASSMANN 1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 1025. See also RENOU 1958: 66.

mixed to it (i.e. is mixed, yielding this nature), as light [unites] to the single [light (?)].³⁷⁵

(RV 1.110.4)

ṛbhávaḥ [...] *saṁvatsaré sám apr̥cyanta dhītībhiḥ*
‘Within [one] year the ṛbhus united with the [divine] visions.’³⁷⁶

After the RV, *pr̥cyá-te* occurs only in usage β, both in the simplex and in compounds with *sám*. All attested forms are imperatives; the majority of them are encountered in constructions built on the pattern (*sám*) *X*_{NOM/VOC} *Y*_{INS} [or: *X*_{INS}] *pr̥cyá-IMPV* (*pr̥cyantām, -dhvam*) ‘Let *X* be united with *Y* [or: with *X*]!’ / ‘O *X*, become united with *Y* [or: with *X*]!’. Examples are:

(AV 6.74.1ab)

sám vaḥ pr̥cyantām tanuvāḥ ‘*sāṁ mánāṁsi sám u vratā*
‘Let your bodies be united together, your minds, your vows’.

(VS 10.4.u (= ŚB 5.3.4.27))³⁷⁷

mādhumatīr mādhumatībhiḥ pr̥cyantām
‘Let the sweet ones mix with the sweet ones!’³⁷⁸

In the Brāhmaṇas (ŚB, TB, JB) *pr̥cyá-te* occurs only in mantra quotations and comments thereon. The only non-imperative form appears in such a comment in the ŚB:

³⁷⁵ Cf. KUPFER (2002: 134): ‘Das (besitzt) du als höchstes indrisches (Wesen) in weiter Ferne. [...] Auf (der) Erde ist dieses eine (hier), im Himmel sein anderes. Zusammengemischt wird es wie (ein) Licht zu einem ganzen (sc. brennenden Licht).’ In my view, the enclitic pronoun *ī* should be taken here as an accusative of content/result, retained in the passive construction, not as a nominative subject (contra KUPFER); for discussion, see KULIKOV 2005b: 86.

³⁷⁶ I follow ELIZARENKOVA’s translation (‘Рибху [...] / В течение года соединились с (божественными) силами прозрения’). Cf. also GONDA’s (1963: 191) interpretation (‘the Ṛbhus ... were endowed with visions’, i.e. ‘they come by means of visions into contact with the suprahuman sphere of the divine’), adopted by RENOU, EVP XV, 79. GELDNER’s interpretation (‘Die Ṛbhu’s ... sahen in Jahresfrist ihre Erwartungen erfüllt’) is syntactically impossible and semantically unlikely, in particular, because the meaning ‘fill’ is attested only with the preverb *úpa*.

³⁷⁷ For the variants of this mantra in the Saṁhitās of the Black YV, see s.v. *sr̥j*.

³⁷⁸ For this mantra, see, in particular, GONDA 1989b: 46.

(ŚB 1.2.2.2)

átháika upasárjanībhīr áiti, tá á náyati. táḥ pavítrābhyāṃ prāti gṛhṇāti: sám āpa óṣadhībhir íti; sám hy ètád āpa óṣadhibhir etábhiḥ piṣṭābhiḥ samgáchante; [...] sám revátīr jágatībhīḥ pr̥cyantām íti, revátya āpo jágatya óṣadhayas tá u hy ètád ubháyaḥ sampr̥cyānte; sám mādhumatībhīḥ pr̥cyantām íti; sám rāsavatyo rāsavatībhīḥ pr̥cyantām íti évaitád āha

‘Then someone (sc. the Āgnīdhra priest) comes with the mixing-waters, he pours them. [The Adhvaryu] receives them through the strainers, [with the mantras:] “[Let] the waters [unite] with the plants!” [VS 1.21.c] – for then the waters unite with the plants, with this ground [rice]; [...] “Let the wealthy ones **become united** with the moving ones!” [VS 1.21.c] – for the waters are wealthy, the the plants are moving, and they both **are** then **united together**; “Let the sweet ones **mix** with the sweet ones!” [VS 1.21.c]; “Let the ones full of sap **mix** with the ones full of sap!”³⁷⁹ – thus he says.’

The only Brāhmaṇa attestation outside the ŚB and TB occurs in an unidentified JB mantra (cf. BODEWITZ 1973: 92 and 96, note 6):

(JB 1.39:4)

athāpaḥ pratyā nayati: yas te apsu rasaḥ praviṣṭas, tena sam̐ pr̥cyasva íti
‘Then he pours the waters on it, [with the mantra:] “Unite with your sap which entered into the waters!”.’

(Other passives)

Middle presents with the nasal infix as well as participles *pap̥rcāná-* RV 1.141.6, 9.74.9 (which may belong with the paradigm of the stative made from the perfect stem) and *pr̥cāná-* RV 9.97.11 (belonging with the alleged medio-passive aorist **áparci*) are employed in the same intransitive usages as *(-)pr̥cyá-*^{te},³⁸⁰ cf.:

(RV 10.95.9ab)

yád āsu márto am̐tāsu nisp̥rk ' sám kṣoṇībhiḥ krátubhir ná pr̥ñkté
‘When a mortal, touching these immortal [women], unites with [them] with

³⁷⁹ This mantra (not mentioned by BLOOMFIELD (1906 [VC])) is missing in the VS.

³⁸⁰ See KÜMMEL 2000: 305.

squeals according to [their] wishes ...³⁸¹

(RV 9.74.9)

adbhīḥ soma papṛcā́śya te rásaḥ [...] dhāvati

‘The sap of yours, O Soma, of the one mixed with waters, flows.’

To conclude this lemma, it will be in order to discuss the position of *pṛcyá-te* among the -yá-presents. Unlike most of the middle -ya-presents with suffix accentuation, *pṛcyá-te* typically exhibits no passive meaning. Even in the contexts where passive translations (‘is filled’, ‘is united’ or the like) are theoretically possible, they usually seem less appropriate than the corresponding non-passive (anticausative) interpretations (‘becomes full’, ‘increases’, ‘unites’).

In addition, there are a number of features which *pṛcyá-te* has in common with the non-passive middle -ya-presents:

(1) *pṛcyá-te* does not occur constructed with the instrumental passive agent.

(2) The *figura etymologica* construction (*upapárcanam ... úpa pṛcyatām*), attested in RV 6.28.8, does not occur with -yá-passives, but is very common, for instance, with the non-passive -ya-present *tápyá-te* (*tápas tapyate* ‘he performs penance, ascesis’; see Chapter B.III, s.v.).

(3) Semantically, *pṛcyá-te* (when employed in usage α ‘become full, increase’) is very similar to another non-passive -ya-present with fluctuating accentuation, *pūryá-te*; see Chapter III, s.v. Note that both of them are opposed to transitive presents with nasal affixes (*pṛṇákti*, *pṛṇāti*).

(4) Only three of the early Vedic occurrences built on the stem *pṛcyá-* are indicative forms. Such a ratio of moods (indicative / imperative) is quite unusual for a -yá-passive (see Chapter C.IV.1). Furthermore, the imperfect -*apṛcyanta* (RV 1.110.4) is one of the two RVic examples of an imperfect built on a -yá-stem (beside -*anīyata* in the late Vāṅkhilya hymn RV 8.56.4). Thus, from the paradigmatic point of view and *pṛcyá-te* turns out isolated among -yá-passives.

These system-related arguments favour grouping *pṛcyá-te* with the non-passive -ya-presents, rather than with -yá-passives – which requires an explanation of its suffix accentuation. One of the two accented occurrences appears in the ŚB and cannot, by itself, serve as evidence for the passive interpretation; cf. e.g. the semantically similar *pūryá-te* ‘becomes full’ and other -ya-presents with fluctuating accentuation in the ŚB (see Chapter C.II.3

³⁸¹ For this passage, see, in particular, SCARLATA 668, with fn. 949.

for details). I presume that our -ya-present originally bore the accent on the root: **pṛcya-te*. The suffix accentuation of the only RVic accented occurrence (-*pṛcyáte* RV 9.69.2), might be accounted for as follows:

(i) *pṛcyáte* is adjacent to the -yá-passive *sicyáte* (note the similar phonological structure);

(ii) middle -ya-presents of the type *CṛC-ya-* are unattested in the RV (*mṛṣya-te* and *ṛjya-te* do not occur accented), while -yá-passives of this structure are quite common, cf. *ṛcyá-te*, *mṛjyá-te*, *vṛjyá-te*, *sṛjyá-te* (see Chapter C.I for a complete list). The secondary accent shift (**pṛcya-* → *pṛcyá-*) could further be supported by the secondary suffix accentuation of the type *mriyáte* (*Criyá-* ← **Cṛ-ia-*); see Chapter C.II.2.3.

pṛch/prach (praś) ‘ask’: pṛchyá-te

RV 4.3.8, 4.5.11, 8.40.3 (+)

accented: +

• pass.

The passive stem *pṛchyá-* is based on the secondary root *pṛch*, extracted from the -cha-present *pṛchāti*, which is derived from the root *pṛś* (< IE **prek-*).

The passive *pṛchyá-te* does not occur in Vedic outside the RV.³⁸² An example is:

(RV 4.5.11a)

ṛtām voce námasā pṛchyámānaḥ

‘With a reverence, I proclaim the truth, when I am being asked.’

pyā ‘swell’

pass. of caus. (*pyāyáya-ti* ‘make swell’): -*pyāyyámāna-*

+ *ā* VS 8.57, ŚB 12.6.1.20, ŚrSū.

accented: VS, ŚB

³⁸² WHITNEY’S (1885b [Roots]: 102) indication “V.+” is inexact; *pṛchya-te* does not appear after the RV until Epic Sanskrit.

The passive *-pyāyyá-^{te}* (built to the causative *pyāyáya-^{ti}* ‘make swell, extend’) occurs in the VS and in a Brāhmaṇa passage commenting on this mantra:

(VS 8.57.b)

viṣṇur āprītapā āpyāyyámānaḥ

‘[Soma is] Viṣṇu, guarding those who are propitiated, when he is being made swell (in the waters).’³⁸³

(ŚB 12.6.1.20)

átha yády āpyāyyámānaḥ / kímcid āpádyeta, viṣṇava āprītapāya sváhéti juhuyāt

‘And if [his Soma] were to meet with any mishap while being invigorated (lit. being made to swell), let him perform an oblation with [the mantra]: “To Viṣṇu Āprītapa hail!”.’

Along with *-vartyá-^{te}* and *sādyá-^{te}*, *-pyāyyá-^{te}* is one of the earliest causative passives in Vedic (YV^m +); see Chapter C.II.1.2.2.

bandh ‘bind’: *badhyá-^{te}*

Simplex RV–YV, ŚB 11.8.3.2, JB 3.279:2, ŚĀ^m 12.6 (30), ŚvetU 1.8 (*badhyate*, v.l. *budhyate*)³⁸⁴, ĀpŚS 24.2.27, VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 3.11 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 4.13:4 (CALAND 1928: 109f. [= KI.Schr., 409f.))), VādhŚS +;

+ *ānu* KS^p 29.4:172.10 = KpS^p 45.5:271.8, HirŚS 21.3.4 +;

+ *ā* ‘tie to’ ĀpŚS 22.26.9 = HirŚS 23.4.22;

+ *úpa* MS^p 4.7.8:103.18, 19;

(+ *ní* AVP-Kashm. 13.10.2,³⁸⁵ ms. *°nu vahnyatām*, ed. BARRET [†]*ni badhyantām*,³⁸⁶ read with Or. [12.19.10] *°n ava hanmi tām*);

+ *prati* BaudhŚS 26.5:278.1;

+ *sam* DhSū.

³⁸³ For this mantra, see GONDA 1983c: 16f.

³⁸⁴ Cf. ed. HAUSCHILD, comm. ad loc.

³⁸⁵ Misprint (“AVP XVIII 10, 2”) in GOTÖ 1997a: 1015.

³⁸⁶ Another conjecture, hesitantly suggested by BARRET, *ibid.* [JAOS 48, p. 57], is [†]*ni uhyantām*.

accented: +

• pass.

The passive *badhyá^{te}*, well-attested in the mantras, becomes somewhat less common in Vedic prose. Examples are:

(RV 4.57.4c)

śunām varatrā badhyantām

‘For prosperity let the straps be bound.’

(AV 9.6.6)

yát tárpaṇam āhāranti, yá evāgnīṣomīyaḥ paśúr badhyáte, sá evá sáh

‘When they bring satiation, that is just the same as an animal for Agni and Soma that is bound [for sacrifice].’

Other passives

Beside -yá-passives, the passive usage is also attested for the 2sg. form *bedhiṣe* (see GOTÖ 1997a: 1014; KÜMMEL 2000: 329):

(AVŚ 6.63.3a = 6.84.4a = AVP 19.11.3a)

ayasmāye drupadé bedhiṣa ihá

‘You are bound to an iron post here.’

This is one of the rare examples of the passive usage of middle perfects after the RV³⁸⁷ (alternatively, it might be taken as one of the last remnants of the early Vedic stative) and, at the same time, a rare instance of the passive usage of a middle perfect / stative which is not a 3rd person form.

bhakṣ ‘consume, drink’: *bhakṣyamāna*-³⁸⁸

VS 8.58 ≈ ^{+U}KS^m 34.16:47.8 (conjecture CALAND apud ed. VON SCHROEDER; ms. *bhakṣa*^o), ŚB 12.6.1.32 (+)

accented: +

• pass.

³⁸⁷ Not counting middle perfects of verbs of perception (such as *dadṛśe*), which are common in the passive usage up to late (post-Vedic) texts; see Chapter C.V.3.

³⁸⁸ Not to be confused with the homonymous middle future from the root *bhaj* ‘share’.

The secondary root *bhakṣ* is extracted from the old denominative *bhakṣāya*-^{ti} ‘consumes, drinks’ (⇐ *bhakṣá-* ‘drink, food’), with the secondary accent retraction (see WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]: 107; JAMISON 73, 76f.). The *-yá*-present *bhakṣyá*-^{te} (attested only in participles) is the earliest Vedic attestation of a passive derived from a root of a denominative origin.³⁸⁹ *bhakṣyámāna-* first appears in a passive-rich mantra, adjacent to *bhakṣá-*, and may be a nonce formation:

(VS 8.58.ef ≈ ^UKS 34.16:47.8)

nṛcákṣāḥ prátikhyātaḥ / *bhakṣó bhakṣyámāṇaḥ* [KS ms. *bhakṣa*°]³⁹⁰
 ‘[You are] the one who watches over men³⁹¹ [when] beheld, food [when] being consumed.’³⁹²

The only occurrence of this participle in the Brāhmaṇas (ŚB) occurs in a passage related to the Soma-sacrifice and must be based on this YVic mantra:

(ŚB 12.6.1.32)

átha yádi bhakṣyámāṇaḥ kīṃcid āpádyeta, bhakṣāya sváhéti juhuyāt
 ‘And if [his Soma] were to meet with any mishap while being consumed, let him perform an oblation with [the mantra]: “To Bhakṣa hail!”.’

***bhaj* ‘share, distribute, divide’: *-bhājyá*-^{te}**

+ *ví* :

-bhajya-^{te} MS^p 3.7.6:82.17, KS^p 34.15:47.1, (ŚB 11.6.1.3, all eds. *vibhājamāna-*, improbable WHITNEY 1892 ⁺*vibhajyámāna-*), PB 10.12.7, 20.15.2^{2x} = JB 2.241^{2x}:2, 3, MānŚS 8.13.13, HirŚS 3.8.63, 66 +

-bhājyá-^{te} (pass. of recipr.?) AVŚ 12.5.28 (*vibhājyámānā* ≈ AVP 16.144.1 mss. ^o*bhajy*°, ed. BARRET ⁺*bhājy*°, ed. BHATTACHARYA ⁺*bhajy*°), MS^p 2.2.13:25.13

³⁸⁹ Other formations of this type (*gupyá*-^{te}, *-mantryá*-^{te}) appear in the Brāhmaṇas; see s.vv. and Chapter C.II.1.2.4.

³⁹⁰ BLOOMFIELD & EDGERTON (1930 [Ved. Var. I]: 52) group this form with the instances of interchange between passive and middle, but the Kāthaka reading *bhakṣa*° may be a simplification of the cluster *-kṣy-*, or even a graphic error (cf. *dhokṣamāṇā-* (v.l.) for *dhokṣyamāṇā-* in AVP 5.31.1; see s.v. *duh*).

³⁹¹ On the meaning of *nṛcákṣas-*, see GRIFFITHS (2009: 111) ad AVP 6.9.1b.

³⁹² For this mantra, see GONDA 1983c: 22.

accented: AV, MS^p 2.2.13:25.13

• pass.

The passive *-bhājya-te* occurs only in compounds with *ví*. Its transitive counterparts (class I presents) can be inflected both in the active and middle. The active *vi-bhāja-ti* ‘make share, distribute’ is constructed with the accusative or genitive of shared goods and with the dative of the recipient of distribution (cf. JAMISON 129, GOTŌ 221f.), as in:

(AV 3.4.2d = 3.4.4d)

táto na ugró ví bhajā vásūni

‘From there, the mighty one, share out goods to us!’

The middle *vi-bhāja-te* is the reciprocal pendant of the active *(vi-)bhāja-ti*, meaning ‘distribute among each other, share with each other’,³⁹³ cf.:

(AV 6.66.3cd)

áthaiśām indra védāṃsi 'śataśó ví bhajāmahai

‘Then we will, O Indra, share among ourselves their (sc. belonging to the foes) possession hundred-fold.’

The passive *vi-bhājya-te* is attested both with the long and short vowel in the root. The long vowel variant first appears in the passive-rich hymn AV 12.5:

(AVŚ 12.5.28 ≈ AVP 16.144.1)

páutrādyam vibhājyāmānā [AVP mss. °bhajy°]

‘[The Brahman’s cow is] the eating of one’s children when being shared out.’ (WHITNEY)

Another attestation of this stem is encountered in the MS:

(MS 2.2.13:25.13-14)

*sátvāno gā ichanti. yád eté taṇḍulā vibhājyānte; sátvāno vā etá eṣṭāro
'bhiroddhāra evá*

‘The warriors seek for cows. [The fact] that these grains are distributed is, verily, [due to the fact that] these warriors are seekers and catchers.’

Morphologically, *-bhājya-te* might be taken as a passive built to the

³⁹³ This syntactic type can be called ‘indirect reciprocal’, since it denotes reciprocal situations with symmetric relationships between the subject and the indirect (dative) object; see KULIKOV 2007a: 719ff.

causative *bhājáyati*, as actually suggested by MACDONELL (1910: 398) and DEBRUNNER (1956a: 41) for the aforementioned AVic occurrence. This interpretation poses several difficulties, however:

- 1) First of all, this would be the only instance of a -yá-passive derived from a causative in the RV and AV – which disfavours a causative analysis.
- 2) The causative meaning badly suits the context; DEBRUNNER's interpretation ('wenn man sie [sc. die Kuh] verteilen läßt') is forced.³⁹⁴
- 3) Syntactically, this interpretation is impossible. According to JAMISON 129 and GOTŌ 221f., *bhājáyati* serves as a causative to the middle I/T (intransitive/transitive) present *bhájate* 'X_{NOM} takes a share of Y_{ACC/GEN}'. This pattern has two causative counterparts: the active class I present *bhájati* 'Z_{NOM} apportions Y_{goods}_{ACC/GEN} to X_{recipient}_{DAT}' and the -áya-causative *bhājáyati*, constructed with the recipient of goods (X) in the accusative and with the genitive of goods: 'Z_{NOM} makes X_{recipient}_{ACC} take a share of Y_{goods}_{GEN}'. Accordingly, the subject of *-bhājyá-te* must correspond to the accusative object of the underlying transitive construction, i.e. to the recipient (X) of the Brahman's cow, but hardly to the cow itself (the meaning '[the cow] which one makes take a share [of something?]' makes of course no sense). Hence, syntactically, *-bhājyá-te* cannot be a passive of *bhājáyati*.

Since a causative interpretation of *-bhājyá-te* is impossible, the long root vowel must be of secondary origin. In my view, it could be due to the influence of the nominal *vibhāgá-* (RV +) 'distribution', thus being of the same nature as, for instance, *ā* in *abhi-cārya-te* (\Leftarrow *abhi-cāra-*) 'be bewitched, be subject of abhicāra' (see s.v. *car*); in other words, *vi-bhājyá-te* might be rendered as 'be subject of vibhāga'. This assumption leaves open the question on whether there existed any difference in use between *vi-bhājya-te* and *vi-bhājyá-te*. I will return to this issue below.

The short vowel variant *-bhājya-te* is attested from the Saṃhitās of the Yajurveda onwards. Examples are:

³⁹⁴ It is interesting to note that in WHITNEY's Index verborum to AV (1881: 205) the form in question is given with the short *a* as if it were an ordinary passive (*vibhajyāmāna-*). In a later article, WHITNEY (1892: 305) mentioned this entry in his Index as an "erratum". DEBRUNNER, who obviously was not aware of this correction made by WHITNEY himself, assumed in his review of RENOU's *Grammaire védique* (1956a: 41) that this could be WHITNEY's emendation, not a misprint, based perhaps on the non-causative semantics of *vibhajyāmāna-*.

(MS 3.7.6:82.17-83.1)

ṣaḍ vá áhāni vāg ví bhajyate, ná vái ṣaṣṭhām áhar vāg áti vadati

‘Verily, speech is distributed over six days, speech does not speak beyond the sixth day.’

(PB 10.12.7)

saṃvatsaro ’gnir, vāk saṃvatsaro; yad agnir vibhajyate, vācam eva tad vi bhajanti

‘Agni is the year, the year is speech; in that Agni is being divided [into several varieties],³⁹⁵ they thereby divide the speech.’

Two occurrences of *vi-bhajya*^{le} in the HirŚS represent a particular (and syntactically interesting) usage. Ed. ĀnSS reads the relevant passages as follows:

(HirŚS 3.8.63 ≈ BaudhŚS 1.7:11.3-4)

carupuroḍāśyān prāg adhivapanād vibhajyeraṃs [BaudhŚS °*carupuroḍāśīyān vibhajeran*, v.l. °*ḍāśīyā vibhajyeran*]. *tatra vibhāgamantram japati, samān dvaidham karoti, viśamān yathābhāgam*

(HirŚS 3.8.66)

adhiśrayaṇakāle mitho vibhajyeran

The former of these two passages was translated by EINO (1988: 20) as follows: ‘Die (enthülsten Körner) für den *caru* und für den *puroḍāśa* soll man **voneinander abtrennen**, bevor die für den *puroḍāśa* auf den Mühlstein geschüttet werden. Dabei murmelt er [d.h. der *Adhvaryu*] den *vibhāgamantra*. (Wenn die Opfergaben aus einem *caru* und aus einem *puroḍāśa* bestehen), teilt er sie in zwei gleiche Teile. (Wenn nicht,) in ungleich[e] Teile je nach dem Umfang der Opfergaben.’

It seems that EINO misinterpreted the passage. First, he apparently confused *bhaj* and *bhāj*:³⁹⁶ *vi-bhaj* cannot mean ‘abtrennen’.³⁹⁷ Second, EINO renders the whole construction as non-passive (transitive), and it remains unclear how the passive suffix -ya- should be accounted for. On the other hand, a passive analysis would immediately pose the following two syntactic problems: 1) there is no passive subject in the sentence, and 2) an accusative direct object (*carupuroḍāśyān*) is impossible in a passive construction. Here one should recall that the middle *bhājate* can be constructed either with the accusative or with the partitive genitive of shared goods (see above). A

³⁹⁵ I.e. mentioned in different case forms (nominative, vocative, accusative, etc.; cf. PB 10.7). Agni is, in a sense, “distributed” among its own aspects, represented by the case forms of the word *agni*-; see GONDA 1984: 74f.

³⁹⁶ Cf. below on a similar EGELING’s mistake in his translation of ŚB 11.6.1.3.

³⁹⁷ This meaning can hardly be expressed by *bhāj* either; rather it might be rendered by *vi-vic* ‘separate’.

number of mss. mentioned in the crit. app. of ed. ĀnSS read the genitive form *carupuroḍāśānām* (one ms. *carupuroḍāśīyānām*) instead of the accusative *carupuroḍāśyān*. This reading seems more attractive. The active construction corresponding to the attested passive sentence would then be **carupuroḍāś(īy)ānām* ... *vibhajeran* ‘they should share among each other [some amounts of rice grains] for the *caru* and for the *puroḍāśa*’, and the parallel BaudhŚS passage attests indeed a transitive construction °*ḍāśīyān vibhajeran* (with the accusative). Since normally only an accusative object becomes a passive subject, the genitive argument could be left unchanged by passivization, which results in a subjectless (or, to be more exact, nominative-less) passive construction.³⁹⁸ Thus, the beginning clause of the sūtra can be translated as ‘[the amounts of the rice grains] for the *caru* and for the *puroḍāśa* should be shared among each other.’ This interpretation is supported by the construction with the nominative passive subject instead of the genitive (*prāg adhvāpanāc carupuroḍāśīyā vibhajyeran*), attested as a variant reading in a ms. for the BaudhŚS passage (CALAND 1909: 66 [= Kl.Schr., 187]).

The meaning of the form *vibhajyeran* in sūtra 3.8.66 must be the same: ‘when one puts [the oblation] on [fire], [the rice grains] should be (mutually) distributed [among each other].’ The reciprocal interpretation of *vi* is confirmed by the adverb *mithah*;³⁹⁹ cf. also the commentator’s gloss *parasparam* ‘each other’.

Since both the active and middle (reciprocal) *vi-bhāja^{ti/te}* can be constructed with an accusative direct object, each of these two patterns can be passivized, at least theoretically. Obviously, it is not always easy to draw a strict boundary between the passive counterparts of the active *vi-bhāja^{ti}* ‘make share, distribute’ and middle *vi-bhāja^{te}* ‘distribute among each other, share with each other’ (reciprocal). An overtly expressed recipient noun in the dative would rule out a reciprocal interpretation, but passive constructions with a dative are not attested. Another feature correlated with the reciprocal/non-reciprocal distinction is the number characteristics of the agent nominal. By definition of the reciprocal construction, the subject can only be non-singular (plural or dual): ‘X’s / X and Y share smth. with each other’. On the other hand, the subject of the corresponding non-reciprocal verb is often a singular noun.⁴⁰⁰ Consequently, a singular passive agent (also when not

³⁹⁸ A collection of examples of the partitive genitive from Vedic prose can be found in SEN 1930: 55f.; cf. e.g. AB 2.9.7 *puroḍāśasya yajati* ‘[with these words] he offers some *puroḍāśa*’.

³⁹⁹ For a similar case, see s.v. *tr̥h*.

⁴⁰⁰ All active occurrences of the compound *vi-bhāja^{ti}* attested in the AV and the majority of the RVic attestations of this compound (all except one, *vī bhajanti* at RV 10.114.10) are singular forms.

overtly expressed but presumed) rules out a reciprocal interpretation and, *vice versa*, the presence of a non-singular agent makes a reciprocal interpretation at least possible.

Thus, for instance, in the context of the plural subject *sátvāno* ‘the warriors’ (MS 2.2.13:25.13-14), a reciprocal interpretation is very likely: ‘these grains are distributed [by warriors among each other]’. Likewise, a non-referential plural passive agent can be supplied for AV 12.5.28 (‘[The Brahman’s cow is] the eating of their children when being shared out [by men among each other]’). By contrast, there are no good reasons to surmise a non-singular agent for MS 3.7.6:82.17-83.1 (‘speech is distributed over six days [by the priest]’). Furthermore, for PB 10.12.7, a non-reciprocal interpretation is supported by the active (hence, non-reciprocal) form *vibhajanti* in the following sentence.

Thus, both occurrences for which a reciprocal interpretation seems quite probable, are forms derived from the long vowel stem. Evidence is rather scant, but one may assume that there existed a tendency, at least in the Saṃhitās, to introduce the long *ā* in passives of reciprocal, in order to distinguish them from non-reciprocal uses.

Other passives

Most middle forms of the compound *vī-bhaj* are employed in the transitive (reciprocal) usage, but at least for the following occurrence of the middle perfect (or stative? see KULIKOV 2006a: 67f.) *-bhejire* a passive interpretation is very likely:

(AV 5.4.8)

údañ jātó himávataḥ ' sá prācyāṃ nīyase jánam
táttra kuṣṭhasya nāmāṇy ' uttamāni ví bhejire

‘Born in the north from the snowy [mountain], you (sc. the kuṣṭha plant) are conducted to people in the east; the highest names⁴⁰¹ of the kuṣṭha are distributed there [by people among each other].’⁴⁰²

⁴⁰¹ I.e. various sorts and kinds of the plant.

⁴⁰² Thus BLOOMFIELD (1897: 5): ‘there the most superior varieties of the *kusṭha* were apportioned’; WEBER (1898b: 180): ‘dabei sind die trefflichsten Namen (Arten) des *Kusṭha* vertheilt worden (überall hin gebracht worden)’. WHITNEY renders the second part of the stanza as a transitive construction (‘they have there shared out the highest names of the *kuṣṭha*’; likewise KÜMMEL 2000: 335).

Unlike middle perfects, middle class I presents cannot be employed in the passive usage (GOTŌ 56), and this generalisation holds true for (vi-)bhája-^{te}. One seeming exception is the participle *vibhájamānān* at ŚB 11.6.1.3, attested in the passage where Varuṇa's son Bhṛgu tells him what he came upon during his journey:

(ŚB 11.6.1.3)

éd u púruṣaiḥ púruṣān párvāṇy eṣāṃ parvaśāḥ saṃvráscam parvaśó vibhájamānān: idāṃ távedāṃ māméti. sá hovāca: bhīṣmāṃ bata bhoḥ, púruṣānn vá etát púruṣāḥ párvāṇy eṣāṃ parvaśāḥ saṃvráscam parvaśó vy àbhakṣatéti

WEBER (1855: 240 [≈ Ind.Str. I, 24]) took the participle *vibhájamānān* as passive, with the instrumental *púruṣaiḥ* as a passive agent: '... [Bhṛgu] traf auf Männer, die durch Männer, unter gliedweisem Zerhauen ihrer Glieder, gliedweis **getheilt wurden**, mit den Worten „dies dir, dies mir.“ Er sprach: „Schreckliches! weh! he! Männer wahrlich hier Männer, deren Glieder gliedweis zerhauend, gliedweis zertheilten.“⁴⁰³

DELBRÜCK (1888 [AiS]: 404; cf. also p. 265) rightly pointed out that middle presents do not occur in the passive usage in Vedic prose. To avoid a passive analysis, DELBRÜCK conjectured the accusative *púruṣān* instead of *púruṣaiḥ*; however, it is unclear which exact translation he might suggest for the emended passage. EGGELING adopted DELBRÜCK's emendation and translated 'men were dismembering men', probably confusing *bhaj* 'distribute' and *bhañj* 'break' (see Chapter B.IV, s.v.). Since the present *bhāja-* cannot belong to *bhañj*, EGGELING's translation is impossible.

In his review of DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS], WHITNEY (1892: 302) rejected DELBRÜCK's emendation and proposed his own conjecture, ⁺*vibhajyāmānān* instead of *vibhájamānān*⁴⁰⁴ (thus apparently returning to WEBER's passive interpretation), without translating the passage, however.

Finally, GOTŌ (1999: 130, fn. 15) has suggested a reciprocal translation of a similar sentence in ŚB 11.6.1.8 (*yān vái tát prácyāṃ diśy ádrākṣīḥ púruṣaiḥ púruṣān párvāṇy eṣāṃ parvaśāḥ saṃvráscam parvaśó vibhájamānān, idāṃ távedāṃ māméti vánaspatayo*⁴⁰⁵ *vái té 'bhūvan*⁴⁰⁶): 'Die

⁴⁰³ Quoted from the text reproduced in *Indische Streifen* I, which slightly differs from the original version, published in *ZDMG* 9 (1855). WEBER's passive translation is also adopted by TICHY (1995b: 323, with fn. 14, 336f., 342).

⁴⁰⁴ In the text *vibhájamānāu* and *vibhajyāmānāu*, obviously by misprint.

⁴⁰⁵ Ed. Weber erroneously reads *vánapátayo*.

du da in östlicher Richtung gesehen hast, Männer mit Männern, ihre Gelenkstücke gelenkstückweise (fortwährend) zerhackend, gelenkstückweise **unter sich verteilend** [mit den Worten:] ‘Dies ist deins. Dies ist meins’, das fürwahr sind die Bäume gewesen.’⁴⁰⁷

Both DELBRÜCK’s and WHITNEY’s emendations are too drastic and unlikely.⁴⁰⁸ Since the middle *vi-bhāja-te* is employed in the reciprocal usage, GOTŌ’s interpretation seems most likely.⁴⁰⁹

bhuj ‘consume, enjoy, use’: *bhujyá-te*

ŚB 3.9.3.27, ĀgnivGS, DhSū. +
accented: +
• pass.

The passive *bhujyá-te* occurs only once in Vedic:

(ŚB 3.9.3.27)

*tásmād āpa etāvati bhóge bhujyámāne*⁴¹⁰ *ná kṣīyante*

‘Therefore the water, although so much use [of it] is made, does not give out / run short., although so much of food and drink is being consumed, the waters does not waste.’

⁴⁰⁶ Ed. WEBER erroneously reads *té abhūvan*.

⁴⁰⁷ I am much indebted to W. KNOBL for discussing with me the interpretation of this passage as well as for pointing out to me two mistakes of ed. WEBER.

⁴⁰⁸ OERTEL’s (1941: 99 [= Kl.Schr. II, 1468], fn. 1) account of the loss of *-y-* in this form as resulting from the simplification of the palatal cluster, parallel to *vr̥ścyá-te* → *vr̥śca-te* in the AV and MS (see s.v. *vraśc* for details), does not seem convincing. The sequence *-jy-* (and, in general, *-y-* after a single palatal) is less heavy than *-ścy-* and quite common in Sanskrit.

⁴⁰⁹ TICHY’s (1995b: 337) statement that the passive and reciprocal functions are incompatible (“einer Verwendung des grammatisch regulären, semantisch und funktional jedoch dem Aktiv zugeordneten Passiv *vibhajyá-* ‘verteilt werden’ stand die reziproke Komponente entgegen, die durch die wörtliche Rede *idāṃ táve, -dāṃ mamé-ti* noch zusätzlich hervorgehoben wird”) does not seem convincing; on reciprocal passives, see s.v. *tṛh* and KULIKOV 2007a: 721f.

⁴¹⁰ Cf. also PW V, 382 (‘obwohl sie [die Wasser] so vielfache Verwendung finden’). I am thankful to W. KNOBL for valuable suggestions on the interpretation of this passage.

bhr̥ ‘carry, bring’: *bhriyá-^{te}*

Simplex RVKh. 5.7.4.f [= Praiśādhya 38 in ed. MINKOWSKI, p.216f.] (*bhriyāntām*), AVP 4.14.7 (Or. *bhriyamāṇa-*, v.l. *bhr̥ya^o*, Kashm. *bhr̥ya^o*⁴¹¹), YV^p, (JB 3.264:2-3 [ed. CALAND §207]⁴¹²), GB 1.2.20:56.3, TĀ +;
 + *sam-ā* MS^p 1.9.5:136.6;
 + *āva* ‘bring down, set’ RV 5.31.12;
 + *nī* id. RV 7.21.2;
 + *prā* RV 1.14.4, RVKh. 5.7.3.a [= Praiśādhya 22 in ed. MINKOWSKI, p.208f.] = MS^m 4.13.8:209.9-10 = ^UKS^m 19.13:15.15 = TB^m 3.6.13.1 (*prā bhriyeta*);
 + *sām* ‘bring together, collect; make ready, prepare’ YV, ŚB 12.6.1.22, ŚBK 4.6.3.1, AB 1.8.16, TĀ 5.11.1, KāthĀ +
 accented: RVKh. 5.7.4.f⁴¹³ +
 • pass.

The passive *bhriyá-^{te}* is well-attested from early Vedic onwards. One of the three RVic occurrences is the only instance of a passive subjunctive in early Vedic (see HOCK 1985-86: 86 and Chapter C.IV.1):⁴¹⁴

(RV 5.31.12c)

vādan grāva āva védim bhriyāte

‘The resounding pressing stone shall be brought down on the Vēdi.’

Another noteworthy form is the optative *prā-bhriyeta* encountered in a young mantra (RVKh.–YV). *-bhriyeta* and *vṛjyeta* (in the same passage) are probably the earliest Vedic attestations of passive optatives:⁴¹⁵

⁴¹¹ Erroneously reckoned by RENOU (1957b: 95) to the root *bhr̥*.

⁴¹² *bhriyamāṇa-* in ed. CALAND exists only as a variant reading; ed. RAGHU VIRA/LOKESH CHANDRA has *tasmāt sa babhriyamāṇo* [read **barbhriyamāṇo*] *jīvati* ‘therefore he (sc. the donkey) lives carrying the burden’; see LUBOTSKY (2002: 105) ad AVP 5.22.6.

⁴¹³ Accentuation according to ed. MINKOWSKI; ed. SCHEFTELOWITZ gives no accents for RVKh. 5.7.4.f.

⁴¹⁴ For RV 1.120.11 *ūhyāte*, see below, s.v. *vah*.

⁴¹⁵ Cf. HOCK 1985-86: 98.

(RVKh. 5.7.3.a [= Praiṣādhya 22] = MS^m 4.13.8:209.9-10 = ^UKS^m 19.13:15.15 = TB^m 3.6.13.1)

devām barhiḥ sudevām ⁴¹⁶ *devāiḥ syāt*, ⁴¹⁷ *suvíraṁ vīráir. vástor
vr̥jyētāktóḥ* ⁴¹⁸ *prá bhriyeta*

‘May the divine barhis be godly through the gods, heroic through the heroes. May it be gathered in the morning; may it be spread out before dawn.’ (MINKOWSKI 208f.)⁴¹⁹

Worthy of being mentioned is also the imperative (also relatively rare for -yá-passives in early Vedic) *bhriyántām* in RVKh. 5.7.4.f. [= Praiṣādhya 38 in ed. MINKOWSKI, p.216f.].

Other passives

The -i-aorist is represented by the injunctive form attested once in the RV (*prá ... bhāri* RV 9.97.23); see KÜMMEL 1996: 78f. Besides, the passive usage is attested for the participle *babhrāṇá-* (probably belonging to the paradigm of the stative derived from the perfect stem; see KULIKOV 2006a: 67f.).⁴²⁰

(RV 3.1.8a)

babhrāṇáḥ sūno sahaso v̥y àdyaut
‘Born out, O son of power, [Agni] shone.’

The middle class I presents *bhára-^{te}* can be employed both transitively (in the self-beneficent sense) and intransitively, as anticausatives or reflexives,⁴²¹ as in:

(RV 5.59.4d)

prá yád bháradhve suvitāya dāvāne
‘If you move forward, in order to give wealth ...’

For three RVic occurrences of the middle class I present (1.135.3f = 6b, 5.73.8,

⁴¹⁶ Thus accented in the MS and TB; RVKh. reads *sudevām*.

⁴¹⁷ RVKh. *syat*.

⁴¹⁸ *vr̥jyetā°* in the RVKh.; see also MINKOWSKI 179 and fn. 32.

⁴¹⁹ For this mantra, see also GONDA 1980a: 157f., with fn. 128; 1985b: 192, with fn. 26.

⁴²⁰ For the relationship between the two perfect stems, *jabhár-/jabhr-* and *babhár-/babhr-*, see KÜMMEL 2000: 338f.

⁴²¹ See GOTÖ 225f. and fn. 481-482.

7.24.2), most scholars give passive interpretations.⁴²² However, as GOTÖ 226, fn. 483 convincingly argues, all these cases can be taken either as non-passive intransitives (reflexives) or absolute (objectless) transitives, as in:

(RV 7.24.2c)

visṛṣṭadhenā bharate suvrktīḥ

‘Lobpreisung, deren Milchstrom losgelassen ist, **bringt** [ihre Milch] **dar**.’

(GOTÖ)⁴²³

In spite of HETTRICH’s objections (1989: 304), GOTÖ’s analysis seems more attractive, in particular, for system-related reasons.

Likewise, for RV 10.31.6d *samāná ā bhāraṇe bībhramāṇāḥ*, taken by most scholars as a passive construction,⁴²⁴ a non-passive analysis⁴²⁵ is more probable for the same reasons.

mad ‘rejoice’: *-madyāmāna-*

+ *ānu* ‘cheer, jubilate’ RV 7.63.3, 10.98.8

accented: RV

• pass.

The verbal system of the root *mad* has been discussed at length by NARTEN 185ff., JOACHIM 120f., and, especially, by GOTÖ 235ff. (with bibl.). The verb *mad* is fundamentally intransitive (‘rejoice, exhilarate’), but can be employed transitively with the preverb *ānu* (see GOTÖ 237f.). Passives of the compound *ānu-mad* ‘cheer, rejoice over, welcome’ are twice attested in the RV:

⁴²² In particular, GRASSMANN (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 959ff.), LUDWIG, DELBRÜCK (1888 [AiS]: 264) – for RV 7.24.2 *bharate*; WENZEL 102, EATON 25, DELBRÜCK, *ibid.*, WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER (1954 [AiG II/2]: 774, §619dβ) – for RV 1.135.3, 6 *bhāramāṇa-*; VELANKAR (2003: 118) – for RV 5.73.8 *bharanta*.

⁴²³ Contra GELDNER: ‘Die Lobrede **wird** in entfesseltem Strome **dargebracht**.’

⁴²⁴ EATON 25, GRASSMANN (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 962), DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 264, WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 774, §619dβ, GELDNER (‘in gleicher Tragung getragen’), RENOU, EVP XVI, 130.

⁴²⁵ Anticausative (‘carrying themselves’) or reciprocal (according to GOTÖ 227: ‘sich gegenseitig tragend’).

(RV 7.63.3ab)

vibhrājamāna uṣāsām upāsthād ' rebhāir úd etīy anumadyāmānaḥ
 ‘Shining widely, [Sūrya] rises from the womb of the dawns, cheered by the singers’.

(RV 10.98.8)

agne [...]
viśvebhir devāir anumadyāmānaḥ ' prā parjanyaṁ trayā vṛṣṭimāntam
 ‘Cheered by the All-Gods, raise, O Agni, Parjanya [so that he be] rich in rain.’

man ‘think’**pass. of desid.** ‘doubt’: *mīmāṃsyāmāna-*

AVŚ 9.6.24 (mss., ed. VISHVA BANDHU [9.7.7], ed. ¹ROTH/WHITNEY *mīmāṃsāmāna-*; transl. WHITNEY, notes ad. loc. ⁺*mīmāṃsamāna-* or ⁺*mīmāṃsyāmāna-*; ed. ²ROTH/WHITNEY/LINDENAU, Vorwort, p. XIV ⁺*mīmāṃsamāna-* (?) ≈ AVP 16.113.1 (*mīmāṃsyāmāna-*)

➡ Chapter II, s.v. *man***mantr** ‘pronounce a mantra; address’: *-mantryāmāna-*

+ á ŚB 1.4.1.10, 1.4.1.18;

+ *anu* JB 3.96:4 = “Lost-Br.”, p. 44, l. 29 [ŚāṭyB, Fragn. XV]

accented: +

• pass.

The present *-mantryá-^{te}* is one of the few *-yá*-passives built on the secondary root extracted from a denominative stem.⁴²⁶ Probably, by virtue of its transitivity, the denominative *mantráya-^{te/(ti)}* (← *mántra-* ‘spell’) was early grouped with transitive *-áya*-presents, which triggered the secondary accent retraction (JAMISON 86) and enabled the derivation of a number of formations (absolutives, infinitives, etc.; see GOTÖ 1997a: 1022), including *-yá*-passives. The passive *-mantryá-^{te}* is attested in the Brāhmaṇas, only as a participle, cf.:

⁴²⁶ I would like to thank Marcos ALBINO for discussing with me the semantics and usages of this verb.

(ŚB 1.4.1.18)

kathāṃ nū na āmantryāmāṇo ná prátý aśrauṣīḥ

‘Why did you not answer when being addressed by us?’

manth α ‘stir, whip’, β ‘churn, produce [fire]’: *mathyá-^{te}*

α ‘stir, whip, churn’:

Simplex YV^p + ;

+ *pari* ‘stir around’ Kāṭh-Saṃk. p.18, 1.7 [Agnýādheya-Br. 7 (ed.

CALAND, p. 481)]

β ‘churn, produce [of fire]’:

Simplex RV 5.11.6, YV^p +;

+ *abhi* ŚvetU 2.6⁴²⁷;

+ *nír* AV 10.8.20;

accented: RV +

• pass.

The simplex passive *mathyá-^{te}* (root *manth* ‘stir’) almost exclusively denotes producing fire by rapidly whirling or rotating a dry stick in another dry stick. Examples are:

(RV 5.11.6c)

sá jāyase mathyámānaḥ sáho mahát

‘You, [o Agni], are born, being produced [by whirling], as a great power.’

(KS 6.2:50.17-18 = KpS 4.1:37.10)

tásmād dhástābhyām agnír mathyámāno jāyate

‘Therefore Agni is born, being produced by (two) hands.’

(JB 1.1:4)

tasya vai mathyamānasya bhasmāvaśītyate

‘While it (sc. the lower piece of kindling wood) is churned [by the upper piece of wood], some borings fall down.’⁴²⁸

The meaning (α) ‘stir, whip, churn’ occurs in the following YVic passage:

⁴²⁷ For this passage, see s.v. *rudh*.

⁴²⁸ For the meaning of *śī* in this passage, see Chapter III, s.v. *śī*.

(MS^p 2.6.6:67.1-2 ≈ KS^p 15.5:212.7)

*átha śvetāñ śvetāvatsām duhanti. tát svayám mūrchatī, svayám mathyate
svayañvilínám ájyam bhavati*

‘Then they milk a white [cow] with a white calf. That [obtained milk] coagulates by itself, is whipped [into butter] by itself, becomes self-melted butter.’⁴²⁹

At first glance, this example instantiates an exceptional non-passive usage of *mathyate*. Note, however, that the verb does not refer to a spontaneous event and cannot be qualified as anticausative. This occurrence represents a rare example of a ‘reflexive passive’, where the reflexive emphatic adverb (intensifier) *svayám* ‘(by) itself’ (see KULIKOV 2007a) renders the idea that the passive subject (Patient) is referentially identical with the Agent: the milk is whipped by itself.

The meaning ‘stir’ is also attested for the compound with *pari*:

(Kāth-Saṃk. p. 18, l. 5-7 [Agnýādheya-Br. 7] = ed. CALAND, p. 481f.)

*devā vai sarve sametya prajāpatim apr̥cchan: kiṃ vāyam agnir mithunāt
saṃbhavaty, atho araṇyā, athottarād iti. tām prajāpatir abravīd: yathā vai
puruṣaḥ striyam upetya, tatas triḡuṇān mithunāt parimathyamānāt
puruṣād retaḥ saṃ bhavati*

‘All gods, having come together, asked Prajāpati: “Does this Agni arise from the pairing, or from the [lower] araṇi-wood, or from the upper one?” Prajāpati replied to them: “[This is] as when a man has [sexually] approached a woman, and then, from the threefold one, from the pairing, from the one which is being stirred around”⁴³⁰ [and] from the man, the seed arises.”’⁴³¹

(²*mā* ‘measure’: *mīyá-^{te}*)

Simplex (RV 3.8.3, AV 11.1.6: most likely, from *mi* ‘fix, set up’, q.v.),
ĀpŚS–HirŚS +;

⁴²⁹ The parallel KS passage reads [...] *svayam vi līyate* ‘melts by itself’; see Chapter II, s.v. *lī*.

⁴³⁰ I.e. the yoni, the female organ.

⁴³¹ I am much indebted to Werner KNOBL for discussing with me the interpretation of this passage.

+ *anu* MaitrU 6.1^{2*} ≈ MaitrāyaṇyU 5.1^{2*} +;

(+ *sám* TS^p 6.6.4.6 ≈ KS^p 30.1:181.4 = KpS^p 46.4:278.3 ≈ ŚB 13.3.3.8 :

most likely, from *mi* ‘fix, set up’, q.v.)

• pass.

The existence of a passive of the root ²*mā* ‘measure’ in the Vedic period properly speaking is dubious. All Vedic occurrences of the -yá-present *mīyá-^{te}* belong either to \sqrt{mi} ‘fix, set up’, or to $\sqrt{mī}$ ‘damage, diminish, violate, perish’ (see Chapter III, s.v.), or, at best, are ambiguous ($\sqrt{^2mā}$ or \sqrt{mi}); for a discussion, see s.v. *mī*.

The earliest reliable attestations of the passive *mīyá-^{te}* ‘be measured’ ($\sqrt{^2mā}$) appear in the Śrauta-Sūtras, cf.:

(ĀpŚS 14.8.5 ≈ HirŚS 10.8.10, 13)

rājani mīyamāne mahāvedyām uttaravedyām ca kriyamāṇāyām agnau mīyamāne kṛṣyamāṇe opyamāne [...] dakṣiṇata āste

‘While the [Soma-]King is being measured, while the Mahāvedi and Uttaravedi [altars] are being made, while the fire-place is being measured, ploughed and sown, [...] [the priest] is sitting to the south [from the sacrificial site].’

The translation ‘be measured’ is supported by the transitive counterparts of the passive construction above, attested in ĀpŚS 10.24.8 (*mimīte* ‘he measures [Soma]’)⁴³² and ĀpŚS 16.17.8 (*agniṁ vimimīte* ‘he measures the fire-place’) (note that the reduplicated present *mimīte* can only belong to ²*mā* ‘measure’).

The compound *anu-mīyate*, attested twice in the MaitrU, is likely to belong to the root ²*mā*, too:

(MaitrU 6.1 ≈ MaitrāyaṇyU 5.1)

ato bahirātmanyā gatyāntarātmano ’numīyate gatiḥ [...] antarātmanyā gatyā bahirātmano ’numīyate gatiḥ

‘Consequently, from the course of action of the outer self the course of action of the inner self is measured. [...] From the course of action of the inner self the course of action of the outer self is measured.’ (VAN BUITENEN 134)⁴³³

Other passives

While the passive *mīyá-^{te}* ‘is measured’ is lacking in Vedic, we find in the

⁴³² On Soma-measuring, see CALAND & HENRY 40ff.

⁴³³ For this passage see also VAN BUITENEN 38f. The meaning ‘is fixed, established’ is not impossible in the context; cf. WELLER 1955: 546 [= Kl.Schr. 1, 104] (where *anumīyate* is rendered as ‘wird erschlossen’).

RV the middle reduplicated present *mímīte* in the passive usage:

(RV 8.12.10⁴³⁴)

iyám ta ṛtvíyāvatī ' dhītír eti nāvīyasī

saparyántī purupriyā ' mímīta ít

‘This prayer, being in proper time, goes, as a new one, for you; the worshipping one, dear to many, it is measured [as a verse].’

Note that we only exceptionally find both -yá-passives and other middle presents of the same root in the passive usage – which serves as an additional evidence against the existence of a -yá-passive of $\sqrt{2}mā$ in early Vedic.

mi ‘fix, set up’: *mīyá-^{te}*

Simplex RV 3.8.3, AV, YV^p, PB 6.4.6 ≈ ⁺JB 1.70:8 (conjecture by BODEWITZ⁴³⁵), 6.4.11 +;

+ *ní* AV 9.3.21, 12.1.38, AB 2.1.2, (⁺JŚS 1.25.16, most mss. *minīyamāne*, ed. GAASTRA [24:31.3] ⁺*ni-mīyamāne*, read with comm. and ed. PARPOLA ⁺*mīyamāne* [simplex]);

+ *nir* VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 4.36 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 4.59b:7 (CALAND 1928: 170 [= Kl.Schr., 470])) (all mss. *niramāyata*; CALAND ⁺*niramīyata*);

+ *sám* TS^p 6.6.4.6 ≈ KS^p 30.1:181.4 = KpS^p 46.4:278.3 ≈ ŚB 13.3.3.8, ĀpŚS 14.8.7 = HirŚS 10.8.29

accented: RV +

• pass.

The passive *mīyá-^{te}* ‘be fixed, set up’ is attested from the early Vedic period onwards (though relatively poorly in the Brāhmaṇas). The direct object of *minóti* (= the subject of the corresponding passive *mīyá-^{te}*) typically refers to the sacrificial post (*sváru-*, *yūpa-*), as in the following AVic examples:

(AV 4.24.4b)

yásmai mīyánte sváravaḥ s_uvarvīde

‘For whom, the heaven-finder (sc. Indra), the sacrificial posts are being set up ...’

⁴³⁴ The refrain *mímīta ít* is also repeated at RV 8.12.11-12.

⁴³⁵ Ed. RAGHU VIRA/LOKESH CHANDRA *audumbarīm īyate*, read ⁺*audumbarī mīyate* (BODEWITZ 1979: 78, fn. 7 = 1990: 214, note 10).

(AV 12.1.13ce)

*yáśyāṃ mīyānte sváravaḥ pṛthivyām [...]**sā no bhūmīr vardhayad vārdhamānā*

‘On what earth the sacrificial posts are being set up [...], let this earth, growing, make us grow.’

Since -yá-presents of the three distinct roots, ²*mā* ‘measure’, *mi* ‘fix, set up’, and *mī* ‘damage, diminish, etc.’ formally fell together into *mīyá-te*, they can only be distinguished on semantic grounds. While the existence of the -yá-passive of *mi* ‘fix, set up’ and the -yá-present of *mī* ‘damage, diminish’ raises no doubts (see examples above and in Chapter B.III, s.v. *mī*), Vedic evidence for pass. *mīyá-te* ‘is measured’ is insufficient. All Saṃhitā and Brāhmaṇa occurrences adduced in VWC s.v. *mā* ‘measure’ can be taken as passives of *mi* ‘fix’. The relevant passages are quoted below.

The most likely candidate for the -yá-passive of the verbal root ²*mā* appears in the following AVic passage:

(AV 11.1.6cd)

iyāṃ mātṛā mīyāmānā mitā ca 'sajātāṃs te balihṛtaḥ kṛotu

Although, at first glance, the translation ‘this measure, which is being measured and which is measured’ (thus PW V, 681; HENRY 1896: 98;⁴³⁶ BLOOMFIELD 1897: 180; WHITNEY; GONDA 1965: 80; ELIZARENKOVA 2007: 127) is prompted by the *figura etymologica* (*mātṛā mīyāmānā mitā*), the meaning ‘is fixed, established’ cannot be ruled by the context either.⁴³⁷

‘Let this measure, which is being established and which is established, make [your] tribute-bringers your fellows.’

For part. *mīyāmānaḥ* at RV 3.8.3, the meaning ‘being set up’ is more likely:

(RV 3.8.3abc)

úc chrayasva vanaspate 'várṣman pṛthivyā ádhi 'súmitī mīyāmānaḥ

As in the AVic passage quoted above, *mīyāmāna-* appears in a *figura etymologica* construction. *súmitī* can belong to either of the roots ²*mā* and *mi* and does not remove the ambiguity. The general content of the hymn, addressed to the sacrificial post (cf. the vocative *vanaspate* ‘O tree!’), and the

⁴³⁶ ‘... cette portion, tandis qu’on la mesure et lorsqu’elle est mesurée...’

⁴³⁷ Cf. also GONDA (1965: 138): “These verbal forms do not only express the idea of “measuring out” and of “apportioning” but also that of “preparing, arranging”.”

imperative *úc chrayasva* favour the interpretation ‘being set up’:

‘Stand erect on the top of the Earth, O Tree, being set up⁴³⁸ / (measured⁴³⁹) with the excellent setting / (measurement).’

For the third occurrence of *mīyá-*^{te} reckoned to ²*mā* ‘measure’ in VWC-Samh. V, 3314*b* and VWC-Br. II, 1553*c*, the compound *sám mīyate*, attested in similar (but non-identical) passages in the YV (TS, KS, KpS) and ŚB, the meaning ‘is measured’⁴⁴⁰ is even less probable. Consider the TS and ŚB versions:

(TS 6.6.4.5-6)

yád dása yūpā bhāvanti, dásākṣarā virāḍ; ánnam virāḍ, virājaivānnādyam áva runddhe; ||5|| yá ekādaśá stána evāsyai sá duhá evāinām téna. vājro vā eṣá sám mīyate, yád ekādaśínī

‘By virtue of the fact that there are ten posts, the Virāj⁴⁴¹ has ten syllables; the Virāj is food; verily, he obtains proper food by the Virāj; verily, he milks her with that what is the eleventh breast of her. Verily, when [it becomes] a set of eleven [syllables], it **is being set up** as a vajra.’⁴⁴²

(ŚB 13.3.3.8)

yád ekādaśa yūpā, virāḍ vā eṣá sám mīyate; yád ekādaśínī tásyai, yá ekādaśá, stána evāsyai sá; duhá evāinām téna

‘By virtue of the fact that there are eleven posts, this Virāj, verily, **is being made of the same measure**,⁴⁴³ when [there is] a set of eleven at her, the one which is eleventh is her breast; thereby he milks it.’

⁴³⁸ Thus GRASSMANN 1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 1025; LUDWIG 1876 [RV übers.]: II, 410 (‘mit sorgfältiger gründung gegründet’); OLDENBERG 1897: 252 (‘erected by skilful erection’); GELDNER (‘gut eingesenkt’); RENOU, EVP XIV, 35 (‘Te fondant en bonne fondation’) [though not ruling out the alternative interpretation: “*súmitī mā-*, ou plutôt *su^o mi-* (comme l’indique en effet *nimimiyūḥ* [3.8.]6, *sumékaḥ sváruḥ* 4.6,3)” (ibid., p. 104)]; ELIZARENKOVA (‘Воздвигаемое прекрасным воздвиганием’).

⁴³⁹ Thus PW V, 681; GRASSMANN 1876 [RV übers., Anhang]: I, 526 (‘mit rechtem Mass gemessener’); LUBOTSKY 1997a [RVWC]: 1060.

⁴⁴⁰ Cf. PW V, 686: ‘nach dem Maasse (eines Andern) machen, gleichmachen (an Grösse, Zahl u. s. w.)’.

⁴⁴¹ A metre consisting of 10 syllables, which represents here a cow.

⁴⁴² Thus KEITH: ‘a thunderbolt is set up.’

⁴⁴³ EGGELING: ‘When there are eleven stakes, then that Virâg (metre), the Ekâdasinî, is contrived.’

Although the meaning ‘[the metre] is being made of the same measure’ is possible in the context,⁴⁴⁴ the identification “Virāj = vajra = sacrificial post” favours the translation ‘Virāj is being set up [as the sacrificial post]’.

A discussion of the post-Vedic (Sūtra) occurrences of *mīyá-te* goes beyond the scope of the present study, but, for most of them, the meaning ‘be measured’ can be ruled out as well – as, for instance, at VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 4.36 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 4.59b:7 (CALAND 1928: 170 [= Kl.Schr., 470])) (quoted below), where the passive subject *vajra*- rules out the translation ‘is measured’.

To sum up, there are no Vedic occurrences of *mīyá-te* which unambiguously belong to ²*mā* ‘measure’ and cannot be interpreted as derived from *mi* (‘be fixed, set up, established’) or *mī* (‘be damaged, diminish’). On the other hand, none of the usages particularly typical of ²*mā*, such as *ójo mīmānaḥ* ‘measuring (his) force’ (cf. RV 2.17.2, 7.82.6, 10.84.2), the frequent compounds with *ví* and *úpa* (especially in constructions like *úpa no vājān mīmīhi* / *māhi* ‘apportion (lit. measure) for us the rewards’, cf. RV 7.19.11, 7.26.5, 10.28.12), is attested in a passive construction with *mīyá-te*. This fact puts into doubt the very existence of the passive *mīyá-te* of the root ²*mā*. Of course, in some cases the phonological similarity or identity of several forms derived from the two roots could be the subject of a word play (*mi* ‘set up’ // ²*mā* ‘measure’). However, given the lack of positive evidence for an independent passive *mīyá-te* ‘be measured’, we exclude this lexical entry from the list of Vedic -yá-passives.

-i-aorist

The passive -i-aorist -*māyi* is attested in the VādhS, adjacent to the corresponding -ya-passive:

(VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 4.36 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 4.59b:7 (CALAND 1928: 170 [= Kl.Schr., 470]))

*sa vai sa vajra eva +niramīyata*⁴⁴⁵ [...] *te devā abruvan: vajro vā ayaṃ niramāyi*
‘Verily, this vajra was set up. [...] These gods said: “This vajra was set up”.’

⁴⁴⁴ Cf. GONDA 1984: 67.

⁴⁴⁵ Thus emended by CALAND; the form *niramāyata*, attested in all mss. (Y. IKARI, p.c.), may have emerged under the influence of the adjacent -i-aorist *niramāyi*.

***mṛ* ‘die’ : *mriyá*^{-te}**

Simplex RV 1.162.21 +;

+ *ava* ĀrṣU [ed. BELVALKAR 1. 26 = ed. Adyar Libr., Unpubl. Up., p. 8, l. 4];⁴⁴⁶+ *pári* ‘die around’ AB 8.28.1, 2 ≈ TĀ 9.10.4 (= TaiU 3.10.4), ŚĀ 4.13;⁴⁴⁷+ *sám* ‘die together [with]’ ^AKāṭh-Saṃk. p.48, 1.2, p.49, 1.4 (Upanayana-Br.) [ed. CALAND, p. 491]

accented: AV +

• anticaus.

(*mriyá*^{-ti} :)JB 2.269:10 *mriyatāt* (v.l. *kriyatāt*); (*mriyet* late Up. – -yet-optative)**pass. of caus.: *māryá*^{-te}**MS^p 3.10.1:128.11 = 130.19-20 (*māryámāṇasya* ≈ TS^p 6.3.9.1 *ālabdhasya*) (+)*mriyá*^{-te} is quoted in all Vedic and Indo-European grammars as a parade⁴⁴⁶ See RENOU 1957d: 130.⁴⁴⁷ The compound *pari-mriyá*^{-te}, attested in Vedic prose, relies on the secondary etymology of the philosophical term *parimarā-* (cf. THIEME 1939: 235f. [= Kl.Schr. I, 4f.]). *parimara* denotes the mythological cyclical dying and rebirth of the cosmic principle Brahman, not ‘dying around [Brahman]’ (as explained by some indigenous commentators; see e.g. BOETZELAER 1971: 191 on Sureśvara’s comment on TaiU 3.10.4; see also TaiU, ed. ANGOT, p. 748); see BODEWITZ 1986 (with bibl.). Historically, *parimara* may be a derivative of another root, *mṛ* (cf. THIEME, *ibid.*); the prefix *pari-* refers to the cyclical or successive character of the process (BODEWITZ, *op.cit.*, 441). The compound *pari-mriyá*^{-te} was created by Indian exegetists to explain the semantics of *parimara* but obviously presuming another meaning of *pari-*, ‘around’), thus being a typical example of “mystische Etymologie” (THIEME; cf. also RENOU 1933: 76):

(AB 8.28.1 ≈ TĀ 9.10.4 (= TaiU 3.10.4))

yo ha vai brahmaṇaḥ parimaraṃ veda, pary enaṃ dviṣanto bhrātṛvyāḥ pari sapatnā mriyante‘Wer das Verwelken [Hinschwinden] des Brahman kennt, um den herum sterben Feinde, [eidersüchtige] Vetteren, Nebenbuhler.’ (THIEME, *op.cit.*; see also Chapter IV, s.v. *nam*)

example of the non-passive usage of a *-ya*-present with suffix accentuation.⁴⁴⁸ It never functions as a passive (cf. e.g. JAMISON 150, fn. 92)⁴⁴⁹ and, semantically, belongs with the root-accented *'-ya*-presents (class IV) of change of state, cf. esp. *jáyate* 'is born'. The clearly secondary suffix ("passive") accentuation of *mriyá-^{te}* is due to the accent shift **Cf̣-ṛi-* → *Criyá-*; see KULIKOV 1997 and Chapter C.II.2.3 for details. This present first appears in the late RV (maṇḍala I):

(RV 1.162.21a)

ná vā u etán mriyase ná riṣyasi

'You (sc. the sacrificial horse) do not die here,⁴⁵⁰ nor receive harm.'

Accented forms are attested from the AV onwards, cf.:

(AV 12.2.39b)

striyá yán mriyáte pátiḥ

'... if the husband of a woman dies ...'

There is one more feature shared by *mriyá-^{te}* with class IV presents. The passive meaning is expressed by *-yá*-presents and by middle forms outside the system of the present (cf. *dhīyáte* 'is put' :: stative (/pf.med.) *dadhé* 'has been put', etc.), but never by active forms. By contrast, active forms employed in the same usage as corresponding middle *'-ya*-presents (non-passive intransitives) are quite common; cf. *pádyate* 'falls' :: pf.act. *papáda* 'has fallen'.⁴⁵¹ This is also the case for *mṛ-*: we find active non-present forms (perfect, future, aorist subjunctive) in the same usage and with the same

⁴⁴⁸ Cf. DELBRÜCK 1874 [AiV]: 167f.; WHITNEY 1896 [SktGr]: 277, §277; MACDONELL 333, §444a.

⁴⁴⁹ A few attempts to take this present as a passive proved unsuccessful. NEGELEIN (1898: 38) treated it as the passive of the transitive *mṛ-* (< **melH-*) 'crush, destroy' ["Der Inder mag sich den Hergang des Todes sehr wohl als ein Zermalmwerden (mṛ malmen) vorgestellt haben"], which is etymologically impossible; see MAYRHOFER, EWAia II, 319. GONDA's (1951: 92f.; 1979: 82) explanation of the passive accentuation of *mriyáte* as due to its semantics ("Dying was considered as an 'event'"), in the vein of his treatment of Vedic *-yá*-passives as 'eventives', does not solve the problem. HARTMANN (1954: 186ff.) even assumed a particular passive conceptualization ("das Gefühl des Ausgeliefertseins") of death in ancient India – which hardly deserves a serious discussion.

⁴⁵⁰ On the meaning of *etád* in this verse, see KUPFER 2002: 154.

⁴⁵¹ See e.g. HOFFMANN 1976d: 590.

meaning ('die') as *mriyáte*,⁴⁵² cf.:

(RV 1.191.10cd = 1.191.11cd)

só cin nú ná marāti ' nó vayám marāma
'Verily he will not die, and we will die neither.'

Although *mriyá-te* occurs only once in the RV, its Old Iranian cognates (Av. *miriiete* etc., OP *amariyatā*; see KELLENS 120f.) show that this -ya-present can be traced back to common Indo-Iranian and, probably, further to Proto-Indo-European (cf. Lat. *morior*). The scarcity of attestations in the RV is likely to be due to a taboo on mentioning death; see ZIMMER 1985: 195ff. and KELLENS, *ibid.*, and KELLENS 1976: 118f. on a similar phenomenon in Iranian.

(Active forms)

Active forms from the stem *mriyá-* are unattested.⁴⁵³ An imperative in -*tāt*, which is usually associated with the active paradigm, but in rare cases can also belong with middle forms (see e.g. MACDONELL 317f.), is once attested in the JB:

(JB 2.269:9-10 [ed. CALAND §151])

yadi vā enaṃ kāmayaṣye, yadi ca na, mariṣyaty eva syā / hantainaṃ
kāmayaṣ / brāhmaṇasya cit syā priyaṃ kṛtvā mriyatād iti
'Whether I will make love to him or not, verily, I shall die. Well, let me make love to him. After having done pleasure [i.e. after having made love] to at least one Brahman, I shall die.'⁴⁵⁴

Caus. pass.

The passive built on the causative stem *mārāya-* occurs in the MS:

(MS^p 3.10.1:128.11-12 = 130.19-20)

paśór vāi māryāmāṇasya prāṇāñ śúg ṛcchati
'When an animal is being slaughtered, the pain reaches its vital airs.'

⁴⁵² Cf. WACKERNAGEL 1907: 307 [= Kl.Schr. I, 496].

⁴⁵³ The post-Vedic form *mriyet* (attested in the Amṛtanāda-Up.) is likely to instantiate a -yet-optative; see KULIKOV 2006d: 35f.

⁴⁵⁴ I am thankful to Werner KNOBL for his valuable comments on the translation of this passage.

mṛj ‘wipe, cleanse, adorn’: *mṛjyá-^{te}*

Simplex RV, ĀśŚS 5.12.17;

(+ *abhí* ŚB 14.1.1.12 [ed. WEBER, ed. SASTRI *abhy àmṛjyanta*; read with PW V, 577, ed. Kalyan/Bombay, MINARD 1956, ²VWC-Br. I, 209*b* *abhy àsrjyanta*]);

+ *ud* ŚrSū.;

+ *ní* MS^m 1.11.3:163.13 = 1.11.7:169.10 (*ní-mṛjyethām* ≈ ^AKS^m 14.1:201.2 *ní-mṛjatām* ≈ TS^m 1.7.8.4.p *ní-mṛḍḍhvam* (v.l. *ni-mṛḍhvam*) ≈ VS 9.19.b *ni-mṛjānāḥ* (≈ ŚB 5.1.5.27));

+ *nir* GB 1.4.13:104.13-14 (mss., ed. MITRA *nir-mṛjyeran*, ed. GAASTRA ^{+o}*mṛtyo*);⁴⁵⁵

(+ *pári* SV 2.320 [= 2.3.2.4.3] (*pári...mṛjyāse* ≈ RV 9.20.3 *pári...mṛṣāse*), AVP-Kashm. 4.2.4 [ms., ed. BARRET *pari-mṛjyante* ≈ AVŚ 4.8.7 *mamṛjyānte*, AVP-Or. ed. DIPAK BHATTACHARYA ⁺*marmṛjyante*, mss. *mamṛhyante*, *memṛhyante*));

+ *sám* RV 9.97.3, PB 6.7.18, ŚrSū.

accented: +

• pass.

The majority of the attested occurrences of the passive *mṛjyá-^{te}* are found in the RV (19×). It is especially frequent in maṇḍala IX (17×), referring to Soma being cleansed or adorned. Examples are:

(RV 9.43.1ab)

yó átya iva mṛjyáte ‘*góbhir mādāya haryatāḥ*

‘[Soma], which is anointed with milk, like a courser, for the exhilaration, the enjoyable one ...’

(RV 9.30.2ab)

índur hiyānāḥ sotṛbhir ‘*mṛjyámānaḥ kánikradat*

‘The sap, impelled, being purified by pressers, the roaring one...’

(RV 10.69.7cd)

dyumān dyumátsu nṛbhir mṛjyámānaḥ ‘*sumitréṣu dīdayo devayátsu*

‘The shining one among the shining ones, being cleansed by the men, you (sc. Agni) shine among the Sumitras, longing for gods.’

⁴⁵⁵ For this middle optative form, see KULIKOV 2006d: 36ff., with fn. 27.

After the RV, *mṛjyá-^{te}* becomes less common and occurs only in compounds.⁴⁵⁶ Quite notable is its rarity in post-RVic mantras (2×). One of the two occurrences is *pári ... mṛjyáse* at SV 2.320 [= 2.3.2.4.3], which stands for *pári ... mṛśáse* ‘(you) encompass’ of the corresponding RVic stanza:

(RV 9.20.3ab)

pári víśvāni cétasā ' mṛśáse pávase matí

‘You encompass everything with [your] mind; you purify yourself with [your] thought.’

pári...mṛjyáse must be a corrupt repetition (probably due to the adjacent *pávase*; cf. OLDENBERG 1917: 18 [= Kl.Schr. I, 336], fn. 1) rather than a deliberate replacement of the RVic verb, as it makes the syntax awkward and can only be acceptable under heavy ellipsis: ‘you [encompass] everything with [your] mind; you are being cleansed, you purify yourself by means of the prayer’.⁴⁵⁷

The only occurrence of *-mṛjyá-^{te}* in YVic mantras appears in the MS:

(MS 1.11.3:163.11-13 (= 1.11.7:169.8-10))

vājinau vājajíttau vājam jítvá ['] bṛhaspáter bhāgám áva jighratañ

vājinau vājajíttau vājam jítvá ['] bṛhaspáter bhāgé ní mṛjyethām

‘O you, two horses running for the vāja, winning the vāja, having won the vāja, smell at the share of Bṛhaspati! O you, two horses running for the vāja, winning the vāja, having won the vāja, be cleansed in the share of Bṛhaspati!’⁴⁵⁸

The three other Saṃhitās of the YV have middle forms of the root present instead:⁴⁵⁹ we find imperative forms in the TS and KS (2pl. *ní mṛḍḍhvam* in TS 1.7.8.4.p, 3pl. *ní mṛjatām* in KS 14.1:201.2), while VS 9.19.b (≈ ŚB 5.1.5.27)

⁴⁵⁶ Except for one occurrence in ĀśŚS 5.12.17 (*mṛjyamāne dvitīya[m]* ‘while [the Soma-filament] is being cleansed, [he should recite] the second [part of the verse]’), which is probably taken from RV 9.107.21a *mṛjyamānaḥ suhastya* ‘[you, O Soma], being cleansed, worthy of skilful hands’, quoted two sūtras before (ĀśŚS 5.12.15).

⁴⁵⁷ Cf. BENFEY’s translation: ‘Über alles an Weisheit du, wirst du gereinigt und strömt durch Sang’.

⁴⁵⁸ For this mantra and the meaning of *vāja-* (generative power), see GONDA 1989c: 32ff., with fn. 104.

⁴⁵⁹ Cf. BLOOMFIELD & EDGERTON 1930 [Ved. Var. I]: 52: “middles substantially in passive sense”.

attests the participle *ni-mṛjānāḥ* (*bṛhaspāter bhāgām āva jighrataṃ nimṛjānāḥ*).⁴⁶⁰

-mṛjyá-te occurs in the Brāhmaṇas only once, with the preverb *sam* (PB 6.7.18),⁴⁶¹ but becomes more common in the Sūtras.

Other passives

Middle forms of the verb *mṛj* are employed both transitively (transitive-affective usage) and intransitively (anticausatives, reflexive, passive).⁴⁶² The passive usage is attested for statives derived from the stems of perfect (*māmṛje*)⁴⁶³ and intensive perfect (*marmṛjānā-*⁴⁶⁴), participle of the

⁴⁶⁰ WEBER (1892: 791, with fn. 5) translates this participle transitively: ‘beschnopert hier den Antheil des Brihaspati, lustrierend [≈ den Opfernden von jeder Sünde reinigend?!]’

⁴⁶¹ The ŚB form *abhy-āmṛjyanta* (quoted in ¹VWC-Br. I, 109a) probably represents a ms. error. The passage in question runs (in ed. WEBER, ed. Kāśī and ed. Kalyan-Bombay) as follows:

(ŚB 14.1.1.11-12)

tāsyā yó rāso vyākṣarat, tāṃ pāṇibhiḥ sām mamṛjus; tasmāt samrāt ||11|| tāṃ devā abhy āmṛjyanta

‘They wiped away the vital sap which flowed from him; therefore [he is called] Samrāj. The gods ... toward him.’

The meaning ‘cleanse, wipe’ makes little sense in the context. The correct reading must be *abhy-āsṛjyanta*, as emended already in PW V, 577 and by WEBER elsewhere (1886: 70); this reading is adopted in ed. Kalyan/Bombay and ²VWC-Br. I, 209b as well as in EGGELING’s translation (‘the gods rushed forward to him’) and by GONDA (1959: 278); see also MINARD 1956: 305, [§]836, fn. a, with bibl. ^o*srjya*^o could be replaced with ^o*mṛjya*^o under the influence of *sām mamṛjus* in the preceding sentence. RÖNNOW’s (1929: 131, with fn. 3) interpretation (‘die Götter wischten mit den Händen den *rasa*, bzw. Soma ab’ = ‘sie sammelten ihn jeder für sich’) and argumentation do not seem convincing.

⁴⁶² The frequent passive usage of the middle forms of *mṛj* was repeatedly noticed in the literature; see e.g. WENZEL 103; EATON 25; GONDA 1979: 188f.; SCHAEFER 1994: 168; LUBOTSKY 1997c: 559. Cf. also the similar syntactic behaviour of *pū* ‘purify, cleanse’ (q.v.), which belongs to the same semantic domain.

⁴⁶³ See KÜMMEL 2000: 372.

⁴⁶⁴ See LUBOTSKY 1997c: 559; KULIKOV 2006b: 59, 62. SCHAEFER’s (1994: 167f.) analysis of this form as belonging to the present system is erroneous. Note also the passive usage of the participle *marmṛjānā-* (cf. RV 9.91.2), as opposed to the transitive

passive aorist (*mṛjāná-*),⁴⁶⁵ as well as for the middle intensive with the suffix -yá- (*marmṛjyá-^{te}*).⁴⁶⁶ Cf. especially the following examples with overtly expressed passive agents, which rule out non-passive interpretations:

(RV 9.14.5ab)

naptíbhir yó vivásvataḥ 'śubhró ná māmṛjé yúvā

‘Who is purified by Vivasvat’s granddaughters (= the fingers), like a bright youth ...’

(RV 9.91.2cd)

prá yó nṛbhir amṛto mártiyeḥbhir 'marmṛjānó 'avibhir góbhir adbhíḥ

‘... the immortal one, purified by mortal men with a woollen strainer, milk and waters, [moves] forward.’ (see SCHAEFER 1994: 168)

(RV 9.62.13ab)

eṣá syá pári śicyate 'marmṛjyāmāna āyúbhiḥ

‘Being purified by Āyus, he (sc. Soma), is being poured around.’

mṛd ‘rub, crush, tread’: *mṛdyá-^{te}*

Simplex ŚB 1.1.4.14, 1.1.4.16;

+ *áva* MS^p 2.2.5:19.2 (*-mṛdyéta*, v.l. *-mṛjyéta*);

(+ *ā* AVP-Kashm. 16.7.8 (?) (ms. *ā mṛddhyaṃntām*, ed. BARRET ⁺*ā mṛdyantām*, read with Or. mss. *ā vṛścantām* = AVŚ 8.3.16 *ā vṛścantām* = RV 10.87.18 *ā vṛścyaṃntām*))

accented: MS, ŚB(K)

• pass.

The only mantra attestation of the passive *mṛdyá-^{te}*, based on BARRET’s conjecture for the corrupt Kashm. ms. reading *ā mṛddhyaṃntām*, is doubtful

syntax of participles with the accent on the reduplication syllable (SCHAEFER 1994: 168), which thus belongs with the intensive perfect, not with the stative derived from the intensive perfect stem.

⁴⁶⁵ See KULIKOV 2006b: 58f., 61.

⁴⁶⁶ On the passive usages of this intensive, see, in particular, WRIGHT 2008: 519, fn. 36. This is the only Vedic -yá-intensive well-attested in the passive usage; see Chapter C.V.1.

(as noticed by BARRET himself). The stanza in question runs as follows:

(AVP 16.7.8ab ≈ AVŚ 8.3.16ab)

viṣaṃ gavāṃ yātudhānāḥ pibant_{uv} ' ā vṛścantām [Or.] / +mṛdyantām
[Kashm.] *aditaye durevāḥ*

The parallel RVic passage (10.87.18) reads *pibantv ā vṛścya_{ntām}*; the Śaunakīya version has ... *bharantām ā vṛścantām*.⁴⁶⁷ Both semantically and syntactically, the reading *ā vṛśc(y)antām* seems more likely ('let the sorcerers [which harm] cows drink poison, let them be brought low to Aditi'). *ā mṛdyantām* ('let the evil-doers be crushed at (?) Aditi'??) must be a corrupt reading.

Apart from this questionable occurrence in the Paippalāda, *mṛdyá^{-te}* first appears in Vedic prose (MS, ŚB).⁴⁶⁸

(MS 2.2.5:19.2)

yád adhò 'vamṛdyéta, yác ca sphyá āślíṣyet, tád víṣṇava urukramāyáva dyet

'That [part of the sacrificial cake] which may be rubbed off underneath [the cake] [onto the barhis], and that which may stick to the wooden spade (*sphyá-*), he should apportion to Viṣṇu the Wide-Striding.'⁴⁶⁹

(ŚB 1.1.4.14)

mánor ha vá ṛṣabhá āsa. tásminn asuraghní sapatnaghní vák praviṣṭāsá. táśya ha sma śvasáthād raváthād asurarakṣasāni mṛdyámānāni yanti

'Manu had a bull. An Asura-killing, foe-killing voice entered into it. By his snorting and roaring the Asuras and Rakṣases continued to be crushed.'⁴⁷⁰

mṛś* 'touch': -*mṛśyá^{-te}

+ *abhi* JŚS-Kār. 105, VaitS 28.9;

+ *sám* 'grasp' KS^p 10.5:129.17, 25.6:109.20 = KpS^p 39.4:215.20

accented: KS 10.5

• pass.

⁴⁶⁷ For the variation *vṛśca-*/*vṛścya-*, see s.v. *vraśc*.

⁴⁶⁸ See GOTÖ 249, with fn. 557.

⁴⁶⁹ I am thankful to Werner KNOBL for valuable comments on this passage.

⁴⁷⁰ For this passage, see JAMISON 1996: 24f.

The rare -yá-passive -mṛśyá-^{te} occurs in Vedic only in the closely related KS and KpS. The two relevant passages (discussed and translated by JAMISON (1991a: 61, 82, 103, fn. 106)) are:

(KS 25.6:109.20-21 = KpS 39.4:215.20-21)

*yatīn vai sālāvṛkeyā ādaṁs. ta ādīyamānās saṁmṛśyamānā uttaravediṁ
samudakrāman*

‘The Sālāvṛkeyas ate the Yatis. They, being taken, being grasped, went up upon the uttaravedi-altar.’

(KS 10.5:129.16-17)

*īndram vāi jātām rākṣāṁsy asacanta. sá ādīyamāno rākṣobhis
saṁmṛśyamāno ’gnīṇ prāviśat*

‘The Rakṣases followed the (newly) born Indra. He, being taken by the Rakṣases, being grasped, entered the fire.’

mṛ ‘crush, destroy’: -mūryá-^{te}

+ *úpa* ŚB 1.7.3.21 ≈ 1.7.4.12

accented: ŚB

• pass.

The rare passive -mūryá-^{te} occurs only in the ŚB, in two similar passages:

(ŚB 1.7.3.21)

*ítarā āhutīḥ paśávo ’nuprá jāyante, rudríyaḥ sviṣṭakṛd; rudríyeṇa paśúṇ
prá sajed, yád ítarábhir āhutibhiḥ saṁsrjét, tè ’sya gṛhāḥ paśáva
upamūryámāṇā īyuh*

‘Following the other oblations, cattle are born, the Sviṣṭakṛt [represents] Rudra’s [power]; he would impose Rudra’s [power] on the cattle if he were to bring it into contact with other oblations, [and] his (sc. the sacrificer’s) household and cattle would be destroyed.’ (cf. HOUBEN 2010: 610)

yaj ‘perform [sacrifice], worship’: iḥyá-^{te}

Simplex [i_{pass.}] ‘Y^{sacrifice}_{NOM} is performed’ / [ii_{pass.}] ‘Z^{recipient}_{NOM} is worshipped’ YV^P +;

+ *pári* [_{i_{pass.}}] YV^P
 accented: +
 • pass.

pass. of caus.: *yājya*-^{te}

yājyamāna- VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 4.94 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 4.101:9 (CALAND 1928: 222 [= Kl.Schr., 522]))

yaj is a typical example of a ‘two pattern’ verb. When used transitively, it can be constructed either with the accusative object of the sacrifice being performed (first object) or with the accusative of the addressee (recipient) of worshipping (deities, fathers, etc.):⁴⁷¹

- [i] ‘X^{sacrificer}_{NOM} performs Y^{sacrifice}_{ACC}’;
 [ii] ‘X^{sacrificer}_{NOM} worships Z^{recipient}_{ACC}’.

Correspondingly, the passive *ījyá*-^{te} (attested from Vedic prose onwards) can be employed in the following two patterns:

[_{i_{pass.}}] ‘Y^{sacrifice}_{NOM} is performed [by X^{sacrificer}_{INS}]’, cf.:

(TS 2.6.1.4)

yásyaivám vidúṣaḥ prayājā ījyānte, prāibhyó lokébhyo bhrátṛvyān nudate
 ‘The one knowing thus, for whom the prayāja-sacrifices are performed,
 drives his rivals away from these realms.’

[_{ii_{pass.}}] ‘Z^{recipient}_{NOM} is worshipped [by X^{sacrificer}_{INS}]’, cf.:

(TB 1.6.8.2 = 1.6.8.5 = 1.6.9.1)

ubháye hí devāś ca pitáraś cejyānte
 ‘... for both fathers and gods are worshipped.’⁴⁷²

The abnormal passive participle *yājyamāna*- (full grade!), attested in the Kāśikā Vṛtti (*mitro no atra varuṇo yājyamānaḥ*) and Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya (*mitrāvaruṇau yājyamānaḥ mitrāvaruṇau ījyamānaḥ*, ed. KIELHORN, vol. III, p. 82, l. 2) ad Pāṇ. 6.1.108 (see RAU 1985: 55 (No. 519) and 1993: 74 (No. 0821)) must have two sources. On the one hand, it corresponds to *yujyámāna*- in AV 18.1.39:

(AV 18.1.39cd)

mitró no átra váruṇo yujyámāno ‘agnír váne ná v_iyásṛṣṭa śókam

The AVic form, in turn, results from misunderstanding the RVic passive *ajyámāna*- at RV 10.31.9 (cf. WEBER 1895: 833):

⁴⁷¹ Cf. DELBRÜCK 1888: 175; HAUDRY 347f.; HETTRICH 2007: 138ff.

⁴⁷² For this passage, see EINO 1988: 193f.

(RV 10.31.9cd)

mitró yátra váruṇo ajyámāno ' 'gnír váne ná vyásṛṣṭa śókam

‘... where Mitra [and] Varuṇa, being anointed, has emitted his glow, as Agni [anointed with ghee emits his glow] in the wood.’

The passive *ajyá-te*, which becomes rare after the RV and does not occur in the AV (see s.v. *añj*), was probably unfamiliar to the editors of the AV and therefore was replaced with more common *yujyá-te*, which of course has crucially changed the meaning of the stanza (‘here our Mitra, [and] Varuṇa, being joined [with him]’ (?)). The irregular form *yajyamāna-* may have emerged as a compromise reading, i.e. a contamination of *ajyámāna-* and *yujyámāna-*, which has yielded a new sense: ‘Mitra and Varuṇa, being worshipped...’ Note also that in the post-Vedic literature the roots *yaj* and *yuj* could be secondarily associated with each other; cf., in particular, the names of some yajus derived from the root *yuj* (*yuj-*, *prayuj-*, *sañyuj-*); see ROLLAND 1971: 26 and cf. also s.v. *yuj* below.

Caus. pass.

As in the case of *ni-dhāpyamānam* (VaitS; see above s.v. *dhā*), the causee (= the subject of the causative construction), not the initial object, becomes the subject of the passive construction, cf. VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 4.94 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 4.101:9) *sa yo ha vā evaṃvidādadhvaryuṇā yājyamāno yajamāno nardhnoti...* ‘if the institutor of the sacrifice (*yajamāna*), though being caused by the thus-knowing adhvaryu to perform a sacrifice, does not succeed...’⁴⁷³

yam ‘hold, submit, yield’: *yamyá-te*

Simplex ŚĀ 6.15 (?) (*yamyate* ≈ KauṣU 4.15 ed. RENOU *gamyate*, most other eds. *yamyate*);

+ *apā* (*avā*?) ‘keep away’ VādhŚS [ed. IKARI] 11.19 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 3.88^{3x} (= CALAND 1926: 194ff. [= Kl.Schr., 377ff.]) (CALAND’s ms. *apāyamyamāna-*, other mss. [ed. IKARI] *avāyamy*°);

+ *úd* ‘raise, lift (up)’ ŚB 4.3.4.23, KB 8.8.8 [ed. LINDNER 8.7], ŚŚS 5.10.12;

+ *ni* ‘be intended for’ ŚrSū.;

+ *prá* ‘offer’ RV 3.36.2, TB 2.4.3.12

⁴⁷³ CALAND’s (1928: 222 [= Kl.Schr., 522]) translation (‘wenn ein Opferherr, während ein solcher wissender Adhvaryu das Opfer für ihn verrichtet, nicht gedeiht ...’) does not render the causative meaning.

accented: RV, TB

• pass.

The passive *yamyá*⁴⁷ occurs only once in the mantras, with the preverb *prá*, in the sense ‘be given, offered’:

(RV 3.36.2ac)

índrāya sómāḥ pradívo vídānāḥ [...]

prayamyámānān prāti śú gṛbhāya

‘The Soma-saps [are] known to Indra from old, ... take well [the saps] which are being offered [to you, O Indra].’

In the Brāhmaṇas, this passive occurs with the preverb *úd*, as in:

(ŚB 4.3.4.23)

táthaivá vājra úd yamyate

‘And thus the thunderbolt is being raised up.’

The only simplex occurrence (ŚĀ) is a nonce formation, based on the word play *yama-/yam*:

(ŚĀ 6.15 (≈ KauṣU 4.15))

yamo rājeti vā aham etam upāsa iti. sa yo haitam evam upāste, sarvaṃ

hāsmā idaṃ śreṣṭhyāya yamyate

‘“He is king Yama”, thus I reverence him. For the one who reverences him (sc. Yama) thus, everything here is indeed subdued to his supremacy.’⁴⁷⁴

Cf. also the similar word play *prajāpati-/pra-jan* in the adjacent passage:

(ŚĀ 6.16 (≈ KauṣU 4.16))

prajāpatir iti vā aham etam upāsa iti. sa yo haitam evam upāste prajāyate

prajayā paśubhir yaśasā brahmavarcasena svargeṇa lokena ...

‘Verily, I reverence him as Prajāpati. The one who reverences him (sc. Prajāpati) thus proliferates in offspring, cattle, glory, holiness, the heavenly world...’

Other passives

Alongside the rare -yá-passives and the *i*-aorist *áyāmi* (RV), the participle *yemāná-* (belonging to the paradigm of the middle perfect or stative derived from the perfect stem; see KULIKOV 2006a: 67f.) is attested a few

⁴⁷⁴ For a detailed discussion of this occurrence, see s.v. *gam*.

times in the passive usage in the RV, mostly in the formulaic expression *nṛbhir yemāná-* ‘steered by men’ in maṇḍala IX (9.75.3, 9.107.16, 9.109.8, etc.; see WENZEL 103; KÜMMEL 2000: 397), cf.:

(RV 9.109.8)

nṛbhir yemānó jajñānāḥ pūtāḥ kṣārad víśvāni ...

‘Steered by men, born (and) purified, he flows (for) all [goods] ...’

According to KÜMMEL (ibid. and p.c.), all finite forms of the middle perfect are to be interpreted as non-passive intransitive (reflexive, anticausative). However, at least for the following attestation a passive interpretation is at least possible:

(RV 10.56.5cd)

tanúṣu víśvā bhúvanā ní yemire ' prāsārayanta purudhá prajā́ ánu

‘All creatures are confined⁴⁷⁵ to their bodies⁴⁷⁶. (Yet) they have extended themselves in many ways through their progeny.’ (JAMISON 170, with fn. 135)

Accordingly, the form *-yemire* attested in this stanza might be qualified as a 3pl. stative derived from the perfect stem. For RV 3.59.8 *mitráya pā́nca yemire jánā́* ..., a passive analysis (suggested by DE VRIES (1979: 9, fn. 5), contra THIEME 1957: 55f. [= Op.Mai. I, 249f.]), is possible, but less probable than non-passive interpretations: reflexive (THIEME), ⁴⁷⁷ anticausative (HILLEBRANDT 1913: 74;⁴⁷⁸ BRERETON 1981: 21;⁴⁷⁹ ELIZARENKOVA⁴⁸⁰) or absolute transitive (RENOU, EVP V, 66)⁴⁸¹ translations.

Beside statives/perfects, we find in the passive usage sigmatic aorists (see NARTEN 205ff.):

⁴⁷⁵ GELDNER: ‘sind ... gebunden’; RENOU (EVP XVI, 133): ‘ont été confiés-humblement’; GONDA (1979: 18): ‘... are confined to’; ELIZARENKOVA: ‘К (их) телам привязаны все существа’.

⁴⁷⁶ Or: ‘to themselves’ (see KULIKOV 2007b).

⁴⁷⁷ ‘For Contract, who has protective strength, the five peoples have **put reins on themselves**’ (“undergone contractual restrictions”).

⁴⁷⁸ ‘Vor Mitra mit seiner überlegenen Kraft **beugten sich** die fünf Stämme.’

⁴⁷⁹ ‘The five peoples **submit** to Mitra ...’

⁴⁸⁰ ‘Митре [...] **покорились** пять народов.’

⁴⁸¹ ‘Vers Mitra ... les cinq (espèces d’) hommes **ont dirigé** (leurs rênes).’

(RV 1.135.3f = 1.135.6b)

adhvaryúbhir bháramāṇā ayaṁsata

‘Moving with Adhvaryus, [the Soma-juices] are offered.’⁴⁸²

yuj ‘yoke, join; employ’: *yujyá-^{te}*

Simplex (α_{pass} .i/ii) ‘Y^{animal}_{NOM} is yoked’/‘Z^{vehicle}_{NOM} is yoked’;

(β_{pass}). ‘be employed’ RV +;

(+ *abhi* (?) ⁽⁺⁾ŠvetU 2.6 (ed. “108 Up.”, ed. HAUSCHILD, SILBURN (1948: 58), DELLA CASA (1976: 50) ⁽⁺⁾*abhi-yujyate*; ed. RÖER [B.Ind.] *abhiyuñjate*; read probably with ed. ĀnSS, ed. “18 Up.”, ed. OBERLIES (1996: 128) *adhirudhyate*);⁴⁸³

+ *ud* VārGS 8.4 (*udyujyamāna-*, v.l. *yujyamāna-*);

+ *ní* (α.i) ‘plunge, bind’ AVŚ 2.12.2 (*ní-yujyatām* ≈ AVP-Kashm. 2.5.3 ms. *bhyucyatām*, ed. BARRET ⁺*abhi-yujyatām*, AVP-Or. ed. ²BHATTACHARYA *ny-acyatām*, ed. ZEHNDER ⁺*ni-yujyatām*),⁴⁸⁴ MS^p 3.9.5^{2x}:122.16, 17, (JB 2.245:5 [*ni-yujyante* ≈ PB 20.14.4 *vy-ajyante*], see s.v. ²*añj* ‘manifest’);

+ *prá* β ‘use, employ’ YV^p +; + *anu-pra* BhārŚS 10.7.17;

+ *sam* ‘join (also sexually), associate’ PraśU 1.13^{2x}, ŚŚS 1.1.8 +

accented: +

• pass.

yuj ‘yoke, join’⁴⁸⁵ is a typical ‘two pattern’ verb, which can be constructed either [i] with the accusative of animal(s) (or animal substitute) being yoked, such as horses etc. (first object), or [ii] with the accusative of vehicle (chariot etc.) (= second object, or locative object); cf. HAUDRY 260ff. In constructions of type [i], the second object (vehicle) can optionally be expressed by the locative; in pattern [ii] the first object can surface (rarely) in the instrumental. Examples are:

[α.i] ‘X_{NOM} yokes Y^{animal}_{ACC} [to Z^{vehicle}_{LOC}]’ :

⁴⁸² I follow GOTÖ’s (1987: 226, fn. 483) non-passive translation of *bhāramāṇa-* (‘zusammen mit den Adhvaryus sich [vorwärts] bringend’); see ibid. for a discussion of possible interpretations (passive, reflexive).

⁴⁸³ For a discussion of this occurrence, see s.v. *rudh*.

⁴⁸⁴ For a discussion of this occurrence, see Chapter B.IV, s.v. ²*añc*.

⁴⁸⁵ For the original meaning, see esp. OGUIBÉNINE 1984a, 1984b.

(RV 8.98.9ab)

yuñjānti hārī iṣirāsya gāthay_aorāu rátha urúyuge

‘They yoke with a song two fallow [horses] of the vigorous [Indra] to the broad chariot with a broad yoke.’

[α.ii] ‘X_{NOM} yokes Z^{vehicle}_{ACC} [Y^{animal}_{INS}]:’

(RV 7.23.3a)

yujé rátham gavéṣaṇam hāribhyām

‘In order to yoke the chariot, desirous of cows, with two fallow [horses] ...’

Correspondingly, the passive *yujyá-^{te}* can be constructed with the subject of an animal or a vehicle:

[α.i_{pass.}] ‘Y^{animal}_{NOM} is yoked [to Z^{vehicle}_{LOC}]:’

(RV 3.35.1a)

tíṣṭhā hārī rátha ā yujyámānā

‘Ascend, [o Indra,] the two fallow [horses], which are being yoked to the chariot.’

(RV 10.175.1c)

dhūrṣú yujyadhvam sunutá

‘[O pressing stones], be yoked to the poles, press out [Soma].’⁴⁸⁶

This pattern is also attested for the passive aorist, as in:

(RV 3.41.2c)

áyujran prātár ádrayaḥ

‘The pressing-stones have been employed (lit.: yoked) in the morning [for performing the ritual].’

[α.ii_{pass.}] ‘Z^{vehicle}_{NOM} is yoked [Y^{animal}_{INS}]:’

(RV 4.45.1)

... yujyáte ráthaḥ párijmā divó asyá sánavi

‘The omnipresent chariot is being harnessed on the top of this sky.’

(RV 2.40.3)

sómāpūṣaṇā [...] rátham [...] manasā yujyámānaḥ [...] jinvathaḥ

‘O Soma and Pūṣan, urge the chariot, yoked with a thought.’

⁴⁸⁶ Less exact is the reflexive translation by GELDNER: ‘Schirret euch an die Joche, presset aus!’. For the metaphorical sense of this passage (pressing stones = horses), see HILLEBRANDT 1891: 155.

In the compound with *ní*, the meaning (α.i) ‘yoke [a horse]’ has developed to ‘plunge, bind’, cf.:

(AV 2.12.2cd)

páše sá baddhó durité ní yujyatām ' yó asmākaṃ māna idām hinásti
 ‘Let him, bound to a fetter, be plunged (lit. yoked down) in difficulty, who injures this our mind.’

Besides, the verb *yuj* attests the secondary meaning β ‘employ, use’, constructed with the direct object (= passive subject) of the sacrifice or sacrificial speech, religious thought or some sacrificial implements (vessels etc., cf. TS 6.5.11.1-2). This usage is obviously based on the metaphorical representation of a sacrifice as joining (“yoking”) sacrificial implements, in order to fulfil their function (see e.g. RENOU 1953: 177ff.; LÜDERS 1959: 451ff.; OGUIBÉNINE 1984a: 133f.; 1984b: 85ff. [= Essais, 153ff.]):

(AV 10.8.10abd)

yá purástād yujyáte yá ca paścād ' yá viśvato yujyáte yá ca sarvātāḥ
 [...] *tām tvā pṛcchāmi katamā sá ṛcām*
 ‘The one which is employed in front and which behind; the one which is employed in all cases and which in every case – [...] I am asking you: Which one of the stanzas is it?’

From Vedic prose onwards, this usage is also attested for the compounds with *prá*, cf.:

(TS 2.4.11.2)

kāmāya-kāmāya prá yujyate, sárvebhyo hí kāmēbhyo yajñāḥ prayujyáte
 ‘(The sacrifice) is employed for every wish, because the sacrifice is employed for all desires.’

For some contexts, both interpretations (α/β) are possible, cf.:

(AV 12.1.38ef, 40ab)

[38] *yujyānte yásyām ṛtvíjaḥ ' sómam índrāya pátave*
 [40] *sá no bhūmīr ā diśatu ' yád dhānam kāmáyāmahe*
 ‘Let that earth, on which the priests are being employed⁴⁸⁷ / yoked⁴⁸⁸ for Indra, to drink Soma, [...] assign to us the wealth which we desire.’

⁴⁸⁷ Thus BLOOMFIELD (‘upon whom the serving-priests are employed’), EDGERTON (1965: 114f.), GONDA (1974: 86).

⁴⁸⁸ Thus WHITNEY.

Other passives

Beside *-yá*-passives and finite passive aorists in *-i/-ran* (see INSLEER 1968a: 326; KÜMMEL 1996: 87ff.), passive usages are attested for the participle *yujāná-* (see DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 264; KÜMMEL 1996: 90), as in:

(RV 6.34.2c)

rátho ná mahé śávase yujānáḥ

‘Like a chariot yoked for the great power.’

In such usages, *yujāná-* should be taken as belonging to the paradigm of the passive aorist (for argumentation, see KULIKOV 2006a; 2006b: 46ff.).

Forms such as 3pl. *yuyujre* can also be employed in passive usages (see KÜMMEL 2000: 407f.), and, in that case, should be treated as statives built on perfect stems, rather than as middle perfects (see KULIKOV 2006a: 67f.). Cf.:

(RV 1.46.8c)

dhiyā yuyujra índavaḥ

‘The [Soma] drops have been yoked with a religious thought.’

rabh/labh* ‘take, seize’: *-rabhyá^{te}* / *labhyá^{te}

-rabhyá^{te}:

+ *ā* ‘sacrifice, offer’ TS^p 6.3.6.4, JB 2.245:7, GB 2.1.12:152.7,⁴⁸⁹ VādhAnv

[ed. IKARI] 4.13 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 4.28d:7 (= CALAND 1928: 135f. [= KL.Schr., 435f.]

(*ā-rabhyāsai*, as in all mss. [IKARI]; CALAND’s conjecture **ā-rabhāsai* is unnecessary)

accented: TS

• pass.

(-)*labhyá^{te}*

Simplex APrāyaśc. 5.1, AVParīś. 72.4.7 (*alabhyamāna-*) +;

+ *ā* ‘sacrifice, offer, slaughter’ YV^p + ; + *upā* ‘touch, seize’ KS^p

29.9:178.12;

+ *pary-ā* YV^p;

+ *upa* ‘reach, apprehend’ Up. +;⁴⁹⁰

⁴⁸⁹ Not mentioned in VWC-Br.

⁴⁹⁰ Cf. KathU 6.12 *astīti bruvato 'nyatra 'katham tad upa labhyate* ‘How can He be apprehended otherwise than by saying “He is!” ?’. For a discussion of this passage, see WELLER 1953: 187f., fn. 5; BOUY 2000: 295.

accented: +

• pass.

pass. of desid.

-lipsyámāna-:

+ *ā* ŚB 7.5.2.4 ≈ 7.5.2.28

(*-rips(y)amāna-*:

+ *ā* VaitS 8.1 [ed. VISHVA BANDHU *āripsyamāna-* (fut. of desid.?), ed. GARBE

āripsamāna- ≈ GB 2.1.12:152.3-4 *āripsamāna-* ≈ MS 1.4.14:63.13 *ālapsyámāna-* ≈

MānŚS 1.5.6 *ārapsyamāna-*])

In spite of some differences in usage and meaning between forms built on the root variants *rabh* and *labh*, synchronically, they seem to belong together; for the distribution of *r*- and *l*-variants in texts, see GOTŌ 1976; 1987: 261f.

While in the transitive usage simplex forms are quite common, passives are attested in Vedic only for compounds. Most frequent is the compound with *ā*, employed in the idiomatic technical sense ‘offer, sacrifice’ (← ‘take, seize [an animal when tying it for a sacrifice]’), euphemistically expressing killing a sacrificial animal.⁴⁹¹ Examples are:

(TS 5.6.22.1 = ^UKS-Aśvamedha 5.10.2:184.12)

ékādaśa prātār gavyāḥ paśáva ā labhyante

‘In the morning eleven pieces of cattle are being offered.’

(TB 1.2.5.4)

yád eté brāhmaṇavantaḥ paśáva ālabhyānte, nāpriyaṃ bhrātṛvyam abhy ātiricyate...

‘If these pieces of cattle are sacrificed in accordance with the Brāhmaṇa, [and] no[thing] unpleasant [or] hostile remains...’

As GOTŌ (1976: 1010ff. = (28)ff.) points out, the *l*-variant is essentially more common in the Saṃhitā prose, except in the TS and TB, where both *r*- and *l*-forms are well-attested. The distribution of passives is similar: *-rabhyáte* occurs in the YV only once, in the TS:

(TS 6.3.6.4)

eṣá hy àpām pātá, yó médhāyārabhyáte

‘... for he is a drinker of the waters who is being seized for the sacrifice.’

⁴⁹¹ For this technical meaning and its origin, see GOTŌ 1976: 1009f. [= (29)f.]; 1987: 262, fn. 595; KRICK 1982: 490, fn. 1327.

Two more attestations are found in younger Brāhmaṇas:

(JB 2.245:7)

tad yena yena vai rūpeṇa prajāpatir vācam vyaśjata, tena tena rūpeṇājyāny ārabhyante

‘Then, with whatever manifestation Prajāpati has emanated the speech, with the same manifestation ājya-chants are offered.’

(GB 2.1.12:152.7-8)

atha yat parastāt paurṇamāsa ārabhyate, tad yathā pūrvaṃ kriyate

‘And what is being offered at the full-moon sacrifice, that is being done as before.’

Desid. pass.

The rare desiderative passive⁴⁹² -*lipsyāmāna-* is attested in the ŚB:

(ŚB 7.5.2.4 ≈ 7.5.2.28)

etād vāi yātraitān prajāpatiḥ paśūn ālipsata, tā ālipsyāmānā úd acikramiṣan

‘And when, on that [occasion], Prajāpati tried to slaughter these animals, they, the ones whom [P.] tried to sacrifice (lit.: desired for sacrificing), tried to run away.’

The participle *ārips(y)amāna-*, attested in two late texts of the AVic tradition, GB and VaitS, does not belong here. The relevant passage runs as follows:

(GB 2.1.12:152.3-4 ≈ VaitS 8.1)

agnāvaiṣṇavam ekādaśakapālaṃ nirvaped darśapūrṇamāsāv āripsamāṇaḥ [VaitS, ed. VISHVA BANDHU *āripsyamāna-*]

‘The one who wishes to offer the Darśapūrṇamāsa-sacrifice should bring cakes for Agni-Viṣṇu on eleven kapālas.’

The accusative *darśapūrṇamāsau* rules out a passive analysis of the participle in question, and the reading *āripsamāṇa-* (without y; thus both GB and VaitS, ed. GARBE) seems more likely. Yet, the reading *āripsyamāna-*, adopted in ed. VISHVA BANDHU, but rejected by PATYAL (1970b: 131; 1973: 256), is not impossible. -*ripsya-*^{te} might be a future of desiderative, a rare and late formation, first attested in the Sūtras (cf. -*rurutsyamānā-*, *mīmaṃsyamāna-*

⁴⁹² For a general discussion of this formation, see Chapter C.II.1.2.3.

ĀśŚS; see s.vv. and Chapter C.II.1.2.3). This morphological analysis is supported by the parallel passages MS 1.4.14:63.13 and MānŚS 1.5.6.19, which have the future forms *ālapsyāmāna-* and *ārapsyamāna-*, respectively.⁴⁹³ *āripsamāna-* could be a *lectio facilior* with regard to *āripsyamāna-*.

⁽¹⁾ ***rudh*** ‘obstruct, keep (back), withhold’: *rudhyá-*^{te/(-ti)}

rudhyá-^{te}

Simplex JB 2.423:14 (*rudhyate*, v.l. *rūddha*^o);

+ *adhi* (← *abhi* (?)) (OBERLIES)) ŚvetU 2.6 [ed. ĀnSS, ed. “18 Up.”, ed. OBERLIES (1996: 128) *adhirudhyate*; ed. “108 Up.”, ed. HAUSCHILD, SILBURN (1948: 58), DELLA CASA (1976: 50) *abhi-yujyate*; ed. RÖER [B.Ind.] *abhiyuñjate*; unlikely RAU (1964: 44) ⁺*abhivyajyate* or ⁺*abhivyanyate*;

+ *ānu* ‘adhere, cling to’ (?) RV 8.43.9;

+ *āpa* ‘expell’ TS^p, AB 8.10.7, JB 1.79:8, PB 2.3.7, 2.10.4, ⁺18.5.6 (*ava-rudhyate*, read ⁺*apa-rudhyate*),⁴⁹⁴ VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 5.15 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 4.114:5 (CALAND 1928: 235 [= Kl.Schr., 535])) (*apa-rudhyate*⁴⁹⁵);

+ *āva* ‘achieve, fulfill [a sacrifice]’ MS^p, TB, AB 2.17.9, 6.2.3, JB 3.129:6 (+); + *sam-ava* PB 16.15.9 = 19.9.5, VādhS +;

+ *ā* (KauṣU 2.2, version A: ed. ĀnSS, ed. “108 Up.”, ed. “18 Up.” *ā-rundhe*; version B: ed. COWELL [B.Ind.] (= ŚĀ 4.2, all eds.) *ā-rundhate*; RENOU (1948: 31) *ā-run(d)dhe*, read probably with ed. FRENZ *ā-runddhe*; impossible COWELL, transl., fn. ad loc. ⁺*ā-rudhyate* (?)), ĀpŚS 5.26.3;

+ *nī* ‘obstruct, keep back’ AV 5.17.12-17;

+ *vi* HirŚS 3.6.2 +; + *sam* ĀpŚS 21.22.5 (*saṃ-rundhyeran* ≈ HirŚS 16.7.17 *saṃ-rundheran*);⁴⁹⁶

⁴⁹³ I am grateful to François HEENEN for having drawn my attention to this parallel.

⁴⁹⁴ Not mentioned in VWC-Br. both s.v. *ava-rudh* (I, 255) and *apa-rudh* (I, 167).

⁴⁹⁵ Erroneously recorded in VWC-Sū. I, 705b as *upa-rudhyate*.

⁴⁹⁶ The abnormal post-Vedic passive optative *-rundhyeran* is attested in the ĀpŚS (cf. OERTEL (1931: 294 [= Kl.Schr., 597]):

(ĀpŚS 21.22.5 ≈ HirŚS 16.7.17)

yat samāhṛtyāhuṭīḥ saṃrundhyāt, tad anu yajamānāḥ saṃrundhyeran

‘If he were to hinder (CALAND: ‘insperre’) the oblations, after having poured these together, by virtue of that the sacrificers would be hindered.’

The nasal infix is undoubtedly borrowed from the present stem *rundh-*, probably due to the preceding 3sg.pr.opt. *-rundhyāt* (WERBA [VIA I] 230). The parallelism between the

accented: AV, TS^{p3x}, ŚBM 6.8.2.4 = ŚBK 8.8.1.17 (≈ RV 8.43.9)

• pass., (anticaus.)

-rudhya-^{ti}

+ *ud* 'go astray' (anticaus.?) JB^v 2.383:10 (ed. RAGHU VIRA/LOKESH CHANDRA *ud-rudhyati*, HORSCH (1966: 120), EHLERS 102 ⁺*udrudhyate*) (+);

(+ *ni* VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 3.11 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 4.13:4 (CALAND 1928: 109f. [= Kl.Schr., 409f.])), CALAND's ms. *ni-rudhyanti*, read with the Malayalam mss. [IKARI *nirundhanti*]⁴⁹⁷

pass. of desid.: -rurutsyāmāna-

+ *āpa* KS^p U10.9:134.21 (*apa-rurutsyamāna-* ≈ TS 2.2.8.5 *apa-rudhyāmāna-*), ^A11.6:151.3, ^A37.11:91.21, (ĀśŚS 11.2.18 *ava-rurutsyamānā-*: fut. of desid.?)

Apart from the unclear RVic *ānu rudhyate* (8.43.9), which will be discussed later, the -yá-present *rudhyá-^{te}* occurs only once in the mantras (AV), with the preverb *ní*:

(AV 5.17.12)

nāsya jāyā śatavāhī ' kalyāñī tálpam ā śaye

yāsmīn rāṣṭré nirudhyāte ' brahmajāyā_acittiyā

'No beautiful hundred-bringing wife comes to lie on the bed of the one, in whose [lit. in what] kingdom the Brahman's wife is held back'⁴⁹⁸ [i.e. is not

two forms may have been supported by y of the optative suffix (-*rundhyāt* ~ -*rundhyeran*). According to CALAND (1928b [ĀpŚS übers., ad loc.]: 300), the parallel passage in the HirŚS has the grammatically correct form *saṃrudhyeran*; however, ed. ĀnSS reads *sañ-rundheran*. A passive usage of this middle nasal present (i.e. *sañ-rundheran* = *sañ-rudhyeran*) in the late Sūtra text is unlikely; rather, the HirŚS variant should be taken as an absolute transitive construction: '... the sacrificers would hinder [the sacrifice]' (?). Note, incidentally, that a similar case of borrowing of a consonant from a different stem is the passive *vitatyamāna-* 'being stretched', also attested in the ĀpŚS (12.12.13) (~ abs. *vi-tatya* = *vi-tat-ya*; see s.v. *tan*).

⁴⁹⁷ In the transitive usage: *anyān nirundhanti badhnanty anyān* '[they] lock up some [sacrificial animals] [and] tie up the others.'

⁴⁹⁸ Thus WHITNEY, LUDWIG 1878: 447 ('die brahmafrau wird vorenthalten'), LÜDERS 1945-49: 115 [= Kl.Schr., 48] ('wo die Frau eines Brahmanen aus Unverstand zurückgehalten wird'), Elizarenkova 2005: 237 ('В чьем царстве притесняется / По непониманию жена брахмана'). Inexact is WEBER's (1898b: 228) translation: 'in welchem (in wessen) Reiche vergewaltigt wird die Gattin eines Brahman ...'

returned to her husband when he asks for her release] through ignorance (of the king?) by ignorance, does not lie on his bed.’⁴⁹⁹

In Vedic prose, this -yá-passive becomes more common. Not counting attestations in young Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras, it occurs only with preverbs *āpa* and *āva*. Examples of the former compound are:

(AB 8.10.7)

yady u vā enam upadhāved rāṣṭrād aparudhyamānas: tathā me kuru yathāham idam rāṣṭram punar avagachānīti

‘If he resorts to him (asking for help), being expelled from his kingdom, [with the words]: “Act for me in such a way that I may return to this kingdom (of mine)” ...’

(PB 2.10.4)

viśa eva tad rājānam nir hanty; apāvagato rudhyate, [’]va gachaty aparuddhaḥ

‘Thus he drives away the king from [his] people; the one who has returned (i.e. who tries to receive back his dominion) is expelled, the one who has been expelled, returns.’

Compounds with *āva* are employed with the idiomatic meaning ‘obtain, achieve, fulfil [a sacrifice]’, typically constructed with the locative of time or event, cf.:

(MS 1.11.6:168.9-10 = 4.3.3:42.2-3 = 4.4.7:58.15-16)

saṁvatsarād vā ādhy utsannayajñó ’va rudhyate. saṁvatsarād evānam ādhy āptvāva runddhe

‘An interrupted sacrifice is indeed achieved after one year. Having reached it after one year, he achieves [it] for himself.’

(AB 2.17.9)

prajāpater vā etad ukthaṁ yat prātaranuvākas; tasmin sarve kāmā ava rudhyante

‘The morning litany is the litany of Prajāpati; in it all desires are fulfilled.’

(TB 1.3.4.1)

brahmavādīno vadanti: / nāgniṣṭomó nókthyaḥ, / ná ṣoḍaśī, nātirātrāḥ / ātha kásmād vājapēye sārve yajñakratávó ’va rudhyanta íti

⁴⁹⁹ I am thankful to WERNER KNOBL for his valuable comments on the translation of this passage.

‘Those who debate on sacred texts, say: “[There is] no Agniṣṭoma, no Ukthya, no Ṣoḍaśin, no Atirātra [in the Vājapeya]; then why are all sacrificial acts achieved in the Vājapeya?”.’

(TB 2.3.6.4)

*tāsmāt samvatsarē sārve yajñakratávō 'va rudhyante*⁵⁰⁰

‘Therefore all sacrificial acts are achieved at the end of a year.’⁵⁰¹

Cf. also the compound with *sam-ava*:

(PB 16.15.9)

tad āhur: nānālokāni prṣṭhāni. yad ekasmin yajñakratau samavarudhyanta, īśvaro yajamāno 'pratiṣṭhātor iti

‘About this they say: “The prṣṭha-sāmans have different locations.⁵⁰² If all of them are achieved⁵⁰³ together at one and the same sacrificial ceremony, the sacrificer may lose his firm support”.’

ava-rudhyate at PB 18.5.6 (not registered in VWC-Br. I) seems to be an error (a misprint?) for ⁺*apa-rudhyate*, as emended by BURROW (1986: 295) (without discussion). The passage runs as follows:

(PB 18.5.6)

viḍ vā etam atī pavate, yo rājāvarudhyate

‘The people abandon⁵⁰⁴ that king who is expelled⁵⁰⁵ [from his kingdom].’

CALAND’s translation (‘[i]t is the peasantry (the people) that flows through him (that departs from him) through whom flows the soma’) seems impossible; the meanings ‘obtain, achieve’ and ‘apply’ (as CALAND usually translates this compound) make little sense in the context. By contrast, the

⁵⁰⁰ Sāyaṇa: *antarbhavanti*.

⁵⁰¹ I would like to thank W. KNOBL for his valuable clarifications on the meaning of both TB passages.

⁵⁰² I.e. are performed at different moments.

⁵⁰³ Sāyaṇa: *prayujyante*; CALAND: ‘are applied’.

⁵⁰⁴ Sāyaṇa: *parityajate*. There is no separate root *pū* ‘go, move, flow’, posited by BURROW – in particular, for this occurrence (‘the people desert a king ...’); see MAYRHOFER, EWAia II, 106f., with bibl. The meaning ‘abandon’ can perhaps be deduced from the original meaning of *páva-te*: (lit.) ‘the people become clean beyond the king’ → ‘the people become free of the king’s dominion’.

⁵⁰⁵ BURROW: ‘is dislodged’.

meaning of the compound *apa-rudh* ‘expel’ suits the context much better (cf. PB 2.10.4 quoted above).

While the semantics of the aforementioned compounds with the root *rudh* ‘obstruct etc.’ raises no doubts, in spite of idiomatic semantic shifts, the only occurrence with the preverb *ānu* (which is also the only RVic attestation of this -ya-present) poses serious difficulties:

(RV 8.43.9)

aps_uv āgne sādhiṣ táva ' sāuṣadhīr ānu rudhyase
gārbhe sām jāyase pūnaḥ

This RVic mantra is glossed in ŚBM 6.8.2.4 = ŚBK 8.8.1.17 with an accented form:

sāuṣadhīr ānu rudhyasa ity óṣadhīr hy èṣò 'nurudhyáte

Most scholars treat this form as a non-passive (class IV) present of the root ²*rudh* (/ruh) ‘rise, grow’, cf. e.g. GELDNER’s translation:

‘Im Wasser ist deine Wohnstatt, Agni, du **wächst** in den Pflanzen **nach**, und in ihrem Mutterleib befindlich wirst du wiedergeboren.’

This analysis was also adopted by RENOU (1954a: 382f. and EVP XIII, 71: ‘c’est toi aussi qui **pousses le long** des plantes’), JOACHIM 148f. (‘in die Pflanzen **wächst** du **nach**’), GOTÖ 276, ELIZARENKOVA (‘ты **пропращаешь** в растениях’), WERBA [VIA I] 229f., KÜMMEL (LIV 248f., with note 16). JOACHIM points out that the root ¹*rudh* ‘obstruct etc.’ does not occur with the preverb *ānu* and considers the form in question as a nonce formation due to *jāyase* in the next pāda.

By contrast, GRASSMANN (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 1175f. (‘hinstreben zu’), WHITNEY (1885b [Roots]: 143), BLOOMFIELD (1893b: 154) (‘to the plants you are attached’), WACKERNAGEL (1902: 757 [= Kl.Schr. I, 147]) (‘einschließen’), MACDONELL 334, §445 (‘hinder’), INSLER (p.c.: ‘thou dost attach thyself to the plants’) and LUBOTSKY (1997a [RVWC]: 1205) reckon this form to ¹*rudh*. The latter analysis seems more attractive. The main arguments against the analysis of this occurrence as belonging with ²*rudh* / *ruh* can be summarized as follows:

1) The common variant of the Vedic root ²*ru(d)h* is *ruh*. *rudh* is moribund and occurs in nominal derivatives like *vī-rúdh-* ‘plant’, *nyag-ródha-* ‘Ficus religiosa’ (lit. ‘growing downwards’); see LUBOTSKY 1995b: 139f.; there is no evidence for the assumption that the *dh*-variant has survived in the verbal paradigm. Apart from the unclear form in question, the only finite form based

on the *dh*-variant which is usually taken as belonging to ²*ru(d)h* ‘grow’ (see LUBOTSKY 1997a [RVWC], *ibid.*) is the class I pr.inj. at RV 1.67.9a (*ví yó vīrútsu ródhan mahitvā́*; cf. e.g. GELDNER: ‘[d]er in den Pflanzen mächtig wächst’).⁵⁰⁶ However, this form appears in the same semantic context as in RV 8.43.9 (Agni in the plants), and probably belongs with *ánu rudhyase* (‘[Agni], who attaches himself / is attached to the plants powerfully’).⁵⁰⁷ Furthermore, *ródhat* immediately follows *vī-rúdh*- and, given the assumption that it belongs to ²*rudh* / *ruh* ‘grow’, the *dh*-variant might be explained as triggered by the word play. Thus, there are no reasons to assume that the alleged -ya-present from the root ²*ru(d)h* must be *rudhyate*, not **rúhyate*.

2) The analysis of *rudhyase* as a class IV present of ²*ru(d)h* ‘grow’ leaves unexplained the passive accentuation of *anu-rudhyáte* in the ŚB gloss.

3) In the cases where a middle class IV present co-exists with an active class I present within an IVS, they are opposed in transitivity: the former is intransitive, the latter is transitive. Cf. *jáya-te* ‘be born’ - *jána-ti* ‘bear’, *búdhya-te* ‘(a)wakes’ - *bódha-ti* ‘perceives’.⁵⁰⁸ By contrast, *róha-ti/(te)* ‘grow’ is intransitive (see GOTÖ 277f.) and thus supposedly synonymous with -*rudhyate* ‘grows’.

Thus, the ¹*rudh*-analysis of the RVic -*rudhyase* seems more likely. Yet, because of the lack of accent, it is difficult to decide whether this formation should be qualified as a non-passive class IV present (thus GRASSMANN, INSLEER, LUBOTSKY) or a -yá-passive (WHITNEY, BLOOMFIELD, MACDONELL). The suffix accentuation in the ŚB gloss and in post-RVic attestations of other compounds of this -ya-present favours the latter analysis. Note also that middle -ya-presents do not co-exist with -yá-passives within an IVS.⁵⁰⁹ Thus,

⁵⁰⁶ *ródhati* RV 8.43.6 probably belongs to ¹*rudh*; see LUBOTSKY 1997a [RVWC], *ibid.* (contra GOTÖ 276).

⁵⁰⁷ Likewise, *anūrúdh*- (RV 3.55.5), translated by GELDNER, JOACHIM 148, fn. 482 and SCARLATA 94, 462 as ‘nachwachsend’ (cf. SCARLATA 94: ‘Er [...] **wächst** in den späteren **nach**’; SCARLATA 462: ‘Er (Agni) [...] **wächst**/(steigt) in die späteren **nach**’), occurs in a similar context and cannot be taken as evidence for the analysis of *ánu rudhyase* as derived from the root ²*rudh* / *ruh*.

⁵⁰⁸ Transitive usages of *búdhyate* (‘perceives’) are post-RVic and secondary; see Chapter II, s.v.

⁵⁰⁹ The only possible exception may be the pair *pácyā-te* ‘ripen’ ~ *pacyá-te* ‘be cooked’ (with the idiomatic meaning distinction); see Chapter III, s.v. *pac* and Chapter IV, s.v. *yabh*.

the system-related reasons favour BLOOMFIELD's passive translation 'you are attached', although the original passive semantics could be weakened under the influence of the non-passive middle -ya-presents of motion and body posture (see Chapter C.II.1.2.1).⁵¹⁰

Beside the aforementioned compounds of -*rudhyá-*^{te}, one should also mention one unclear post-Vedic occurrence attested in the ŚvetU. The relevant passage runs (in ed. OBERLIES):

(ŚvetU 2.6)

agnir yatrābhimathyate 'vāyur yatrādhirudhyate
somo yatrātiricyate 'tatra saṃjāyate manah

OBERLIES (1996: 128) translates as follows:

'Wo Feuer gequirlt wird, wo der Wind **abgehalten wird**, wo der Soma überströmt, dort (d.h. auf dem Opferplatz) entsteht das Denken.'

It is unclear which original form might have underlain the attested readings; editors and translators give more than half-dozen possible readings, conjectures and interpretations; see a convenient survey in OLIVELLE 1998: 619. Ed. RÖER [B.Ind.] reads *abhi-yuñjate*,⁵¹¹ but RÖER's (1853: 53) translation ('where ... the wind is noisy') is of course impossible. More likely is the reading adopted in ed. "108 Up.", ed. HAUSCHILD *abhiyujyate*; cf. HAUSCHILD's translation: 'wo Wind hinzugeführt wird'. Similar, but more in the vein of the secondary meaning of *yuj*, i.e. (β) 'apply, employ' are translations suggested by HUME (1931: 398) ('where the wind is applied thereto') and SILBURN (1948: 58) ('... là où le vent est mis en activité'). As DELLA CASA (1976: 403) suggests, *pāda b* may refer to wielding over the wind or, since *vāyu-* can denote vital air in the Upaniṣads (cf. e.g. ĪśU 17), to the control over breath.⁵¹²

By contrast, two Indian editions (ed. ĀnSS, ed. "18 Up.") read *adhirudhyate*. OBERLIES adopts this reading, assuming that *adhirudhyate* results from the assimilation of *abhirudhyate* (as attested in two mss.), and translates in accordance with the meaning of this compound given by BR ('abwehren, abhalten').

Unlikely are both conjectures proposed by RAU (1964: 44), ⁺*abhivyajyate* and ⁺*abhivyanyate*, as well as his translations ('wo Wind zugefächelt [zugehaucht?] wird'; *ibid.*, p. 31). The verb *añj* (q.v.) makes no sense in the context ('is anointed'? 'is manifested?'); passives of *an* do not occur in Vedic at all.

⁵¹⁰ Cf. also *vacýá-*^{te} 'be directed' → 'move' (see below s.v. *vañc*).

⁵¹¹ This reading is not mentioned by OBERLIES in his detailed critical apparatus (*ibid.* and fn. 18).

⁵¹² Cf. DELLA CASA 1976: 50 (for conjecture) and 403 (for translation): '... dove il vento vien sottoposto a controllo...'; cf. also his comments (p. 403, fn. 23): "Ossia dove si pratica il controllo del respiro. Tutta la strofa sembra significare che il sacrificio ha un valore purificatorio e promuove lo sviluppo della mente".

Desid. pass.

The desiderative passive participle *apa-rurutsyámānāḥ*, attested three times in the Kāṭhaka, is one of the earliest Vedic attestations of this tertiary formation (see Chapter C.II.1.2.3). An example is:

(KS 10.9:134.21-22 ≈ TS 2.2.8.4-5)

*indrāya sutrāmṇa ekādaśakapālaṃ nir vaped aparuddho
vāparurutsyamāno* [TS *apa-rudhyámāno*] *vendro vai trātendro 'paroddhā*
'To Indra, the good protector, the one who is expelled or whom someone
wants to expel (lit.: who is wished to be expelled) should offer cakes on
eleven kapālas. Verily, Indra is protector [and] repeller.'⁵¹³

The participle *-rurutsyamāna-*, attested in ĀśŚS 11.2.18 *grāmyāraṇyān*⁵¹⁴ *paśūn avarurutsyamānāḥ...*,⁵¹⁵ albeit formally indistinguishable from the Kāṭhaka passives of desideratives discussed above, seems not to belong here. The accusative *paśūn*, syntactically connected with *avarurutsyamānāḥ*, rules out a passive interpretation. MYLIUS (1994a: 442 and fn. 56) hesitates between two translations ('Diejenigen, die sich der zahmen wie auch der wilden Tiere **bemächtigen wollen**, (sollen dieses *sattra* begehen)' or '... diese Tiere *einsperren wollen*'), both leaving the function of -ya-unexplained. Like the participle *mīmaṃsyamāna-* (incidentally, attested in the same book of the ĀśŚS), this form may be a future of desiderative; for general discussion, see Chapter C.II.1.2.3.

Active forms

The only Vedic attestation of an active form derived from the stem *-rudhya-* occurs in the JB:

(JB 2.383:10-11)

*mahāpathād viśvavayo 'yad udrudhyati puruṣaḥ
tam eva sṛptvājīm śrāntaḥ 'punar abhyājigāṃsati*

This verse is translated and discussed by HORSCH in his collection of late Vedic mantras and verses:

'Wenn, O Viśvavayas, der Puruṣa aus der großen (Renn-)Bahn herausgedrängt wird, (dann) strebt er, sie wieder zu betreten, (obwohl) ermüdet nach einem Zurückgelegten Wettlauf.' (HORSCH 1966: 120)

⁵¹³ See GONDA 1987: 103.

⁵¹⁴ Ed. Hoshiarpur *grāmyān āraṇyān*.

⁵¹⁵ Thus in all the three eds. (B.Ind., ĀnSS, ed. Hoshiarpur); ed. ĀnSS gives also the variant reading *avarutsa°*.

Since the active inflection is abnormal with -yá-passives, HORSCH, *ibid.*, and subsequently EHLERS 102 conjecture ⁺*udrudhyate*.⁵¹⁶ This solution leaves open the question as to whether the active ending is a mere ms. error or not. It is worth mentioning that -yá-passives practically never appear with the active inflection in Vedic, while in the paradigms of some non-passive middle -ya-presents active forms do occur, although very rarely (cf. *sam-ṛdhyanti* ChU 7.14.2, *ápa-kṣīyati*, *ā-pūryati* TĀ, *atapyat* GB, etc.; see Chapter C.VI.1). Although evidence is rather scant, we have some reasons to assume that the compound ⁺*udrudhyate* has been interpreted as non-passive by the editors of the JB, in analogy with other -ya-presents of motion, such as *pádyate*^{te/(ti)} ‘fall’. Without entering into a philosophical discussion whether Puruṣa’s way should necessarily be determined by some external (divine) forces (which is implied by HORSCH’s passive translation) or not, I would assume that a non-passive (anticausative) interpretation makes better sense in this context, and the translation of the verse can be corrected accordingly: ‘If Puruṣa goes astray from the great path ...’⁵¹⁷

Other passives

A passive interpretation has been suggested by some translators for an unclear middle present form, repeated four times in the following Upaniṣadic passage:

(KauṣU 2.2 (= ŚĀ 4.2))

*prāṇo brahmeti ha smāha paiṅgyas. tasya vā etasya prāṇasya brahmaṇo
vākparastāc cakṣur ārunddhe, cakṣuḥparastāc chrotram ārunddhe,
śrotraparastān mana ārunddhe, manāḥparastāt prāṇa ārunddhe*

The reading of the form in question differs in the two versions of the KauṣU, called for short A and B (cf. e.g. RENO 1948: 10f.). The reading of A (adopted in ed. ĀnSS, ed. “108 Up.”, ed. “18 Up.”) is *ārunddhe*, the reading of B (ed. COWELL [B.Ind.]; both eds. of the ŚĀ: ed. ĀnSS, ed. BHIM DEV) – *ārundhate*. RENO (1948: 31) conjectures ⁺*ā-run(d)dhe*, and this reading is also adopted by the standard ed. FRENZ (*ā-runddhe*), which is reproduced above. Both COWELL and KEITH (1908: 22; see also fn. 1) probably

⁵¹⁶ Another Vedic occurrence of the compound *ud-rudh* is the sigmatic aorist *udarautsīt*, attested in the transitive usage:

(ŚB 14.7.1.41 (= BĀUM 4.3.41 = BĀUK 4.3.33))

medhāvī rājā sārvebhyo mātēbhya udarautsīt

‘The intelligent king has driven me from all the corners (in discussion).’

⁵¹⁷ Cf. also the non-passive usage of the active form *uparudhyanti* in Rām. (crit. ed.) 3.64.11 *uparuddhyanti* [thus ed.] *me prāṇā[h]* ‘my breath is coming harder’ (VAN DAALEN (1980: 134): “reflexive”).

saw here an objectless transitive (?) ('after [the] speech, the eye envelop[e]s' etc.). RENO (1948: 31) interpreted this form as passive: 'Le souffle est *brahman*, dit Paṅgya. A ce souffle quie est *brahman* (appartient) la parole; derrière la parole l'œil **est enfermé**, derrière l'œil l'oreille **est enfermée**, derrière l'oreille l'esprit **est enfermé**, derrière l'esprit le souffle **est enfermé**';⁵¹⁸ COWELL mentioned this meaning (hesitantly conjecturing ⁺*ārudhyate*) among possible analyses (p. 151f., fn. §). Although passive usages of middle presents other than -yá-passives, being common in early Vedic, are exceptional in late texts, the general content favours RENO's passive interpretation.⁵¹⁹ The non-passive translation by F.M. MÜLLER's (1879: 280f.), essentially followed by HERTEL (1921: 166)⁵²⁰ and FRENZ (1968-69: 109),⁵²¹ appears to be, ultimately, its reformulation.⁵²²

ruh/(rup) 'rise, ascend'

pass. of caus.: -*ropyámāṇa-*, -*rohyamāṇa-*

+ *ā* :

-*ropyá-te* KāthĀ^p 3.233:100.6 (*āropyámāṇa-*), VaitS 24.14 (*samā-ropyamāṇam*)

-*rohya-te* VaitS 27.6 (*ā-rohyamāṇaḥ*)

accented: KāthĀ

⁵¹⁸ Likewise, DELLA CASA (1976: 320): 'dietro la parola **si trova racchiusa** la vista, dietro la vista **si trova racchiuso** l'udito ...', etc.; OLIVELLE (1998: 335): 'the sight is confined behind speech ...', etc.; JEŽIĆ (1999: 195): '... vid **je ograden** onkraj (granice) riječi, sluh **je ograden** onkraj vida ...', etc. (cf. also JEŽIĆ's remark *ibid.*, fn. 74: "Medij stoji u značenju pasiva (ili se značenje korijena znatno mijenja)").

⁵¹⁹ Cf. also BODEWITZ's (2002b: 23) translation and explanation: 'beyond (the outer circle of) speech sight **is enclosed**'. As BODEWITZ's (*ibid.*, fn. 63) explains, "[t]he one vital power is enveloped [...] by the other".

⁵²⁰ 'sie [= die Sprache] **hüllt sich** außen um den Gesichtssinn; der Gesichtssinn ... **hüllt sich** außen um das Gehör ...' etc.

⁵²¹ '“Der Brahman [ist] der Prāṇa”, so sagte Paṅgya. Fürwahr bei diesem Prāṇa, dem Brahman, **reicht** der Gesichtssinn über die Rede **hinaus**, **reicht** der Gehörsinn über den Gesichtssinn **hinaus**, **reicht** das Denken über den Gehörsinn **hinaus**, **reicht** der Prāṇa über das Denken **hinaus**.'

⁵²² I would like to thank Mislav JEŽIĆ for valuable comments on this Upaniṣadic passage.

The relationships between the synonymous roots *ruh*⁵²³ and *rup* are unclear.⁵²⁴ Causatives are derived from both roots, but a *-yá*-passive is attested in Vedic (in the late KaṭhĀ) only for the more recent (AVP, Br.+) causative *ropaya-te*:

(KaṭhĀ 3.233:100.6)

tāt pariḡharmyā āropyāmāṇe gāyati

‘He sings [the sāman] when the [golden] dish is being raised.’

By contrast, the *-yá*-passive *-rohya-te*, derived from the older causative stem *rohāya-* (RV +; see JAMISON 117), first appears in the post-Vedic VaitS.

labh ‘take, seize’: *labhyá-te*

➔ S.V. ***rabh***

lip ‘stick, smear; stain’: *lipyá-te*

[i] ‘stick’ (‘S_{NOM} sticks [to R_{LOC}]’):

Simplex VS 40.2 (= ĪśU 2);

+ *ví* ‘come unstuck’ MS^p 3.9.7^{2x}:125.11 = 125.15 = 3.10.1:130.4

[ii] ‘be stained, smeared’ (‘R_{NOM} is stained with S_{INS}’):

Simplex ŚB^v 14.7.2.28 (= BĀUM^v 4.4.28 ≈ BĀUK^v 4.4.23) ≈ TB^v 3.12.9.8, JB 1.275^{2x}:7, ChU 5.10.10, KaṭhU 5.11^{2x} +;

+ *anu* VaitS 10.5; + *vi* late Up.; + *sam* MānŚS 6.1.2.8

accented: MS

• anticaus.

The *lipyá-te* ‘stick; be stained, smeared’ expresses a spontaneous process

⁵²³ On the connections of this root with ²*rudh* ‘grow’ (probably, of secondary nature), see LUBOTSKY 1995b: 139f.

⁵²⁴ The *p*-variant may be built upon the causative stem *ropaya-*, which could have emerged in analogy with the *-páya*-causatives (thus MAYRHOFER, EWAia II, 469); according to WERBA [VIA I] 231, 373, *rup* may be a separate root (< Proto-Indo-Aryan **(H)raup*).

and consequently belongs to the anticausative type. In spite of the suffix accentuation of the only accented occurrence (MS), it never occurs in the passive usage.⁵²⁵ There are two intransitive patterns attested with *lipyá-te*, which differ in frequency and chronological distribution.

The two earliest occurrences (in the Saṃhitās of the YV) attest pattern [i], with the subject of smearing substance (S) and the locative object of recipient of smearing (R): ‘S_{NOM} sticks to R_{LOC}’:

(VS 40.2cd (= ĪśU 2cd))

evāṃ tvāyi nāñyáthetò ’asti ’ ná kárma lipyate náre

‘Thus – in no other way than this – it (the action) is in you, (and yet) the action does not stick to the man (that you are).’⁵²⁶

The compound *vilipyáte* (MS), denoting the opposite process (coming unstuck), is also constructed with the subject of smearing substance and thus belongs to the same syntactic type:

(MS 3.9.7:125.10-11 = 126.14-15 = 3.10.1:130.4)

skándati vā etád dhavír, yád viścótati, yád vilipyáte

‘That offering is spilt when it drops away or when it comes unstuck [and falls off].’

From the Brāhmaṇas onwards, *lipyá-te* appears in pattern [ii], with the subject of recipient and instrumental object of substance: ‘R_{NOM} is stained with S_{INS}’. [ii] is the anticausative counterpart of the transitive construction ‘X stains R_{ACC} with S_{INS}’, as in:

(KS^p 6.5:53.12)

rudra oṣadhīr viṣeṇālimpat

‘Rudra smeared plants with a poison.’

The smearing substance cannot of course be considered an agentive participant, which, as in the case of [i], rules out a passive interpretation. Examples are:

⁵²⁵ Cf. BLOOMFIELD & EDGERTON (1930 [Ved. Var. I]: 52) on *lipyate* at VS 40.2 (quoted below): “almost transitive in meaning”.

⁵²⁶ I adopt the metrical structure of the verse (the first half of the passage is likely to represent a triṣṭubh pāda) and the translation as suggested to me by Werner KNOBL (p.c., letters of 27.08.2001 and 16.11.2004). For the philosophical content of this verse, see also THIEME 1965: 90ff. [= K1.Schr. I, 229ff.].

(ŚB 14.7.2.28 (= BĀUM 4.4.28 ≈ BĀUK 4.4.23) ≈ TB 3.12.9.8)

tásyaivá syāt padavít; táñi viditvā ' ná kármaṇā lipyate pápakena

‘One should know its (sc. the Brahman’s) path; having known that, he is not stained with evil action.’⁵²⁷

(ChU 5.10.10 [ed. MORGENROTH 5.10.9])

atha ha ya etān evaṃ pañcāgnīn veda, na saha tair apy ācaran pāpmanā lipyate

‘But he who knows these five fires thus, is not stained with evil, even consorting with those [bad people].’

Pattern [i] seems to disappear with *lipyá-te*, but survives with another -ya-present, *ślīṣya-*^{ti(ite)}⁵²⁸.

Most likely, *lipyá-te* should be grouped with the -ya-presents with fluctuating accentuation, the root-accented forms being by chance unattested (see KULIKOV 1998b: 348 and Chapter C.II.3-4).

(Other passives)

Apart from the present *lipyá-te*, middle forms of *lip* are rare. The three occurrences of the sigmatic aorist (a nonce formation, see NARTEN 229), attested with the preverb *ní*⁵²⁹ in the Atharvan-like RVic spell 1.191, are rendered as passives by some scholars:

(RV 1.191.4)

ní gāvo goṣṭhé asadan ' ní mṛgāso avikṣata

ní ketávo jánānām ' nṛy ādṛṣṭā alipsata

‘Die Kühe haben sich im Stall niedergelegt, das Wild ist zur Ruhe gegangen, zur Ruhe auch die Lichter der Menschen, die Unsichtbaren **sind angeschmiert**.’ (GELDNER)⁵³⁰

However, one might expect that the middle sigmatic aorist will be employed in

⁵²⁷ Cf. THIEME, *ibid*.

⁵²⁸ The active diathesis seems to have been original with *ślīṣya-*, the introducing of the middle inflection (for instance, at ChU 4.14.3) may be due to the influence of the synonymous *lipyá-te*; see Chapter B.V, s.v.

⁵²⁹ For the compound *ní-lip*, see, in particular, WACKERNAGEL 1905 [AiG II/1]: 182; JOHANSON 1927: 17; RENOU, EVP XVI, 95.

⁵³⁰ Thus also GONDA 1967-68: 18 [= Sel.St. III, 327] (‘the invisible ones have been besmeared’), ELIZARENKOVA (‘замазаны невидимые’).

the same usage as the corresponding -ya-present (see Chapter C.V.2.1). Accordingly, INSLEER's (1970: 139f.) non-passive translation seems more probable:

'The cows have lain down in the stalls; (even) the wild animals went to rest; to rest the beacons of men (= the sacrificial fires). The invisible (poisonous insects) **have adhered themselves** (to everything).'

vac 'speak; pronounce; call': *ucyá-*^{te} ⁵³¹

Simplex ($\alpha_{\text{pass.}}/\alpha_{\text{anticaus.}}$) 'be pronounced; sound' RV 3.57.5, 5.25.8, 6.28.6 (?), 10.64.15 = 10.100.8;

($\beta_{\text{pass.}}$) 'be called, declared' (impersonal passive) RV +;

Compounds ($\alpha_{\text{pass.}}$):

+ *ánu* (a) 'repeat, utter' YV^p +;

(b) quasi-denom. [*anuvākyā-* \Rightarrow *ánu-vac*] 'recite *anuvākyā*' YV^p +;

+ *abhy-ánu* (most often) 'say [in a verse]' TS^p 7.1.5.5 +;

+ *nír* 'speak out, mention' KS^p 9.16:119.20, AB (+);

+ *prá* SV 1.573 [= 1.6.2.3.8] (*ucyate* \approx RV 9.103.1 *údyatam*, $\sqrt{\text{yam}}$)⁵³², 'teach, explain' JB (+);

+ *vi* 'stop the recitation' JB 3.303:14 (*avyucyamána-*)⁵³³

accented: RV +⁵³⁴

• pass., agentless pass., anticaus.

pass. of caus.: *vācyá-*^{te} 'be made (be caused to) speak, recite'

VaikhŚS 18.5:256.6 +

⁵³¹ The four occurrences of *vacyá-*^{te} in the Brāhmaṇas (TB 2.8.2.5 = KB 12.8.17 [ed. LINDNER 12.7] *vacyámānāḥ* (= RV 3.6.1), GB 2.6.12^{2x}:262.9-10 *vacyasva* (= RVKh. 5.9.1 = AV 20.127.4) are reckoned in VWC-Br. II, 1269c, 1274l to the root *vac* 'speak' by misunderstanding; all these forms belong to the verb *vañc* (q.v.).

⁵³² *prá...ucyate* at SV 1.573 [= 1.6.2.3.8] seems to result from misinterpretation of *prá...údyatam* in the underlying RVic passage 9.103.1 (*prá ... sómāya váca údyatam* 'the speech is raised to Soma') as a -yá-present.

⁵³³ See CALAND, note ad PB 15.7.4; OERTEL [= Kl.Schr. I, 1176, 1476], EHLERS [Unpublished Habilschrift]: 'die Ritualhandlung dadurch unterbrechen, dass auf einen Fehler in der Rezitation hingewiesen wird.'

⁵³⁴ With the erroneous root accentuation in RVKh. 2.14.8 (*úcyate*).

The two patterns in which the passive *ucyá-te* occurs are based on the transitive uses α (with the accusative of speech) and β (with the accusatives denoting the object of nomination and his/her/its name).⁵³⁵ Examples are:

(α) ‘ X_{NOM} says, pronounces S_{ACC} ’:

(RV 1.78.5ab)

ávocāma rāhūgaṇā ' agnáye mādhumad vácaḥ

‘We, the Rāhūgaṇas, have pronounced for Agni a honey-sweet speech.’

(β) ‘ X_{NOM} declares Y_{ACC} to be Z_{ACC} ’; ‘ X_{NOM} calls Y_{ACC} Z_{ACC} ’, cf.:

(RV 3.54.19)

devānām dūtāḥ ... ānāgān no vocatu

‘Let the messenger of the gods ... declare us [to be] sinless.’

Syntactically, the opposition between patterns α and β is comparable to the distinction between the first and second objects (i.e. the accusative direct object may refer either to the speech (words properly speaking) or to its denotatum). However, from the semantic point of view, we are faced in this case with a considerable meaning shift, not amounting to mere change of the syntactic pattern.⁵³⁶

This semantic non-parallelism of α and β may account for the dissimilarity of the intransitive constructions corresponding to patterns α and β . The transitive usage α underlies two intransitive patterns: the regular passive ($\alpha_{\text{pass.}}$) ‘ S_{NOM} is said, pronounced’ and the non-passive intransitive (anticausative) pattern ($\alpha_{\text{anticaus.}}$) ‘ S_{NOM} sounds’. Examples are:

($\alpha_{\text{pass.}}$):

(RV 1.114.6a)

idām pitré marútām ucyate vácaḥ

‘This speech is pronounced for the Maruts’ father.’

The anticausative pattern⁵³⁷ has undoubtedly developed from the

⁵³⁵ Cf. DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 173f.; MINARD 1949: 81, [§]221, fn. c; HAUDRY 329f.

⁵³⁶ For that reason I use Greek letters, not Latin characters (i/ii) (as in the case of other ‘two pattern’ verbs).

⁵³⁷ GRASSMANN (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 1191): “Passiv mit medialer Bedeutung”; cf. also VELANKAR (2003: 174): “This passive form is used in the active sense of ‘resound’ ”.

ordinary passive $\alpha_{\text{pass.}}$ through the stage of the agentless passive ('X is pronounced [by smb.]' → 'X sounds'). Subsequently, this usage could be expanded to a larger class of subjects, so as to include, alongside sounds proper (speech, songs, etc.), sound sources: tongue, pressing-stone,⁵³⁸ etc.⁵³⁹ Type $\alpha_{\text{anticaus.}}$ is rarer than $\alpha_{\text{pass.}}$ in the RV and disappears in later texts. The following three occurrences are taken by most or all translators as examples of this type:

(RV 10.64.15c = 10.100.8c)

grāvā yātra madhuśūd ucyāte bṛhāt

'... where the stone pressing out the sweet drink (= Soma) sounds loudly.'

(RV 5.25.8ab)

tāva dyumānto arcāyo ' grāvevo_{cyate} bṛhāt

'Your (sc. Agni's) brilliant rays [are manifested (?) as brightly], as the pressing-stone sounds loudly.'⁵⁴⁰

(RV 3.57.5ab)

yā te jihvā mādhumatī sumedhā ' āgne devē_{ūcyāta} urūcī

'Your honey-sweet wise tongue, O Agni, which sounds towards / among the gods, the far-reaching one ...'⁵⁴¹

A remarkable feature shared by all these constructions is the presence of an adverb (*bṛhāt* 'loudly') or an adjective (*urūcī* 'far-reaching') syntactically connected with the verb or subject, respectively, which expresses the loud and far-reaching character of the sound:⁵⁴² 'S_{NOM} Adv./Adj.^{loud(ly)} sounds'.

⁵³⁸ On pressing-stones (*grāvan-*) and the sounds made by them, see now WRIGHT 2008.

⁵³⁹ Such a semantic derivation is typical of verbs of sounding; see PADUČEVA 1998: 19.

⁵⁴⁰ Or: '... [you sound loudly], as the pressing-stone sounds loudly'; cf. HENRY 1898: 90, with fn. 2; GELDNER, ad loc.; RENOU, EVP XIII, 33, 117; ELIZARENKOVA, ad loc.; VELANKAR 2003: 68.

⁵⁴¹ Thus GELDNER, ELIZARENKOVA. Differently LUDWIG (1876 [RV übers.]: I, 217) and GRASSMANN (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 1194 and 1876 [RV übers.]: I, 100): 'Mit deiner ... Zunge, die weitgestreckt, o Agni, heisst bei Göttern' (type $\beta_{\text{pass.}}$; see below). RENOU was hesitating in his comments on this passage ("*ucyāte*, «erklingt» G[E]LD[NER], en conformité avec les passages où le sujet est *grāvan* ... Mais l'emploi usuel mène au sens de: est appelée, est dite" (EVP IV, 56)), but has eventually adopted GELDNER's interpretation ('Ta langue ... qui se fait entendre chez les dieux') in his translation (EVP V, 18).

⁵⁴² Cf. GRASSMANN (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 911) on *bṛhāt*: "von Tönen (laut), wo ...

To this type may also belong the following RVic construction:

(RV 6.28.6cd)

bhadrām gṛhām kṛṇutha bhadravāco 'brhāt vo váya ucyate sabhāsu

ucyate in pāda d is translated by some scholars as ‘is declared’; cf. GELDNER: ‘... Eure hohe Lebensstärkung **wird** in den Versammlungen **verkündet**’; ELIZARENKOVA: ‘О великой вашей подкрепляющей силе **говорят** в собраниях’. In fact, GELDNER and ELIZARENKOVA render *ucyate* as ‘is subject of speaking, is spoken about’ – the meaning which, to my knowledge, is unattested for this passive elsewhere. GRASSMANN (1876 [RV übers.]: I, 259),⁵⁴³ HILLEBRANDT (1913: 52),⁵⁴⁴ LOMMEL (1955: 99)⁵⁴⁵ and OGUIBÉNINE (1988: 175)⁵⁴⁶ understand this form as ‘is praised’, thus tacitly assuming that *ucyate* is employed here (nearly) in the meaning of *śasyáte* (q.v.). Although it cannot be ruled out that the replacement of *śasyáte* with *ucyate* could be triggered by the word play *bhadravāco ... ucyate*, such a usage would be isolated for *vac*. LUDWIG (1876 [RV übers.]: II, 134) reckoned this occurrence as belonging to type α_{pass} . (‘groszes wird in den versammlungen von eurer kraft gesagt’), but *brhāt* ‘high’ can hardly refer to the speech proper. Unlikely is also GRASSMANN’s earlier interpretation (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 1194) of this construction as an example of the binominative type β_{pass} . (for which see below).

It seems that the key to this construction is *brhāt*, which can be syntactically connected either with the verb (as an adverb), or with the subject *vāyas* (as an adjective). The parallelism between this construction and the anticausative pattern ‘S_{NOM} Adv./Adj. sounds’ (where Adv./Adj. = *brhāt* in two of the three occurrences quoted above) favours an anticausative (α) analysis:

‘You [o cows] make the house prosperous, O [you who speak] auspicious speech. Your energy sounds loudly in the assemblies.’

The passive counterpart of the transitive pattern β is the agentless passive constructed with two nominatives: (β_{pass}) ‘Y_{NOM} is called Z_{NOM}’, cf.:

auch oft die Anschauung der weiten Ausbreitung ... mit hineinspielt”.

⁵⁴³ ‘hoch wird gerühmt eur Trunk bei den Gelagen’.

⁵⁴⁴ ‘Laut wird bei den Versammlungen eure Macht gepriesen.’

⁵⁴⁵ ‘eure belebende Kraft wir im Versammlungshaus gerühmt.’

⁵⁴⁶ ‘votre force vitale est hautement célébrée dans les assemblées.’

(RV 10.97.6cd)

vípraḥ sá ucyate bhiṣág ' rakṣohāmīvacāṭanaḥ‘That poet (Brahman) is called healer,⁵⁴⁷ Rakṣas-killer, disease-dispeller.’

(AV 11.4.15b)

vāto ha prāṇá ucyate

‘Breath is called Vāta (the wind).’

The passive *ucyá-^{le}* does not occur with an overtly expressed instrumental agent. The only exception may be the following occurrence in maṇḍala VIII:

(RV 8.13.9)

*utó pátir yá ucyáte ' kṛṣṭīnām éka íd vaśí**namovṛdháir avasyúbhiḥ ' suté raṇa*

Most scholars take *namovṛdháir avasyúbhiḥ* as an instrumental agent, cf. e.g. GELDNER’s translation:

‘Und der der Herr der Völker, der einzige Gebieter genannt wird **von den sich oftmals verneigenden**⁵⁴⁸ **Schutzsuchenden**. Ergötze dich am Somasaft!’⁵⁴⁹

The isolated character of this construction renders such syntactic analysis doubtful. I presume the noun phrase *namovṛdháir avasyúbhiḥ* is syntactically connected with *raṇa* of the next pāda, thus being a sociative instrumental: ‘... enjoy the pressed [Soma-juice] together with those who increase reverence⁵⁵⁰ and long for favour.’⁵⁵¹

ucyá-^{le} does not occur with preverbs in the RV. After the RV, the simplex is only attested in usage β_{pass} . ‘be called, declared’, while pattern α_{pass} . (‘be pronounced’, with several idiomatic changes in compounds) is possible only with preverbs, and the rare type α_{anticaus} . (‘sound’) disappears. Examples of type α_{pass} . are:

⁵⁴⁷ Or: ‘As a poet, he is called healer’ (W. KNOBL, p.c.).

⁵⁴⁸ For the meaning of the compound *namovṛdháir*, see LÜDERS’ comments (next fn.).

⁵⁴⁹ Similarly, GRASSMANN, LÜDERS (1959: 565 and fn. 6: ‘[der] der Herr der Völker genannt [wird] von den (ihn) durch *námas* wachsen machenden Hilfesuchenden’), ELIZARENKOVA.

⁵⁵⁰ ‘Die Ehrerbietung mehrend’ (< *‘Vermehrung der Ehrerbietung habend’?) (SCARLATA 519).

⁵⁵¹ To my knowledge, this analysis was only adopted by LUDWIG (1876 [RV übers.]: II, 185): ‘... der freue sich **mit den anbetung merenden hilfe suchenden** beim safte.’

- with *ānu* ('recite, repeat'):

(TS 2.5.8.4)

yád ghṛtávat padám anūcyáte, sá āsām várṇaḥ

'In that the verse containing [the word] *ghṛtá-* is recited, they (sc. the kindling-stanzas) have their "colour" (efficiency?).'⁵⁵²

- with *nír* ('mention'),⁵⁵³ attested mostly in the AB:

(AB 4.29.8)

prathame pade devatā nír ucyate

'The deity is mentioned in the first pada.'

The only exception may be *ádhi ucyate* attested in Puruṣa-hymn AV 11.8:

(AV 11.8.34)

apsú stīmāsu vṛddhāsu 'śārīram antará hitám

tāsmiñ chávó 'dhīy antará 'tāsmāc chávó 'dhīy ucyate

'In the quiet old waters the body is placed; within that is *śávas*; therefore it is called (?) *śávas*.'

Obviously, the meaning of the last two pādas is based on the word play *śáva(s)-* 'power'/'body'. The exact content of this word play was the subject of controversy, however, yielding a variety of interpretations.⁵⁵⁴ Apparently, the passive form in pāda d is employed in the meaning of simplex ('is called').⁵⁵⁵

⁵⁵² I am thankful to Werner KNOBL for valuable clarifications on the meaning of this passage.

⁵⁵³ Although the direct object of *nír-vac-* (and, correspondingly, the passive subject of *nír-ucya-te*) refers to the referent of a name, not to the name itself, the act of mentioning X suggests pronouncing X's name ('mention Y' ≈ 'pronounce Y's name'). For that reason this usage should be grouped with type α ('pronounce'), rather than with β ('call').

⁵⁵⁴ Cf. the following three translations of this passage:

'in ihm ward er gelaicht gleichsam, darum wird Leichnam er genannt' (DEUSSEN 1894: 277);

'... et dans ce Corps réside le courage: c'est pour cela qu'il s'appelle "courage" ' (HENRY 1896: 126);

'... within that is might (?); thence is it called might.' (WHITNEY)

⁵⁵⁵ Impossible is the translation 'is known' given in EDS III, 1650: this meaning is unattested for *ucyá-te* and makes little sense in the context.

The basic meaning of the compound *ádhi-vac-*, viz. ‘advocate, protect’,⁵⁵⁶ does not suit the context; furthermore, this compound is constructed with the dative of the being which is protected or blessed (GEHMAN 1917: 225 et passim) and hence cannot be passivized. Most likely, in both pādas c and d, *ádhi* is used as a postposition, syntactically connected with pronouns *tásmīn* and *tásmāc*. The two pādas in question should probably be understood as follows: ‘In that [body] there is power, inside [it]. Because of that [power], it (the [dead] body) is called “corpse” ’ (W. KNOBL, p.c.).

Quasi-denom. passives

The passive of the quasi-denominative *ánu-vac* ‘recite anuvākya (an invitation addressed to the gods, recited by the Hotar)’ is attested from the Saṃhitā prose onwards (e.g. in KS 10.11:139.2 *tām anūcyāmāne paścāt prāñcam udāharanti* ‘they bring [the vessel] from behind forward, while the anuvākya is being recited’); see, in particular, KEYDANA 1997: 124f. and Appendix II. Note that this quasi-denominative is morphologically indistinguishable from the compound *ánu-vac* ‘repeat, utter’ (see examples above).

-i-aorist

For the -i-aorist *ávāci*, see KÜMMEL 1996: 95f. All the seven RVic occurrences are employed in usage α_{pass} . (‘be pronounced’ etc.); one of them (RV 7.70.1) is a compound with *prá*, meaning ‘declare, proclaim’. An example is:

(RV 6.34.5ab)

ásmā etán máhīy āṅgūṣám asmā ' índrāya stotrám matíbhir avāci

‘This is for him, a great praising for him, a praise with prayers was pronounced for Indra.’

In contrast to the simplex -yá-passive *ucyá-^{te}*, unattested in usage α_{pass} . after the RV, the -i-aorist (*a*)*vāci* occurs in this usage without preverbs in the formulaic expression *uktham (a)vāci* ‘the hymn was recited’⁵⁵⁷ (with the optional dative of the recipient) in a number of young mantras (TS, AB, JB, GB, ŚrSū.), for instance, in *uktham avācīndrāya* ‘the hymn has been recited to

⁵⁵⁶ Or ‘bless’, according to GEHMAN (1917).

⁵⁵⁷ See CALAND & HENRY 304.

Indra' (KB 14.4.11 [ed. LINDNER 14.3]),⁵⁵⁸ *ukthām vāci* (TS 3.2.9.1 = AB 3.12.2 etc.).

Caus. pass.

The causative passive *vācya-^{te}* (based on caus. *vācaya-^{ti}* 'make (cause to) speak, recite'), attested from the Sūtras onwards, is constructed with the subject of speaker (i.e. causee), not of the speech (= the initial direct object), as, for instance, in VaikhŚS 18.5:256.6 *kāraṇo ... vācyamānāḥ* 'the poets which are caused to speak', KauŚS 63.20 *dadyād dātā vācyamānāḥ* 'the giver who is caused to pronounce [the ritual words] should give [the oblation]'.⁵⁵⁹

vañc 'move (waveringly), jump': *vacyá-^{te}*

vacyá-^{te}

Simplex RV, RVKh. 5.9.1 = AV 20.127.4 (≈ GB 2.6.12:262.9-10);

+ *achā* RV 1.142.4;

+ *ā* RV

accented:

vacyá-^{te} RV, RVKh.

vācyasva AV 20.127.4 (thus mss., ed. VISHVA BANDHU; ed.

¹ROTH/WHITNEY + *vacyásva*) (= RVKh. 5.9.1 *vacyásva*)

• anticaus. (← pass.?)

The present *vacyá-^{te}* 'move (waveringly, crookedly)',⁵⁶⁰ poses serious

⁵⁵⁸ Cf. WHITNEY 1892: 305.

⁵⁵⁹ For this passage, see GONDA 1965: 228; 1967b: 263 [= Sel.St. III, 92].

⁵⁶⁰ Some Indian interpreters derive this formation from the root *vac*. For instance, Sāyaṇa often glosses it as *ucyate* (e.g. at RV 1.142.4, 3.39.1, 10.47.7; though not quite consistently; see GELDNER 1897 [VSt II]: 259, fn. 1). In the Western scholarship, Sāyaṇa's analysis was advocated by OLDENBERG (1897: 153 and 155, note 2 ad RV 1.142.4), but his account of *vacyáte* as a replacement of the regular *ucyáte* after *sujihva* (in RV 1.142.4) "in order to avoid the hiatus" with the preceding vowel is untenable. Besides, the meaning 'is addressed', suggested for this occurrence (*tvā matír ... sujihva vacyáte* 'my prayer ... is addressed to thee whose tongue is good'), is hardly possible for *ucyáte* (see above, s.v. *vac*). Note also that *vacyántām* in RV 3.6.2 has been translated by OLDENBERG (ibid., 244) as 'may [thy horses] move along.'

According to VISHVA BANDHU (1950: 25f.), *vacyate* = ***vacasyate* (← *vacas-*).

difficulties for the study of Vedic -ya-presents. In spite of its suffix accentuation, it is always translated as a non-passive, typically expressing the wavering race of a horse or draught-animal.⁵⁶¹ The “passive” accentuation, repeatedly noticed by Vedic scholars,⁵⁶² has not received a satisfactory explanation thus far;⁵⁶³ unlike the non-passive -ya-presents of the type *mriyáte* (instead of ***mṛīate*; see KULIKOV 1997 and Chapter C.II.2.3), its suffix accentuation cannot be accounted for phonologically.

Let us have a closer look at the IVS of *vañc*. There are two present formations: the class I present *vāñca-ti* (RVKh., AV, YV^m, ŚB) and the -ya-present *vacyá-te*, which, apart from two occurrences in one stanza attested in the AV (book 20) and RVKh. (see below), does not occur after the RV. The semantic difference between these two formations is captured by GOTÖ 280 in terms of the ‘facientive’/‘fientive’ opposition.⁵⁶⁴ *vāñca-ti* denotes a controllable activity and occurs constructed with the subjects of a human being (AV 4.16.2, 10.8.27), a bird (RVKh. 5.21.2 = AV 20.135.12) and, most commonly, a horse not yoked to a chariot but going freely, in accordance with the Aśvamedha ritual (see GOTÖ, *ibid.*). By contrast, *vacyá-te* expresses a

This analysis is morphologically impossible, leads to forced translations (e.g. for *á vacyasva* RV 9.2.2: ‘[o Soma], sing songs!’) and hardly deserves any serious discussion.

⁵⁶¹ See e.g. BERGAIGNE (1881: 110 and fn. 5; 1883: II, 442 and fn. 3): ‘caracoler’; GELDNER ad 1.46.3a (“*vacyánte* drückt hier und 1, 184, 3; 3, 6, 2 eine bestimmte Gangart des Pferdes aus, etwa das spätere *plutam* oder *valgitam* (Hem. 1248), das Springen oder Galoppieren, oder das Schweben, Fliegen”). Cf. also BRERETON’s (1981: 118) comments on the usage of this verb: “The root *vañc* properly means “bend” or “go crookedly.” When used of horses, it refers not to their running or leaping, but to their bodies, which at full gallop are bent like a bow.”

⁵⁶² Cf. e.g. DELBRÜCK 1874 [AiV]: 167; GELDNER 1897 [VSt II]: 258, fn. 3; GONDA 1979: 17f.; HOCK 1985-86: 85, fn. 2; ELIZARENKOVA 1989: 632 [ad RV 1.142.4], 692 [ad RV 3.6.1].

⁵⁶³ Cf. GOTÖ 280: “Der Akzent des wohl urindoiranischen -ya-Präs. *vac-yá-* ... bleibt ... noch zu klären”; likewise KÜMMEL 2000: 445, fn. 821 (“der passivische Akzent von *vacyá-te* is synchron rätselhaft, da patientive Bedeutung ausgeschlossen ist”). In the introduction to his “Materialien” (1990: 988), GOTÖ mentions *vacyá-te* as, presumably, the sole representative of the non-passive -yá-presents (“[pres. subclass] IVc (formal = Pass.)”).

⁵⁶⁴ “*vacyá-te* ‘wogend sich fortbewegen’, fientiv (also gewißermaßen automatisch) :: *vāñca-ti* stärker facientiv (mit Absicht bzw. Bestreben) ‘wogend, wankend gehen’”.

non-volitional, non-deliberate, automatic motion and occurs with the subject of horses, draught-animals (*váhnayaḥ* RV 3.6.2, *kakuhá(sa)ḥ* RV 1.46.3, 1.184.3) or Soma regarded as a race-horse,⁵⁶⁵ cf.:

(RV 3.6.2d)

vacyántāṃ te váhnayaḥ saptájihvāḥ

‘Let your (sc. Agni’s) seven-tongued draught-animals jump.’

(RV 9.97.2c)

ā vacyasva cam_uvōḥ pūyāmānaḥ

‘[O Soma], move in the two camū-vessels, being purified.’

The imperative *vacyásva*, attested twice in a post-Rigvedic mantra (RVKh. 5.9.1 ≈ AV 20.127.4), is also addressed to Soma, called Rebha in this stanza:

(RVKh. 5.9.1ab = AV 20.127.4ab⁵⁶⁶)

*vacyásva rebha vacyásva 'vr̥kṣé ná pakvé śakunáh*⁵⁶⁷

‘Jump,⁵⁶⁸ O Rebha, jump like a bird on a tree with ripe [fruits] (lit.: on a ripe tree).’

In RV 1.142.4, the subject is a prayer, metaphorically regarded as a draught-animal of the sacrifice:⁵⁶⁹

(RV 1.142.4cd)

iyám hí tvā matír māmācchā sujihva vacyáte

‘Because this prayer of mine moves towards you, O having good tongue.’⁵⁷⁰

Finally, the subject can refer to the poets proper, also regarded as draught-animals of the sacrifice. Two of the three occurrences of this latter

⁵⁶⁵ See already BERGAIGNE (1881: 110 and fn. 5; 1883: II, 442 and fn. 3); cf. also GELDNER ad RV 9.2.2.

⁵⁶⁶ Pada a is also quoted in GB 2.6.12:269.9-10.

⁵⁶⁷ With the corrupt accentuation in the AVic mss. (*vácyasva rébha* ...); ed. VISHVA BANDHU adopts the mss. reading; ed. ¹ROTH/WHITNEY conjectures as in the RVKh.

⁵⁶⁸ GELDNER (1897 [VSt II]: 259): ‘schwing dich auf’; RENOU (EVP XII, 103): ‘élance-toi’; GOTÖ 280: ‘hüpf’.

⁵⁶⁹ Cf. BERGAIGNE, op.cit.

⁵⁷⁰ For the impossible translation given by OLDENBERG (‘my prayer ... is addressed to thee’), see above.

type (RV 3.6.1, 3.39.1, 10.47.7) are constructed with the instrumental *mananā* or *mānasā* ‘with (religious) thought’, cf.:

(RV 3.6.1ab)

prā kāravo mananā vacyāmānā 'devadrīcīm nayata devayāntaḥ
 ‘Soaring up with (your) religious thought,⁵⁷¹ O poets, who serve the gods,
 conduct [the sacrificial spoon] assigned to the gods.’

The -ya-present *vacyá-te* is inherited from Proto-Indo-Iranian. Its Avestan cognate *vašša-* occurs already in the Gāthās, in the same usage as the Vedic *vacyá-te*, with the subject of a religious thought or song (cf. on RV 1.142.4 above):

(Y 44.11)

yaēibiiō mazdā θβōi vaššietē daēnā
 ‘... to whom Your religious thought moves forth, O Wise One.’⁵⁷²

Thus far I was only concerned with the two intransitive presents of *vañc-*. Traditionally, this verb is regarded as lacking transitive formations. The only exception I am aware of is LUBOTSKY’s RVic Word-Concordance (1997a: 1222), where the reduplicated present *vívakti* is grouped with *vacyá-te*. In formal terms, *vívak-* can belong to either *vac* (as a full grade stem) or *vañc* (as the weak grade of the hypothetical stem ***vivañk-*). Although most of the occurrences of *vívakti* clearly belong to *vac* ‘speak’,⁵⁷³ a few attestations can readily be interpreted as transitive counterparts of the intransitives *vāñca-ti* and *vacyá-te* ‘move’, cf.:

(RV 10.120.8)

imā bráhma bṛháddivo vivaktīndrāya śūṣám ...
 ‘Bṛhaddiva pronounces / sets in motion these prayers as energy supply for

⁵⁷¹ Cf. GELDNER: ‘[m]it eurem Denken **euch aufschwingend**’; RENOU: ‘O Bardes qui **vous élancez** par la pensée’ (EVP XII, 55); ELIZARENKOVA: ‘О певцы, **воспаряя** молитвой...’.

⁵⁷² Cf. HUMBACH (1956: 74ff.) and (1991: II 155, note (1)): ‘wells forth, wells out, issues.’ HUMBACH (1956: 76; 1991: I, 160) takes *yaēibiiō* as an ablative (‘... from whom Thy religion wells forth...’); more probable is KELLENS & PIRART’s (1988: 151) translation: ‘... devant lesquels ... volette ta conscience’.

Less likely is INSLEY’s (1975a [Gāthās]: 247) interpretation: ‘(those) to whom Thy (good) conception **is taught**’ (i.e. *vaššietē* = Skt. *ucyate*).

⁵⁷³ For the full list of attestations of this present, see CASARETTO 2006: 135ff., 150f.

(= towards) Indra ...'

Cf. especially *iyám* ... *matír* ... *vacyáte* 'this prayer moves' in RV 1.142.4. Note also that the preverb *áchā* 'towards' is particularly common with the verbs of motion (*dru* 'run', *nī* 'lead, conduct', *nakṣ* 'reach', *yā* 'drive', *gam* 'go', *gā* id., *vah* 'drive' etc.), while the only verb of speech, apart from *vac*, with which this preverb is frequent, is the phonetically similar *vad*.

It cannot be ruled out that *vívakti* has ever existed as a regular present of *vañc*, with the subsequent reanalysis of the weak stem as derived from *vac* and the generalization of this stem throughout the paradigm (cf. the full grade 2 pl. impv. *vivaktana* RV 1.156.3). The usages with the preverb *áchā* (which might thus be regarded as indirect evidence for the primary meaning of this present) could have been analogically expanded to the phonetically similar *vad*.

Let us return to *vacyá-^{te}*. This present is constructed with the subject of a draught-animal directed by someone (horses, bulls, etc.) or other beings regarded as draught-animals (prayers, poets). Thus the subject of *vacyá-^{te}* always refers to beings set in motion and directed by someone else, not moving on its own – unlike subjects of *vāñca-^{ti}* (see above). Then the anticausative ('fientive') *vacyá-^{te}* can be accounted for as originating in the passive counterpart of the reduplicated transitive present **vivañkti* (?) 'sets in (wavering) motion, directs', almost extinct already by the times of the RV; the weak stem *vívak-* could be generalized throughout the paradigm. In some uses, its passive semantics could be weakened (depassivized),⁵⁷⁴ but, at least for some occurrences, the original passive character of the meaning ('be set in motion, directed') appears to be transparent. In particular, the poet and his religious thought in RV 3.6.1 can be considered, metaphorically, as a draught-animal (chariot-horse) and its charioteer, respectively. Under this assumption, the construction in question may exemplify a passive syntactic pattern with an overtly expressed agentive nominal in the instrumental: 'Being raised by (your) religious thought, O poets ...'⁵⁷⁵ A passive analysis is also

⁵⁷⁴ Such a depassivization was particularly common for verbs of motion, see Chapter C.II.1.2.1.

⁵⁷⁵ Thus actually translated by KEITH (1920: 417) for the quotation of *pāda* a in KB 12.8.17 [ed. LINDNER 12.7] ('the singers **urged** by thought') and by SCARLATA 25 ('O Sänger, [...] von eurer Andacht auf und ab **getragen**'). Cf. also SCARLATA's translation for RV 10.47.7 *stómāḥ* [...] *mānasā vacyāmānā*: 'die vom Geist **in galoppierende Bewegung versetzten** Loblieder' (SCARLATA 669).

possible for RV 1.142.4 (*iyám hí tvá matír māmācchā* .. *vacyáte* ‘because this prayer of mine is being directed towards you’) and perhaps for the Avestan cognate *vaššietē* mentioned above (‘to whom Your religious thought is directed’).

Thus, we arrive at a different analysis of the present system of *vañc* as based on the tripartite opposition “passive/non-passive intransitive (anticausative)/transitive”:

vacyáte ‘is directed’ :: *vāñcati* ‘moves’ :: *vívakti* ‘sets in motion, directs’

The system of *vañc* turns out to be parallel to those of the verbs such as *pū* or *vah* (see s.vv.), cf.:

pūyáte ‘is purified’ :: *pávate* ‘becomes clean’ :: *punáti* ‘purifies’;

uhyáte ‘is carried’ :: *váhate* ‘drives’ :: *váhati* ‘carries’.

The parallelism is not complete because of the active inflection of the anticausative member of the opposition, but it may be due to the loss of the transitive present, with the subsequent further differentiation of the two intransitive formations:

vacyáte :: **vāñcate* (?) → *vāñcati*.

Other passives

The 3pl. form *vāvakre* is a hapax attested in the RV (maṇḍala VII):

(RV 7.21.3abc)⁵⁷⁶

t_uvám indra srávitavá apás kaḥ ‘*pářiṣṭhitā áhinā śūra pūrvīḥ*

t_uvád vāvakre rath_iyò ná dhénāḥ

Most translations render *rathyá-* as ‘charioteers’⁵⁷⁷ or ‘related to chariots’⁵⁷⁸, but this adjective is more likely to refer to horses (thus GRASSMANN 1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 1141; 1876 [RV übers.]: I, 320;⁵⁷⁹ KÜMMEL 2000: 445). First, *rathyá-* commonly occurs as an epithet of horse(s) yoked to a chariot (cf. RV 2.4.4, 9.35.1, 9.86.2). Second, whatever the referent of *dhénāḥ* in this passage, streams (GRASSMANN [RV übers.], GELDNER, KÜMMEL) or songs (LUDWIG,

⁵⁷⁶ For a detailed discussion of the passage, see now KÜMMEL 2000: 445f.

⁵⁷⁷ Thus LUDWIG (1876 [RV übers.]: II, 157): ‘wie **wagenfarer** rollten heran von dir [ihre] tönenden lieder’; GELDNER: ‘Vor dir wichen die Ströme aus wie **Wagenlenker**.’

⁵⁷⁸ Cf. OLIPHANT (1912: 404): ‘Thy war songs rolled from thee as if **on chariots borne**’; ELIZARENKOVA: ‘Из-за тебя выкатились потоки, словно **на колесах**.’

⁵⁷⁹ ‘Sie sprangen von dir her wie **Wagenstuten**.’

OLIPHANT),⁵⁸⁰ both are often compared with horses (cf. e.g. RV 4.58.6-7, 9.97.45 and the discussion on RV 1.142.4 at the beginning of this lemma); GRASSMANN (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 695) even translates *dhénāḥ* in the passage in question as ‘Stuten’. Semantically, the form *vāvakre* undoubtedly belongs with the *-yá*-present *vacyá-te* (KÜMMEL, op.cit.), and, under the assumption that the subject of *vāvakre* refers to horses yoked to a chariot and driven by a charioteer, a passive interpretation of the passage in question is quite probable; accordingly, the form *vāvakre* can tentatively be qualified as a stative built on the perfect stem:

‘You, O Indra, made flow many waters, surrounded by the snake. The songs / streams **are set in motion** because of you (or: by you), like [horses yoked] to a chariot.’

vad ‘(re)sound, speak, pronounce, declare’: *udyá-te*

Simplex RV 5.55.8, AV 7.66.1, TS^P 6.4.7.3, MS^P 1.6.8:100.1, KS^P 23.5:80.8, 24.4:93.2 = KpS^P 37.5:198.6, ŚB, TB 2.5.1.3^{2x} +;
 + *abhi* JUB 4.10.1.5 [ed. OERTEL 4.18.5] (= KenaU 1.4);
 + *upa* ‘reproach’ JUB 1.12.4.2 [ed. OERTEL 1.38.2]^{2x}
 accented: RV +
 • pass.

pass. of caus.: *vādyá-te*

Simplex ‘play [a musical instrument]’ ŚB, TB 3.9.14.1 +
 accented: ŚB

The passive *udyá-te*, quasi-synonymous with *ucyá-te* in usage α_{pass} (‘is said, pronounced’), is much rarer and occurs only once in the RV:

(RV 5.55.8abc)

yát pūrvāyám maruto yác ca nūtanam ‘yád udyáte vasavo yác ca śasyáte
viśvasya tāsya bhavathā návedasaḥ

‘What is ancient, O Maruts, and what is new, what is being spoken, O gods,
 and what is praised, – you become cognizant of all that.’

In contrast to *vac*, *vad* does not belong with ‘two pattern’ verbs and cannot be constructed with the accusative of addressee of speech (pattern β).

⁵⁸⁰ For Vedic *dhénā-*, see, in particular, OLIPHANT 1912.

Caus. pass.

While passives of the causative of *vac* do not occur before the Sūtras (see s.v. *vac* above), passives of the causative *vādāya*^{ti} are attested already in Vedic prose. The simplex is employed with the idiomatic meaning ‘play [a musical instrument]’:

(ŚB 13.1.5.1)

vīṇāsmāi vādyate

‘The vīṇā is being played for him.’

(ŚB 14.5.4.8 (= BĀUM 2.4.8 = BĀUK 2.4.9))

sā yāthā vīṇāyai vādyāmānāyai, ná bāhyāñ chābdāñ chaknuyād grāhaṇāya

‘It (sc. the Brahma) is [so] as one is unable to grasp the external sounds when a vīṇā is being played.’⁵⁸¹

The form *sam avādyanta* in KS 24.9:100.6 *te priyās tanvas sam avādyanta* is not a causative passive of the compound *sam-vad* (contra HOCK (1981: 19), who translates this passage as ‘these pleasant bodies were caused to converse’), but the 3pl. middle imperfect of the verb *sam-áva*-^{3/4}*dā* (pres. -*dyá*-^{ti}; see Ch. B.VI, s.v. ^{3/4}*dā*). The passage in question should be rendered as ‘sie (die Götter) trennten ihre lieben Leiber von sich ab’ (W. KNOBL, p.c.).⁵⁸²

It is important to note that, although *vad* ‘speak’ is generally transitive, the causative passive *vādyá*-^{te} is based on an intransitive usage (*vadati* ‘[a musical instrument] sounds’). This syntactic feature could enable the relatively early tertiary (passive of causative) derivation – in contrast to the causative passive *vācyá*-^{te} (Sū.+), which corresponds to the transitive *vac* ‘speak, pronounce’.

***vap* ‘sow, scatter’: *upyá*-^{te}**

[i_{pass.}] ‘be sown, scattered’:

Simplex RV 1.176.2, KS^m 16.12:234.20 = KpS^m 25.3:96.11, Sū.;

+ *ā* AV 12.3.28, KB 14.4.23 [ed. LINDNER 14.3] (*opyate*, ed. LINDNER

⁵⁸¹ For a philosophical interpretation of this passage, see HANEFELD 1976: 93f.

⁵⁸² Cf. the parallel passage MS 3.7.10:90.4 *téṣāñ yāḥ priyās tanvā āsañs tāḥ samāvādyan* (with the active form corresponding to the middle -*adyanta* in the KS).

v.1. *āpyate*); + *sam-ā* AĀ 2.3.1;
 + *ūpa* ŚBM 2.3.4.9 (*ūpoppyate* ≈ ŚBK 1.4.1.7 *ūpakīryate*), VārŚS 1.6.7.36;
 + *nī* AVP 16.111.10 [Kashm. 16.111.14];
 + *nīr* AVŚ 9.6.14 ≈ AVP 16.111.10 [Kashm. 16.111.14], YV^p +;⁵⁸³
 + *anu-nīr* ŚB 3.8.3.2, +KB 10.8.22 [ed. LINDNER 10.5] (mss. and ed. ĀnSS
nīr-upyate; ed. LINDNER, ed. SARMA +*anunir-upyate*);
 + *pārā* TB^m 2.8.8.2, JB, GB 2.1.2:144.12-13, VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 5.12 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 4.112^{2x} (= CALAND 1928: 234 [= Kl.Schr., 534])); + *vi-parā* JB 3.8:1;
 (+ *pari* VārŚS 3.4.4.24 *parivāpyamānābhyām* ?⁵⁸⁴);
 + *pra* AB 5.11.1 (*praupyanta*)⁵⁸⁵ = +GB 2.6.11:260.5 (mss. *prārūpyanta*;
 read with AB +*praupyanta*); + *prāti* TB 1.2.6.5⁵⁸⁶

[i_{pass.}] ‘be scattered, offered’ / [ii_{pass.}] ‘be besprinkled, offered upon’:
 + *nī* [i_{pass.}] AVP 8.18.10 [Kashm. 8.18.9], VSK 9.7.41 (*ny-upyāmāneṣu*
 ≈ VSM 8.57 *ny-ūptaḥ*);
 [ii_{pass.}] YV^p, ŚB, TB 3.3.8.1, GB 2.2.17:183.7, VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 3.2
 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 3.41:33 (= CALAND 1926: 36 [= Kl.Schr., 338]))
 accented: RV +
 • pass.

The passive *upyá-te*, first attested in the late RV (maṇḍala I), appears in a syntactically difficult passage:

(RV 1.176.2)

tāsminn ā veśayā giro ' yá ékaś carṣaṇīnām

ānu svadhā yām upyáte ' yávaṃ ná cārkrṣad vṛṣā

‘(a) Make the songs enter into him (sc. Indra), (b) who is the only [king] of peoples, (c) ..., (d) like the bull ploughing the barley (?)’

⁵⁸³ The long root vowel in *nir-ūpyate* in JB 2.201:7 (for +*nir-upyate*, see FRENZ 36, EHLERS 49) may be due to the influence of the passive *uhyate* (√*vah* ‘carry’), often confused with *ūhyate* (derived from the genetically related root *ūh* ‘shift, transpose’) in late Vedic – above all, in compounds (see below, s.v. *vah*). The same explanation may hold true for the absolutive *nir-ūpya* (again with *nir*!) in HirGS 1.1.27 (qualified by BÖHTLINGK (1889: 602) as “wohl nur Druckfehler”; see also TSUI 1960: 53, fn. 34), adjacent to *nir-ūhya*.

⁵⁸⁴ CALAND: “hopelessly corrupt”.

⁵⁸⁵ WEBER’s (1865b: 267) emendation +*prāvapyanta* is unnecessary.

⁵⁸⁶ Cf. LOWE 1987: 116.

This stanza has been discussed at length by BLOOMFIELD (1917: 16ff.), who has pointed out that *ánu* may belong with *svadhā́*, rather than with *upyáte*, as in the frequent adverbial group *ánu svadhām* (or adverb *anuṣvadhām*) ‘according to one’s habit, custom’. We cannot rule out indeed the influence of *ánu svadhām* (*anuṣvadhām*) on the syntax of the passage, but the reconstruction of the original sense of *pādas* cd suggested by BLOOMFIELD (‘Make enter into him (sc. Indra), who is sole (ruler) of the peoples, our songs, as a bull ploughs (i.e. makes enter) grain (into the field), grain which is sown according to (established) custom!’) seems too drastic. Translations offered by GELDNER⁵⁸⁷ and RÖNNOW (1927: 135)⁵⁸⁸ stick close to the original syntactic structure, but the simile looks awkward (*svadhā* follows Indra = the bull follows the barley grains being sown – i.e. just the opposite of what one might expect). Assuming that *yávam* refers to a barley field, not to barley properly speaking, we obtain a better sense; cf. OLDENBERG, *Noten ad loc.*: ‘hinter welchem her die *svadhā́* gesät wird, (er) der das Getreide(feld) gleichsam pflügende Stier.’⁵⁸⁹

The simplex passive also occurs in a YVic mantra:

(KS 16.12:234.20 = KpS 25.3:96.11)

śunāsīrā havyajūṣṭim juṣāṇedaṃ bījam avatam upyamānam

‘Suna and Sīra, enjoying the enjoyment of oblation, help this seed being sown.’

The simplex *upyá-te* is not attested in Vedic prose and appears again only in the Sūtras, but compounds with preverbs become quite common after the RV, especially in prose. Examples are:

- with *ā́*:

(AV 12.3.28)

sámkhyātā stokāḥ prthivīm sacante ' prāṇāpāndīḥ sámmitā óṣadhībhiḥ

ásamkhyātā opyamānāḥ suvárṇāḥ ' sárvaṃ vṛṣṭipuh śúcayaḥ śucitvām

‘The numbered drops fasten on the earth, commensurate with

⁵⁸⁷ ‘Bring ihm die Lobreden bei, der der einzige (Gebierter) der Völker, dem die Svadhā **nachzieht** wie der pflügende Stier der Gerste!’

⁵⁸⁸ ‘... dem die Götterkost **nachfolgt** wie der Stier dem Korne.’

⁵⁸⁹ Likewise ELIZARENKOVA: ‘Дай войти песням в того, / Кто единый (царь) народов. / За кем **сеется** собственная мощь, / Как при вспашке ячменного (поля), (кто) бык’; GOTŌ in WITZEL et al. 2007: 324: ‘... dem hinterher die Svadhā gesät wird’. On the fixed collocation *yávam kṛṣ-*, see HOFFMANN 1967c: 19 [= Aufs. 2, 479], note 6.

breaths-and-expirations, with herbs; the unnumbered, being scattered on,⁵⁹⁰ of good colour, the clean ones, have reached the complete clarity.⁵⁹¹

- with *úpa*:

(ŚBM 2.3.4.9 ≈ ŚBK 1.4.1.7)

yán nyṛcháty, asyám evá tát úpopyate [ŚBK *úpa kīryate*]; *tát áhnā rátryā bhūyo-bhūya evākṣayyám bhavati*

‘Whatever decays, that is sown⁵⁹² [as seed] in this [earth]; that becomes more and more by day and night, imperishable ...’

- with *nír* (‘scatter, offer [by scattering]’):

(AVŚ 9.6.14 ≈ AVP 16.111.10 [Kashm. 16.111.14])

yé vrīhāyo yāvā nirupyānte, ’mśāva evá té

‘The grains of rice, of barley which are being scattered, they are soma-shoots.’⁵⁹³

(TS 3.4.9.7)

átho yásmai kāmāya nirupyānte, tám evábhīr úpāpnoti

‘... and for whatever wish they (sc. the various metres) are offered, he achieves that by means of them.’

(KB 10.8.22 [ed. LINDNER 10.5])

atha vai paśum ālabhyamānaṃ puroḷāśo +anunir upyate [mss. and ed. ĀnSS *nirupyate*]

‘And after the victim being offered, a puroḷāśa-cake is offered.’⁵⁹⁴

- with *pārā*:

(TB^m 2.8.8.2)

yád adyáte lupyáte yát paropyáte ’śatatamí śá tanúr me babhūva

‘What is being eaten, [what] is being damaged, what is being thrown aside,

⁵⁹⁰ Thus WHITNEY; BLOOMFIELD (1897: 188f.): ‘that are poured into (the porridge)’.

⁵⁹¹ For a ritual interpretation of this stanza, see esp. GONDA 1965: 82f., 166f.

⁵⁹² EGGELING: ‘is buried’.

⁵⁹³ The Paippalāda version is somewhat different: *yad vrīhāyo yad yāvā nirupyante, amśava eva te ny upyante* ‘when the grains of rice, of barley are being scattered, they are being scattered down [as] soma-shoots’. Ed. BARRET omits the last verb, apparently in accordance with the Śaunakīya reading; ed. RAGHU VIRA conjectures [*te*] + *nūpyante*, thus assuming a compound with *anu* (unattested elsewhere).

⁵⁹⁴ Conjecture of ed. LINDNER (adopted in ed. SARMA); for discussion, see OERTEL 1926: 88.

this has become my hundredfold body.’

- with *prá*:

(AB 5.11.1 = GB 2.6.11:260.5)

*te vai devāḥ ṣaṣṭhenaivāhnaibhyo lokebhyo 'surān prāṇudanta. teṣāṃ yāny antarhastināni vasūny āsaṁs, tāny ādāya samudram praupyanta*⁵⁹⁵

‘The gods repelled the asuras from these worlds by means of the sixth day [rite]. Taking the wealth that was in the hands of these [asuras], this [wealth] was scattered over the sea.’⁵⁹⁶

Unlike the compounds discussed above, which show the same syntactic pattern as the simplex, *nī-vap* behaves as a ‘two pattern’ verb and can be constructed either [i] with the accusative of scattered things (‘first object’), or [ii] with the object of the recipient of scattering (altar, fire, etc.), thus meaning ‘besprinkle’. Pattern [i_{pass.}] (with the passive subject of scattered offerings) is attested in the mantra language (AVP, VSK):

(AVP-Or. 8.18.10 ≈ AVP-Kashm. 8.18.9)

tasmin dhānyaṃ nīy upyate 'yavo vrīhir atho tilaḥ

‘On this [threshing floor] grain is being scattered: barley, rice, and also

⁵⁹⁵ *praupyanta* is the correct imperfect form, with the regular augment sandhi; WEBER’s (1865b: 267) conjecture ⁺*prāvapyanta* is impossible.

The parallel GB passage attests the corrupt form *prarūpyanta* instead (thus all mss.; see ed. GAASTRA, crit.app.), which should be emended to ⁺*praupyanta* in accordance with the AB reading (see also OERTEL 1926: 311f.; PATYAL 1969: 362, note 2; 1973: 256).

⁵⁹⁶ For the syntax of this passage, see OERTEL 1926: 311f. KEITH (1920: 233, fn.1) notes that “the passive *praupyanta* is an odd use, which, however, can hardly reasonably be corrected”. The syntax is indeed awkward under the assumption that the subject of the absolutive is always referentially identical with that of the main verb. This rule was no longer valid in Vedic prose, however; cf. DELBRÜCK (1888 [AiS]: 408), OERTEL (1926: 308f.) and, most comprehensively, TIKKANEN (1987: 148ff.). Cf. an example given by TIKKANEN (p. 152; quoted according to ed. LINDNER):

(KB 24.8.3 [ed. LINDNER 24.9])

tad yāni tatra vaiśvadevāni bhavanti, tāny uddhṛtyānyāni prājāpatyāni aniruktāni parokṣavaiśvadevāny avadhīyante

‘These (hymns) to the All-Gods having been omitted, others addressed to Prajāpati (and) undefined (i.e. without special indication of the divinity to which they are addressed) (and) esoterically addressed to the All[-]Gods are substituted.’

sesame.⁵⁹⁷

(VSK 9.7.41 ≈ VSM 8.57.a)

viśve devā aṁśúṣu nyupyāmāneṣu

‘[Soma is] the All-Gods when the [Soma-]stalks are being thrown down
[on the pressing-boards].’⁵⁹⁸

Pattern [ii_{pass.}] (with the passive subject of recipient of scattering or besprinkling) first appears in Vedic prose. An example is:

(TS 6.3.1.6 ≈ MS 3.8.10:111.7 = ^UKS 26.1:120.1 = KpS 40.4:226.4)

ny ànyé dhiṣṇiyā upyānte nānyé

‘Some of the dhiṣṇiya-altars are being besprinkled, some others not.’

(*-i*-aorist)

For the unclear form *avāpi* (TĀ^m 4.40) (pass.aor.? thus WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]: 154), which rather represents a passive aorist of *āp* with the preverb *áva*, see s.v. *āp*.

(Other passives)

According to BHARADWAJ (1982: 113), the active (!) injunctive of the sigmatic aorist (with the prohibitive *mā*) may occur in passive usages in the Dharma-Sūtras. One of the passages he mentions runs as follows:

(ĀpDhS^v 2.13.6)

apramattā rakṣatha tantum etaṁ mā vaḥ kṣetre parabījāni vāpsuḥ

BHARADWAJ apparently follows the translation given by BÜHLER (1879: 130f.):

‘Carefully watch over (the procreation of) your children, lest stranger seed *be sown* on your soil.’ (a prevention from sons being born from a man who is not the wife’s husband)

A passive interpretation of an active form is of course impossible and unnecessary. We can readily supply a plural (generic) subject and translate the second clause as active: ‘... lest [strangers] sow (their) seed in your field’ (thus OLIVELLE 2000: 93).

⁵⁹⁷ See GONDA 1967a: 58.

⁵⁹⁸ The Mādhyandina recension uses the *-tá*-participle *nyùptaḥ* instead of the present passive participle in the Kāṇva (cf. RENOU 1954c: 134) and a different syntactic construction, with Soma, not his stalks, as subject: *viśve devā aṁśúṣu nyùptaḥ* ‘[Soma is] All-Gods when thrown down in [the shape of] the stalks’; cf. GONDA 1983c: 16.

³*vas* ‘dwell, stay’pass. of caus.: -*vāsyá*^{-te}

+ *úd* ‘remove, take off [food, milk etc. from fire]’ MS^p 1.8.3:118.7, ŚB 11.5.3.2 ≈ GB 1.3.11:77.8-9, ŚB 11.5.3.5 ≈ GB 1.3.12:79.2, TB 2.1.8.2 + accented: MS
• pass.

The fundamentally intransitive verb ³*vas* ‘dwell, stay’ can be passivized in the compound with *úd*. The causative passive -*vāsyá*^{-te} first appears in Vedic prose.⁵⁹⁹ Examples are:

(MS 1.8.3:118.6-8)

yády ádhiśritaṁ skánded, yády udvāsyámānaṁ, yády údvāsitaṁ [...], hómāya púnar avanīyānyābhidúhyā

‘If [the milk] put on [fire] spills, [or] when being taken off [from fire], [or] when taken off [...], [then], having poured out [the milk which is left], one should milk another [cow] for the oblation.’

(ŚB 11.5.3.2 ≈ GB 1.3.11:77.1ff.)

sá hovāca: gāutama [...] kīṁ duhyámānam? [...] kīṁ udvāsyámānam?

‘He said: “O Gautama! [...] What is [the milk] like when being obtained by milking? [...] What is [the milk] like when being taken off [from fire]?”’

vah ‘carry, convey; marry’: *uhyá*^{-te} (/ *ūhyá*^{-te})*ūh* ‘shift, transpose’: -*ūhyá*^{-te}

α ‘carry’ / β ‘marry’ (√*vah*):

Simplex: (α) RV (1.120.11 [Pp.] *ūhyāte*, probably -ya-int. of *vah*), 2.18.6, AVŚ 14.2.9 (*uhyámāna*- = ĀpM 1.7.8 *ūhyámāna*-, v.l. *ohyámāna*- [= *ā*~*uhyámāna*-]), AVP-Or. 5.17.7 (*uhyate*, Kashm. *uddhṛtam* ≈ AVŚ 6.111.2 *údyutam*), KS^p 9.16:119.15, MaitrU 3.2 (*uhyamāna*- ≈ MaitrāyaṇyU 3.2, MaitrU ed. VAN BUITENEN [3.2/2] *tṛpyamāna*-);

(β) KB 18.1.9 (ed. ĀnSS, ed. LINDNER *uhyamāna*-; ed. SARMA

⁵⁹⁹ AVP-Kashm. (ms.) 13.5.16 *apavasyamāna*-, for which ed. BARRET (hesitantly), and subsequently RENOU (1957b: 98), adopt the reading ^{+o}*vāsyamāna*- (√³*vas* ‘dwell’) is an error for *avapaśyamāna*- (thus AVP-Or. 12.10.7).

ūhyamāna-), VādhPrāyaśc. [ed. IKARI] 23, GṛSū.⁶⁰⁰ +;

α ‘carry’ (√*vah*) / γ ‘shift, undo, transpose’ (√*ūh*):
 + ā MS^p 3.7.8:87.3-4, 5, +6 (*ūhyate*, read probably +*óhyate*), ŚrSū.;
 + *ud* (γ ?) MānŚS 5.1.4.18 (*ud-ūhyete* ‘[the verses] are left out’), VaitS 28.24;
 + *upa* ŚŚS 5.9.10;
 + *nír* ŚB 4.5.2.4;
 + *pári* RV 10.17.1, 10.85.13 (≈ AV 14.1.13 *vy-ūhyate*), ŚB +;
 + *prá* VS 8.55 ≈ TS^m 4.4.9.1 ≈ KS^m 34.14:46.6, AB^m 1.29.1, 4, 1.13.1 ≈ ŚBK^m 4.3.4.11, AB 1.13.6 +;
 + *sam* VādhŚS [ed. IKARI] 6.1 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 2.21:4 (= CALAND 1924a: 151f. [= Kl.Schr., 286f.]));

β ‘marry’ (√*vah*) / γ ‘shift, transpose’ (√*ūh*):
 + *ví* : (β) AVŚ 14.1.13 (*vy-ūhyate* [≈ AVP-Kashm. ms. 18.2.2 *vi havyate*] (≈ ĀpGS (1.)3.2 [vy-ūhyate, v.l. vy-ūhate] = BhārGS 1.12:13.1 [vy-ūhyate, v.l. *uhy^p*]) ≈ RV 10.85.13 *páry-ūhyate*);
 (γ) MS^p 4.8.4:111.4, ŚB 8.7.1.11, BhārŚS 4.17.5 (*vy-ūhyamāne*, v.l. *vy-ūhamāne*, *vy-ūhayamāne*) ≈ HirŚS 6.3.9;

accented:
ūhyá^{te} RV +
ūhyate MS^p 3.7.8:87.6 (read probably +*óhyate*)
 • pass.

The passive *uhyá^{te}*, well-attested from the RV onwards, is rare as a simplex. The only RVic attestation is:⁶⁰¹

⁶⁰⁰ For instance, at BhārGS 1.18:18.9 (ed. SALOMONS *uhyamāna-*, v.l. *ūhyamāna-*, *upyamāna-*). All Śrauta-Sūtra occurrences recorded in VWC-Sū. IV, 2173a as simplex passives (VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 4.31 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 4.51:1 (= CALAND 1928: 162 [= Kl.Schr., 462] and fn. 4)), LāṭyŚS, DrāhyŚS) instantiate in fact compounds with *ā*.

⁶⁰¹ The two RVic occurrences of the long vowel stem *ūhya-* do not belong with the passive *uhyá^{te}*. RV 4.56.6 *ūhyā́the* (constructed with the accusative *ṛtām*, which rules out passive interpretation; see PISCHEL 1889 [VSt I]: 3) belongs to *ūh* ‘respect’: *ūh_iyā́the sanā́d ṛtām* ‘from old you two (sc. heaven and earth) respect the truth’ (see NEISSER 1892: 312 [= Kl.Schr., 67], fn. 1; INSLEER 1996: 182f.; OBERLIES 2000: 140; but cf. also LIV 663).

RV 1.120.11 *ūhyā́te* represents a -ya-intensive of *vah*, meaning ‘[this chariot] will carry [me]’; see OLDENBERG, *Noten ad loc.*, HOFFMANN (1982: 69f. [= Aufs. 3, 775f.])),

(RV 2.18.6ab)

āśītīyā navatyā yāhīy arvān ' ā śatēna hāribhir uhyāmānaḥ
 'Drive here, carried by eighty, ninety, hundred horses.'

The two other mantra attestations of the simplex passive are found in the AV(P):

(AV 14.2.9f = ĀpM 1.7.8d)

*mā himsiṣur vahatūm uhyāmānam [ĀpM ūhyāmānām, v.l. ohyāmānām]*⁶⁰²
 'Let them (sc. the beings who stand upon the forest trees) not injure the
 bridal procession being driven.'

More problematic is another AVic occurrence, attested in the Orissa version of the Paippalāda, in a hymn addressed to a mad man, who is believed to be possessed by demons:

(AVP-Or. 5.17.7ab ≈ AVŚ 6.111.2ab)

agniṣ te ni śamayatu ' yat ta etan mana uhyate
 'Let Agni calm down your mind when it is being carried (away).'⁶⁰³

The Śaunakīya recension differs in pāda b: *yādi te māna údyutam* (WHITNEY: 'if thy mind is excited'; BLOOMFIELD (1897: 32): 'it has been disturbed'), and the Kashmir version of the Paippalāda also reads a -*tá*-participle (*yat te unmana uddhṛtam*, emended in ed. BARRET in accordance with the Śaunakīya: *yat te tan mana uddhṛtam*).

It is unclear which original reading might have underlain the three attested forms: *údyutam*, *uddhṛtam* and *uhyate*; for discussion, see LUBOTSKY 2002: 90. However, at least from the semantic point of view, the Orissa variant (*uhyate*) is quite appropriate in the context of a description of the state of a mind (*manas*) carried away (*vah*) by demons. Cf., for instance, the following Upaniṣadic passage, where a man (and his mind) is said to be carried away by the external phenomena (*guṇas*):

(MaitrU 3.2 (≈ MaitrāyaṇyU 3.2) = 6.30)

guṇaughais uhyamānaḥ kaluṣīkṛtaś cāsthiraś cañcalo (lo)lupyamānaḥ
sasprho vyagraś cābhimānitvaṃ prayāte
 'Carried (away) and troubled by streams of *guṇas* (external phenomena),

OBERLIES, *ibid.*, 146 and KULIKOV 2000c for a detailed discussion of the passage.

⁶⁰² For the readings attested in the ĀpM quotation, see below.

⁶⁰³ For this verse, see LUBOTSKY 2002: 90.

unstable, movable, volatile, greedy and eager, he reaches the (erroneous) self-consciousness.⁶⁰⁴

On the contrary, in the case of *(lo)lupyamānaḥ* the reading of the MaitrāyaṇyU (*lolupyō*) appears to be more authentic; for discussion, see Chapter III, s.v. *lup*.

In Vedic prose, the simplex *uhyá-te* almost disappears (only one occurrence in the KS^p) and does not occur again until the very end of the Vedic period (Up.); the passive *-uhyá-te* only appears in compounds (with *ā́*, *nír*, *prá*, *pári*). Examples are:

- with *prá*:

(VS 8.55.e ≈ TS^m 4.4.9.1 ≈ KS^m 34.14:46.6)

viṣṇur narándhiṣaḥ prohyámāṇaḥ

‘[Soma is] Viṣṇu Narandhiṣa when being carried forward [in the cart].’⁶⁰⁵

- with *ā́*:

(MS 3.7.8:87.3-6)

váruṇo vā eṣá krītó yájamānasya grhám óhyate. sá íśvaró ’śānto yájamānaṁ híṁsitor. yád ā́ha: námo mitrásya váruṇasya cákṣasā iti

⁶⁰⁴ I essentially follow COWELL’s (p. 250) interpretation: ‘Borne along and soiled by the stream of qualities, uncertain, unstable, bereft (of all true knowledge,) full of desires and forlorn, it becomes subject to self-consciousness’. VAN BUITENEN (1962: 129) explains *abhimānitvaṃ prayāte* as ‘he reaches the stage where he mistakes his empirical ego for the self’.

Instead of *uhyamānaḥ* and *lupyamānaḥ* in the MaitrU, the closely related MaitrāyaṇyU (called “Southern Maitrāyaṇī” [SM] by VAN BUITENEN (1962: 14 et passim)) reads *ṭṛpyamānaḥ* and *lolupyamānaḥ*, respectively. Ed. VAN BUITENEN adopts these readings for 3.2/2, but preserves *uhyamānaḥ* and *lupyamānaḥ* in the identical passage 6.30 (p. 115) – the section omitted in MaitrāyaṇyU (SM). As far as the former form is concerned, the reading of the MaitrāyaṇyU (*ṭṛpyamānaḥ*) seems less likely. Note that the passive *-ta*-participle *kaluṣīkṛta* ‘spoiled, troubled’, with which our form is coordinated, and the instrumental *guṇaughais* plead for a passive interpretation. However, a passive construction (thus in VAN BUITENEN’s (1962: 129) translation: ‘Satisfied by multitudes of qualities...’) must rely on the transitive usage (‘satisfy’), which is attested only for the *-áya*-causative *tarpáya-ti* (see JAMISON 140f.). By contrast, the passive *uhyamānaḥ* ‘being carried (away)’ makes good sense (cf. also Rāmatīrtha’s gloss *itas tataś cālyamānaḥ* ‘being driven hither and thither’) and matches well together with the passive *kaluṣīkṛta*.

⁶⁰⁵ Cf. GONDA 1983c: 12. The form *paryuhyamānaḥ* is recorded by GONDA (alongside *prohyamānaḥ*) by mistake: all the three versions of this YVic mantra (VS, TS, KS) read *prohyamānaḥ*.

śamáyaty evá. śāntá evóhyate yájamānasyāhiṁsāyai. sárvābhyo vā eṣá devātābhyā úhyate

‘Verily, this bought Varuṇa is being conveyed to the house of the sacrificer. He, the Lord, being unappeased, [may] injure the sacrificer. When [the sacrificer] says: “Reverence to the eye of Mitra and Varuṇa” [RV 10.37.1a], he thus appeases [him]. When appeased, [Varuṇa] is being conveyed, in order the sacrificer not to be hurt. He is being conveyed to all the deities.’

The abnormal accentuation of *úhyate* may be due to *evóhyate* of the preceding clause: *evóhyate* (= *evá-ā-úhyate*) could have been reanalysed as *evá-úhyate*; the root accentuation may be thus, in a sense, the trace of the omitted preverb, so that we can tentatively restore the compound ⁺*óhyate* in the last clause.

Compounds with *ví* show the idiomatic meaning ‘marry’, probably developed from the original ‘carry, convey away’, i.e. ‘carry a bride/wife away to the husband’s house’.⁶⁰⁶ In the mantra language, the passive of *ví-vah* occurs only once, in the AV:

(AV 14.1.13cd (= KauśS 75.5 ≈ BhārGS 1.12:13.1 = ĀpGS (1.)3.1-2)⁶⁰⁷ ≈ RV 10.85.13cd)

maghāsu hanyante gāvāḥ ' phālgunīṣu vīy úhyate

‘In the Maghās the cows are slain; in the Phalgunīs the wedding is performed (lit.: the ride is conveyed away).’

From Vedic prose onwards, the meaning ‘be married’ can be expressed by the simplex, as in the following examples:

(KB 18.1.7-10)

atha yatra ha tat savitā sūryāṁ prāyacchat somāya rājñe / yadi vā prajāpateḥ / tat sahasram anvākarod duhitra uhyamānāyai [ed. SARMA *ūhya*^o] / *tad āsāṁ devatānām āsīt*

‘Now when Savitar gave Sūryā to Soma, the king, whether she was Prajāpati’s [or his own], he made over this thousand [verses] to his daughter being married; that was in possession of these deities.’⁶⁰⁸

⁶⁰⁶ Cf. WHITNEY ad AV 14.1.13.

⁶⁰⁷ On the quotation of this verse in the KauśS, see also GRIFFITHS 2004b: 49, fn. 1. Quotations in the Gr̥Sū. will be discussed below.

⁶⁰⁸ KEITH: ‘Now when Savitṛ gave Sūryā to Soma, the king, he made over to his

(BhārGS 1.11:11.2-3)

*na khalv iyam arthebhya ūhyate*⁶⁰⁹

‘Verily, not for [some other] purposes this [bride] is being married.’⁶¹⁰

I will return to this usage (*simplex pro compositum*) at the end of this lemma.

The meaning ‘marry’ is also attested for the Avestan cognate of Vedic *uhyá-^{te}* – *vazīia-* (see DE VAAN 2004: 592ff.). We find only one reliable occurrence of this formation: *vazīiamnābīiō kainibīiō* (Y 53.5), which INSLEER (1975a [Gāthās]: 325) and HUMBACH (1991: II, 242 (1)) translate as ‘girls being married’ (HUMBACH lit. ‘girls being carried’); cf. also KELLENS 128f. The full grade of the root vowel poses some problems, however. In an earlier paper, HUMBACH (1956: 74f.) treated the form in question as a denominative (built on *vazīia-* ‘Tracht, Fuhre’), meaning ‘auf der Hochzeitsfahrt befindlich(es) Mädchen’; this interpretation is hesitantly adopted by KELLENS & PIRART (1990: II, 300: ‘se trouver sur le charriot de noce’); cf. also KELLENS 131, 133, note (14).⁶¹¹ The second alleged occurrence of this present, YAv. *vazīiānte* at Yt 14.43 (hesitantly translated by WOLFF as ‘[die erfolgreich] kommen’; cf. also KELLENS 128, 126, note (6)) probably does not belong with the root *vaz* and should be read (with some of mss.) *vaniiānte*, i.e. as pass. of *van* ‘conquer’ (DE VAAN 2004: 594).

Thus far I was only concerned with the passive of the root *vah* ‘carry’ properly speaking. There is another verbal root, genetically related to, but synchronically distinct from *vah*, viz. *ūh* ‘shift’. This secondary root, built upon the reduplicated present **uḗ-uḡ^h-e-* or **uṛ-uḡ^h-e-* (cf. GOTŌ 62, 72, 296f.), occurs from Vedic prose onwards in the technical sense ‘push apart, adjust, transpose [verses],⁶¹² lay [sacrificial spoon – *sruc-*]’, especially often with the preverb *vī*.⁶¹³ The regular -yá-passive of *ūh* is expected to be *(*)ūhyá-^{te}*

daughter whether she was Prajāpati’s (or his own) on marriage this thousand (of verses) that was in possession of these deities’.

⁶⁰⁹ For the long root vowel variant of the passive stem, see below.

⁶¹⁰ Cf. WINTERNITZ 1914: 16f. [= Kl.Schr. I, 144f.].

⁶¹¹ Less likely is the analysis by FRITZ (2000): *vazīia-* represents a middle future participle of the root *vad* (< **uḗdh*) ‘marry’ (attested e.g. in V 4.44, 14.15), i.e. *vazīiamna-* < **uḗdh-sja-mHna-*.

⁶¹² Cf. HOFFMANN 1960c: 242 [= Aufs. 1, 113], fn. 1; MURAKAWA 2000; see also OBERHAMMER et al. 1996: 55f. (on the technical meaning of the term *ūha-* ‘adjustment’).

⁶¹³ Cf. *srugvyūhana-*; see EINOŌ 1988: 269f. For the use of -*ūh* (in compounds with *vī*,

and thus must be distinguished from the passive *uhyá^{te}* by vowel length. However, this passive does not occur in Vedic as simplex, whereas after preverbs, *ū* in *ūh* is shortened before the suffixes beginning with *-y-* – in particular, in *-yá*-passives, *-ya*-absolutives, according to Pāṇini's rule 7.4.23; see e.g. WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER AiG I, 92; Nachtr. zu I, 54; RENOU 1930: 70, §63e; NARTEN 1982: 131 [= Kl.Schr. 1, 257].

There are at least two reliable attestations of the passive of *ūh* in Vedic prose:

(MS 4.8.4:111.4)

yád ṛksāmé vyuhyáte ...

'When the ṛk verses and the sāmāns are transposed ...'

(ŚB 8.7.1.11)

tā ná vyūhet / néd ṛtūn vyūhānīti; yó vái mriyāta ṛtāvo ha tásmāi vyūhyante⁶¹⁴

'Let him not undo these [seasonal bricks].⁶¹⁵ "Lest I should confuse the seasons; for the seasons are confused for the one who dies".⁶¹⁶

Since some derivatives of *vah* and *ūh* are homonymous and can be confused in certain contexts, by virtue of the proximity of the meanings 'carry' and 'shift' (cf. WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]: 13). The phonological similarity of the compounds *vi-vah* 'marry' and *vy-ūh* 'transpose [verses]' has often been quibbled upon; see HOFFMANN 1960c: 242 [= Aufs. 1, 113], fn. 1; BODEWITZ 1982: 24ff.; MURAKAWA 2000: 1150 = (3), note 6.

The merge of the passives of *vah* and *ūh* in compounds has given rise to confusion of these two formations and subsequently to expanding the long vowel to the simplex passive of *vah*. In later texts, we often find *ūhyate* instead of the expected *uhyate*, cf. *ūhyate* BhārGS 1.11:11.3 'is married', *ūhyāmānām* ĀpM 1.7.8 'being carried off' (quotation of AV 14.2.9). In some cases mss.

sām, upa-sām, sam-ūd) in Vedic prose, see OERTEL 1938: 33f. [= Kl.Schr. II, 1043f.].

⁶¹⁴ When discussing this passage in his monograph, OERTEL (1926: 5) quotes *vyuhyante* with the short vowel (as in ed. WEBER etc.), but in two later writings (1938: 33 [= Kl.Schr. II, 1043]; 1939: 651 [= Kl.Schr. I, 495]) it is given with the long root vowel (*vyūhyante*). OERTEL seems to have tacitly conjectured the long *ū*, as in other derivatives of this root and against the aforementioned Pāṇini's rule. I was unable to trace the long vowel variant in any of the editions of the ŚB available to me.

⁶¹⁵ I.e. shift these from their proper place; see EGGELING, comm. ad loc.

⁶¹⁶ For the construction with the dative in this passage, see OERTEL 1926: 5.

attest both readings, i.e. *ūhy*° and *uhy*°; cf. *ūhyamāna*- KB 18.1.9 (ed. SARMA *ūhy*°; ed. ĀnSS, ed. LINDNER *uhy*°) ‘being married’; BhārGS 1.18:18.9 (ed. SALOMONS *uhy*°, v.l. *ūhy*°).

Due to the confusion of *vah* and *ūh* in a number of derivatives, Pāṇini’s rule 7.4.23 is violated in many cases, and mss. often read *-ūhy*° in compounds,⁶¹⁷ regardless of whether they belong to *vah* or *ūh*, cf. *ud-ūhyete* MānŚS 5.1.4.18; *vy-ūhyate* BhārGS 1.12:13.1 = ĀpGS 3.2 (in quotation of AVic stanza 14.1.13);⁶¹⁸ cf. also SALOMONS’s remarks in Introduction to her ed. of the BhārGS, p. xxviii. The same apparently holds true for other formations of *vah/ūh* with the suffixes beginning with -y-, which accounts, for instance, for the length vacillation in *pratyūhya*- KB 5.6.2, *vyūhya* KB 6.9.9 (Kerala version = ed. SARMA *-ūhy*°, vulgata = ed. ĀnSS, ed. LINDNER *-uhy*°); VārŚS 1.3.1.8, 1.3.1.28 *abhyūhya* (KASHIKAR 1975: 197); DrāhyŚS *samūhya*, *pratyūhya* ≈ LāṭyŚS *samuhya*, *pratyuhya* (PARPOLA 1973: 612); HirGS 1.1.27 *nirūhya*, *pratyūhya*; 2.7.2 *vyūhya*, *samūhya* (BÖHTLINGK 1898: 81); cf. also BLOOMFIELD & EDGERTON 1932 [Ved. Var. II]: 264, §560.

In view of the confusion of some derivatives of *vah* and *ūh*, late Vedic has developed some new morphological contrasts to differentiate between homonymous formations. The meanings ($\beta_{\text{pass.}}$) ‘be married; be carried off (of a bride)’ and ($\gamma_{\text{pass.}}$) ‘be shifted’ are distinguished by preverbs: the simplex *ūhya*-^{te} is employed in the sense of (RVic) *vy-uhya*-^{te}, i.e. ‘be married’ (*simplex pro compositum*) in the Brāhmaṇas (cf. KB 18.1.9 quoted above) and, especially, in the Gṛhya-Sūtras (*ūhyate* BhārGS 1.11:11.3, *ūhyamāna*-BhārGS 1.18:18.9 [ed. SALOMONS *uhy*°], BaudhGS 4.1.9, 10) and Dharma-Sūtras (*ūhyamāna*- VāsDhS 13.60). By contrast, the compound *vy-ūhyate* occurs in Vedic prose and Sūtras only with the meaning ($\gamma_{\text{pass.}}$) ‘be shifted’.⁶¹⁹

⁶¹⁷ See, for instance, KASHIKAR 1975: 197.

⁶¹⁸ I do not see good reasons to see in such cases a grammatical peculiarity of the Black YV, as WINTERNITZ suggested in his comments on ĀpGS 3.2 (1892: 32, fn. 2).

⁶¹⁹ Except for in quotation of AVic verse 14.1.13 in BhārGS 1.12:13.1 = ĀpGS 3.2 (*maghābhīr gāvo gṛhyante* ‘*phalgunībhyām vyūhyate*’), translated by WINTERNITZ (1892: 20) as ‘Unter (dem Nakshatra) Maghā werden die Kühe genommen. Unter (den beiden Nakshatras) Phalgunī führt man (die Braut) heim.’ Incidentally, some indigenous commentators apparently have interpreted this occurrence as a form of *ūh* – undoubtedly, due to the preverb *vi* (in accordance with the aforementioned rule); cf. WINTERNITZ, *ibid.*, 32.

The development of usages of the passives of *vah* and *ūh* can be summarized as follows:

I. Early Vedic (mantras): only passive of *vah* occurs:

vah : *uhyate* ‘is carried’
 vy-uhyate ‘is married’
ūh : –

II. Vedic prose (Brāhmaṇas): passives are derived from both *vah* and *ūh*, the vowel length is determined by Pāṇ. 7.4.23, though not quite consistently. In order to avoid confusion of *vy-uhyāte* ‘is married’ ($\sqrt{v}ah$) and *vy-uhyāte* ‘is shifted, transposed’ ($\sqrt{u}h$), the simplex *uhyāte* is employed in the sense of (early Vedic) *vy-uhyāte* ‘is married’:

vah : *uhyate* (‘is carried’), ‘is married’ (KB)
 ā- / pari- / ... -ūhyate ‘is carried etc.’ (MS^p, ŚB +)
ūh : *vy-uhyate* ‘is shifted, transposed’ (MS^p, ŚB +)

III. Sūtras: approximately the same distribution of forms as in the Brāhmaṇas, but the vowel length vacillates: *u* and *ū* occur both in simplex and compounds, regardless of the meaning:

vah : *ūhyate* ‘is married’ (GṛSū., DhSū.)
 ā- / ud- / ... -ūhyate ‘is carried etc.’ (ŚrSū. +)
ūh : *vy-ūhyate* ‘is shifted, transposed’ (ŚrSū.)

As a result of these developments, the simplex passive *uhyāte* almost disappears in Vedic prose in its primary sense (‘is carried, driven’ etc.); instead, this meaning is expressed by a variety of compounds (with *ā*, *pāri*, *prā*, etc.).

The distribution outlined above accounts for the readings attested in the ĀpM quotation of AV 14.2.9 *mā himṣiṣur vahatūm uhyāmānam* (see above), i.e. *ūhyāmānām* and *ohyāmānām*. Since the use of the simplex *uhyā-te* in the sense α_{pass} ‘be driven’ was impossible by that time, the editors of the text could have reinterpreted the form as belonging to β_{pass} ‘be married’, in accordance with the common use of the simplex in the Sūtras, i.e. as a participle referring to the bride, not to the bridal procession – whence the feminine ending *-ā*.

vic ‘sift, separate’: *-vicyā-te*

+ *vī* AV 11.1.12, MS^m 4.1.7:9.3, ŚB 1.1.4.22, 12.8.1.16, KB 18.4.9, JB 3.282:5-6, TĀ 6.5.3^{2x}, JUB 4.11.1.8 [ed. OERTEL 4.22.8]
 accented: ŚB

- pass.

The passive *-vicyá-te* (attested only with the preverb *vī*) first appears in the AV:

(AV 11.1.12b)

yūyām vī vicyadhvaṃ yajñiyāsas tūṣaiḥ

‘Be separated, you, worshipful ones, from the husks (?)’.⁶²⁰

Accented forms occur only in the ŚB:

(ŚB 1.1.4.22)

áthāpa vinakti: vāyúr vo vī vinaktv īti [...] eṣá vā idám sārvaṃ vī vinakti, yád idám kīṃca vivicyáte

‘Then he separates [the husked grains from the unhusked, with the words]: “Let the wind separate you.” [...] Verily, it is (the wind) that separates here everything that can be separated.’⁶²¹

GONDA (1951: 22) qualifies the latter example as “pure intransitive” (= anticausative), but, in my view, the transitive construction with the subject of the wind (= agent) in the preceding clause rather points to a passive interpretation.

vich ‘impel [by (brutal) whacks]’: *-vich[y]á-te*

+ *āti* ⁺ŚBK 4.2.4.12

accented: ŚBK

- pass.

The passive ⁺*-vichyá-te* is conjectured by CALAND (1916: 73 [= Kl.Schr., 236]) for the following ŚB passage (Kāṇva recension):

(ŚBK 4.2.4.12)

tām āhur: údīcīm āti vichāyatéti; tām údīcīm ⁺ativich[y]āmānām⁶²² abhí mantrayate

⁶²⁰ Thus WHITNEY; HENRY (1896a: 99): ‘de la ball de riz’; BLOOMFIELD (1897: 181): ‘from the chaff’.

⁶²¹ See GONDA 1989b: 40f.

⁶²² Misprinted as *ativichamānām* (without accent) in ed. SWAMINATHAN.

Recapitulating and discussing CALAND's conjecture, HOFFMANN (1966: 64 [= Aufs. 2, 457]) pointed out that the secondary root *vich* could be built upon the denominative *vi-chāyāti* 'impels [an animal by brutal whacks]' and translated the passage in question as follows:

'([I]n bezug auf die Somakarayaṇī-Kuh) sagt man: treibt sie in nördlicher Richtung vorbei; wenn sie in nördlicher Richtung vorbeigetrieben wird, spricht man sie an.'

The loss of *y* after *ch* in mss. (*-vichá°*) is a common copyist error (HOFFMANN, *ibid.*, fn. 3).

¹*vid* 'find': *vidyá-te*

Simplex RV 5.44.9, 10.64.2, AVŚ 19.49.7^{2x}, AVP 5.27.7, 19.9.11, VS, AB, ŚB 11.7.1.2, ŚB 14.7.1.23-30 (= BĀUM/K 4.3.23-30) = 14.7.3.16-23 (= BĀUM 4.5.16-23), PB 6.4.15 ≈ JB 1.72:9, 2.74:6, GB, Lost-Br., p. 103 [Kaṅkati-Br., quoted in ĀpŚS 14.20.4] = p. 106 [Chāgaleya-Br., quoted in BaudhŚS 23.5:156.1], TĀ, ChU 1.10.2, 8.1.2, ŚvetU, Sū. +;

+ *ānu* AV 19.50.4, AVP 9.3.5, AB 1.12.2^{2x}

accented: RV 5.44.9, AV, VS 20.26

• agentless pass. ('is/can be found'), anticaus. ('exists')

Vedic ¹*vid* 'find' and ²*vid* 'know' are historically related, going back to the same source, PIE **ueǵd-* 'see', but represent synchronically distinct roots, with different IVSs. ¹*vid* 'find' forms aor. *ávidat*, pres. *vindāti*, the reduplicated perfect *vivéda*. The paradigm of ²*vid* 'know' includes the perfect without reduplication *véda*, *vidé* (with the participle *vidāna-*, *vidāná-*) and caus. *vedáyati* (cf. JAMISON 166). The following formations are attested in the passive usage:⁶²³

• for ¹*vid* 'find' ('be found'): the *-yá*-passive *vidyá-te* and the *-i*-aorist *avedi* (with inj. *védi*);

• for ²*vid* 'know' ('be known; be famous'): three forms derived from the non-reduplicated perfect stem, 3sg. *vidé*, 3sg. *vidré*⁶²⁴ and participle *vidāna-*

⁶²³ See GELDNER 1917: 331, fn. 2; RENOU, EVP IX, 98; KÜMMEL 1996: 101ff. (with bibl.); contra SEEBOLD 1973: 20ff.

⁶²⁴ Cf. RV 8.93.32ab *dvitā yó vṛtrahántamo* ' *vidá índraḥ śatákratuḥ* 'Indra, who is known twice, as the killer of Vṛtra [and] as possessing hundred powers' (see KÜMMEL

(with the accent on the root),⁶²⁵ which should probably be taken as statives rather than middle perfects (cf. KÜMMEL 1996: 104 and see also VELANKAR 2003: 294; KULIKOV 2006a: 67f.).⁶²⁶

The *-yá*-present *vidyá-te* is employed in the agentless passive ('is found, can be found' and, especially, with negation, 'is not found, cannot be found') and non-passive intransitive (= anticausative: 'exists, is')⁶²⁷ usages – which is typical of verbs of perception and knowledge (cf. e.g. *drś* 'see' – *drśyáte* 'is seen; is visible' and see Chapter C.II.1.2.1). The distinction between the

1996: 103).

⁶²⁵ By contrast, the participle *vidāná-* (with the accent on the suffix) appears in non-passive constructions, in particular, in reflexive ('knowing oneself') and reciprocal usages (see GELDNER 1917: 331, fn. 2; KÜMMEL 1996: 103f.). This may also hold true for the occurrence of this participle in the syntactically difficult passage RV 1.169.2ab, which is, according to KÜMMEL (1996: 88, 103f.), the only instance of *vidāná-* used as passive: *áyujran tá ind_ara viśvákrṣṭīr ' vidānáso niṣṣídho mart_iyatrā*. A tentative rendering of these two pādas might be: '[the Maruts' chariots] have been yoked; they, knowing of their tributes famous among all tribes, among mortals ...'; cf. GOTŌ's translation (in WITZEL et al. 2007: 314): 'Sie haben (ihren Streitwagen) angespannt [rather: 'their chariots have been yoked', with passive rendering of 3pl. pass. aorist *áyujran* – LK; cf. KÜMMEL's translation], o Indra, da sie wissen, (daß es) auf allen Grenzen übergreifende Tribute unter den Sterblichen (gibt)' (likewise GELDNER). For the participle *saṃvidāná-* 'agreeing, harmonious (with smb.)' (esp. in the expression *pitṛbhiḥ saṃvidāná-*), see also THIEME 1952: 45ff. The meaning 'agreeing (with)' (THIEME: 'sich vereinigend [mit seinen Vätern]'; KÜMMEL: 'einträchtig'; cf. also RENOU, EVP IX, 124: "*sám-vid-*, l'idée est bien celle d'un accord, pas seulement d'une rencontre") can be deduced from 'knowing oneself (together with)' → 'associating oneself (with)'; cf. a similar semantic development of the passive of the compound *sám-khyā*: 'be considered together; appear (together)' → 'be counted together, be associated'; see s.v. *khyā* and KULIKOV 2008: 256.

An accentual parallel to the opposition between stative (passive) part. *vidāna-* 'known, famous' and middle perfect (in middle/late Vedic reassessed as present) part. *vidāná-* 'knowing (oneself)' is provided by the pair *dú(g)hāna-* 'giving milk, milch(-cow)' ~ *duhāná-* 'milking (for oneself)': the root-accented *dú(g)hāna-* belongs to the paradigm of the stative (together with 3sg. *duhé* and 3pl. *duhré*), while the suffix-accented participle *duhāná-* is a member of the root present paradigm (3pl. *duhaté* etc); see KÜMMEL 1996: 104 and KULIKOV 2006b: 52.

⁶²⁶ For an example (RV 3.36.2), see above, s.v. *yam*.

⁶²⁷ Such a semantic development is typical of intransitive (passive) derivatives of the verb 'find'; cf. Germ. *sich finden*, Fr. *se trouver*, Russ. *находиться*.

meanings ‘is found’ and ‘exists’ cannot be drawn with accuracy in many cases. Examples are:

(RV 5.44.9cd)

átrā ná hárdi kravaṇásya rejate ' yátrā matír vidyáte pūtabándhanī

‘The Kravaṇa’s heart does not tremble here, where the prayer is found that is connected with the purified [Soma].’

(RV 10.64.2c)

ná marḍitā vidyate anyā ebhyaḥ

‘There is no one who shows compassion except for them (sc. the All-Gods).’

(AVŚ 19.50.4 ≈ AVP 14.9.4)

yáthā ś(y)āmyākaḥ prapátann ' apavān (?) nānuvidyáte

evā rātri prā pātaya ' yó asmāñ abhyaghāyāti

‘As a particle of śāmī-tree (?),⁶²⁸ flying forth, is gone, as it were (?),⁶²⁹ [and] cannot be found, so, O night, make fly forth the one who is malicious against us.’

In spite of the clear synchronic differentiation of the two roots, the meanings of ¹*vid* and ²*vid* remain rather close and, at first glance, several contexts allow of both translations of *vidya*-^{te}, i.e. ‘(does not) exists’ / ‘is (not) known’ – particularly, in negative constructions; in the literature we quite often come across both of them. Examples of such (seemingly) ambiguous contexts are:

(VS 23.47cd, 48cd)

[47] [...] *kīm sv it prthivyái vārṣīyaḥ ' kásya mātṛā ná vidyate*

[48] [...] *índraḥ prthivyái vārṣīyān ' gós tú mātṛā ná vidyate*

‘What is vaster than the Earth? The measure of what does not exist / (is not known)? [...] Indra is vaster than the Earth. The measure of the cow does not exist / (is not known).’

⁶²⁸ WHITNEY’s conjecture ⁺*śyāmākaḥ* (‘millet-seed’) against the mss. reading *ś(y)āmyākaḥ* may be unnecessary. The word *śāmyākaḥ* could perhaps refer to a tiny particle of *śāmī*-tree (used for producing fire) (A. LUBOTSKY, p.c.).

⁶²⁹ WHITNEY’s translation (‘blowing away’) makes little sense in the context. AVP-Or. has *predivān* (AVP-Kashm. *tedivāṇ*); read perhaps ⁺*preta* ⁺*va* ‘[as the millet-seed, flying forth,] is gone, as it were’ (?) (see KULIKOV, in preparation).

(AB 1.12.2)

taṃ trayodaśān māsād akrīṇaṃs, tasmāt trayodaśo māso nānu vidyate‘They bought him (sc. Soma) from the thirteenth month. Therefore no thirteenth month, appropriate [for a sacrifice], exists⁶³⁰ / (is known)⁶³¹.’

(ŚvetU 6.8)

na tasya kāryaṃ karaṇaṃ ca vidyate 'na tatsamaś cābhyadhikaś ca dṛśyate‘No action or organ of his (sc. Brahma’s) exists⁶³² / (is known)⁶³³; neither his equal, nor a superior can be seen.’

Note, however, that, while some occurrences of *vidyá-te* can only be translated as ‘be found, exist’, there is not a single occurrence for which only the meaning ‘be known’ is possible. On the other hand, the passive of ²*vid* ‘know’ is regularly expressed in early Vedic by the forms *vidé*, *vidré* (statives based on perfect stems; see above). Thus, although we cannot rule out that in some contexts *vidyá-te* could have been (secondarily) reinterpreted as belonging to ²*vid* (‘be known’), supplying the missing present passive,⁶³⁴ the solution advocated by KÜMMEL (1996: 100, with fn. 183) appears methodologically and lexicographically most consistent: only ¹*vid* has a -yá-passive in Vedic, whereas ²*vid* has not.⁶³⁵ Correspondingly, *vidyá-te* should be consistently translated as ‘be found, exist’, not as ‘be known’. The same holds true for its aorist counterpart; see examples below.

⁶³⁰ Thus HAUG: ‘Thence the thirteenth month **is found** unfit (for any religious work to be done it).’

⁶³¹ Thus KEITH: ‘Therefore the thirteenth month **is not known**.’

⁶³² Thus PW VI, 1049; DEUSSEN (1897: 307): ‘Nicht **gibt es** an ihm Wirkung noch Organe auch’; HUME (1931: 409): ‘No action or organ of his **is found**’; RAU (1964: 41): ‘**Es gibt** für ihn kein Werk und kein Werkzeug’; DELLA CASA (1976: 413): ‘Per lui non **c’è** azione né strumento d’azione’; OBERLIES (1998: 115): ‘Weder besitzt er einen (grobstofflichen) Körper noch einen (psychischen) Apparat.’

⁶³³ Thus F.M. MÜLLER (1884: 263): ‘There **is** no effect and no cause **known** of him’; HAUSCHILD (‘Nicht **kennt** man an ihm Wirkung, nicht Sinnesorgane’); SILBURN (1948: 72) (‘En lui on ne **connaît** ni effet, ni organe’). Cf. also HAUSCHILD’s translation of ŚvetU 3.8 = 6.15 (= VS 31.18) *nānyaḥ panthā vidyate 'yanāya* ‘nicht **kennt** man einen anderen Weg zum Gehen’.

⁶³⁴ Especially in late texts, as in the Upaniṣadic passage quoted above. Cf. also OBERLIES 1998: 114f., fn. 238 on the confusion of ¹*vid* and ²*vid*.

⁶³⁵ Thus, in fact, already WHITNEY (1885b [Roots]: 159f.).

Other passives

For the -i-aorist *avedi* (inj. *védi*), see KÜMMEL 1996: 99f. Like their present counterparts, passive aorists should be consistently translated as ‘was found’, not as ‘was known’. Examples are:

(RV 4.16.4a)

suvār yád védi sudṣīkam arkāiḥ

‘When the looking beautiful sun was found by means of magic songs ...’

(RV 7.8.2ab)

ayám u śyá súmahāṁ avedi ' hótā mandró mánuṣo yahvó agníḥ

‘This very great one is found⁶³⁶ now, the pleasant priest of the Manus, the youngest Agni.’

For the form *vividé*, also attested in the passive usage (stative?), see KÜMMEL 2000: 493.

***viṣṭ* ‘wrap, cover’**

pass. of caus.: *veṣṭyámāna-*:

Simplex MaitrU^v 7.9 (*veṣṭyamāna*-⁶³⁷ ≈ MuṇḍU 1.2.8 = KaṭhU 2.5 *varṭamāna-*);

+ *nī* MS^p 3.6.8:70.8, KB 18.3.24 [ed. LINDNER 18.4]

accented: MS (*nī-veṣṭyámāna-*)

The passive of the causative *veṣṭaya-*^{ti} is attested from the Saṃhitā prose (MS) onwards (see GOTÖ 300, fn. 715). An example is:

(KB 18.3.23-24 [ed. LINDNER 18.4])

*dvīr evāśvināyāhvayete pratipade caiva paridhānīyāyai ca | tad yathā
pratighātenā-niveṣṭyamāno dhāvayed evaṃ tat*

‘Twice they (two) utter the call for the Āśvins, for the introduction and for the concluding verse; that is as when one, not being obstructed (lit. covered), makes a covering by an obstruction.’

⁶³⁶ Thus KÜMMEL (1996: 99f., with fn. 181), contra GELDNER (‘ist bekannt’); cf. also RENOUE, EVP XIII, 58 and 143 (‘*avedi*, « s’est trouvé être » ..., c[’est-]à-d[ire] « a été reconnu comme » (sans lien génétique avec *vid-* « savoir »’’).

⁶³⁷ *avidyāyām antare veṣṭyamānāḥ* ‘enveloped within ignorance’; for this passage, see below, s.v. *han*.

vī ‘pursue, strive after, approach’: vīyá-^{te}

Simplex MS^m 4.1.14:20.5 = TS^m 1.1.13.2 = TB^m 3.3.9.6 (MS *vīyámāna-*, TS, TB *°māṇa-* ≈ KS^m 1.12:7.14 = ⁺31.11:14.11 = KpS^m 1.12:9.9 = 47.11:295.12 *idhyamāna-* ≈ VS 2.17 (= ŚB 1.8.3.22) *guhyámāna-*)⁶³⁸
 accented: MS^m–TS^m–TB^m

- pass.

In formal terms, the passive stem *vīyá-* is homonymous and may belong to either of the roots *vī* ‘pursue, strive after, approach’ (pres. *véti*) and *vyā* (*vī*) ‘envelop, cover’ (on which see below). However, only one occurrence (which is also the only attestation of the simplex stem) seems to be derived from the former root. The form in question appears in a YVic mantra:

(MS 4.1.14:20.5-6 = TS 1.1.13.2.m = TB 3.3.9.5-6 (≈ VS 2.17.u (= ŚB 1.8.3.22)) ≈ KS 1.12:7.14-15 (≈ 31.11:14.10-11) = KpS 1.12:9.9-10 (≈ 47.11:295.12))

yám paridhīm paryádhatthā ' ágne deva paṇibhir vīyámānaḥ [TS, TB *°māṇaḥ*]⁶³⁹

tām ta etám ánu jóṣaṃ bharāmi

‘The fence, which you put around you, when being striven after by the Paṇis, O heavenly Agni, that I bring here to you, for rejoicing.’⁶⁴⁰

Instead of *vīyámāna-*, the VS (with ŚB) has *guhyámāna-*, KS and KpS have *idhyamāna-*; for the VS variant of the mantra (cf. HILLEBRANDT 1916: 517 [= Kl.Schr., 203]), see s.v. *gūh*. It is unclear which verb the original version of the mantra could have, but, given the lack of attestations of the simplex *vīyá-^{te}* elsewhere in Vedic, the reading attested in the MS and TS may be secondary.

⁶³⁸ *pra vīyatām*, attested in Orissa mss. of AVP 10.2.6 (*tubhyaṃ śulkaḥ pra vīyatām*) and translated by TSUCHIYAMA (2007: 73) as ‘let the toll go forth to you’, is an erroneous reading. *pra vīyatām* cannot be a passive form of *vī* ‘pursue, strive after, approach’ (which is only attested as simplex and does not have the non-passive meaning ‘go forth’). The passive of *prá-vyā* (-*vī*) ‘cover, impregnate’ (see s.v.) does not fit the context either. The correct reading is undoubtedly *pra dīyatām* (as attested in Kashm. ms.) ‘let [the toll] be given [to you]’ (see KULIKOV 2008 [2009]: 138f., fn. 3).

⁶³⁹ The Taittirīya variant attests a rare instance of retroflexivization triggered by the final -*r* of the preceding word.

⁶⁴⁰ I am thankful to W. KNOBL for valuable suggestions on the meaning of this passage.

vr̥j ‘prepare, do; lay’: *vr̥jyá-^{te}*

Simplex RV 1.83.6, 10.110.4, RVKh. 5.7.3.a [= Praiṣādhyāyaḥ 22 in ed. MINKOWSKI 208f.] = MS^m 4.13.8:209.9 = ^UKS^m 19.13:15.15 = TB^m 3.6.13.1 (+);

+ *apa* ŚrSū.; + *pári* KS^p 12.5:167.22-23; + *ví* (ŚBK 2.3.3.9 (v.l.) *vivr̥jyate*, ed. CALAND ⁺*vivr̥hyate*; see Chapter B.IV, s.v. *vr̥h*), BhāṛŚS 11.19.7 (ed. RAGHU VIRA *vi-vr̥jyeran*, v.l. *vi-kalperan*, ed. KASHIKAR *vi-kalperan*);

+ *prá* (a) ‘put’ (also: ‘put on the fire’); (b) quasi-denom. [*pravargyà-* ⇒ *prá-vr̥j*] ‘perform pravargya’ YV^p +

accented: RV 1.83.6, MS^m 4.13.8:209.9 = TB^m 3.6.13.1, ŚB 14.1.3.16, TĀ

• pass.

The complex system of meanings of the verb *vr̥j* has been discussed at length by GELDNER (1889 [VSt I]: 151ff.); BLOOMFIELD (1915); cf. also GONDA (1985b: 142ff.). It seems that most of its uses can be deduced from the original meaning ‘do, prepare’ (see esp. BLOOMFIELD, op.cit.). *vr̥j* is particularly common with the accusative object (= passive subject) *barhís*. Here belong all occurrences of the passive *vr̥jyá-^{te}* (as well as pf. *vāvr̥je* in the passive usage in RV 7.39.2, see below) in the mantras:

(RV 1.83.6a)

barhír vā yát svapatyā́ya vr̥jyáte

‘When the barhis is being laid for good offspring...’

(RV 10.110.4ab)

prācī́nam barhiḥ pradī́sā pr̥thivyā́ ' vástor asyā́ vr̥jyate ágre áhnām

‘The barhis is being laid eastwards, in the direction of the earth, this morning, at the beginning of the days.’

The same meaning is attested for one of the earliest attestations of the optative of -yá-passive (*vr̥jyéta*⁶⁴¹ ‘may it (sc. the barhis) be spread out’) in the late mantra RVKh. 5.7.3.a = MS^m 4.13.8:209.9 etc. (quoted s.v. *bhr̥*).

While the simplex almost disappears after the mantra period, in Vedic prose *vr̥jyá-^{te}* becomes common with *prá*, meaning, in particular, ‘put [on the fire]’ (see GELDNER, op.cit., 154; BLOOMFIELD, op.cit., 285f.), cf.:

⁶⁴¹ Accented in the MS and TB; with no accent in the RVKh.; see also MINKOWSKI 1991: 179 and fn. 32.

(ŚB 14.1.1.10)

tād ghṛṇṇ īti papāta [...] áthétaraḥ prāñ evá prāvṛjyata

‘It (sc. Viṣṇu’s head) fell with [the sound] “ghṛṇṇ”. [...] And the rest (i.e. the headless body of Viṣṇu) was laid [with the top] towards the east.’

(ŚB 14.1.3.16)

tásmin pravṛjyámāne pátnī śíraḥ prórṇute

‘While this [vessel] is being put on the fire, the [sacrificer’s] wife covers her head.’

Beside its primary usage, *prá-vṛj* functions as a quasi-denominative based on the ritual term *pravargyà-*,⁶⁴² constructed with the direct object *pravargyām*, meaning ‘perform [pravargya]’, cf.:

(TĀ 5.6.1)

purástād upasádām pravargyām prá vṛṇakti

‘Before the upasad-performance he performs the pravargya.’ (HOUBEN 68)

In the corresponding passive construction, *pravargyà-* surfaces as the passive subject:

(TĀ 5.10.2)

[...] *yásyaivám vidúṣaḥ pravargyāḥ pravṛjyáte*

‘... for whom knowing thus the pravargya is being performed.’ (cf. HOUBEN 94)⁶⁴³

In some contexts it is difficult to distinguish between meanings (b) ‘perform pravargya’ (= quasi-denominative; see Appendix II) and (a) ‘put [the pravargya vessel on the fire]’ (= the compound *prá-vṛj* properly speaking, constructed with *pravargyà-* ‘pravargya vessel’), as in:

(TĀ 5.1.7)

yát pravargyām pravṛṇakti, yajñásyaivá tác chíraḥ prāti dadhāti

‘If one places the pravargya-vessel on the fire⁶⁴⁴ / performs pravargya, then one puts back the head of the sacrifice.’

⁶⁴² For pravargya (the ritual which includes, among others, putting the ritual vessel, also called pravargya, on the fire), see HOUBEN, Introduction.

⁶⁴³ For a general discussion of quasi-denominatives and their passives, see Appendix II.

⁶⁴⁴ Thus HOUBEN 48.

Other passives

The form *vāvr̥je* (probably a 3sg. stative derived from the perfect stem; see KULIKOV 2006a: 67f.) occurs once in the passive usage:

(RV 7.39.2a)

prá vāvr̥je suprayá barhír eṣām

‘The barhis has been laid for them (sc. the All-Gods) pleasant to step upon.’ (see KRISCH 1996: 26; KÜMMEL 2000: 461f.).

***vr̥t* ‘turn’**

pass. of caus.: *-vartyá-^{te}*

+ *ā* ĀśŚS 9.9.8;

+ *ni* BaudhŚS 14.14:178.3, MānŚS 8.16.1;

+ *nir* ĀpŚS 5.10.12;

+ *prá* ‘roll forward, bring forth’ MS^p 3.8.7:104.8-9, ŚB^m 3.5.3.16 ≈ KB^m 9.3.8 (*pravartyámāna-* ≈ AB^m 1.29.1, 4 *prohyamāṇa-*), KB 7.12.12 [ed. LINDNER 7.10] +

accented: MS, ŚB

• pass.

The causative passive *-vartyá-^{te}* occurs in Vedic only with the preverb *prá* and with the passive subject *havirdhāna-* (mostly in the dual form), denoting the cart in which Soma plants are conveyed to the sacrifice. Examples are:

(MS 3.8.7:104.8-9)

tásmāt pravartyámānāyor hótānvāha ...

‘Then, when [the Soma-carts] are rolled forward, the hotar recites ...’⁶⁴⁵

(ŚB 3.5.3.16 ≈ KB 9.3.8 ≈ AB 1.29.1, 4)

*áthāha: havirdhānābhyām pravartyámānābhyām [AB prohyamāṇā°]
ānu brūh̥tī*

‘He then says [to the hotar]: “Recite to the Soma-carts, as they are rolled forward”.’

⁶⁴⁵ Cf. OERTEL 1926: 289.

-i-aorist

-i-aorists are derived directly from the root (*varti*, *ávṛtran*) and from the reduplicated stem *vavṛt-*, most likely belonging to the perfect system.⁶⁴⁶ Both are employed in the non-passive intransitive (anticausative) usage (see KÜMMEL 1996: 107f.); for an example (RV 1.164.47), see Chapter IV, s.v. *ud*.

***vṛ̥* (¹*vṛ̥*) ‘choose’**

pass. of quasi-denominative [*pravará-* ⇒ *prá-vṛ̥* (¹*vṛ̥*) ‘perform pravara’]:

pra-varyámāṇa- MS^p 1.4.11:60.6, VārŚS 1.1.2.31 = MānŚS 1.4.1.24 (v.l. -*vriya*^o);

pra-vriyamāṇa- GB 1.5.21:134.4 (v.l. -*vr̥tya*^o), unidentified Br. (quoted by Sāyaṇa, Introduction to the RV; see OERTEL 1926: 288), ĀpŚS 4.9.6, BaudhŚS 3.18:89.14 (v.l. -*vr̥tya*^o, -*vṛ̥tya*^o, -*vṛ̥ṇīya*^o), BhārŚS 4.13.1, VaitS 2.15

accented: MS

The Vedic root *vṛ̥* (¹*vṛ̥*)⁶⁴⁷ forms no true -*yá*-passives (one might expect **ūryá-^{te}*). Passive usages are, however, attested in early Vedic for the participle *urāṇá-*,⁶⁴⁸ which may belong with the unattested stative.⁶⁴⁹ However, from Vedic prose onwards, we find passives of the quasi-denominative based on the nominal *pravará-*, employed in constructions of the type *pravarám prá-vṛ̥* ‘perform pravara’.⁶⁵⁰ For a syntactic

⁶⁴⁶ Not to the reduplicated causative aorist, as KÜMMEL (1996: 108) believes: the reduplicated aorist stem is *-vṛvṛt(a)-*; furthermore, the function of such a formation could only be passive (i.e. ‘was turned [by someone]’), not anticausative (“fientive”).

⁶⁴⁷ The secondary anit̥-variant *vṛ̥* is homonymous with ²*vṛ̥* ‘cover’; see LUBOTSKY 2000.

⁶⁴⁸ Cf. DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 264. An example is:

(RV 4.7.8c)

dūtá ūyase pradīva urāṇáh

‘You (sc. Agni) speed, chosen from old to a messenger.’ (see INSLEY 1968b: 6)

⁶⁴⁹ See KULIKOV 2006b.

⁶⁵⁰ A ritual activity (lit. ‘election [of the priest]’), which starts with electing Agni to the Hotar and aims to establish a particular connection between the sacrificer and the ancestors. See, in particular, BROUGH 1953: 8ff.; RENOU 1954b: 110f.; NARTEN 1985: 37f. [= Kl.Schr. 1, 285f.]. According to SCHLERATH (1980: 206f. [= Kl.Schr. 2, 572ff.]), *pravara* suggests the incorporation of Agni into the line of ancestors or the identification of Agni with them.

interpretation of constructions *pravaram prá-vṛ* ‘perform/recite pravara’, *arṣeyám prá-vṛ* ‘recite the pravara of ṛṣi-names’, see, above all, BROUGH 1953: 8ff. and esp. p. 15; NARTEN 1985: 38f. [= Kl.Schr. 1, 286f.] and 47 [= Kl.Schr. 1, 295], notes 11-12. For a general discussion of this and other quasi-denominatives and their syntax, see Appendix II.

Apart from a few corrupt readings in the Sūtras (see below), there are two passive stems attested for the quasi-denominative *prá-vṛ*. The MS and the two Śrauta-Sūtras of the Maitrāyaṇī tradition (VārŚS 1.1.2.31, MānŚS 1.4.1.24) attest the variant *pra-varyá-* (with v.l. *-vriya-* in the MānŚS), cf.:

(MS 1.4.11:60.6)

tát pravaré pravaryámāṇe brūyāt: devāḥ pitarah! pítaro devāḥ!

‘Then, when the pravara is performed, he should say: “O gods-fathers! O fathers-gods!”.’ (cf. NARTEN 1985: 38f. [= Kl.Schr. 1, 286f.])

The late Atharvānic texts (GB, VaitS) and three Śrauta-Sūtras of the Taittirīya school (ĀpŚS, BaudhŚS, BhārŚS) attest the stem *pra-vriya-*, as in:

(GB 1.5.21:134.4-5)

tasmāt pravare pravriyamāṇe vācayed: devāḥ pitara iti

‘Therefore, when the pravara is performed, he should make [the sacrificer] say: “O gods, O fathers!”.’

Similar or identical constructions occur in VaitS 2.15, ĀpŚS 4.9.6, BaudhŚS 3.18:89.14, BhārŚS 4.13.1. Besides, OERTEL (1926: 288) mentions *pravriyamāṇe* from an unidentified Brāhmaṇa passage quoted by Sāyaṇa in his Introduction to the RV.

While the variant *-vriya-* is a regular derivative of the secondary anit̥-variant of the root (¹*vṛ*), *-varyá-* is usually explained as the passive derived from the causative stem *-varaya-* (thus WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]: 163; OERTEL, *ibid.*; ⁶⁵¹ SAKAMOTO-GOTŌ 2000: 483f. ⁶⁵²). The causative *prá-varaya-*^{ti} is not attested in Vedic, however, and, furthermore, the Kāṭhaka passage parallel to MS 1.4.11 (KS 31.15:18.5 *tát pravaram pravṛṇāṇe* [not ***pravarayamāṇe!*] *brūyāt*) does not support a causative interpretation.

In my view, *-vriya-* and *-varyá-* belong together as stem variants of one and the same formation, namely, the passive of the quasi-denominative *prá-vṛ* (¹*vṛ*). The lack of the hypothetical passive stem ***ūryá-^{te}*, based on the more

⁶⁵¹ ‘While the list of ancestors is caused to be chosen ...’

⁶⁵² ‘... während eine Priesterwahl abgehalten (wählen gelassen) wird.’

archaic *seṭ*-variant *vṛ*, may be due to the morphological opacity of this formation (particularly, in the compound with *prá-*: ***prórya^{-te}*) with respect to the base noun *pravará-*. Most likely, the stem *prá-varya-* has been built directly to the noun *pravará-*. The morphological opacity of this formation could give rise to further variants (attested in mss.), such as *pravṛya-*, *pravṛṇīya-* (based directly on the present stem *-vṛṇī-*) and *pravṛīya-* (built on the secondary pattern *Cr* – *Crīya-* / (*Crīya*); see KULIKOV 2005a).

vyā* (*vṛ*) ‘envelop, cover’: *vīyá^{-te}

+ *apa* Yā. 6.12;⁶⁵³

+ *pari* ‘cover round’ KB 10.3.15 = 10.3.23 [ed. LINDNER 10.2^{2x}] +;

+ *prá* ‘impregnate’ AV 11.4.3, 12.4.37, AVP-Or. 5.15.5a = AVP-Kashm. 5.15.4c (AVP-Kashm. ms. *vra viyantām*, ed. BARRET and AVP-Or. *pra vīy^o*), AVP-Or. 13.9.1.[2] = AVP-Kashm. 13.14.16 (Kashm. ms. *prārvīta*, ed. BARRET + *prārdhīta*, HOFFMANN (1970: 67 [= Aufs. 2, 522], fn. 7) + *prāvīya^o*), 16.21.3,⁶⁵⁴ TS^p, MS^p 4.3.5:44.16 – KS^p 12.8:170.16, JB 3.24:5 [ed. CALAND §171], HirŚS 13.3.40;⁶⁵⁵

(+ *sam* AVP-Kashm. 5.13.7 [*sam ... vīyatām*, read probably with AVP-Or. *sam ... dhīyatām*])⁶⁵⁶

⁶⁵³ For the post-Vedic (Nirukta) *apa-vīyate* (‘wird entblößt?’), see HOFFMANN 1955: 82 [= Aufs. 1, 54], fn. 3.

⁶⁵⁴ On *pra vīyatām*, attested in mss. of AVP 10.2.6 (an erroneous reading for *pra dīyatām* ‘let [the toll] be given [to you]’), see s.v. *vī* ‘pursue, strive after, approach’.

⁶⁵⁵ Ed. ĀnSS *pravītā pravīyamāṇety ekeṣām*; read with HEESTERMAN (1957: 41, fn. 2) and TSUJI (1964: 11) + *pravītāpravīyamāṇ^o* (i.e. *°tā~apra^o*) ‘[a cow] that has been impregnated once and since then has not been impregnated again.’

⁶⁵⁶ The relevant passage runs in Orissa mss.:

(AVP-Or. 5.13.7bcd)

saṃ dhībhir dhīyatām ayam

saṃ pṛthivyā sam agninā ' saṃ sūryasya raśmibhiḥ

‘Let it (sc. the rice-gruel) be united with visions, with the Earth, with Agni, with the rays of the Sun.’ (see LUBOTSKY 2002: 72)

The compound *sam-vīyá^{-te}* is unattested elsewhere, which renders the Kashm. reading *°vīyatām* doubtful. Most likely, *°vīyatām* is a later replacement of the original reading preserved by the Orissa version, perhaps a ‘learned mistake’ (in WITZEL’s terms),

accented:

vīyá-te: AV 12.4.37, MS^p 4.3.5:44.16

-vīya-te: TS^p 6.1.7.1

• pass.

The passive *-vīya-te* is only attested with preverbs. The compound *pari-vīya-te* is met with in the Brāhmaṇas, but appears to point to the fact that this usage was also possible in the RV:

(KB 10.3.15 = 10.3.23 [ed. LINDNER 10.2^{2x}])

yuvā suvāsāḥ parivīta āgād iti – saiva paridhānīyā sā parivīyamāṇāya

“‘As a youth, well-clad, girded around [with a rope], it (sc. the yūpa) has come” [RV 3.8.4a] – that is the concluding [stanza]. That [stanza is recited] for [the victim] being covered around.’⁶⁵⁷

More frequent is the compound with the preverb *prá*, with the idiomatic meaning ‘be impregnated’. Although *prá-vīya-te* is attributed by many scholars to a different root, *vī* (q.v.) ‘pursue, strive after, approach’ (cf. WHITNEY 1881 [Index to AV]: 277; 1885b [Roots]: 161; MACDONELL 334f.; WERBA [VIA I] 318; cf. also SOMMER 1977b: 78f.), its meaning seems to perfectly fit the general semantics of *vyā* (*vī*) ‘envelop, cover’. The meaning ‘be impregnated’ can easily be deduced from the primary meaning of *vyā* ‘cover’ (cf. NARTEN 1986: 233, fn. 135). The same semantic development of the verb ‘cover’ as a cattle-breeding term is attested in many languages, cf. Eng. *cover*, German *decken*, Dutch *dekken*, Russian *покрывать*. Examples of this compound are:

(AV 12.4.37ab)

pravīyāmānā carati 'kruddhā gópataye vaśā

‘Being impregnated, the cow goes around, angry at her master.’⁶⁵⁸

(AVP-Or. 5.15.5ab = AVP-Kashm. 5.15.4cd)

pra vīyantāṃ striyo gāvo 'viṣṇur yonim anu kalpayāti

‘Let the female cows be impregnated; Viṣṇu will duly prepare the womb.’

meaning ‘let it be impregnated by prayers ...’ (?), ‘let it be enveloped by prayers ...’ or the like.

⁶⁵⁷ It is interesting to note that the participles of the compound *pari-vī*, *parivīta*- and *parivīyamāṇā*-, refer in this passage to different entities: to the sacrificial post in the RVic citations and to the sacrificial animal in the Brāhmaṇa commentary (W. KNOBL, p.c.).

⁶⁵⁸ Cf. JOHANSSON 1927: 23.

(AVP-Or. 13.9.1.[1-2] = AVP-Kashm. 13.14.16)

*sā manasaḥ sam abhavat. sā prāvīyata, sā garbham ādhata*⁶⁵⁹

‘She arose from the thought. She was impregnated, she became pregnant.’⁶⁶⁰

(MS 4.3.5:44.15-17 ≈ ^UKS 12.8:170.14-16)

*pūmān dhātā. pārācīr vāi prajā réto dadhate. pārācīṣv evāsu réto dadhāti.
tād āhur: nā vāi téna pārā dhatte, yād āntarā pravīyātā iti. vyāvadadhyād
dhātāraṃ madhyatāḥ*

‘Dhātar is the man. Verily, turning away [their faces], the creatures take the semen. Verily, [the man] places the semen into those who turn away [their faces]. About this they say: “Verily, [the sacrificer] thereby does not turn himself away, when the proximate one is being impregnated.” He should remove the Dhātar from the middle.’⁶⁶¹

The only occurrence with root accentuation (TS) is attested in the same usage as the aforequoted forms with suffix accentuation:

(TS 6.1.7.1)

kāsmāt satyād anasthīkena prajāḥ pravīyante, ’sthanvātīr jāyante

‘How is that creatures are impregnated by means of that which is boneless, and yet are born with bones?’

There are two possible accounts of this unique attestation of the root accentuation in *pravīyante*:

(1) The accent on the root is authentic and, accordingly, the form in question should be taken as a non-passive, as suggested in INSLER 1987: 58, with fn. 13 (“certainly intrans., not passive”), meaning ‘becomes pregnant’. Since the alleged opposition “pass. *pra-vīyāte* ‘is covered, impregnated’ ~

⁶⁵⁹ Thus Kashm.; Or. *adha*°.

⁶⁶⁰ The corrupt text of the Kashm. version was emended and translated by HOFFMANN (1970: 67 [= Aufs. 2, 522], note 7).

⁶⁶¹ I follow Ch. H. WERBA’s interpretation (per littera, 7.5.1998): ‘Dhātar ist der Mann. Indem sie (ihr Gesicht) abwenden, nehmen fürwahr die (weiblichen) Geschöpfe den Samen auf, (und) er (sc. der Mann) setzt in sie, während sie eben (ihr Gesicht) abwenden, den Samen. Dazu heißt es: “Es ist fürwahr nicht [so, daß] er (sc. der Opfernde) [sie] damit (d.h. mit der Spende an Dhātar als letzter) von sich abwendet, weil/insofern die nächste begattet wird.” Absetzen soll er Dhātar, (und zwar) in die Mitte.’ Cf. also HEESTERMANN 1957: 41ff.

pravīyate ‘becomes pregnant’ would be isolated in the Vedic verbal system,⁶⁶² we were to emend the accent not only in AV 12.4.37, as INSLER suggested (**pravīyamānā*), but also in other accented occurrences of this present (MS 4.3.5, MS 4.1.14 = TS 1.1.13.2 etc.).

(2) The root accentuation is secondary, probably emerging in analogy with the phonologically similar -ya-presents with fluctuating accentuation, such as *kṣi*: *kṣīyá-^{te}*, *mī*: *mīyá-^{te}*, *jī* (note esp. the root variant *jyā*): *jīyá-^{te}*; see Chapter C.II.3.6 for details.

The latter solution is favoured by the semantics of the root *vyā* (‘be covered’ = ‘be impregnated’, referring to an event that cannot come about by itself, spontaneously) as well as by the solidly attested suffix accentuation.

vraśc/vrśc ‘cut off’: *vrścyā-^{te}* (AV, MS *vrścá-^{te}*)

Simplex: α ‘cut’ AVŚ 8.10.18 (*vrścáte* ≈ AVP 16.134.1 [tr.] *vrścanti*), AVŚ 6.136.3 (*vrścáte* ≈ AVP-Or. 1.67.3 ed. DIPAK BHATTACHARYA *vrhyate* [a better reading?], v.l. and ed. DURGAMOHAN BHATTACHARYYA *vrścyate* ≈ AVP-Kashm. *drśyate*), VaitS 10.2 (*vrścamāna-*, unnecessary conjecture ed. GARBE ⁺*vrścyamāna-*);

(β ‘bring low to’ KB 11.3.3 [ed. LINDNER 11.4] *vrśc(y)eta*, read probably ⁺*ā-vrśc(y)eta*);

+ ⁺ā β ‘bring low to, bring under the wrath of’ RV 10.87.18 +; α ‘cut off, separate from’ JUB 1.5.1.3 [ed. OERTEL 1.19.3] = 1.18.2.9 [ed. OERTEL 1.57.9]

accented: AV

• pass.

(*vrścyā-^{ti}*, for ⁺*vrścā-^{ti}*):

(Simplex (α) AVP-Or. 5.32.10 *vrścyati* (v.l.); read *vrścati*);

+ ⁺ā (β) ‘bring low to’ JB 3.359:10 *vrścyāmi*, read ⁺*ā-vrścāmi* (EHLERS);

+ *sām* ‘cut down’ JB 2.208:5 (ed. RAGHU VIRA/LOKESH CHANDRA *saṃ-vrścyan*, FRENZ ⁺*saṃvrścyan*)

The secondary root *vraśc* (*vrśc*) seems to have been built upon a

⁶⁶² The only middle -ya-present for which a semantic opposition between forms with the root accentuation and forms with the suffix accentuation is attested is *pacyāte* ‘is cooked’ ~ *pācyate* ‘ripens’; see also Chapter IV, s.v. *yabh*.

-sk-present.⁶⁶³ The original meaning of this verb (attested in the simplex) is ‘cut down, cut off, fell down [a tree]’. However, apart from a few occurrences in the AV (for which see below), its -yá-passive occurs only with the preverb *ā*, with the idiomatic meaning change. As noticed by LUDWIG (1881 [RV übers., Comm. I]: 249f.), S. SEN (1928: 134), OERTEL (1935: 164-167 [= Kl.Schr. I, 373-376]), NARTEN (1959: 46ff. [= Kl.Schr. 1, 9f.] and notes 40ff., with bibl.), *ā-vraśc* has the meaning ‘make a prey, bring low to, bring under the wrath of’, not ‘separate, turn away from’ (contra DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 143; GELDNER ad 10.87.18;⁶⁶⁴ GONDA 1965: 357, 359f.), being constructed with the dative of a deity to whom the evil-doer is brought low. Correspondingly, the passive *ā-vrścya-te* is employed in construction ($\beta_{\text{pass.}}$) ‘X^{evil-doer}_{NOM} is brought low to Y^{deity}_{DAT}’ (in the AV also with the locative;⁶⁶⁵ see examples below). It appears only once in the mantras, in the late RV:

(RV 10.87.18b)

ā vrścyaṁtām āditaye durévāḥ

‘Let the evil-doers be brought low to Aditi.’⁶⁶⁶

In Vedic prose, this compound becomes more common. Examples are:

(TS 5.5.7.2)

rudrō vā eṣā yád agnís, tásya tistráḥ śaravyāḥ: pratīcī tiráścy anūcī;
*tābhyo vā eṣā ā vrścya-te,*⁶⁶⁷ *yò ’gnīm cinuté*

‘Verily, by virtue of the fact that Agni is [identical with] Rudra, his [are] three arrows: [one comes] in front, [another comes] transversely, [another one comes] from behind; to these the one who piles the fire-altar is a prey.’ (cf. OERTEL 1935: 166 [= Kl.Schr. I, 375])

⁶⁶³ Probably, derived from the root *vrj*, i.e. **ur̥g-ske-*, with the semantic development ‘twist off, remove’ → ‘fell [trees], cut off’ (see LUBOTSKY 2001: 38f.).

⁶⁶⁴ “*ā-vraśc* mit Dat. verbunden, hat diesen besonderen Sinn: ‘sich entfremden, es verderben mit, sich verfeinden mit’”.

⁶⁶⁵ Cf. NARTEN, *ibid.*, note 40.

⁶⁶⁶ Thus contra GELDNER (‘die Bösewichter sollen sich der Aditi entfremden!’), RENOU, EVP XIV, 22 (‘que (ces êtres) malfaisants soient déchirés (pour être livrés) à Aditi!’) and 90, and BRERETON 1981: 210 (‘let those of evil action alienate themselves from Aditi’); correctly translated by WHITNEY for the AVic repetition (8.3.16b): ‘let them ... fall under the wrath of Aditi.’

⁶⁶⁷ Ed. B.Ind. *vrścate*.

(ŚB 3.4.3.19)

tán mithyā kurvanti, devébhya ā vṛścyaṇte

‘Thus they do wrong [and therefore] are brought low to the gods.’

Cf. also TS 6.1.4.8 *nā devātābhya ā vṛścyaṇte*, TB 1.5.6.7 *devébhya ā vṛścyaṇte*, TB 1.3.10.7 *pitṛbhya ā vṛścyaṇte*,⁶⁶⁸ TB 2.1.2.10 *ā sūryāya vṛścyaṇte ... āgnāye vṛścyaṇte*.

The only occurrence of the compound *ā-vṛścya-^{te}* which exhibits the meaning $\alpha_{\text{pass.}}$, normally possible only for the simplex (see below), is found in the late JUB:

(JUB 1.5.1.3 [ed. OERTEL 1.19.3] = 1.18.2.9 [ed. OERTEL 1.57.9])

etasmād u eva sarvasmād āvṛścyaṇte, ya evaṃ vidvāṃsam upavadati

OERTEL (1935: 166 [= Kl.Schr. I, 375]) groups this occurrence with examples of type β (*ā-vṛścyaṇte* with the dative), thus tacitly assuming the meaning ‘he is brought low to the universe/all this’ (?), but such an interpretation is both semantically and syntactically (note the ablative *sarvasmād*) impossible. More probable is the translation proposed by OERTEL in his ed. of the JUB: ‘... and from this same universe⁶⁶⁹ he is cut off who speaks ill of one knowing thus.’

The secondary pattern ‘X^{evil-doer}_{NOM} is separated, cut off from Y^{deity}_{ABL}’ may have resulted from the reinterpretation of the grammatically ambiguous dative-ablative plural forms in pattern (β) as ablatives (cf. S. SEN 1928: 134).

The stem variant *-vṛścá-*, attested in the AV and MS,⁶⁷⁰ results from the simplification of the palatal cluster.⁶⁷¹ Examples are:

(AV 12.4.6ab)

yó^a syāḥ kárṇāv āskunót^y ' ā sá devéṣu vṛścate

‘The one who brands her (sc. Brahman’s cow) ears falls under the wrath of

⁶⁶⁸ Impossible is MALAMOUDE’s (1972: 13, fn. 22) translation: ‘[ce ne serait point un *havis*], et il en **priverait** les Pères.’

⁶⁶⁹ Thus for 1.19.3; for 1.57.9: ‘... from this all’.

⁶⁷⁰ Cf. BLOOMFIELD & EDGERTON 1930 [Ved. Var. I]: 51, §87; OERTEL 1935: 165f. [= Kl.Schr. I, 374f.]; 1941: 99 [= Kl.Schr. II, 1468], fn. 1; RENOU 1965: 16.

⁶⁷¹ Cf. OERTEL 1941: 99 [= Kl.Schr. II, 1468], fn. 1; see also s.v. *bhāj*. The loss of -y- in -ścy- seems to be an isogloss shared by the dialects of the AV and MS.

Note that a class VI analysis of *-vṛścá-^{te}*, albeit possible in formal terms, is improbable on system-related grounds, since middle class VI presents do not occur in the passive usage.

the gods.’⁶⁷²

(AVP 9.21.6)

*kalpante asmā ṛtavo ' na ṛtuṣṣu ā vr̥ścata*⁶⁷³

ṛtūnām priyo bhavati ' ya [evam veda]

‘The Ṛtus [= seasons] conform to him. [He] who [knows thus] is not brought low to the Ṛtus, he becomes pleasant for the Ṛtus.’

(MS 3.5.1:58.1)

ā vā eṣā prajāpataye vr̥ścate ...

‘He is brought low to Prajāpati ...’

Cf. also *ā vr̥ścantām* in AV 8.3.16b (= repetition of RV 10.87.18b quoted above).

The stem variant *vr̥śca-^{te}* also occurs in late texts of the AVic and Maitrāyaṇī traditions, in particular, in VaitS 10.2 *yūpaṃ vr̥ścāmānam anumantrayate* ‘[he] ... addresses to the sacrificial post being cut down’ and MānSS 11.8.1.6 *āvr̥ścate vā eṣa oṣadhībhyaḥ paśubhyaḥ pitr̥bhyaḥ ...* ‘verily, he is brought low to the plants, cattle, fathers ...’; the emendations of the editors (*vr̥ścya^o* in ed. GARBE, Critical Notes, p. 64 and in ed. VAN GELDER) are thus unnecessary.

Apart from the AV and MS, passive forms built on the stem variant *vr̥śca-* occasionally occur (although rarely), as variant readings, in some other texts: TS 3.2.8.4 *vr̥śceta*, TS 5.5.7.2 *vr̥ścate* (thus in both cases in ed. B.Ind.; ed. WEBER and ed. ĀnSS read *vr̥ścya^o*), KB 11.2 [ed. SARMA 11.3.3-5], which will be discussed at length below.⁶⁷⁴

The simplex opt. form *vr̥ścya^o* found once in the KB in the same usage as *ā-vr̥ścya-^{te}* must be a ms. error (for *ā-vr̥ścya^o*); cf. especially *āvr̥ścya^o* at the end of the passage:

(KB 11.3.2-5 [ed. LINDNER 11.4])

sa ya ekām devatām ādiśya pratipadyeta / athetarābhyo devatābhyo

[⁺ā-]vr̥śc[y]eta / aniruktayā prati padyate / teno na kasyaicana devatāyā ā

vr̥śc[y]ate

⁶⁷² Note the locative *devéṣu* instead of the dative.

⁶⁷³ Kashm. ms. *āvr̥ścatu*. Under the assumption that *vr̥śca-* was the regular passive stem in the AV(P), BARRET’s conjecture *āvr̥ścya^o* is unnecessary. Ed. DIPAK BHATTACHARYA underlines *śca*, apparently as an unclear form.

⁶⁷⁴ Readings adopted in eds. are: ed. ĀnSS and ed. BHATTACHARYA *-vr̥śca^o*, *-vr̥śce^o*; ed. LINDNER *-vr̥ścya^o*, *-vr̥ścye^o*; with v.l. *-vr̥śca^o*, *-vr̥śce^o* [ms. WBbK]; ed. SARMA *-vr̥ścya^o*, *-vr̥ścye^o*.

‘If he (hotar) were to start by indicating one deity, he would be brought low to other deities. He starts with [a verse] not addressed [to one deity]; thereby he is not brought low to any deity.’

Apart from this erroneous form, the passive *vṛśc[y]áte* occurs as a simplex (meaning ‘is cut (off)’) only in the AVŚ:

(AVŚ 8.10.18 ≈ AVP 16.134.1)

tāsmād vānaspātīnām samvatsarē vṛkṇām āpi rohati; vṛścāte ’syāpriyo bhrātṛvyo yā evāṃ veda

‘Therefore what is cut of the forest trees grows (whole) again in one year; the unfriendly foe of the one who knows thus is cut off.’⁶⁷⁵ (see GONDA 1094: 31)

Another occurrence of the simplex passive is questionable:

(AVŚ 6.136.3ab ≈ AVP 1.67.3ab)

*yās te kéšo ’vapadyate ’sāmūlo yās ca vṛścāte [vṛhyate?]*⁶⁷⁶

‘What of your hair falls down, and what is torn off with its root ...’

vraśc is typically said of the trees being cut off, not of the hair being torn off. The reading *vṛhyate*, attested in the Orissa version and adopted in ed. DIPAK BHATTACHARYA, better suits the context and appears to be original, while *vṛścāte* in the Śaunakīya version may be secondary;⁶⁷⁷ *vṛścāte* (AVP-Or., ms. Ja.) could be its hypercorrection.⁶⁷⁸ Note, however, that, apart from this unclear AVic form, the passive (-)*vṛhya-te* first appears in Vedic

⁶⁷⁵ The corresponding Paippalāda passage has a transitive construction instead: *vṛścanty asyāpriyaṃ bhrātṛvyaṃ ya ...* ‘they cut off the unfriendly foe of the one who ...’. The Kashm. ms. reading *patyaṃ dasyāpriyaṃ bhrātṛvyas* (for which ed. BARRET conjectures ‘*patyate ’syāpriyaṃ bhrātṛvyaṃ*, i.e. ‘he dominates his unfriendly foe’ (?)) is corrupt.

⁶⁷⁶ AVP-Or. mss. *vṛhyate*, *vṛścāte*; ed. DURGAMOHAN BHATTACHARYA reads *vṛścāte*, ed. ²DIPAK BHATTACHARYA has *vṛhyate*, AVP-Kashm. ms. *dṛśyate*.

⁶⁷⁷ “*vṛścāte* erklärt sich vielleicht durch Missinterpretation von *hy* als *śc*” (Th. ZEHNDER, p.c.).

⁶⁷⁸ Another instance of such a hypercorrection (probably on the model *vṛścāte* :: *vṛścāte*) can be the irregular active form *vṛścāti*, employed transitively ([he] tears off [the roots of the man]’; see LUBOTSKY 2002: 148), attested in AVP-Or. 5.32.10 as a variant in two mss., Ja. and Ma. The correct reading must be *vṛścāti*, found in other mss., including Kashm.

prose and, furthermore, is unattested without preverbs, which renders the Orissa reading (*vṛhyate*) somewhat suspect.

(Active forms)

FRENZ 38 records for the JB a hypothetical active present *vṛścya^{-ti}*. The relevant passages are:

(JB 2.208:5-6)

tad yathā paraśunā purastāt +saṃvṛścyan⁶⁷⁹ iyād, agninā paścāt samam kurvan

‘Similarly, it is like if one with an axe goes first [to the forest], cutting down [trees], and then doing the same thing with a fire ...’

(JB 3.359:9-10)

yā stabdhā devatā, tasyai tvā vṛścya^{mīmām ārtiṃ nyeṣyasīti}

‘I bring you low to the deity which is stable, [so] you will go to this perdition.’

For the latter occurrence EHLERS (p.c.; Unpublished Habilschrift) reads *tvāvṛścā^o* in accordance with BURNELL’s copy and a similar passage in VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 4.13 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 4.28d:6 (= CALAND 1928: 136 [= Kl.Schr., 436])): *etasyai tvā devatāyā āvṛścāmi⁶⁸⁰*.

Both occurrences represent transitive usages, typical of the class VI active present (-) *vṛścā^{-ti}*, and seem to be erroneous readings⁶⁸¹ (cf. also WERBA [VIA I] 400: “Graphie mit ^oy^o nicht morphologischen Ursprungs, ... sondern phonetisch bedingt”).

Other passives

For the sigmatic aorist (1sg.med.) *ā-vṛkṣi* (in the formulaic expression Y_{DAT} *mā^vvṛkṣi* ‘may I not be brought low to Y’), 1pl.med. *+vṛkṣmahi*, attested, in particular, in AVP 2.36.4,⁶⁸² as well as in the RVKh., TS, in the same usage

⁶⁷⁹ Conjecture by FRENZ 11f., 38, adopted by EHLERS 51; ed. RAGHU VIRA/LOKESH CHANDRA *°vṛcyā^o*.

⁶⁸⁰ Translated by CALAND in accordance with DELBRÜCK/GELDNER’s analysis of the compound *ā-vraśc* as ‘ich trenne dich von dieser Gottheit...’

⁶⁸¹ Perhaps hypercorrections based on the model *vṛścya^{-te} :: vṛśca^{-te}*. Note, incidentally, that the regular class VI active present *-vṛścā^{-ti}* does not occur in the JB.

⁶⁸² With ZEHNDER’s (1999: 98f.) emendation, contra HOFFMANN’s (1986: 459 [= Aufs. 3, 821]) *+vṛkṣy;* see the detailed ZEHNDER’s discussion of the attested readings and

as *ā-vṛścyā-te*, see NARTEN 1959: 39ff. [= Kl.Schr. 1, 1ff.], 1964: 251; HOFFMANN 1986: 459 [= Aufs. 3, 821].

śams ‘recite, praise’: *śasyá-te*

[i_{pass.}] ‘Y^{prayer}_{NOM} is recited [for Z_{DAT}]’:

Simplex RV, YV^p + ;

+ *atī* ‘overrecite’⁶⁸³ AB 6.23.11, (KB 28.8.11 [ed. LINDNER 28.10])⁶⁸⁴;

+ *anu* KB, ŚBK 5.6.1.4^{2x}, PB, JB, GB, AĀ 2.3.4, HirŚS 16.6.44;

+ *vī* RV 3.39.2;

[ii_{pass.}] ‘Z^{deity}_{NOM} is praised’:

Simplex RV, RVKh. 1.7.5;

+ *prā* RV 1.138.1, 2.8.3, 5.17.4;

+ *abhī* ‘calumniate, practise against’ YV^p, AB 3.46.4, PB, JB 1.96:1 +
accented: RV +

• pass.

(*śam-śasyet* ŚŚS 17.9.6 – *-yet*-optative)

The ‘two pattern’ transitive verb *śams* can be constructed either [i] with the accusative of a song, prayer, etc. (‘X_{NOM} recites Y_{ACC} [for Z_{DAT}]’), or [ii] with the accusative of the addressee of a prayer, most commonly a deity (‘X_{NOM} praises Z_{ACC}’). Correspondingly, two patterns are attested for the passive *śasyá-te*.

Pattern [i_{pass.}] ‘Y^{prayer}_{NOM} is recited [for Z_{DAT}]’ is clearly prevalent in the RV for the simplex and entirely ousts pattern [ii_{pass.}] (see below) in Vedic prose⁶⁸⁵ (except for in compounds with *abhī*). Examples are:

possible conjectures.

⁶⁸³ I.e. exceed by a few verses in reciting; cf. ŚŚS 12.2.10.

⁶⁸⁴ Instead of the passive construction in ed. ĀnSS, ed. LINDNER (*na sa stoma devān gacchati, yo nātīśasyate* ‘The stoma which is not overrecited does not go to the gods’), ed. SARMA has the corresponding active construction (... *yaṁ nātīśamsanti* ‘[... stoma] which they overrecite’).

⁶⁸⁵ A rich collection of examples from the Brāhmaṇas is given by OERTEL (1926: 289f.).

(RV 3.62.7)

*iyāṇi te pūṣann āghṛṇe ' suṣṭutír deva návyasī
asmābhis túbhyaṇ śasyate*

'This new excellent praise, O god, is recited by us for you, O Pūṣan, glowing with heat.'

To the same syntactic type belong a few occurrences with the passive subject *sārvāṇi rūpāṇi* / *vīśvaṇ rūpām*.⁶⁸⁶

(JB 1.199:4-5)

*janadvatīṣu stuvanti. sarvāṇi rūpāṇy +anuśasyante*⁶⁸⁷

'They praise on verses [which contain a form of the root] *jan* ['beget'].
'All forms' are recited.'

(MS 3.6.10:74.12-13)

tāsmāt tṛtīyasavané vīśvaṇ rūpām śasyate

'Therefore "all forms" are recited at the third pressing.'

The rarer pattern [i_{pass.}] 'Z^{deity}_{NOM} is praised' is attested in the RV only for the simplex and for compounds with *prá*,⁶⁸⁸ cf.:

(RV 5.17.4cd)

ádhā vīśvāsu hávīyo ' 'agnír vikṣú prá śasyate

'Therefore the Agni, [who is] to be invoked, is praised among all tribes.'

(RV 6.5.6c)

yác chasyáse dyúbhir aktó vácobhiḥ

'When you (sc. Agni) is being praised, anointed by day with speeches ...'

The passive subject typically denotes deities (= recipients of prayer); the only exception is the passive construction in RV 10.99.9, with the subject of

⁶⁸⁶ Probably, a technical term denoting a particular ritual formula, cf. TĀ^m 3.12.7 *sārvāṇi rūpāṇi vicītya dhīraḥ*.

⁶⁸⁷ The reading °śāsya° (with the long root vowel) attested in mss. is erroneous; see BODEWITZ 1990: 111 (although this conjecture is not mentioned in his list of emendations). The analysis given by FRENZ 39 (pass. of the root *śās* 'befehlen') is impossible. For the confusion of some derivatives of the roots *śams* and *śās* 'order' in post-Vedic Sanskrit (in particular, *śās* for *śams*), see PW VII, 165, sub 7) and KUIPER 1934: 195 and fn. 3.

⁶⁸⁸ Inexactly HAUDRY 340 ("śams- "proclamer" ... ne connaît que la construction du modèle 2 (= pattern [i] – LK), accusatif des paroles, datif [...] de celui qu'on célèbre").

kavi (poet):

(RV 10.99.9c)

ayám kavím anayac chasyámānam

‘He (sc. Indra) conveyed the kavi being praised.’

In spite of the exceptional character of the usage, the form in question can hardly be anything but pass. of *śams*; cf., in particular, GRASSMANN 1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 1365ff.).⁶⁸⁹

In Vedic prose pattern [ii_{pass.}] is attested only for the compound with *abhí*, which denotes a hostile activity: ‘blame, calumniate’,⁶⁹⁰ cf.:

(TS 2.3.7.4)

etáyaivá yajetābhiśasyámānaḥ

‘The one who is being calumniated should sacrifice with this [sacrificial animal].’

-i-aorist

For the -i-aorist injunctive *śam̐si* (2x in the RV, both attestations in pattern [i_{pass.}] ‘[the formula] is recited’); see KÜMMEL 1996: 108f.

(Other passives)

The only RVic attestation of the middle class I present is interpreted by most scholars as passive:

(RV 8.19.8ab)

praśāṁsamāno átithir ná mitríyo ' ' agnē rátho ná védīyaḥ

However, a passive interpretation (‘being praised as a friendly guest’),⁶⁹¹ is

⁶⁸⁹ A few attempts to translate this pāda differently proved unsuccessful. GELDNER hesitantly emended ⁺*chadyámānam* ‘den Verkleideten’ (?); LUDWIG (1876 [RV übers.]: II, 610), followed by SIEG (1928: 203 [= Kl.Schr., 402]), reckoned *śasyámānam* to the root *śas* ‘cut’: ‘den zerstückten Atka’ (LUDWIG), ‘den zerfetzten Kavi’ (SIEG). Both proposals are dubious: the short root vowel passive of *chad* does not exist at all (and the rare passive *chādyā*-^{ie} first appears in the Brāhmaṇas; see Chapter V, s.v.); passives of *śas* do not occur in the mantras either (see below s.v.); finally, neither of these interpretations yields better translation.

⁶⁹⁰ For the meaning of this compound, see RENOU (1939a: 178 [= Choix I, 60]; cf. also *abhí-car* ‘bewitch’.

⁶⁹¹ Thus GRASSMANN (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 1366; 1876 [RV übers.]: I, 423)

unlikely for system-related reasons (class I middle presents do not occur in the passive usage; see GOTÖ 56), which favours the reflexive interpretation proposed by GOTÖ 803:

‘Sich ankündigend wie ein im Vertragsverhältnis stehender Gast, ist Agni zu erkennen wie ein [gewünschvoller] Streitwagen.’

(Active forms)

ŚŚS 17.9.6 *saṃ-śasyet* (employed transitively: ‘he should recite’) is a *-yet*-optative; see KULIKOV 2006d: 40.

śas ‘cut’: *śasyá-^{te}*

(Simplex RV 10.99.9 *śasyámānam* [LUDWIG, SIEG] belongs to *śams*, q.v.);

+ *ví* ŚBM 3.8.1.14 ≈ ŚBK 4.8.1.11

accented: ŚB

• pass.

The rare passive *śasyá-^{te}* occurs only in the ŚB:

(ŚBM 3.8.1.14 ≈ ŚBK 4.8.1.11)

barhír evāsmā etát str̥ṇāty: áskannaṃ havír asad íti. tād yád evāsyātra víśasyámānasya⁶⁹² kíṃcīt skándati, tād etásmin prāti tiṣṭhati, táthā nāmuyá bhavati

‘He thus strews barhis for it [with the words]: “May the sacrificial food not be spilt”. Whatever of it would then be spilt, when it is being cut up, that rests thereon, [and] thus is not lost.’

(‘Gerühmt wird Agni ...’); EATON 25; GELDNER (‘Gefeiert wird Agni ...’); WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 774, §619dβ; RENOU, EVP XIII, 65 (‘Célébré (est) Agni ...’); ELIZARENKOVA (‘Агни чествуется ...’). Differently LUDWIG (1876 [RV übers.]: I, 424): ‘preisend als freundlicher Gast, Agni...’ (objectless transitive).

⁶⁹² ŚBK v.l. *viśasyamā^ā*.

śrā ‘cook’**pass. of caus.** *śrapyá-^{te}* ‘be cooked’Simplex ŚB + (also in BaudhŚS^m 24.26:211.14)(+ *abhi* AVP-Kashm. ms. 16.71.1 *abhi śrāmyetam*, ed. BARRET *abhi*⁺*śrāpyetām*; read with Or. *abhi śrāmyaitam*)⁶⁹³

accented: ŚB

The passive of the causative *śrapáya-^{ti}* first occurs in the ŚB. Examples are:

(ŚB 5.3.2.8)

sá eṣá ūṣmāṇaivá śrapyate

‘It (sc. the sacrificial dish) is cooked by hot steam.’

(ŚB 2.2.1.2)

sá eténānnena śāntáḥ | úttarāṇi havīṁṣi śrapyámāṇāny úpa ramati

‘Having been appeased by that food, he (sc. Agni) waits patiently for the other oblations being cooked.’

śri ‘lay on, fix on’: -*śrīyá-^{te}* (-*śriya-^{te}*)

(Simplex AVP-Or. 1.92.3 [*śreyamāṇā*, Kashm. ms. *śriya*^o, ed. BARRET, ed. RAGHU VIRA, ed. DIPAK BHATTACHARYA ⁺*śrīya*^o; GOTÖ 314, fn. 754 ⁺*śrīyāṇa-*, read probably [with DIPAK BHATTACHARYA, crit. app.] ⁺*śremāṇam*]; AVP 17.29.2 (*śrīyate*), 17.29.7 (ms. *śreyante*, ed. BARRET *śrīyate*) – read ⁺*śray*^o for both (?));

+ *ádhi* ‘put on [the fire]’ KS^p 6.3:52.3, GB 1.3.11:77.5 (*adhi-śrīyamāṇa-*, v.l. ^o*śriya*^o), 1.3.12:78.13 (*adhi-śrīyamāṇa-*, v.l. ^o*hrīya*^o), KaṭhĀ^p 3.233:94.24-25 ([*á*]*dhi-śrīyeta*) +;

+ *úd* ‘set up’ ŚB 3.7.1.13, 3.7.2.8, AB 2.2.6, KB 10.3.2 (ed. ĀnSS, ed. SARMA *ucchrīyamāṇa-*, ed. SARMA (v.l.) ^o*chraya*^o], ed. LINDNER [10.2] *ucchrīyamāṇa-*), JB 3.62:13 (ed. RAGHU VIRA/LOKESH CHANDRA *ucchrīyate*, v.l. *uśchrīyate*) +;

+ *pári* ‘surround, cover’ (VS 37.13 (= ŚB 14.1.3.26 = 27) *pári śrīyasva* ≈ MS 4.9.4:124.7 *pári śrayasva*), AB 1.29.21 (ed. HAUG, ed. AUFRECHT

⁶⁹³ On this occurrence, see Chapter V, s.v. *śram*.

pari-śriyete, ed. SUDHAKAR MALAVIYA *sam-pari-śriy*^o; BÖHTLINGK (1900: 414) ^{+o}*śrīy*^o), ŚSS 5.13.7

accented: ŚB 3.7.1.13

• pass.

The passive *-śrīyá-^{te}*, well-attested in Vedic prose with preverbs *ádhi*, *úd* and *pári*, typically refers to manipulations with sacrificial implements, such as vessels being put on fire (with *ádhi*), posts being set up (with *úd*), the oblation holders being covered (with *pári*). Examples are:

- with *ádhi*:

(KS^P 6.3:52.3-4 (≈ ĀpŚS 9.5.8 ≈ HirŚS 15.2.7))

*yady adhiśrīyamāṇam, yady adhiśritam skanded, anyām
abhiduhyādhiśrityonnīya juhuyāt*

‘If one were to spill [milk] being put on [the fire] or if [that] put on [the fire], [then], after having milked additionally another [cow], one should put [the vessel on the fire], pour [milk into it] and make oblation.’

(KāthĀ 3.233:94.24-25)

āgnīdhré ’dhi śriyeta

‘In the Āgnīdhra-place [the vessel] should be put on [fire].’⁶⁹⁴

- with *úd*:

(ŚB 3.7.1.13)

áthāhocchrīyāmāṇāyānu brūhīti

‘Then he says [to the hotar]: “Recite to [the stake] being set up”.’

(KB 10.3.2 [ed. LINDNER 10.2])

*ucchritavatīś codvatīś cocchrīyamāṇāyānv āha*⁶⁹⁵

‘For it when being set up, he recites [verses] containing [the word] “erect” and “up”.’

⁶⁹⁴ WITZEL translates: ‘[i]m Āgnīdhra(zelt) soll er (den Kessel) für sich (ans Feuer) setzen’, thus tacitly interpreting *-śrīya-^{te}* as a (transitive) class I present with the abnormal root vowel (for ⁺*-śrayeta?*). However, the class I present stem of *śri* never surfaces as *śriya-* (cf. e.g. GOTÖ 310ff.), while the passive stem *-śriya-* (alongside the regular *-śrīya-*) is quite common (see below) and, hence, a passive analysis of the sentence (‘the vessel should be put on [fire]’) is preferable. The syntax of this construction is thus parallel to that of the preceding (*āgnīdhre rocyeta*), with the causative passive *rocyeta* (see Chapter IV, s.v.).

⁶⁹⁵ Ed. LINDNER ^o*chriya*^o.

- with *pāri*:

(AB 1.29.21)

yajuṣā vā ete pariśriyete yad dhavirdhāne, yajuṣaivaine etat pari śrayanti

‘When the oblation holders are being covered by a Yajus, verily they cover thus with a Yajus both of them.’

The short root vowel stem *-śriya-*, mentioned in passing by some Sanskritists (AUFRECHT, WHITNEY, LIEBICH, BÖHTLINGK, GARBE, CALAND, BLOOMFIELD & EDGERTON, GOTŌ) as an (abnormal) variant of the regular *-śrīya-*,⁶⁹⁶ deserves a special discussion. Obviously, we are confronted with the inadequacy of grammatical prescriptions (resp. descriptions) with regard to the linguistic evidence. Although grammarians teach only the long vowel stem *-śrīya-* (Pāṇ. 7.4.25), the “abnormal” *-śriya-* turns out to be almost as common as the “correct” *-śrīya-*. It will be useful to give here a synopsis of forms attested in the Brāhmaṇas, Āraṇyakas and Sūtras (see also KULIKOV 2005a):

⁶⁹⁶ *-śriyete* (AB 1.29.21) is qualified in ed. AUFRECHT, p. 431 as abnormal. LIEBICH (1891: 23f., 27) also draws attention to this “un-Pāṇinian” form (in accordance with Pāṇ. 7.4.25 we expect **-śrīyete*) and qualifies *pari-śriyete* as “eine fast in der ganzen ind. Literatur vereinzelt stehende Anomalie”, probably representing (together with AB 4.19.2 *pra-vliyeran*, for which see below) a peculiarity of the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa (ibid.: 27). BÖHTLINGK (1900: 414) conjectures *+śrīyete. uc-chriyamāṇa-* (ĀpŚS 9.11.26) is mentioned in ed. GARBE (B.Ind. 92, vol. III, Preface, p. viii) as “prakritical shortening” and emended in CALAND’s translation (1924a: 96) to *+ucchrīya°*; see also WHITNEY 1885 [Roots]: 179; BLOOMFIELD & EDGERTON 1932 [Ved. Var. II]: 257, §536; GOTŌ 1987: 314, fn. 754.

with <i>ī</i>		with <i>i</i>	
<i>adhi-śrīyamāṇa-</i>	KS ^p 6.3:52.3 GB 1.3.12:78.13 HirŚS 15.2.7	<i>adhi-śriyeta</i>	KaṭhĀ ^p 3.233:94.24-25
<i>úc-chrīyate</i>	ŚB 3.7.2.8	<i>adhi-śriyamāṇa-</i>	VaikhŚS 20.11:305.7 APrāyaśc. 4.3
<i>uc-chrīyamāṇa-</i>	ŚB 3.7.1.13 AB 2.2.6 DrāhyŚS 2.4.1, 3 ≈ LātyŚS 1.8.1, 3 ŚŚS 5.15.3 KauśS 43.8 VaitS 10.8	<i>uc-chriyante</i>	BaudhGS 3.5.7
<i>pāri śrīyasva</i>	VS 37.13 (= ŚB 14.1.3.26 = 27)	<i>uc-chriyamāṇa-</i>	ĀpŚS 9.11.26 VaikhŚS 20.24:312.17
<i>pari-śrīyamāṇa-</i>	ŚŚS 5.13.7	<i>pari-śriyete</i>	AB 1.29.21

both variants (ī) are attested

<i>adhi-śrīyamāṇa-</i>	GB 1.3.11:77.5 (<i>adhi-śrīyamāṇa-</i> , v.l. °śriya°) ĀpŚS 9.5.8 (ed. GARBE <i>adhi-śrīyamāṇa-</i> , ed. ŚĀSTRĪ <i>adhi-śrīyamāṇa-</i> in the text, <i>adhi-śriyamāṇa-</i> in the comm.)
<i>úc-chrīyate</i>	JB 3.62:13 (<i>ucchriyate</i> , v.l. <i>uśchrīyate</i>)
<i>uc-chrīyamāṇa-</i>	KB 10.3.2 [ed. LINDNER 10.2] <i>ucchrīyamāṇa-</i> , ed. SARMA (v.l.) °chraya°, ed. LINDNER °chriya° MānŚS 2.2.3.14 (°chrīya°, v.l. °chriya°, °chaya°) ĀśGS 2.8.16 (ed. STENZLER, ed. SĀSTRĪ [2.8.19] <i>ucchrīyamāṇa-</i> , ed. VIDYĀRATNA/VEDĀNTĀVĀGĪSA, ed. ĀnSS, ed. SHARMA, ed. AITHAL °chriya°)

In my view, evidence for the short root vowel variant is too considerable (almost half of the total amount of occurrences – at least in variant readings) to explain forms built on the stem variant -śriya- as mere scribal errors.

The stem -śriya- might be accounted for as emerging under the influence of the stems of the type *Criyá-* (made from the *Cṛ* roots: *mriyá-^{te}* etc.); that is, forms derived from the stem -śriya- could be regarded as passive built on the secondary root variant *śṛ*.⁶⁹⁷ We find indeed some scant evidence for this root

⁶⁹⁷ Cf. GARBE's footnote ad ĀpŚS 9.11.26 (in his ed. of the text): "the form [*uc-chriyamāṇa-*] is derived from a root *śar* with the meaning of *śrī*".

variant (e.g. the absolute *adhiśṛtya*, instead of the correct *adhiśritya*, in KauśS 2.31), but the late and isolated character of such forms rather suggests that they were built under the influence of the -ya-present -śrīya-^{te} (from which the secondary root śṛ could be extracted), rather than *vice versa*. Furthermore, the *i/i* vacillation seems not to be at random; in particular, the short vowel variant always appears before the suffix vowel *e* – which cannot be explained by mere influence of the type *Crīyá-* either. I hope to have demonstrated elsewhere (KULIKOV 2005a) that the root vowel is secondarily shortened in this type before the long vowels in the suffix (i.e. *ā, e*); cf. also the similar vacillation in the stem -*vlīya-*, attested in AB 4.19.2 *pravliyeran* (see Chapter IV, s.v.).

While the passive -śrīyá-^{te} is well-attested in Vedic prose, all alleged attestations in the post-RVic mantras (AVP, VS) are uncertain.

The form *śrīyamāṇa-* in AVP 1.92.3, which, from the formal point of view, might be a present passive participle, is suspect both for semantic and metrical reasons. In Orissa mss., the passage in question runs as follows:

(AVP 1.92.3cd)

somo rājā varuṇo mītradharmā ' mayi śreyamāṇam upa saṃ namantu

The Kashmir ms. has *śrīya*°, for which BARRET (and subsequently ed. RAGHU VIRA and ed. DIPAK BHATTACHARYA) emended ⁺*śrīya*°. GOTÖ 314, fn. 754 tentatively conjectures the root aorist participle ⁺*śrīyāṇa-* (comparing it with the Lat. cognate *cliēns* ‘Klient’), which leads to a forced translation: ‘sie (die angeführten Götter) sollen meinen Klienten mir zuneigen’. More likely seems the reading hesitantly suggested by DIPAK BHATTACHARYA in his crit.app.: *śremāṇam*, i.e. acc.sg. of nom.abstr. *śremán-* (m.) ‘superiority’, attested also in Vedic prose (MS^p +);⁶⁹⁸ *śreyamāṇa-* (Or.) and *śriyamāṇa-* (Kashm.) may be its *lectiones faciliores*.⁶⁹⁹ The passage in question can be translated as follows:

‘Let the king Soma, Varuṇa, Mitra and Dharma submit the superiority to me.’

Two other alleged occurrences of the stem *śrīya-* occur in hymn AVP 17.29:

⁶⁹⁸ See NARTEN 1987b: 277f. [= Kl.Schr. 1, 347f.].

⁶⁹⁹ Worthy of mention is a similar variation attested for SV 1.299 [= 1.4.1.1.7] *trāmāṇam* ≈ AV 6.4.1 *trāyamāṇam* ‘protecting’, noticed by RENOU (1952a: 136; 1952c: 105).

(AVP 17.29.2)

sa pathiṣu devayāneṣu śrīyate, pra patho devayānān jānāti, ya [evaṃ veda]
 ‘He, who [knows thus], follows the divine paths, recognizes the divine paths.’

(AVP 17.29.7)

*budhnasya viṣṭape śreyate*⁷⁰⁰ *ya [evaṃ veda]*
 ‘[The one] who [knows thus] leans to the upper part of the bottom.’ (?)

The latter passage is obscure, but, for both occurrences, the non-passive intransitive meaning (‘leans, follows’) seems more likely than the corresponding passive (‘is leant’ or the like). This interpretation leads to the assumption that in both passages we should read ⁺*śrayate* (class I present),⁷⁰¹ rather than *śrīyate*. The reading *śrey*^o can be based on a series of replacements:⁷⁰² *śra* → *śr* → *śre*.

Finally, *śriyantam* in AVP-Kashm. (ms.) 10.2.4 (2x) is a corrupt reading for *śriyaṃ tvam* (thus Orissa).

The only attestation of the stem *-śrīya-* in a Yajurvedic mantra poses some problems as well:

(VS 37.13.a (= ŚB 14.1.3.26 = 27) ≈ MS 4.9.4:124.7)

svāhā marúdbhiḥ [MS ^o*bhyaḥ*] *pári śrīyasva* [MS *śrayasva*]

Semantically, both passive (‘Hail! Be surrounded by Maruts’) and reflexive (‘Hail! Surround yourself with Maruts’) seem possible.⁷⁰³ The lack of reliable attestations of the passive *-śrīyá-^{te}* in the mantras indirectly support the reading *śrayasva*, attested in the MS; *śrīyasva* (VS) may be its secondary replacement.

Other passives

For the passive *-i*-aorist *ásrāyi*, see KÜMMEL 1996: 114f. Intransitive usages (including passives) are also attested for statives derived from the perfect stem (cf. KULIKOV 2006a: 67f.), e.g. in RV 7.56.13b *vákṣassu rukmā upaśiśriyāñāḥ* ‘the golden ornaments are fixed on [Maruts’] breast’, although it is not always possible to draw with accuracy the distinction between passive

⁷⁰⁰ Thus ms.; ed. BARRET emends ⁺*śrīyante*.

⁷⁰¹ Thus already VWC-Samh. V, 3163, fn. m (hesitantly).

⁷⁰² Noticed by SCHEFTELOWITZ (1907: 122f.) for Kashmirian mss. of the RV: *r̥* → *ra* (cf. *prathúr*, *bibhrayād*) and *r̥* → *re* (cf. *trebhyo*, *reṣabhaḥ*).

⁷⁰³ Cf. BLOOMFIELD & EDGERTON 1930 [Ved. Var. I]: 52.

and non-passive usages.⁷⁰⁴

śru ‘hear’: śrūyá-^{te}

Simplex RV 10.22.1, AVP 1.107.3 (*śrūyate* ≈ RV 10.168.4 *śṛṇvire*), MS^p 4.2.9:32.9, 4.3.10:49.12, KS^p 10.6^{2x}:131.3, 4, TB^m 2.5.1.3, JB 2.1:5, GB 1.1.28:20.6, TĀ 10.11.1 (= MNU, ed. VARENNE 244) +

accented: MS 4.2.9

- agentless pass., anticaus.

pass. of caus.: -śrāvya-^{te}

+ ā ‘announce’ VādhŚS [ed. IKARI] 1.6 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 2.4 (CALAND 1924: 148 [= Kl.Schr., 283]))

The present *śrūyá-^{te}* is employed in the agentless passive usage, typical of the passives of verbs of perception, meaning (α) ‘be heard’ (cf. Chapter A.II.2.2.2 and B.I, s.vv. *drś*, *vid*). This usage easily develops to the non-passive intransitive (β): ‘is heard [by smb.]’ → ‘is audible’ / ‘is known’ → ‘is famous’ (cf. *drśyáte* ‘is seen’ → ‘is visible’, *vidyáte* ‘is found’ → ‘exists, is’; see KULIKOV 2011b). In usage α, *śrūyá-^{te}* is constructed with the subject of sound properly speaking; in β – with the subject of a person or an abstract concept (see CARDONA 1961: 339ff.; KÜMMEL 1996: 115ff.) who/which is the source of sound, thus being metonymically associated with the sound and therefore can be said to ‘be heard’ / ‘be famous’. The only RVic occurrence of *śrūyá-^{te}* belongs to the latter type. Examples are:

- (α) ‘be heard’:

(AVP 1.107.3c ≈ RV 10.168.4c)

ghoṣa id asya śrūyate na rūpam

‘His (sc. Vāta’s) voice is heard, not the form.’

⁷⁰⁴ KÜMMEL’s (1996: 115) example RV 10.91.2 *vāne-vane śiśriye* may belong to the anticausative type: ‘[Agni] leans to the wood’; see also SCARLATA 497, with fn. 695). Likewise, RV 3.8.2a *sámiddhasya śráyamāṇaḥ purástāt*, rendered by KÜMMEL as a passive (‘der du [Opferposten] vor dem entzündeten [Feuer] angebracht wirst ...’) is doubtful for system-related reasons; rather it should be translated as ‘the post leaning in front of the sacrificial fire’ (cf. GOTÖ 310ff.).

The -yá-passive *śrūyate* is the secondary replacement of the RVic plural stative *śṛṇvire*, for which see below.

(JB 2.1:4-5)

yām imām śreṣṭhī vācam vadaṭīty: avocad iti. sā hi dūrāc chrūyate
 ‘... the speech which the chairman⁷⁰⁵ pronounces [and about which they say]: “He said.” This speech is indeed heard from afar.’

- (β) ‘be known, famous’:

(RV 10.22.1ab)

kūha śrutā indraḥ kásminn adyá ' jāne mitró ná śrūyate
 ‘Where is Indra famous? In which community is he known/famous today as a friend?’

(TB^m 2.5.1.3)

śrótṛeṇa bhadram utá śṛṇvanti satyám [...]
śrótṛeṇa módaś ca máhaś ca śrūyate
 ‘With ear they hear good and truth; [...] with ear the joy and greatness are heard.’

Other passives

While the -yá-passive *śrūyate* (RV 10.22.1), passive aorist injunctive -*śrávi* (RV 10.93.14) and middle perfect⁷⁰⁶ (*śuśruve* RV 8.66.9)⁷⁰⁷ occur in the RV only in usage β, statives based on the present stem *śṛṇv-* (*śṛṇvé*, *śṛṇviṣé*, *śṛṇvire*) are well-attested in both usages (CARDONA, *ibid.*; KÜMMEL 1996: 116f.), i.e. with the subject of sound(s) (‘is heard’) or person (‘is known’). Examples are:

(RV 9.41.3ab)

śṛṇvé vṛṣṭér iva svanáḥ ' pávamānasya śuśmīṇaḥ
 ‘The sound of the rushing Pavamāna is heard, like [that] of the rain.’

(RV 3.55.20c)

śṛṇvé vīró vindámāno vásūni

⁷⁰⁵ Cf. RAU 1957: 74.

⁷⁰⁶ Or stative derived from the perfect stem; see KULIKOV 2006a: 67f.

⁷⁰⁷ For this attestation and for possible interpretations of the two other occurrences of the middle perfect, in the AVP and PB (passive or absolute transitive?), see KÜMMEL 2000: 532.

‘He is known as the hero finding goods.’

After the RV, statives disappear; cf. especially the AVic (Paippalāda) passage quoted above, where the -ya-passive *śrūyate* replaces the stative *śṛṇvire*, attested in the original RVic stanza.⁷⁰⁸

Caus. pass.

The present *śrāvāya*^{ti} functions as the causative to both intransitive (‘be heard, famed’) and transitive (intransitive/transitive, I/T, in JAMISON’s terms) (‘hear, obey’) usages of *śru*, thus meaning either ‘make heard, famed’ or ‘make hear, obey’ (JAMISON 175f.). The only Sūtra attestation of the corresponding passive belongs to the former type:

(VādhŚS [ed. IKARI] 1.6 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 2.4 (CALAND 1924: 148 [= Kl.Schr., 283]))

om iti vai stūyata; om iti śasyata; om ity āśrāvyate

‘“Om” – thus it is praised; “Om” – thus it is recited; “Om” – thus it is announced.’

sa(ñ)j ‘hang, attach, consign’: *sajyá*^{te}
(*sajja*^{ti/te} ŚB (BĀU) (v.l.), ŚrSū. +)

sajyá^{te} :

Simplex ŚB 10.2.6.8, 14.6.9.28 (= BĀUM 3.9.28 = BĀUK 3.9.26) = 14.6.11.6 (= BĀUM 4.2.6 = BĀUK 4.2.4) = 14.7.2.27 (= BĀUM 4.4.27 = BĀUK 4.4.22), ŚBK 4.9.3.16, ĀpŚS 9.20.4;
+ *vy-āti* ‘provide with’ TS^p 7.4.3.6

sajja^{te/ti} (also with preverbs):

ŚB (BĀU) (v.l.; see above), BaudhŚS 21.10:86.9-10 (ed. CALAND *anu-śajjetām*, v.ll. °*śajetām* [in most mss.], °*śaje[t]*), VaikhŚS 18.6:256.16 (*ā-sajjati*), MānŚS 11.9.4.14 (ed. VAN GELDER °*pra-sajjeta* (?), mss. *prasejjeti*), (KāthU 2.3 ed. *majjanti*, GELDNER, CHARPENTIER °*sajjanti*) +

accented: ŚB 14.6-7 (= BĀU 3-4) (ed. WEBER, ed. BÖHTLINGK *sajyáte*, ŚB mss. apud ed. WEBER *sájyate*, *sájjate*)

• pass., anticaus.

⁷⁰⁸ “variante ... linguistiquement «normalisante»” (RENOU 1947b: 69, with fn. 1); “modernisme en face de RV *śṛṇvire*” (RENOU 1965: 40).

The passive of the verb *sañj/saj*⁷⁰⁹ first appears in Vedic prose. The only occurrence in the YV (TS) is a compound with *vy-āti*, with the idiomatic meaning ‘be provided with’:⁷¹⁰

(TS 7.4.3.6)

vyātiṣajyante prajāyā paśúbhir, yá evāṃ vidváṃsa etā āsate

‘Those who, knowing thus, perform [the rite of] these [nights] are abundantly provided with offspring and cattle’.

The simplex passive, meaning ‘is consigned’, is attested in the ŚB:

(ŚB 10.2.6.8)

tád yè ’rvāgviṃśéṣu varṣéṣu prayánti / ahorātréṣu té lokéṣu sajyante

‘And those who pass away in the years below 20, are consigned to the days and nights [as to] their worlds.’⁷¹¹

In late Vedic, the original passive (‘be attached’) develops the anticausative usage, meaning ‘adhere, hang’,⁷¹² as in:

(ŚB 14.6.9.28 (= BĀUM 3.9.28 ≈ BĀUK 3.9.26) = 14.6.11.6 (= BĀUM 4.2.6 ≈ BĀUK 4.2.4) = 14.7.2.27 (= BĀUM 4.4.27 ≈ BĀUK 4.4.22)

*sá eṣá néti néty ātmā [...] āsaṅgó na sajyáte*⁷¹³

‘This is Atman [defined only as] neither [this], nor [that]; [it is] free of attachment, [for] it does not adhere [to anything].’⁷¹⁴

(ĀpŚS 9.20.4)

yadi [...] śākhāsu sajyeta ...

‘If [the tree for making a sacrificial post] hangs on the branches [of the trees nearby] ...’

⁷⁰⁹ The nasal in the root seems to be an Indo-Aryan innovation; see OBERLIES 1992b: 11; MAYRHOFER, EWAia II, 688f.

⁷¹⁰ See GOTÖ 1980: 25 and 35, note 43.

⁷¹¹ Instead of yonder world.

⁷¹² See GOTÖ 1980: 27 and 35, note 47; 1987: 322, fn. 779; HOCK 1985-86: 93, fn. 7; KÜMMEL 1996: 119, with fn. 232.

⁷¹³ Thus ed. WEBER, ed. BÖHTLINGK; the ŚB mss. (apud ed. WEBER, crit.app.) read *sājyate* and *sājjate*.

⁷¹⁴ THIEME (1965: 92 [= Kl.Schr. [I], 1, 231]): ‘is without attachment, does not attach itself.’ See also HOCK 2002: 280ff., with fn. 10, on the philosophical content of this passage.

This semantic development could trigger the morphological changes in the passive stem: ^(*)*sajyá-* → *sájya-/sájja-*,⁷¹⁵ which, in turn, accounts for the fact that *sajyá-^{te}* / *sajja-^{te/ti}* has taken over the function of the middle class present *-sájya-^{te}* (attested only with *vy-áti* and very rare in the Brāhmaṇas: ŚB^{1x}, JB^{1x}; see GOTÖ 320ff.). The newly built present *sajja-^{te}* (grouped by WHITNEY (1885b [Roots]: 182) with the passive *sajyá-^{te}*) occurs already in the ŚB (= BĀU), as a variant reading,⁷¹⁶ and becomes common in post-Vedic (Epic and Classical) Sanskrit.⁷¹⁷ The active present *-sajja-^{ti}* is attested from the ŚrSū. onwards (e.g. in VaikhŚS 18.6:256.16).⁷¹⁸

-i-aorist

On the -i-aorist *ny āṣaṇji* (ŚB 3.6.2.4) ‘[the horse’s tail] has been hung down’, see KÜMMEL 1996: 118f.

***sad* ‘sit’**

pass. of quasi-denom. [*upasád-* ⇒ *úpa-sīda-^{ti}* ‘perform upasad’]:

upa-sadyá-^{te} TS^p 6.2.3.2, 6.2.3.4

accented: TS

pass. of caus.: *sādyá-^{te}*

Simplex ‘put’ VSK 9.7.7 (*sādyámāna-* ≈ VSM 8.58 *sanná-*), YV^p, AB

⁷¹⁵ Attested with root accentuation in the ŚB mss.; see ed. WEBER, crit.app., p. 1182.

⁷¹⁶ For a discussion of this occurrence, see also below, Chapter III, s.v. *śṛ*.

⁷¹⁷ See PW VII, 556ff.; WACKERNAGEL 1896 [AiG I]: 162; SCHEFTELOWITZ 1913/14: 152; KÜMMEL 1996: 119, fn. 232. For Epic attestations, see HOLTZMANN 1884: 24, §746; KULKARNI 1942-43: 241; OBERLIES 2003: 244, 529f. The stem *sajja-* is common in the Smṛtis, too, also with active inflection, cf. *pra-sajjeta* BaudhDhS^v 2.15.10 [ed. HULTZSCH] = VāsDhS^v 11.27 [ed. FÜHRER °jj°, v.l. °jy°] = ManuSmṛ. 3.125 (see OLIVELLE 2000: 609, note 3 ad BaudhDhS 2.15.10; OLIVELLE 2000: 662, note 2 ad VāsDhS 11.27), ManuSmṛ. 4.16, 6.55, v.l. *pra-sajyeta* (thus BaudhDhS, ed. ŚĀSTRĪ), *sajjati* ManuSmṛ. 6.55, *sajjant-* (v.l. *sajyamāna-*) ManuSmṛ. 9.2.

⁷¹⁸ GELDNER (1928: 160, with fn. 910) and CHARPENTIER (1928: 226, fn. 107) conjecture ⁺*sajjanti* for KaṭhU 2.3cd *naitāṃ sṛṇikāṃ vittamayīnavāpto* ‘*yasyām majjanti bahavo manuṣyāḥ*’, in GELDNER’s translation: ‘nicht hast du jenes in irdischem Besitz bestehende Angebot angenommen, an dem die vielen Menschen **hängen**.’ This conjecture is unnecessary; see BODEWITZ’s (1985: 26, with fn. 68) detailed discussion of the meaning of the verb *majj* in this context (‘... in which many people **founder**’).

- 2.20.26, ŚBK 5.1.2.6^{2x} +;
 + *ā* KS^m 34.14:46.5 (*āsādyamāna*- ≈ TS^m 4.4.9.1 *āsādīta*-), 7, Sū. +;
 + *ud* KS^p 10.4:128.20, BaudhŚS^m 9.12:282.10 ≈ HirŚS^m 24.5.4^{2x}, JŚS [ed. PARPOLA] 1.24.20 (in the compound *gharmotsādyamāna*-; thus ed. PARPOLA contra ed. GAASTRA [23:30.7] *gharme sādya*^o);
 + *ūpa* MS^p 3.9.5^{3x}:122.16-19, GB 1.3.11:77.11, 1.3.12:79.4 +;
 + *sām* MS^m 4.9.9:130.4 (*sañ-sādyamāna*-) ≈ KaṭhĀ^m 3.144:56.1 (*saṃ-sādyāmāna*-) ≈ ĀpŚS^m 15.12.1^{2x}, AB 1.22.11 +
 accented: YV, ŚBK 5.1.2.6, KaṭhĀ

The intransitive verb *sad* ‘sit’ does not passivize; passives can only be built on the quasi-denominative *ūpa-sad* and on the causative *sādāya*^{ti}.

Quasi-denom. passives

The quasi-denominative (see Appendix II) based on the noun *upasād*- (denoting a particular ritual; see e.g. RENOU 1954b: 45) is well-attested in Vedic prose, but passives occur only in the TS (2x in 6.2.3). The following passage illustrates both the transitive construction with *ūpa-sad* and its passive counterpart:

(TS 6.2.3.3-4)

*devā vai yāḥ prātār upasāda upāśīdann āhnas, tābhir āsurān prāṇudanta;
 yāḥ sāyam rātriyai tābhir. yāt sāyam-prātār upasādaḥ ||3|| upasadyānte,
 ‘horātrābhyām evā tād yājamāno bhrātṛvyān prā ṇudate*

‘Verily, the gods drove away the Asuras from the day by the upasads which they performed in the morning; by those [upasads which they performed] in the evening [they drove away the Asuras] from the night. By the fact that both morning and evening upasads are being performed, verily, the sacrificer drives away his foes from day and night.’

Caus. pass.

The passive of the causative *sādāya*^{ti}, first attested in YVic mantras (VSK, MS, KS) and quite common in Vedic prose (particularly, as a simplex), is one of the earliest formations of this type. Examples are:

- simplex:

(VSK 9.7.7 ≈ VSM 8.58.g)

pítāro nārāśaṃsāḥ sādyaṃānaḥ [VSM *sannāḥ*]⁷¹⁹

‘When being seated [in the Nārāśaṃsā cups], [Soma] is Nārāśaṃsā-Fathers.’⁷²⁰

(TS 6.5.2.2)

úpopte ’nyé grāhāḥ sādyaṃtē ’nupopte dhruvāḥ

‘Some cups are being set down on strewn [ground], the Dhruva – on unstrewn.’

- with *á*:

(KS 34.14.46.4-5 ≈ VS 8.55.d ≈ TS 4.4.9.1)

śipiviṣṭa ūrā āsādyamānaḥ [VS *āsanna-*, TS *āsādita-*]

‘When being put on the [sacrificer’s right] thigh, [Soma] is [Viṣṇu] Śipiviṣṭa.’⁷²¹

- with *úpa*:

(MS 3.9.5:122.16-17)

kāsmāi paśūḥ pratyān niyuḥyātā, údaṇ prá ṇīyate, dakṣiṇatā úpa sādyaṭe, práṇ hūyāte

‘For whom is the cattle tied to the west, brought to the north, set to the south, sacrificed eastward?’

- with *sám*:

(KathĀ^m 3.144:56.1-2 ≈ MS^m 4.9.9:130.4 ≈ ĀpŚS^m 15.12.1)

saṃsādyamānāyānubṛūhīty⁷²² āha

‘[The adhvaryu] says: “Tell [the verse] for the [Pravargya], which is being put together”.’⁷²³

Another variant of this mantra occurs in the Śrauta-Sūtras:

(BaudhŚS^m 9.12:282.10 = HirŚS^m 24.5.4)

gharmāyotsādyamānāyānubṛūhi

‘Recite [the verse] to the Gharma-vessel, which is being taken from [the

⁷¹⁹ Cf. RENOU 1954c: 135.

⁷²⁰ See GONDA 1983c: 22ff. [50ff.] for comments on this mantra and its variants.

⁷²¹ See GONDA 1983c: 11f. [39f.].

⁷²² With the erroneous root accentuation in the MS (*saṃsādyā°*).

⁷²³ WITZEL: ‘für das Zusammensetzen (des Pravargya)’.

fire].’

-i-aorist

The morphological analysis of the *-i*-aorist *āsādi* (with inj. *sādi*) pose some problems. Some scholars derive it directly from the root, as a non-passive intransitive (anticausative), meaning ‘sit’ (passivization of an intransitive verb is impossible). Others connect it with the causative *sādāya*⁷²⁴ ‘set, put’ (i.e. ‘was set’). NEISSER (1906: 304ff. [= Kl.Schr., 220ff.]) demonstrated that a non-passive interpretation is semantically preferable for all RVic attestations of this formation (thus also INSLEER 1968a: 318), but his final conclusion (“zum kausativen *sād-* ziehe ich [...] den RV^{9[x]} belegten aor. *sādi, asādi*, weniger der bedeutung als der form wegen”) is untenable: the root vowel *a* must be long in the *-i*-aorists of *CaC* roots (except for the *seṭ* type) and does not prove anything. KÜMMEL (1996: 119ff.) (apparently unaware of NEISSER’s article) claimed that some of the RVic occurrences (5.43.7, 2.11.8, 2.11.18, 10.93.5) can better be translated as passives of causatives,⁷²⁵ as, e.g., in:

(RV 10.93.5cd)

sācā yāt sād_iy eṣāṃ ‘*āhir budhnēṣu budhn_iyāḥ*

‘... daß in ihrer Gesellschaft der Drache der Tiefe in die Tiefen **gesetzt werden soll**.’⁷²⁵

The remaining five RVic occurrences (1.60.2, 3.4.4, 4.6.2, 7.7.5, 7.73.2) should be translated, according to KÜMMEL, either as passives or as non-passive intransitives (“aktivisch”), cf.:

(RV 1.60.2c)

divás cit pūrvo n_iy āsādi hótā

‘Noch vor Tag hat sich der Hotar hingesetzt / ist der Hotar eingesetzt worden...’ (KÜMMEL 1996: 120)

In spite of the fact that some contexts do not rule out a causative passive translation, NEISSER’s non-passive intransitive analysis of *āsādi* is preferable for system-related reasons. *-yā*-passives derived from *-āya*-causatives (of the

⁷²⁴ All the four occurrences are qualified by NEISSER, op.cit., as non-passive intransitives, meaning ‘ist gelangt’, ‘sank’.

⁷²⁵ NEISSER: „sank“, nicht „ward gestürzt“; cf. also SCARLATA 291: ‘(wenn ... Ahi Budhnya) sich gesetzt hat’.

type *sādyá-te*) first appear in the late mantras (YV). Moreover, we find no reliable examples of passive -i-aorists built on -áya-causatives or reduplicated causative aorists.⁷²⁶ By contrast, non-passive intransitive (anticausative) -i-/-ran-aorists, such as *agāmi* ‘[he] has come’, *ásthiran* ‘[they] have approached, stood’ (see s.vv.), are quite common in early Vedic (see e.g. MIGRON 1975: 276ff.).

sic ‘pour (out)’: *sicyá-te*

[i_{pass.}] ‘Y^{liquid}_{NOM} is poured’:
 Simplex RV + ;
 + *ánu* AV 6.11.2, MS 3.2.1:16.3;
 + *praty-ava* ĀpŚS 18.13.8;
 + *ud* BaudhŚS;
 + *ā* ŚrSū.;
 + *nī* PB 8.2.10 (*ny-ašicyata*);
 + *pārā* ‘pour away [as a useless thing]’ AV 5.19.6, TS^p 2.5.5.1, MS^p 3.5.3:58.14, ŚB 13.1.6.3, TB 3.8.9.5, PB 9.6.2, JB 1.315:9, 3.10:6 + ;
 + *pāri* RV, AV(P), VS 19.5, TĀ^m 3.11.6 + ;
 + *prā* ŚB 14.2.2.54, TĀ 1.30.1 + ;
 + *anu-vī* (/pra) AVŚ 8.10.33 (*anuvī śicyate*) ≈ AVP 16.135.9 [Kashm. 16.135.11, ed. RAGHU VIRA 16.135.10] (*anupra śicyate* [Kashm. ms. *anu prasrjajyate*, ed. BARRET ^{+o}*srjyate*]); ĀpŚS 8.3.8 (*anuvī-śicyamāna-*) ≈ HirŚS 5.1.37 [p. 454, l. 1] (*vi-śicyamāna-*) ≈ BhārŚS [ed. RAGHU VIRA] 8.3.11 = [ed. KASHIKAR] 8.3.15 (*vi-śicyamāna-*, v.ll. [a]*bhi-śicyamāna-*, *sicyamāna-*)⁷²⁷

[ii_{pass.}] ‘Z^{person}_{NOM} is besprinkled’:
 + *abhī* ‘besprinkle, anoint, consecrate (of a king)’ AV, MS^p, KS^p + ;
 + *upābhi* KS^p 12.8:170.5
 accented: RV +
 • pass. / (anticaus.)

⁷²⁶ The morphologically unclear form *jārayāyi* (RV 6.12.4) ‘was awaken’ (?) is a nonce formation. *vartī*, *āvṛtran* belong to the perfect system, not to the causative aorist; see s.v.

⁷²⁷ With the passive subject of the ladle (*srucā* ... ^o*śicyamānayā* ‘with the ladle [= the content of the ladle] being poured out’).

The ‘two pattern’ verb *sic* is constructed with the accusative (= passive subject) [i] of the liquid or [ii] of the besprinkled object. The former pattern is much more common. Examples are:

(RV 9.78.2a)

índrāya soma pári śicyase nṛbhiḥ

‘For Indra you, O Soma, are being poured around by men.’

(AV 10.8.29)

pūrṇāt pūrṇám úd acati ' pūrṇám pūrṇéna sicyate

utó tát adyá vidyāma ' yátas tát pariśicyáte

‘He bails the full from the full; the full is poured with the full; and that may we know today, whence it is poured around.’

(AVŚ 8.10.33 ≈ AVP 16.135.9 [Kashm. 16.135.11]⁷²⁸)

*viśám evāśyāpriyaṃ bhrātṛvyam anuví śicyate*⁷²⁹, *yá evám véda*

‘Poison is poured out after the unfriendly foe of the one who knows thus.’

In the Brāhmaṇas, *sicyá-^{te}* often expresses pouring semen into the womb, constructed with the passive subject *rétaḥ*, as in:

(ŚB 4.1.2.10)

yád vā áyonau rétaḥ sicyáte, prá vái tán mīyate

‘Verily, the semen which is poured (/pours) outside the womb is lost.’

For some attestations, both passive and anticausative (‘fientive’) interpretations are possible, or the anticausative reading is even preferable, as, for instance, in constructions with the subject of semen mentioned above; cf. also ŚB 3.5.3.16 ...*átha rétaḥ sicyate* ‘... then the semen pours [out]’ (quoted and translated in Chapter III, s.v. *tap*). The development of anticausative usages could be supported by such class IV presents referring to flowing liquids as *rīya-^{te}* ‘whirl, swirl’ (opposed to the nasal transitive-causative present *riṇāti* ‘make whirl, set in turbulent motion’); see Chapter C.II.1.2.1 and KULIKOV (forthc.).

Most compounds of *sic* exemplify syntactic type [i]. In particular, the

⁷²⁸ 16.135.10 in ed. RAGHU VIRA.

⁷²⁹ The parallel Paippalāda passage reads *anupra sicyate*. Kashm. ms. has *anu prasṛjajyate*, which ed. RAGHU VIRA [16.135.10] emends to ⁺*śicyate* in accordance with the Śaunakīya version, while ed. BARRET conjectures ⁺*sṛjyate* [*yat pratyāhanti viśaṃ pratyāhanti tam anu prasṛjyate viśam*], which makes little sense in the context, however.

compound *pārā-sic* (lit. ‘pour away, cast away’) can be used metaphorically, to denote the decay or death, cf.:

(AV 5.19.6cd)

pārā tát sicyate rāṣṭrām ' brāhmaṇó yātra jīyāte
‘The kingdom where a Brahman is deprived of property perishes.’⁷³⁰

(JB 1.315:9)

atha yat ta[ta]s sicyate, 'muyaiva tat parā sicyata iti
‘And what [semen] is poured afterwards, that is poured in vain.’

The rarer pattern [ii_{pass.}] (‘be besprinkled’), attested with the preverb *abhí* (cf. HAUDRY 240), first appears in the AV, with the idiomatic meaning ‘be anointed [as a king], be consecrated’, cf.:

(KS^p 12.10:172.21)

vīryeṇa vā eṣa vy ṛdhyate, yo rājasūyenābhīśicyate
‘The one who is consecrated with the Rājasūya, is deprived of manliness.’

Other passives

The passive *-i-* aorist *-āśeci* (with the preverb *abhí*) ‘was anointed (= consecrated) [as a king]’ (pattern [ii_{pass.}]) occurs in the ŚB (6.2); see KÜMMEL 1996: 121. The corresponding injunctive form appears in two late related mantras attested in a number of Śrauta- and Gṛhya-Sūtras, *mā parāśeci matpayah* ‘may my vital essence not be spilled / pour out’ (e.g. in ĀpŚS 4.14.4, MānŚS 1.4.3.9, KātyŚS 25.5.28) and *mā parāśeci me/no dhanam* ‘may my/our wealth not be cast away’ (e.g. in ĀpŚS 13.18.1); see FRANCESCHINI II, 289.

The 1sg. form of the passive aorist paradigm is supplied by the sigmatic middle aorist, attested in the passive usage in a MS mantra:

(MS^m 4.4.9:61.3-4)

abhyāśikṣi, rājābhūm
‘I have been anointed (consecrated), I have become a king.’⁷³¹

Besides these (relatively late) aorist forms, the passive usage is attested

⁷³⁰ Lit. ‘is poured away, is cast away’; cf. WHITNEY, ad loc.; WEBER (1898b: 240): ‘das Reich wird bei Seite gegossen’; BLOOMFIELD (1897: 171): ‘royal power is dissipated’; ELIZARENKOVA (2005: 241): ‘то царство растворяется ...’.

⁷³¹ See NARTEN 267; KÜMMEL, *ibid.*

for middle perfects (*abhí-ṣiṣice*, *abhi-ṣiṣicāná-*) in Vedic prose (MS, ŚB); see KÜMMEL 1996: 122f.; 2000: 571.

(Active forms)

The form *sicyet* (ŚĀ 8.2), attested in the transitive usage ('if he would pour [semen]'), is a -yet-optative; see KULIKOV 2006d: 29ff.

su* 'press out': *sūyá-^{te}

Simplex RV 4.58.9, 8.64.10, 10.116.3, SV 2.383 [= 2.4.1.1.3] (*sūyase* ≈ RV 9.86.12 *pūyate*), VS 8.57, TB^m 3.10.1.2, ŚB (book 12), JB 1.161:8 [ed. CALAND §53], GB 2.3.9:195.1, 6 (*sūyate*, v.l. *śrūyate*) +;

+ *abhí* TS^p 3.1.8.2, ŚB, TB^m 3.10.1.2, GB 1.2.9:42.6 (ed. GAASTRA *abhi-ṣūyate*, v.l. and ed. MITRA [1.2.8:29.19] *vi*°), 2.2.12:177.11 +;

+ *sam* JB 2.165:4

accented: RV +

• pass.

The attestations of the derivatives of the root *su* (as well as of the phonologically similar ¹*sū* 'impel' and ²*sū* 'beget', for which see below) are thoroughly registered by GOTŌ (1991: 698ff.). As GOTŌ (op. cit., 696, fn. 129) rightly points out, most of the occurrences of *sūyá-^{te}* listed in VWC-Br. 1592ff. s.v. *su* actually belong to ¹*sū* 'impel, consecrate' (see Chapter IV, s.v.).

The passive *sūyá-^{te}* does not occur in the oldest parts of the RV; all the three RVic attestations are encountered in the relatively late hymns 4.58 (the last "Anhang"-hymn of maṇḍala IV), 8.64 and 10.116. An example is:

(RV 4.58.9cd)

yátra sómah sūyáte yátra yajñó ' ghr̥tásya dhārā abhí tát pavante

'Where Soma is pressed out, where the sacrifice [is being performed], there the streams of ghee become clean.'

In younger mantras and, particularly, in Vedic prose, pass. *sūyá-^{te}* becomes more frequent. Cf., in particular, the following SVic verse, where the form *sūyase* replaces *pūyate* in the underlying RVic mantra 9.86.12d (*svāyudhāḥ sot̥ḥbhiḥ pūyate vṛṣā* '[Soma], the well-armed bull, is being purified by pressers'), most likely, under the influence of the adjacent *sot̥ḥbhiḥ* (note the alliteration *sv... so... so... su...*):

(SV 2.383d [= 2.4.1.1.3d])

svāyudhāḥ sotṛbhīḥ soma sūyase

‘You, O Soma, well-armed, are being pressed by the pressers.’

Other passives

Alongside the -yá-passive *sūyá-*^{te} and the -i-aorist *ásāvi* (7x in the RV, see KÜMMEL 1996: 125f.), a number of other forms occur in the passive usage, especially in the RV. These include:

1) The stative *sunvé*, *sunviré* RV (GOTÖ, op.cit., 689, with fn. 78; KÜMMEL 1996: 123f.), cf.:

(RV 7.29.1a = 9.88.1a)

ayám sóma indra túbhyaṃ sunve

‘This Soma is pressed for you, O Indra.’

2) The participle *sunvāná-*, which is employed transitively, except one occurrence (*sunvānáśyā́ndhasaḥ* RV 9.101.13) that appears in the passive usage (see GOTÖ, ibid., fn. 79; KÜMMEL 1996: 126) and thus must belong to the paradigm of the stative (KULIKOV 2006b: 50).

3) All attestations of the participle *suṣvāṇá-* in maṇḍala IX (5x) are passives (‘pressed’), whereas the occurrences in other maṇḍalas (IV^{1x}, X^{1x}) are transitive (see GOTÖ, op.cit., 690 and fn. 85; KÜMMEL 1996: 126; 2000: 558); cf.:

(RV 9.67.3ab)

tuvām suṣvāṇó ádribhir' abhy àrṣa kánikradat

‘You (sc. Soma), pressed with stones, run, roaring.’

The passive occurrences must thus instantiate participles of stative derived from the perfect stem (see KULIKOV 2006a: 67f.), while the two occurrences in maṇḍalas IV and X represent middle perfect participles.

4) The participle *s^uvāná-* (dissyllabic, but written *suvāná-*) RV, TS^m is always employed passively (see GOTÖ, ibid. and fn. 81; KÜMMEL, ibid) and thus must belong to the paradigm of the passive aorist *ásāvi* (see KULIKOV 2006a: 74; 2006b: 61).

For the sigmatic middle aorist *asoṣṭa* (in ChU 3.17.5 *tasmād āhuḥ: soṣyaty asoṣṭeti*) a transitive interpretation (e.g. NARTEN 267f.: ‘deshalb sagt man: “er wird (wieder) Soma pressen, er hat sich (ja schon) Soma gepreßt” ...’) is more likely than a passive analysis (as suggested by NARTEN, ibid., though

hesitantly: ‘... (bei dem schon) Soma gepreßt wurde’); see GOTŌ, op.cit., 690, fn. 83.

¹*sū* ‘impel, urge; consecrate’: *sūyá-^{te}* ‘be consecrated’

Simplex RV 10.132.4, YV^p +
 accented: YV +
 • pass.

The homonymous roots ¹*sū* ‘impel, urge’ and ²*sū* ‘generate, bear’ differ in the inventory of forms as follows: ¹*sū* forms the active thematic present *suvá-^{ti}*, the sigmatic aorist *asāvīt*; ²*sū* has the middle root present *sūte* and the active perfect *sasīva* (see GRASSMANN 1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 1560ff.; NARTEN 268, fn. 848; JOACHIM 168; and, most comprehensively, GOTŌ 1991: 692ff.). All Vedic occurrences of the passive *sūyá-^{te}* (except for one form in the late ŚB as well as some post-Vedic forms, for which see below, Chapter IV, s.v. ²*sū* and the homonymous -yá-passive of the verb *su* ‘press out’, for which see above) belong with ¹*sū*, and display the idiomatic meaning ‘be consecrated’ (said of a king, deity, etc.), most likely, developed from ‘impel’ (cf. GOTŌ, ibid., fn. 94). Cf., in particular, the earliest occurrence of this passive, in the late maṇḍala X of the RV:⁷³²

(RV 10.132.4ab)

asāv anyó asura sūyata dyáus ‘*t_uvám víśveṣāṃ varuṇāsi rājā*

‘The other one, the yonder heaven, is consecrated, O Asura; you, O Varuṇa, are king over everybody.’

This important verse has been repeatedly discussed in Vedic studies. The connection of the form *sūyata* with *rājasūya-* ‘royal consecration’⁷³³ raises no doubts, but its primary meaning is unclear. A number of scholars rendered *sūyata* as ‘was born’:⁷³⁴ thus in both RVic concordances (GRASSMANN 1873

⁷³² This is the only RVic attestation of a passive injunctive; cf. AVERY 1885: 356, 361 (*acyanta* RV 5.54.12 belongs with the non-passive class IV presents; see Chapter IV, s.v. *añc*).

⁷³³ Cf. GELDNER, ad loc., and, especially, HEESTERMAN 1957: 72ff.

⁷³⁴ Impossible is BERGAIGNE’s (1883: III, 116) transitive (?) translation: ‘Cet autre ciel (*dyu*) a enfanté, o Asura’ (unless for ‘est enfanté’ ?).

[Wb. zum RV]: 1562 and LUBOTSKY 1997a [RVWC]: 1561); likewise DELBRÜCK 1874 [AiV]: 168 (“*su* schaffen: *sūyata* [RV] 10, 132, 4”); LUDWIG 1876 [RV übers.]: I, 130; BRADKE 1885: 71 (‘Jener andere, o Asura, **wurde geboren**, nämlich Dyâus. Du, Varuṇa, bist König über Alle’); TSUCHIYAMA 1996: 944 (5) and 935-934 (14f.), note 10; ELIZARENKOVA. According to BRADKE, *asura sūyata* may represent a word play. KUIPER (1979: 39 and fn. 127) considers BRADKE’s translation incorrect, but renders *sūyata* in the same way (‘was given birth to’). Cf. also HEESTERMAN’s (1957: 86) statement that “the meaning of the word *rājasūya-* could best be rendered by “king-engendering””; HEESTERMAN further (ibid., 72ff.) assumes that the derivatives of the three roots, *su* ‘press’, ¹*sū* ‘impel’ and ²*sū* ‘procreate’ might have been (secondarily) connected; cf. his translation of MS 4.3.9:49.1-2 *tāsmād vā etām āhuḥ: pūrvedyūr vā eṣā sūyāte ’bhītaś ca sicyatā iti* as ‘therefore they say about him: on the previous day he is quickened (born) and anointed’ (ibid., 74).

GELDNER (‘Jener Andere, der Himmel, **wurde geweiht**, o Asura; du, Varuṇa, bist König über alle’) and RENOU (EVP V, 89: ‘Cet autre là-haut, le Ciel, ô Asura, **fut mis au monde**; (mais) toi, ô Varuṇa, tu es le roi de tous (les êtres)’), in fact, leave open the question of the analysis of the form in question (¹*sū* ‘impel’ or ²*sū* ‘generate, bear, create’).⁷³⁵

In my opinion, more probable is NARTEN’s (1986: 110f. and fn. 99) interpretation (cf. also GOTÔ 1991: 692, fn. 94 and 696, with fn. 128; SCARLATA 245), based on evidence from both Vedic and Avestan: *sūyá-te* ‘be consecrated’, *rājasūya-* etc. belong to the root ¹*sū* ‘urge, impel’, which must underlie the secondary meaning ‘consecrate’ (‘mit wirkungsvoller Kraft versehen, ermächtigen, weihen’). This interpretation is supported by paradigmatic considerations: we find in the corresponding transitive constructions the class VI present *suvá-ti* (which belongs to ¹*sū*), not the middle root present *sūte* (²*sū* ‘create’).⁷³⁶

Of course this analysis does not rule out a secondary association between the passive *sūyá-te* ‘is consecrated’ and the root ²*sū* ‘generate’.

Apart from the above-discussed occurrence in the late RV, pass. *sūyá-te* ‘is consecrated’ does not appear in the mantras,⁷³⁷ but becomes common in

⁷³⁵ Cf. RENOU’s commentary (EVP VII, 64): “Faut-il entendre: le Ciel s’est seulement donné la peine de naître (*sūya-*, hapax en ce sens)?”

⁷³⁶ See examples in TSUCHIYAMA 1996: 943-941 (6ff.).

⁷³⁷ The form *sūyate* in a corrupt AVP-Kashm. passage (3.39.6) (*tvayā vyaṃ vrahmaṇās somapās supayās sutayāna sūyate*) is an erroneous reading for *sūte* (Or.

Vedic prose. An example is (cf. also the passage MS 4.3.9 quoted above):

(TS 5.6.2.1)

savò 'gnír; varuṇasavó rājasūtyam, agnisavás cítyas; tábhyām evá sūyate
 ‘The fire is the consecration; the royal consecration is the consecration of
 Varuṇa, [the fire] to be piled is Agni’s consecration; verily, with them [he]
 is consecrated.’

Other passives

Beside the -yá-passive, we find in the passive usage the middle perfect participles (*suṣuvāṇá-* YV^p+, Br. [JB *suṣvāṇa-*]) and future participles *soṣyāmāna-* (ŚB, 3x in book 9); see GOTÖ, op. cit., 695, with fn. 121; KÜMMEL 2000: 561.

srj ‘set free [for running etc.]; emit; create’: *srjyá-*^{te}

Simplex RV_{IX}^{4x} (with *ā*⁷³⁸), YV^m +;

+ *āti* MS^p 1.4.6:54.2;

+ *ānu* YV^p +;

+ *āpi* KS^p 34.8:41.15;

+ *abhí* MS^p 4.6.8:90.14, 1.10.5:145.16 = KpS^p 48.18:309.2, ŚB 4.1.3.5,
 +14.1.1.12⁷³⁹;

+ *ava* MānŚS 1.1.3.17 = VārŚS 1.2.2.16;

+ *upāva* KS^p 26.1:121.13-14 = KpS^p 40.4:227.18;

+ *ud* KB, (JB 2.396:8^{2x} [CALAND §164])⁷⁴⁰, ŚĀ 2.11 +;

tayā vayaṃ brāhmaṇās somapās sūpayāma uta yānu sūte).

⁷³⁸ *ā* seems to be an adposition (postposition) rather than a preverb in all the four occurrences; cf. especially the accent on *ā* with the participles (*ā srjyāmānaḥ*) in RV 9.88.5 and 9.95.1.

⁷³⁹ For a discussion of this attestation, see s.v. *mṛj*.

⁷⁴⁰ The reading *anutsrjyamānaḥ* in ed. CALAND §164 (*prajāpatiḥ paśūn choḥayaty anutsrjyamānaḥ*) is likely to be an error for *°srjamānaḥ*, as conjectured by CALAND (ibid., note 16) and adopted in ed. RAGHU VIRA/LOKESH CHANDRA, i.e.: ‘P. makes suffer [CALAND: “bedrängt” = “urit (calceus urit)”] the cattle [by] not releasing it’. Cf. also (v.1.) *°srjyante* (ed. *°srjante* ‘they omit’) in the next sentence (JB 2.396:8-9). Another instance of the spontaneous insertion of y after a palatal consonant in the JB is

- + *upa* ŚŚS 5.10.4;
 + *pra* AĀ 1.3.5 +;⁷⁴¹ + *vi-pra* GB 1.1.32:24.8-9;
 + *vī* AV(P), YV^p, ŚB +; + *abhi-vi* KS^p 28.2:155.6 = KpS^p 44.2:257.16,
 ŚĀ 5.4^{4x};
 + *sām* ‘mingle, unite’ AV 12.2.39, YV^m +; + *abhi-sam* “Lost-Br.”, p. 99,
 1.12 [ŚāṭyB, Fragm. LVII]
 accented: RV +
 • pass., (anticaus.)

The original passive meaning of the present *srjyá-te*, ‘be set free, be released (for running etc.)’, well-attested from the RV onwards, easily develops into the non-passive (anticausative) ‘become free, run’. In many contexts, the distinction between the passive and anticausative usages cannot be drawn with accuracy,⁷⁴² cf.:

(RV 9.95.1a)

kānikranti hárir á srjyámānaḥ

‘The fallow [courser = Soma] neighs, being set free⁷⁴³ (i.e. poured out) / running⁷⁴⁴ here.’

A similar passive-to-anticausative development is attested for a few other verbs of caused motion (see, for instance, above, s.v. *sic*) and could be supported by the influence of some class IV presents referring to flowing liquids, such as *rīya-te* ‘whirl, swirl’; see Chapter C.II.1.2.1 and KULIKOV (forthc.) for a general discussion.

In some contexts, the original meaning of the root *srj* ‘set free’ yields the

the active forms *saṃvr̥[ś]cyan* JB 2.208:5 and *vr̥ścyāmi* JB 3.359:10 (for class VI ^{+o}*vr̥ścan* and ⁺*vr̥ścāmi*); see s.v. *vraśc*.

⁷⁴¹ For AVP-Kashm. ms. 16.135.11 *anupra srjajyate*, ed. BARRET *anupra* ⁺*srjyate*, read with Orissa [16.135.9] mss. *anupra sicyate*; see s.v. *sic*.

⁷⁴² Cf. MINARD 1956: 305, [§]836, fn. a; cf. also GONDA (1951: 23) on ŚB 2.3.1.6 *vi hí srjyānte* ..., which he rendered as ‘they are free’. See also GELDNER 1901 [VSt 3]: 27ff. on the parallelism of the non-passive *rj* (q.v.) and pass. *srjyāte*. See also below on the non-passive uses of the compound *sām-srjya-te* ‘unite, mingle’.

⁷⁴³ Cf. GRASSMANN (1877 [RV übers.]: II, 261): ‘Der Goldhengst wiehert, wenn er **ausgesandt wird**’; RENOU: ‘L’alezan (*soma*) hennit-avec-force quand il **est lâché**’ (EVP IX, 43).

⁷⁴⁴ Cf. GELDNER: ‘Der Falbe wiehert laut, wenn er **hersprengt**’.

metaphoric sense ‘emit, create’, which is attested only once in the RV, in a Vāṇakhilya hymn (8.59.6 = Vāl. 11.6), but becomes very common in Vedic prose.⁷⁴⁵ As in the case of the primary meaning (‘be set free’ → ‘run’), the corresponding passive meaning can easily be depassivized: ‘be emitted, created’ → ‘emerge, arise, come into existence’ (anticausative).⁷⁴⁶ Examples are:

(TS 7.1.1.4)

prajāpatir akāmayata: prā jāyeyēti. sā mukhatās trivṛtaṃ nīr amimīta. tām agnīr devātānv asṛjyata

‘Prajāpati desired: “May I proliferate”. He produced (lit. measured) Trivṛt out of his mouth. After that the god Agni was emitted (= created).’

(ŚB 11.5.3.11)

vāyūṃ hy eva sārvaṇi bhūtāny apiyānti, vāyóḥ pūnar visṛjyānte

‘... for all beings, indeed, enter into the wind, [and] from out of wind they are produced again.’

Other passives

Beside *-yá*-passives and passive aorists (*ásarji*,⁷⁴⁷ *ásṛgran/m*, *ásasṛgram*; see INSLE 1968a: 326f., with fn. 23; KÜMMEL 1996: 129ff.), the following forms are attested in the passive usage:

1) participles in *-āna-* derived from the bare root, probably belonging to the paradigm of the passive aorist (see KULIKOV 2006b: 49), cf.:

(RV 9.76.1c)

háriḥ sṛjānó átīyo ná sātvaḥiḥ

‘The fallow [Soma], set free, like a horse, by warriors ...’

2) the 3pl. form of the sigmatic aorist *asṛkṣata*, which replaces in this function the more archaic root aorist in *-ran/m*; see NARTEN 270ff.; INSLE 1968a: 326f., with fn. 23; KÜMMEL 1996: 130f.; 2000: 555 for discussion and

⁷⁴⁵ See RENOU 1955a: 436, fn. 1; GONDA 1982a: 47 [= Sel.St. VI/2, 121].

⁷⁴⁶ Cf. GONDA’s (1982a: 50 [= Sel.St. VI/2, 124]) translation of *prajāpatir asṛjyata* in ŚB 10.2.3.18 as ‘[P.] underwent the process *sṛj-*, he came into existence’; also GONDA 1989c: 36 for JB 2.369:4 *asṛjyata*: ‘[Prajāpati] was created (was emitted, had come into existence)’.

⁷⁴⁷ E.g. in RV 1.190.2b *sárgo ná yó ... ásarji* ‘like a discharge (= oblation) which has been discharged (in Agni = in the fire)’; see INSLE 1968b: 5.

examples.

3) part. *saṣṛjāná-* (see KÜMMEL 2000: 554) and 3pl.pf. *saṣṛjire* (a RVic hapax),⁷⁴⁸ cf.:

(RV 8.69.5ab)

á hárayaḥ saṣṛjiré ' 'aruṣṭīr ádhi barhíṣi

‘The fallow [horses] (= Soma-saps) have been set free toward the reddish [cows] (= milk has been added), on the barhis.’

While middle forms outside the present system (aorist, perfect) are frequent and well-attested in the passive usage in the RV, the class VI present *srja^{-ti/te}* mostly occurs with active endings (more than 100 occurrences of active forms against only ten middles in the RV, i.e. approximately 10 : 1). Like the corresponding active forms, middle presents are employed transitively. A seeming exception is 3pl.inj. *ávāsrjanta* in the well-known Indra hymn 4.19:

(RV 4.19.2ab)

ávāsrjanta jívrayo ná devá ' bhúvaḥ samrāḷ ind_ara satyáyoniḥ

Although most scholars translate this form intransitively,⁷⁴⁹ the mythological context prompts an object (Indra), and, accordingly, the form can be taken as an absolute (objectless) transitive (LUBOTSKY, p.c.):

‘The gods abandoned [Indra], like the feeble ones; you, O Indra, who have a true abode, became the supreme ruler.’

In contrast with the situation in the mantras, in Vedic prose middle presents become quite common in intransitive constructions, e.g. in the reflexive usage, as in:

(ŚB 1.1.1.3 = 1.1.1.6)

átha sámsthite ví srjate

‘After the [sacrifice] has been completed, he releases himself from the

⁷⁴⁸ Note the abnormal (hyper-characterized) morphology, which may result from a contamination of the endings with the connecting vowel *i* (*saṣṛjire*) and without it (*saṣṛjre*).

⁷⁴⁹ GRASSMANN (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 1572ff.): ‘niedersinken’; LUDWIG (1876 [RV übers.]: II, 96) and HILLEBRANDT (1913: 45): ‘[die Götter] ließen nach’; GELDNER: ‘Die Götter **verzichteten** wie die Greise’; GONDA (1979: 26): ‘the gods abdicated’; ELIZARENKOVA: ‘Боги **отпали**, как старики.’

vow.’

Most instructive is the use of the compound *sám-srj* ‘unite, mingle’. The original passive meaning ‘be united, mingled’ easily transforms in some contexts to the non-passive intransitive ((spatial) reciprocal; see KULIKOV 2007a: 723ff.): ‘unite, mingle, pair’,⁷⁵⁰ as in the following YVic mantra:

(TS 1.8.12.1.a = TB 1.7.6.1 ≈ MS 2.6.8:68.6 = KS 15.6:213.9)⁷⁵¹

dévīr āpaḥ sám mádhumatīr mádhumatībhiḥ srjyadhvam

‘O divine waters, unite, the sweet ones with the sweet ones!’

In some cases, it is nearly impossible to draw a clear-cut distinction between passive and non-passive usages of *sám-srjyá-te*, as in:

(TB 3.7.3.5)

médhyā ca vā etáśyāmedhyā ca tanúvau sám srjyete, yáśyāhitāgner anyáir agnībhir agnáyaḥ sám srjyānte

‘Verily, the sacrificially pure and impure bodies of this Āhitāgni mingle / are mingled, if his sacrificial fires mingle / are mingled with other fires.’⁷⁵²

The depassivization of the compound *sám-srjya-te* accounts for the fact that both class VI present middle forms (-*srjá-te*) and -*yá*-passives (-*srjyá-te*) can be employed in the same non-passive (reciprocal) usage, as in the following Brāhmaṇa passage:

(ŚB 4.1.4.4-5)

[4] *sá kṣatráṃ váruṇaḥ | bráhma mitráṃ upamantrayāṇi cakra: úpa má vartasva, sám srjāvahai; purás tvā karavai tvátprasūtaḥ kárma karavā iti. táthéti. táu sám asrjetām; táta eṣá maitrāvaruṇó grāho ’bhavat.* [5] *sò evá purodhā. tásmān ná brāhmaṇāḥ sárvasyeva kṣatríyasya purodhām kāmayera, sám hy ètáu srjéte sukrátam ca duṣkrátam ca; nò evá kṣatríyaḥ sárvaṃ iva brāhmaṇām puró dadhīta, sám hy èvāitáu srjéte sukrátam ca duṣkrátam ca*

‘[4] Varuṇa, the nobility, called upon Mitra, the priesthood: “Turn unto me,

⁷⁵⁰ Such a development is typical of compounds with *sám*; cf. *sám-prcyá-te* ‘unite’.

⁷⁵¹ For the VS variant of this mantra, see s.v. *prc*.

⁷⁵² Cf. also in ŚrSū., e.g., in BaudhŚS 23.5:155.11-12 *yatra kvacana śabdā na sám srjyeran* [...] ‘if somewhere the words [pronounced by two parties] do not come together [...]’ (see, in particular, MYLIUS 1968 [= Aufs., 47f.]). – I am thankful to W. KNOBL for valuable clarifications on the interpretation of this and the following Brāhmaṇa passages.

let us unite; I will make you my Puro[hita], urged by you, I will do work.” – “So [be it].” They both **united**; therefrom arose the cup to Mitra and Varuṇa. [5] And none other than that (i.e. this cup to Mitra and Varuṇa) is the office of the Purohita. Therefore a Brahman should not wish [to obtain] the office of Purohita from just about every Kṣatriya [he may meet], because thereby good deeds and bad deed **mingle**; nor should a Kṣatriya make just about every Brahman [he may meet] Purohita, because thereby good deeds and bad deeds **mingle**.’

Instructive is also the following JB passage:

(JB 2.369:8-9 [ed. CALAND §160])

tad abravīd: āvaṇi vāva prathamāy ajaniṣvahy, āvaṇi śreṣṭhau svas, saṃ
+sṛjāvahai, sahāsāveti

‘He (sc. Prajāpati) said to it (sc. Brahman): “Verily, we [two] have been born the first, we are the best, let us unite ourselves,⁷⁵³ let us be together”.’

Ed. RAGHU VIRALOKESH CHANDRA reads *saṃsṛjyāvahai* (with v.l. *saṃsṛjāvahai*); ed. CALAND §160 (*sṛjāvahai*, without preverb) and TSUCHIDA (1979: 67f., with note 27) (*saṃsṛjāvahai*) adopt the reading without y. This vacillation may be caused by the semantic similarity of *-sṛjā^{te}* and *-sṛjyā^{te}* in compounds with *sām*.

sku ‘poke’: *skūyāmāna-*

MS^p 2.1.11:12.19

accented: MS

• pass.

The only Vedic attestation of the passive *skūyā^{te}* occurs in the MS, in a passage quoted and discussed by DELBRÜCK (1888 [AiS]: 390) and OERTEL (1926: 120, Ex. 51):⁷⁵⁴

⁷⁵³ CALAND reads *sṛjāvahai* (without preverb) and, accordingly, translates ‘wir wollen erschaffen’; TSUCHIDA’s (1979: 115) translation runs: ‘wir beide wollen uns paaren’. Less appropriate is the interpretation by GONDA (1989c: 36) (‘let us create (out of ourselves)’).

⁷⁵⁴ For the derivatives of the verb *sku* (including its passive), see JAMISON 1983b: 72, note 9. On the technical meaning of *ā-sku* ‘mark (the ear of cattle) by punching’, see

(MS 2.1.11:12.17-20)

*índraṁ vái rákṣāṁsy asacanta. sò 'gníṁ práviśat. táni vá enam abhisám
amṛśant. sá etá viprúšo 'janayata, yá imáḥ skūyámānasya viprávante. táni
vá agnínaivāpāhata*

‘The Rakṣases pursued Indra. He entered the fire. They clutched at it (sc. the fire). It (sc. the fire) produced these sparks, which scatter here when it (sc. the fire) is being poked.’⁷⁵⁵ Verily, he repelled them (sc. the Rakṣases) with the fire.’

stu ‘praise’: *stūyá*^{-te}

Simplex RV 1.107.2, 3.22.1, Br. +;

(+ *abhi* (?) ⁺GB 1.2.18:51.13, ed. GAASTRA ⁺*abhi-ṣṭūyet[a]*⁷⁵⁶)

• pass.

pass. of quasi-denom.:

[*stotrā*- ⇒ *stáuti* etc. ‘sing stotra’]:

stūyá^{-te} MS^p 4.6.6:88.14 +

[*prastāva*- ⇒ *pra-stáuti* etc. ‘sing Prastāva’]:

pra-stūyá^{-te} PB 7.7.15, JB 1.115:4, 1.323:1 +

accented: RV 1.107.2, MS, ŚB

The class I present middle forms (as well as middle forms of the other tense systems; see below) of the verb *stu* are very common in the passive usage

LANMAN, ad AV 12.4.6.

⁷⁵⁵ As DELBRÜCK, *ibid.*, explains, *skūyámānasya* forms an absolute construction (*genetivus absolutus*).

⁷⁵⁶ This uncertain form occurs in an unclear sentence, which ed. GAASTRA reads as *tenāśva abhiṣṭūyeteti* (‘thereby the horse should be praised’ (?)). PATYAL (1969: 72 and 74, note 3) adopts this reading and translates: ‘with it let the horse be eulogised’. The nominative *aśva[s]* is GAASTRA’s conjecture; three mss. (and ed. MITRA) read the accusative *aśvam*; the fourth is entirely lacking this word. This fact renders the passive construction dubious. In my opinion, one of the possible readings could be *tenāśvam abhiṣṭūyeti* (thus in one ms. [C]), with the irregular absolutive *abhiṣṭūya*, i.e. ‘having praised the horse thereby...’. This reading is indirectly supported by the fact that the absolutive *-ṣṭūya* (with *abhi*) occurs elsewhere in the GB (1.1.25:17.7), while other Brāhmaṇas attest the regular form *-stūtya* (e.g. *abhiṣṭūtya* in KB 15.1.1).

in early Vedic (RV) – which may explain the rarity of -yá-passives in the Saṃhitās (2x in the RV). The RVic occurrences are:

(RV 1.107.2ab)

úpa no devā ávasā gamant_{uv} ' áṅgirasāṃ sāmabhi stūyámānāḥ
‘Let the gods come to us with their assistance, while being praised with the songs of the Angirases.’

(RV 3.22.1d)

sasavān sán stūyase jātavedaḥ
‘Being victorious, you are being praised, O Jātavedas.’

In the Brāhmaṇas this -yá-passive becomes more frequent. Examples are:

(ŚB 9.4.1.11)

dákṣiṇā vái stāvā, dákṣiṇābhir hí yajñá stūyáte
‘The praises are indeed the dakṣiṇās (priestly fees), for the sacrifice is praised with dakṣiṇās.’

(AB 7.16.10)

tasmā indraḥ stūyamānaḥ prīto manasā hiraṇyaraṭhaṃ dadau
‘Indra, being praised, pleased in mind, gave a golden chariot to him.’

Quasi-denom. passives

Unlike other verbs of speech and worshipping (such as *śams*, *yaj*; see Chapter C.II.1.3.1), *stu* does not belong with ‘two pattern’ verbs in early Vedic, i.e. it is constructed with the accusative of the recipient of praise, not with that of the praise.⁷⁵⁷ The corresponding passive pattern is thus ‘Y^{deity}_{NOM} is praised’, as in the examples quoted above. However, from Vedic prose onwards, we find constructions with the passive subject of stotra, cf.:

(ŚB 4.2.4.6)

tām ná stūyámāné 'va nayet / ná ha saṃvatsarāṃ yájamānó 'ti jīved yát stūyámāne 'vanáyet
‘He should not pour it (sc. the dhruvagraha) down [into the Hotar's cup] while the stotra is being sung. For the sacrificer would not outlive the year if he poured [the graha] down into [the Hotar's cup] while the stotra is being sung.’

⁷⁵⁷ Except for one occurrence in RV 8.96.12 (*stuhí suṣṭutám*; see HAUDRY 340), which could be a content accusative construction, however.

(JUB 1.1.5.6 [ed. OERTEL 1.5.5-6])

tad yatra itac cātvālaṃ khātaṃ, tat samprati sa diva ākāśaḥ. [6] tad bahiṣpavamāne stūyamāne manasod gṛhṇīyāt

‘There, where this cātvāla-hole is dug, exactly there is the empty space of heaven. There (i.e. in the cātvāla-hole) he should take out in his mind [the graha], while the bahiṣpavamāna[-stotra] is being sung.’

At first glance, such examples might be regarded as evidence for the second pattern, i.e. [ii_{pass.}] ‘Y^{praise}_{NOM} is sung’. There are some objections to such an interpretation, however:

(1) Most of the ‘two pattern’ verbs show the opposite development, i.e. they lose one of the patterns in the simplex (usually, attested only in the RV), preserving it with some preverbs.⁷⁵⁸

(2) Unlike other verbs of speech (*śams*, *vac*), the rank of possible objects (= passive subjects) in pattern [ii] (‘sing a praise’) is rather limited. Specifically, while the synonymous *śams* can be constructed with such objects as *ukthā-*, *mantrā-*, *brāhmaṇ-*, *mānman-*, *stōma-*, etc., *stu* only occurs with the terms denoting ritual lauds and metres, i.e. various kinds of stotras.

(3) Quite common are objectless (and, in the case of passive, subjectless, as in ŚB 4.2.4.6) constructions, which are rare or unattested for verbs like *śams*.

The features listed above are typical characteristics of quasi-denominative verbs (see Appendix II), and thus can be explained under the assumption that *stu* in such usages belongs with the noun *stōtra-* as its quasi-denominative, meaning ‘sing a stotra; sing [a laud, metre] as a stotra’.⁷⁵⁹

Correspondingly, the translation of JB 1.285:14-16 should be corrected (*satyayajña pauluṣe, yat stutā gāyatrī bhavati, stūyate triṣṭub, astutā jagatī, katham tās sarvās sampadya mādhyamīdinaṃ savanam udyacchanti*): ‘O Satyayajña Pauluṣi, since the Gāyatrī **is sung as stotra**, since the Triṣṭubh **is being sung as stotra**, [and] the Jagatī **is not sung as stotra**, how do they all combine to undertake the Midday Pressing?’ (rather than ‘... the Gāyatrī **is praised** ... and the Jagatī **is not praised**’, as in BODEWITZ 1990: 162).

⁷⁵⁸ Such is, for instance, the case for *śasyá-^{te}*: [i_{pass.}] for the simplex (RV +); [ii_{pass.}] for the simplex (RV, RVKh.) and with *abhí* (YV^p +); see above s.v. and Chapter C.II.1.3.1 for a survey.

⁷⁵⁹ Note that a content accusative construction corresponding to this quasi-denominative occurs already in early Vedic (RV 8.96.12 *stuhí suṣṭutīm*, mentioned above).

Noteworthy is the co-occurrence of the two different patterns (i.e. regular and quasi-denominative) with the simplex within one chronological period, in the Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras. In particular, *stūyáte* occurs both in the meaning ‘is praised’ (e.g. in AB 7.16.10, KB 15.6.9 [ed. LINDNER 15.5], ŚB 9.4.1.11, ŚŚS 15.22.1) and ‘is sung as stotra’ (e.g. in MS^p 4.6.6:88.14, ŚB 4.2.4.6, PB 17.2.5, JB 1.285:15, JUB 1.1.5.6 [ed. OERTEL 1.5.6], 3.4.2.3 [ed. OERTEL 3.16.3], ĀpŚS 12.17.11).

Another quasi-denominative derived from the root *stu* is the compound with *prá*, based on the technical term *prastāva* (the introductory part of a *sāman*), which denotes recitation of a song or verse as a *prastāva*. An example of the corresponding passive is:

(JB 1.323:1)

prastūyamānaṃ sāma prajākāmo 'bhyud gāyet

‘[If he (sc. the Udgātar)] is desirous of progeny, he should start singing the Udgītha while the Sāman is still being sung as Prastāva.’

Other passives

Beside the *-yá*-passives and the, the following middle forms are attested in the passive usage (particularly commonly in early Vedic; for a synopsis of formations and discussion, see NARTEN 1964: 276ff.; 1969: 12ff. [= Kl.Schr. 1, 100ff.]; GOTÖ 1997b: 180ff.; KÜMMEL 1996: 131ff.; 2000: 579f.):

1) The passive *-i*-aorist *ástāvi* (see KÜMMEL 1996: 132f.) and the participle *stuvāná-* (RV 7.96.3), which must belong to the paradigm of the passive aorist (see KULIKOV 2006b: 51f.).

2) Stative *stáve* (see OETTINGER 1976: 112, 120; KÜMMEL 1996: 131f. (with examples); GOTÖ, *ibid.*). To the stative paradigm must also belong the well-attested participle *stávāna-* ‘praised’ (KULIKOV 2006b: 51f.),⁷⁶⁰ as in

(RV 1.130.10cd)

divodāsébhir ind_ara stávāno ' vāvṛdhīthá áhobhir iva dyáuḥ

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

Unclear is the paradigmatic status of the hapax *stavāná-* (RV 6.46.2), probably resulting from contamination of the stative and passive aorist participles, i.e.

⁷⁶⁰ On the paradigmatic relationships of *stáve* and *stávāna-*, see also INSLER 1972a: 557.

stāvāna- and *stuvānā-* (see KULIKOV 2006b: 52).

3) The class I present *stáva-*⁷⁶¹. Most remarkably, this is the only class I present employed in the passive usage, which points to the secondary origin (see NARTEN 1968b; GOTÖ 56, with fn. 23) of this present, probably based on the stative *stáve* (see KULIKOV 2006a: 72).

4) Perfect participle *tuṣṭuvānā-* (1×):⁷⁶²

(RV 7.51.3abc)

*ādityā víśve marútaś ca víśve ' devāś ca víśva ṛbhávaś ca víśve
índro agnīr aśvínā tuṣṭuvānāḥ*

‘All Ādityas and all Maruts, all gods and all Ṛbhus, Indra, Agni and Aśvins have been praised’ (see KÜMMEL 1996: 133).

5) Sigmatic aorists (*astoṣṭa*, *ástoḍhvam*, *ástoṣata*); see DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 265; NARTEN 296; KÜMMEL 1996: 134.

6) An isolated sigmatic form *stuṣé* (25x in the RV), which is employed as 1sg. (‘I will praise’) in most of its occurrences, but is also attested a few times as a 3sg. form in the passive usage (e.g. in RV 1.122.7).⁷⁶³

7) Middle future (1× in the RV):

(RV 8.70.14ab)

bhūribhiḥ samaha ṛṣibhir ' barhīṣmadbhi staviṣyase

‘Verily, you will be praised by many offering ṛṣis’ (see WENZEL 103; LUBOTSKY 1995c: 259).

8) Two middle optative forms of the class II present (*stuvītā* RV 4.55.6 and *-stuvīmahi* RV 8.22.6), qualified by KÜMMEL (1996: 134) as passives, are considered by most translators as transitives (thus GELDNER; RENOU EVP V,

⁷⁶¹ E.g. *stavase* (RV 1.169.8), *stavate* (RV 8.24.16), *staveta* (RV 5.18.1) (see DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 264), part. *stāvamāna-* (see WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 774, §619dβ).

Unclear and controversial is GONDA’s (1979: 21) statement that “one should not apply the term ‘passive’ to the verb of 10,65,4 *devā stavante* although of course a translation “les dieux sont loués” [Renou EVP V, 57; cf. also Renou 1925: 135. – LK] is not incorrect”. Some occurrences of *stáva-*^{te} are nevertheless considered by GONDA (1979: 21) true passives (e.g. *tvāyā yāt stāvante ... vīrāḥ* at RV 6.26.7).

⁷⁶² See RENOU 1925: 135; KÜMMEL 2000: 579.

⁷⁶³ Some contexts are syntactically unclear; see KÜMMEL 1996: 134f., with fn. 254; LUBOTSKY 1997a [RVWC]: 1589.

19 (for RV 4.55.6); cf. also NEISSER 1925: 195 [= Kl.Schr., 267]).

9) Alongside the stative and passive aorist as well as a plethora of middle forms, we find in the passive usage the participle *stavān* ‘praised’ (three occurrences in the family maṇḍalas: 2.19.5, 2.20.5, 6.24.8, all said of Indra).⁷⁶⁴ By virtue of its suffix accentuation and active morphology, this form cannot belong to the class I present *stávate*, which is only attested in the middle. On the other hand, its semantics and passive syntax plead for the connection of this formation with the stative *stáve*, as the active counterpart of the stative (middle) participle *stávāna-*; for a general discussion of this rare formation, see KULIKOV 2006b: 59ff.

The passive syntax of this archaic active participle and the abundance of middle forms of *stu* attested in the passive usage may point to the fundamental labile character (transitive/passive) of this verb: ‘proclaim / be famous’.⁷⁶⁵

stṛ̥ ‘strew, spread; cover’: *stīryá-^{te}*

[i_{pass.}] ‘Y^{barhis}_{NOM} is strewn [on Z^{altar}_{LOC}]’ :

Simplex KB 18.7.16 [ed. LINDNER 18.10], ŚrSū.;

+ *vi* Smṛ.

[ii_{pass.}] ‘Z^{altar}_{NOM} is covered (with barhis)’ :

Simplex KS^m 34.15:46.12-13 = APṛāyaśc.^m 3.2, TB^m 3.7.6.5, ĀpŚS 4.6.2;

+ *pari* ŚrSū.;

+ *sam* BhārŚS

accented: TB

• pass.

stṛ̥ ‘strew, cover’ is a ‘two pattern’ verb, constructed with the accusative of [i] either the sacrificial grass (barhis) being strewn, or [ii] the altar being covered with barhis (cf. HAUDRY 247ff.; GOTÖ 1997a: 1041, fn. 239). The corresponding passive *stīryá-^{te}* is relatively rare (3x in Vedic) and first appears in young mantras (YV). One of the three occurrences belongs to type [i_{pass.}], with the passive subject of barhis:

⁷⁶⁴ For this formation, see MAYRHOFER, KEWA III, 521 (with bibl.); WATKINS 1969: 142ff.; SCHAEFER 1994: 45f.

⁷⁶⁵ Cf. OETTINGER 1976: 112.

(KB 18.7.16 [ed. LINDNER 18.10])

na hy atra barhiḥ stīryate

‘... for barhis is not being strewn here.’

Two other occurrences exemplify pattern [ii_{pass.}], with the passive subject of the altar being covered with barhis:

(KS 34.15:46.12-13 = APrāyaśc. 3.2)

paśavo⁷⁶⁶ barhiṣi vedyāṁ stīryamāñāyām

‘[You are] kine on the barhis, when the altar is being covered.’

(TB^m 3.7.6.5-6)

sā stīryāmāñā mahaté sáubhagāya ||5|| sā me dhukṣva yájamānāya kāmān

‘You there (sc. sacrificial altar), being covered [with barhis] for great happiness, fulfill (lit.: give as milk) for me, the sacrificer, my wishes.’

In the Sūtras, pattern [i_{pass.}] is attested for the simplex and for the compound with *vi* (in the Smṛtis), cf.:

(MānŚS 1.4.3.4)

nirdviṣantaṁ nirarātiṁ daheti vedaṁ stīryamāñam anumantrayate

‘“Burn the hater, the foe”, – thus he speaks to the bunch of grass being strewn.’

(ViṣṇuSmṛ. 3.97c = ManuSmṛ. 7.33c)

visīryate yaśo loke

‘The fame is far spread in the world.’

Pattern [ii_{pass.}] occurs with compounds, cf. BhārŚS 4.5.4 *agnīn paristīryamāñān* ‘the fires being strewn around’; BhārŚS 4.8.3 *vedīṁ saṁstīryamāñām* ‘the vedi being covered’.

The form *saṁstriyāte* (ŚB 13.1.2.2, ed. WEBER), often quoted in Indo-Iranian studies as the cognate of Av. *striia-* (e.g. KELLENS 126), does not belong with *stī-*, nor with the anīṭ root *stṛ* ‘stretch down, fell’ (which has no *-yá*-passives at all; cf. GOTÖ 1997a: 1038ff.), being an erroneous reading for *saṁ-s-kriyāte* (\sqrt{kr} ‘make’); see GOTÖ 1997a: 1044, fn. 251.

Other passives

Beside *-yá*-passives and *-i*-aorist *ástāri* (RV 6.63.3 – probably a nonce formation, see KÜMMEL 1996: 136), the passive usage is attested in the RV for the form *tistiré* (probably a 3sg. stative derived from the perfect stem; see

⁷⁶⁶ Thus in the APrāyaśc.; *paśavā* in the KS, ed. SCHROEDER, is a misprint (Th. OBERLIES, p.c.).

KULIKOV 2006a: 67f.) and middle root present *-stṛṇītām* (3sg. imperative):

(RV 3.41.2b)

tistiré barhír ānuṣák

‘The barhis has been spread according to the order.’⁷⁶⁷

(RV 7.17.1ab)

āgne bháva suṣamīdhā sāmiddha ' utá barhír urviyá ví stṛṇītām

‘O Agni, be kindled with good kindling [wood], and let the barhis be spread widely.’⁷⁶⁸

The passive usage attested for this middle root present is a strong indication for the lack of the -yá-passive *stīryá-^{te}* in early Vedic.

han ‘kill, smite, hit’: *hanyá-^{te}*

Simplex RV +;

+ *abhí* KāthĀ^p 3.236:102.9;

+ *áva* AVP(-Or.) 16.120.1 (*ava-hanyamāna-* ≈ Kashm. *a-nahyamāna-*),

ŚBK 2.1.3.8 (+);

+ *sam-ā* MS^p 4.8.1:106.6;

+ *úd* TB 1.2.1.1, PB 6.5.6, ĀpŚS 4.5.5 ≈ BhārŚS 4.7.1;

+ *úpa* (pass.) ‘beat, hit etc.’ ŚB 6.1.3.3 +; (anticaus.) ‘make a recitation mistake’ TS^p 7.3.1.1, 2, JB +;

+ *ní* ‘be fixed, fastened on’ AVŚ 6.70.1-3; ‘be slain’ (of sacrificial animals etc.)

Sū. +;

+ *nír* ŚB 9.5.1.62 (+);

⁷⁶⁷ See EATON 26; DELBRÜCK 1897 [VglSynt II]: 206; GOTÖ 1997a: 1042; KÜMMEL 2000: 577, with fn. 1236.

⁷⁶⁸ Thus GRASSMANN (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 1588), LUDWIG, GELDNER, VELANKAR, RENOU (EVP XIII, 64, although with some hesitations, see *ibid.*, 147), GOTÖ (1997a: 1042 and fn. 244). According to DELBRÜCK (1888 [AiS]: 263f.), both passive and non-passive intransitive interpretations are possible. GONDA’s (1979: 21) comments on this passage are unclear: “Forms such as 7,17,1 *barhír ... ví stṛṇītām*, though functioning as agentless passives and translatable by “das Barhis soll gebreitet werden” (Geldner) are **essentially eventive** [emphasis is mine – LK]”. I do not understand what can be meant by “forms ... functioning and translatable as passives” but “essentially” non-passive.

+ *prati* SVB 3.5.2, GṛSū.;

+ *sám* ‘clump, condense (by churning)’ TB 2.2.9.2, ŚB 10.6.5.2 (= BĀU

1.2.2)

accented: RV +

• pass., anticaus. (with *úpa*, *ní*, *sám*)

The passive *hanyá-te* is solidly attested in Vedic from the RV onwards. Examples are:

(RV 10.85.13cd ≈ AV 14.1.13cd)

aghāsu hanyante gāvó ‘*arjunyoḥ páriṣṭi uhyate*

‘In the Aghās the cows are slain;⁷⁶⁹ in the two Arjunīs the wedding is performed (?).’⁷⁷⁰

(RV 3.59.2c)

ná hanyate ná jīyate tāvótah

‘The one who is protected by you (sc. Mitra) is neither slain nor robbed.’

In the mantras, *hanyá-te* appears only as a simplex, except for one AVic occurrence with *ní*, with the idiomatic meaning ‘be fixed on’, which may represent the usage of this compound peculiar to the AV only; the meaning of this compound in the RV is ‘strike down’ (see INSLEY 1967a: 262ff.), cf.:⁷⁷¹

(AV 6.70.1)

yáthā māṃsám yáthā sūrā ‘*yáthākṣā adhidévane*

yáthā pumsó vṛṣaṇyatá ‘*striyāṇi nihanyáte mánah*

evá te aghniye mánó ‘*adhi vatsé ní hanyatām*

‘As meat, as alcohol, as dice on the gambling ground, as the mind of a lustful man is fixed on a woman,⁷⁷² so let your mind, O (milk-)cow,⁷⁷³ be

⁷⁶⁹ According to DANGE (1974: 33ff.), *hanyante gāvah* refers to the ritual of tying up and cutting of the hair (*go*), not to the killing cows in the proper sense of the word.

⁷⁷⁰ For the meaning of *vah*, see s.v.

⁷⁷¹ The transitive *ní-han* behaves as a ‘two pattern’ verb, i.e. can be constructed either with the accusative of the person struck (as in RV 5.32.4d *vájreṇa vajrṇí ní jaghāna śúṣṇam* ‘with his vajra the vajra-bearer struck down Śuṣṇa’) or with the accusative of the weapon (as in RV 7.18.18d *tigmāṇi tásmin ní jahi vájram indra* ‘Indra, strike your sharp vajra at him’). The latter pattern is considered more archaic by INSLEY, op.cit. (cf. also HAUDRY 213f.), but the corresponding passive construction (with the passive subject of the weapon) is not attested in Vedic.

⁷⁷² BLOOMFIELD: ‘hankers after the woman’; ELIZARENKOVA (2005: 294): ‘Как мысль

fixed on your calf.’

Compounds of this passive become more common in Vedic prose. A few of them have developed idiomatic non-passive meanings.

The compound *úpa-han*, next to the meaning ‘beat up’,⁷⁷⁴ is employed in the technical sense ‘make a mistake in recitation’⁷⁷⁵ (cf. German *anstößen*, Russ. *сбиться* [← *бить* ‘hit’] ‘make a mistake in recitation, music, etc.’). Most striking is the fact that both the active forms (e.g. in KB 26.3, AB 3.35.3) and the corresponding -yá-passives, attested in TS 7.3.1.1 (quoted in Chapter III, s.v. *hā*) and JB 1.275:4, occur in (nearly) the same usage, cf.:

(KB [ed. LINDNER] 26.3)

atha kaś cic chastre vānuvacane vā pramatta upahanyāt

‘If someone, through inattention, makes a mistake in the Śāstra, or in the recitation ...’

(JB 1.275:3-5)

atha ya etair asaṃsiddhair aśaknuvann upahanyamāna udgāyed, yathāyantaṃ⁺ pratimived⁷⁷⁶, yathā yad yācet, tan na dadyāt, tādrg u tat

‘And if someone sings not thoroughly performed [Pavamānas] as Udgītha, incompetent, making a recitation mistake, it is as if he would push back the one who is coming, as if he would not give that what he asks.’ (cf. BODEWITZ 1990: 156 and 298, notes 8-9)

The semantic affinity of the active and passive usages can probably be explained by a certain proximity of the semantic roles of the two semantic arguments of this compound and, to some extent, by the symmetrical character of the situation: ‘X_{NOM} strikes upon Y^{obstacle}_{ACC} (and becomes stuck)’ (cf. BODEWITZ 1973: 70, note 5) ≈ ‘Y^{obstacle}_{NOM} strikes X_{ACC}’ ≈ ‘X_{NOM} is struck (by Y^{obstacle}_{INS})’; cf. EHLERS’ [unpubl. Habilschr.] passive translation of JB 3.303:5 *teṣām eṣa hīyate ya upahanyate*: ‘derjenige unter ihnen, der (von

похотливого мужчины / Прикована к женщине ...’.

⁷⁷³ Etymologically, ‘not to be killed’; see NARTEN 1971.

⁷⁷⁴ As in ŚB 6.1.3.3 *sá yadōpahanyáte, mfd evá bhavati* ‘when beaten [by the water] up [onto the land], it (sc. the foam) becomes none other than clay.’

⁷⁷⁵ See PW VII, 1504; OERTEL 1926: 299; HOFFMANN 1951: 24 [= Aufs. 1, 34]; BODEWITZ 1973: 70, note 5; EHLERS [Unpublished Habilschrift], ad JB 3.303.

⁷⁷⁶ Ed. RAGHU VIRA/LOKESH CHANDRA *pratimi*^o; see BODEWITZ 1990: 298, note 9, with references.

einem Hindernis bei diesem Wettrennen bzw. von einem Fehler beim Opfer getroffen wird, bleibt zurück’.

With the preverb *sám*, *hanyá*‑^{1e} displays the anticausative meaning ‘clump, condense, solidify by churning’ (typically in cosmogonic contexts):

(ŚB 10.6.5.2 (= BĀU 1.2.2))

tád yád apām śára āsīt, tát sám ahanyata. śá pṛthivy ābhavat

‘That which was the froth of the water clumped (by churning). That became the earth.’

(TB 2.2.9.2)

tád abhrám iva sám ahanyata

‘That (sc. the *ásad* that heated itself again and again) condensed as a kind of cloud.’ (cf. LOWE 1987: 116)

(Other passives)

For the early post-Vedic intensive participle *jañghanyamāna*- (MuṇḍU), PW VII, 1498 suggested a passive analysis (‘geplagt, gequält’), adopted by WHITNEY (1889 [SktGr]: 369, §1016c; 1890b: 99 [‘much smitten’]) and JAMISON (1983b: 55, 66) as well as, for instance, in HUME’s (1931: 368) translation (‘hard smitten’). The relevant verse runs:

(MuṇḍU 1.2.8 ≈ KaṭhU 2.5 ≈ MaitrU^v 7.9)

avidyāyām antare vartamānāḥ ⁷⁷⁷ *svayaṁdhīrāḥ paṇḍitaṁmanyamānāḥ*
jañghanyamānāḥ ⁷⁷⁸ *pariyanti mūḍhā* ‘andhenaiva nīyamānā yathāndhāḥ

Under a passive interpretation (apparently based on Śaṅkara’s gloss *jarārogādyanekānarthavrātair hanyamānā; bhṛśaṁ pīḍyamānāḥ* ‘being struck by groups of numerous evils, such as old age, diseases; being strongly tormented’), the form *jañghanyamāna*- would be one of the extremely rare examples of a -yá-intensive attested in the passive usage (see Chapter C.V), which renders this syntactic analysis highly suspect. More plausible are therefore non-passive interpretations: reflexive (thus RAU (1965: 219): ‘sich selbst verletzend’; OLIVELLE (1998: 441): ‘hurting themselves badly’) or (in my view, even more likely) reciprocal (DEUSSEN (1897: 549): ‘so stoßen ziellos sich herum die Thoren’; MAURY (1943: 10): ‘ils se heurtent violemment eux-mêmes’):

‘Dwelling in the midst of ignorance, self-wise, considering themselves learned, repeatedly pushing each other (or: themselves), the fools go around, like blind [men] being led by a blind [man].’

⁷⁷⁷ The parallel verse in the KaṭhU and MaitrU has *dandramyamāṇa*- ‘running around’ instead of *jañghanyamāna*-.

⁷⁷⁸ The MaitrU reads *veṣṭyamānāḥ* ‘running around’ instead of *jañghanyamānāḥ*.

hu ‘offer, pour [oblation]’: *hūyá*^{te} 779

- [i_{pass.}] ‘Y^{oblation}_{NOM} is poured’:
 Simplex RV, RVKh. 3.10².7, YV +;
 + *anu* KS^p 21.10:50.8, 11, 27.10:150.14, ŚB 4.2.1.26^{2x}, ĀpŚS 13.8.7;
 + *ā* RV 1.36.6, 5.6.5;⁷⁸⁰
 + *prā* RV 8.82.5;
 [ii_{pass.}] ‘Z^{fire}_{NOM} is poured on’:
 Simplex (*a-hūyāmāna-*) ŚB 12.5.1.2, Sū.;
 + *abhi* ĀśŚS 4.10.3;
 (+ *ā* RV: only with *ājūhvāna-*, *āhuta-*)
 accented: RV 1.34.10 +
 • pass.

hu is a ‘two pattern’ verb, constructed either [i] with the accusative of the oblation⁷⁸¹ (‘X_{NOM} sacrifices Y_{ACC} [to Z_{DAT}]’) or [ii] with that of the sacrificial fire besprinkled with oblation.⁷⁸² The former pattern is more common and occurs both with simplex and compounds; pattern [ii] is attested with the

⁷⁷⁹ The short root vowel stem *huya-* sporadically occurs in mss., albeit rarely, for instance, in KS^p 26.1:121.11 (*huyante*; correctly in the parallel KpS passage 40.4:227.15: *hūyante*); see SIMON 1912 [Index verborum zu KS]: 221; ed. RAGHU VIRĀ, Introduction, p. 29 and MITTWEDE 1989 [Textkr. zur KS]: 124.

⁷⁸⁰ The allegedly irregular form *ahūyeta* in VādhAnv [ed. Ikari] 2.13, for which ed. Caland (VādhS 3.40:11 = Caland 1926: 35 [= Kl.Schr., 337]) hesitantly read *ahūyata* (*āhūyeta?*), exemplifies the rare preterital optative – a formation recently scrutinized at length by SAKAMOTO-GOTŌ (2009). As SAKAMOTO-GOTŌ (2009: 261) explains in her discussion of the passage in question, “[d]er Opt. weist wohl darauf hin, daß die betreffende Handlung von Vājasaneyā [= the person who pronounces the sentence in which the form *ahūyeta* appears. – LK] nicht selber erlebt wurde, sondern auf seiner Vermutung oder dem ihm überliefertem Wissen beruht”. The preterital optative may thus be considered as instantiating the category which specifies the source of information – that is, the category of evidentiality (see, e.g., AIKHENVALD 2004).

⁷⁸¹ Or prayer, metaphorically regarded as an oblation; see KURKE 1989.

⁷⁸² The syntactic parallelism with *yaj* ‘sacrifice, worship’ (which is well-attested with both patterns, i.e. ‘X^{sacrificer}_{NOM} performs Y^{sacrifice}_{ACC}’ and ‘X^{sacrificer}_{NOM} worships Z^{recipient}_{ACC}’, see s.v.), noticed by DELBRÜCK (1988 [AiS]: 175), is thus not complete. Note, furthermore, that the first object of *yaj* denotes a sacrifice properly speaking, not the oblation.

preverb *ā*.⁷⁸³

Correspondingly, two syntactic patterns are possible with the passive *hūyá-te*. The great majority of its attestations belong to type [i_{pass.}], constructed with the passive subject of the oblation, cf.:

(RV 1.34.10a)

ā nāsatyā gáchataṃ hūyáte havíḥ

‘Come here, O Nāsatyas, the oblation is being poured.’

(RV 1.26.6c)

t_uvé id dhūyate havíḥ

‘It is in you (sc. Agni) that the oblation is being poured.’

(KS 21.10:50.8-9)

kṣatraṃ vaiśvānaro, viṇ maruto. yad vaiśvānaraṃ mārutā anuhūyante, kṣatrāyaiva viśam anuniyunakti

‘Vaiśvānara is the kṣatra (nobility), the Maruts are the viś (common people). By the fact that the [oblations] belonging to the Maruts are offered after those belonging to Vaiśvānara,⁷⁸⁴ he just subordinates the viś to the kṣatra.’⁷⁸⁵

In the RV, the rare pattern [ii_{pass.}] (with the passive subject of the sacrificial fire) occurs with middle participles (only in compounds with *ā*, see below) and -*tá*-participles, but not with -*yá*-passives and -*i*-aorists. In late Vedic, this pattern is attested for the present passive participle with the negative prefix *a-*, meaning ‘[the fire] without oblations being made on [it]’ (ŚB, Sūtras):

(ŚB 12.5.1.2)

evām evānvāhitā ahūyāmānāḥ śayīrann iti

‘ “[The fires] should remain like this, provided [with fuel] but without oblations being made on them” – thus [say some].’

⁷⁸³ See KÜMMEL 1996: 142, fn. 270.

⁷⁸⁴ Inexactly MYLIUS (1994b: 95 [= Aufs., 440]): ‘By sacrificing to the Maruts after Vaiśvānara...’ As noticed above, the accusative object of *hu* (= the subject of the corresponding passive construction) refers either to the oblation or (more rarely) to the fire, but not to the recipient of the oblation (deity). Thus, *mārutā[s]* and *vaiśvānaraṃ* must refer to the oblations dedicated to the corresponding gods, i.e. to the Maruts and to Vaiśvānara.

⁷⁸⁵ For this passage, see GONDA 1987: 191.

(VaikhŚS 20.15:307.14-16)

*catūrātram ahūyamāno*⁷⁸⁶ 'gnir laukiko bhavatīti brāhmaṇaṇ; dvādaśarātram
ahūyamāno 'gnir laukiko bhavatīty eke

“‘The fire which [stays] four nights without oblations being made on it becomes non-sacred”, – thus [is said] in the Brāhmaṇa. “The fire which [stays] twelve nights without oblations being made on it becomes non-sacred”, – thus [say] some.’

Cf. also BaudhPS 1.10:14.12 ≈ ĀgnivGS 3.6.2:150.10.

Other passives

Beside -yá-passives and -i-aorists (2x in the RV; see KÜMMEL 1996: 141f.), the passive usage is attested for the 3pl. form *juhure* (most probably, a stative derived from the perfect stem; see KULIKOV 2006a: 67f.);⁷⁸⁷

(RV 2.9.3d)

prá tvé havīm̐ṣi juhure sāmiddhe

‘In you, [o Agni], who have been kindled, oblations are poured.’

For the middle participle (*ā-*)*júhvāna-*,⁷⁸⁸ both passive patterns are attested. Pattern [i_{pass.}] (with the passive subject of the oblation) occurs, e.g., in RV 1.127.1g *ājúhvānasya sarpiṣaḥ* ‘of the offered clarified butter’ and AVP 5.16.2 *havyam āsañ juhvānam* ‘the [...] oblation, poured into the mouth’ (see LUBOTSKY 2002: 84). Pattern [ii_{pass.}] is attested, for instance, in:

(RV 1.188.3ab)

ājúhvāno na īḍyo ' devām̐ ā vakṣi yajñīyān

‘Besprinkled [with oblation], you, the praiseworthy one, convey the gods to us who are worthy of worship.’

⁷⁸⁶ V.II. °*kriyamāṇo*, °*kuyamāno*, °*krīyamāno*.

⁷⁸⁷ See EATON 26; DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 264; 1897 [VglSynt II]: 206; KÜMMEL 1996: 142; 2000: 605.

⁷⁸⁸ Reckoned by LUBOTSKY (1997a [RVWC]: 656) and KÜMMEL (p.c.) to the reduplicated present (*juhóti* etc.). Morphologically, this form is ambiguous, but the lack of the passive usage of the finite present forms (*juhuté* etc.) rather pleads for the analysis of *júhvāna-* as belonging to the paradigm of the stative derived from the perfect stem (see KULIKOV 2006a: 67f.).

hū (hvā) ‘call, invoke’: *hūyá-^{te}*

Simplex RV, AV 10.10.9, 18.3.19, AĀ 2.2.4 (+);
 + *ā* KB 8.1.19; + *aty-ā* MS^p 4.2.6:27.18;
 + *úpa* MS^p 1.4.5:53.2-3, 2.2.13:26.2-3, ŚrSū.;
 + *ní* RV 8.82.4;
 + *prá* RV 1.19.1, 8.17.12, AVP-Or. 6.12.3 = AVP-Kashm. 6.12.5
 (*pra-hūyase*)⁷⁸⁹
 accented: +
 • pass.

hūya-^{te} for ***hvaya-^{te}*** ‘call’:

Simplex KS^p 26.9:133.12 (ms. *hūyante*, ed. VON SCHROEDER ⁺*hvayante*);
 + *ā* KB 30.9.7 (ed. ĀnSS, ed. BHATTACHARYA *ā-hūyante*; ed. LINDNER
 [30.11], ed. SARMA *ā-hvayante*);
 + *upa* VaikhŚS 6.12:68.6 (*upa-hūyamāna-*, CALAND ad loc. ⁺*hvayamāna-*);
 + *sam-upa* DrāhyŚS 4.3.13 (*samupa-hvayeran* ≈ LātyŚS 2.3.12 *samupa-hūyera*)
 unaccented
 • transitive

The transitive verb *hū* is typically employed with the accusative of the invoked deity. Unlike some other verbs of speech, such as *vac*, *śaṃs* (q.v.), it cannot be constructed with the accusative of the uttered speech (pattern i).⁷⁹⁰ The only exception (pattern ii) is attested in the following RVic stanza:

(RV 1.17.9ab)

prá vām aśnotu suṣṭutír 'índrāvaruṇa yām huvé

Under the assumption that the direct object of *huvé* (i.e. the relative pronoun *yām*) refers to the praise, we are forced to acknowledge an uncommon meaning of *hū* for this occurrence: ‘Let the excellent praise reach you, O Indra-Varuṇa, which I **proclsim**’.⁷⁹¹

⁷⁸⁹ The verbal form is lacking in the corresponding Śaunakīya passage (5.9.7).

⁷⁹⁰ Cf. HAUDRY 343f.

⁷⁹¹ Thus GRASSMANN 1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 1672f.; LUDWIG 1876 [RV übers.]: II, 357 (‘euch, Indra und Varuṇa, soll das schöne loblied erreichen, das ich [euch zu] **rufe**’); GELDNER; WITZEL et al. 2007: 34. RENOU saw here an instance of the usual construction attested with *hū* and, correspondingly, took *suṣṭutí-* as the addressee of invocation (‘*suṣṭutí* semi-personnifié’; EVP VII, 75): ‘Que la bonne louange vous atteigne en

Correspondingly, the passive *hūyá-te* is normally constructed with the subject of the deity [*i_{pass.}*], as in:

(RV 8.65.1; pādas ab = 8.4.1ab)

yád indra prág ápāg údañ ' n_iyàg vā hūyáse nṛbhiḥ
á yāhi túyam āśúbhiḥ

‘When you, O Indra, are invoked by men in the East, West, North, or South, come quickly here with the quick ones.’

The only RVic occurrence of *hūyá-te*, usually taken as an example of a different pattern (i.e. [*ii_{pass.}*]), is pres.pass.part. *hūyámānam* in RV 4.23.3:

(RV 4.23.3ab)

kathā śṛṇoti hūyámānam índraḥ ' kathā śṛṇvānn ávasām asya veda

The suggested interpretations can be summarized as follows:

(1) Most scholars translate *hūyámānam* as ‘call, invocation’ (‘Ruf, das Gerufene), cf. GELDNER: ‘Wie hört Indra **den Ruf**? Wie weiß er, wenn er hört, ihm zu helfen?’⁷⁹² Such a usage (*hū* with the accusative/passive subject of the utterance) has no parallels in Vedic and therefore is dubious.

(2) DELBRÜCK proposed the conjecture ⁺*hūyámānas* (apud GRASSMANN 1876 [RV übers.]: I, 574),⁷⁹³ i.e. ‘...[Indra], when being called’ (criticized by OLDENBERG, *Noten ad loc.*).

(3) An even more drastic emendation (⁺*hvéyamānam*) is needed for a transitive translation ‘does Indra hear the one who calls [him]?..’ (cf. GELDNER *ad loc.*).

Although we cannot rule out that our stanza exemplifies pattern [*ii_{pass.}*] (thus corresponding to the equally rare transitive type [*ii*] in RV 1.17.9), I

premiers, ô Indra-Varuṇa, elle que j’**invoque**’ (EVP V, 95). ELIZARENKOVA translates the relative pronoun as if it were in the instrumental (‘[...] прекрасное восхваление, [...] с которым я взываю’), without discussion.

Perhaps *yām* has been substituted for the original **yáu* (which perfectly fits in the context: ‘... O Indra-Varuṇa, whom I invoke’) in analogy with *vām* in pāda a (LUBOTSKY, p.c.).

⁷⁹² Thus also GRASSMANN (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 1676); LUDWIG (1876 [RV übers.]: II, 101); OLDENBERG (*Noten ad loc.*): ‘das Gerufene’; THIEME (1964: 31); ETTER (1985: 43): ‘Hört Indra, was gerufen wird? Kennt er, wenn er hört, dessen Befreiung?’; ELIZARENKOVA (‘Как слышит Индра призыв?’); KUPFER 307f..

⁷⁹³ “Vielleicht mit DELBRÜCK *hūyámānas* zu lesen, doch nicht notwendig.”

would assume a different morphological analysis of the form in question, which requires no emendation and, at least, does not seem impossible in the context. *hūyāmāna-* may belong with the verb *hu* ‘offer (an oblation)’, which yields the following translation: ‘How does Indra hear the (libation) being offered?..’ (perhaps said of the sound which is produced when the oblation is poured into the fire). The resulting sense of the sentence should probably be based on the word play with the two phonologically similar roots, i.e. *hū* ‘call’ and *hu* ‘offer’.

hūyá-^{te} ‘is called’ is well-attested in the RV, but becomes rare in Vedic prose, where it occurs only in compounds (MS, KB), except for one occurrence in the AĀ (AĀ 2.2.4 *hūyate* ‘[Indra] is invoked’), which may instantiate the archaizing style of this Āraṇyaka.

(-)*hūya-^{te}* for (-)*hvaya-^{te}* (tr.). Besides many clear instances of the passive usage, the present *(-)*hūya-^{te}** occurs a few times (in Vedic prose and Sūtras) in contexts where we expect a transitive present, i.e. *(-)*hvaya-^{te}**. Such a usage is attested for the following passages:

(KS^p 26.9:133.11-12)

tasmād acchāvākam upaiva hūyante, na vṛṇate

‘Therefore they invoke Acchāvāka [but] do not choose him.’

A passive does not suit the context (note especially the accusative *acchāvākam*, impossible in a passive construction), and ed. VON SCHROEDER conjectures ⁺*hvayante* against the ms. reading. For unknown reasons, MYLIUS (1982: 129 [≈ Aufs., 376]) restored the ms. reading *hūyante* in his quotation of the passage,⁷⁹⁴ but translated the form transitively (‘Daher ruft man den *Acchāvāka* nur auf (und) wählt (ihn) nicht’).

(KB 30.9.1-7 [ed. LINDNER 30.11])

[1] *pañca chandāṃsi rātrau śaṃsanti*; [2] *anuṣṭubhaṃ gāyatrīm uṣṇiham triṣṭubhaṃ jagatīm iti*; [3] *etāni vai rātricchandasāni*. [4] *pañcāhāvā rātriḥ*, [5] *vājapeyasya cātiriktoktham*. [6] *ukthasyātigraho rātriḥ*; [7] *chandase chandasa eva tad ā hvayante / ā hūyante*

The readings adopted in the editions are: ed. ĀnSS, ed. BHATTACHARYA has *chandaśaś chandasa ... āhūyante*; ed. LINDNER reads *chandasaś chandasa ... āhvayante*; ed. SARMA has *chandase chandasa ... āhvayante*. A passive translation is certainly impossible:

⁷⁹⁴ Corrected back to *hvayante* in the reprint of this paper in MYLIUS 2000 [Aufs.]: 376.

‘[1] Five metres they praise⁷⁹⁵ at night: [2] Anuṣṭubh, Gāyatrī, Uṣṇih, Triṣṭubh, Jagatī; [3] these are the metres of the night. [4] The night has five calls, [5] and [so is] the additional litany of the Vājapeya. [6] The night goes beyond the uktha; [7] verily, thus they call from metre to metre.’

A few examples of the transitive usage of *hūya*-^{te} are found in the Sūtras, cf.:

(VaikhŚS 6.12:68.5-6 ≈ ĀpŚS 3.9.8)

saha devetīdām upahūyamānaṃ [v.l. °ām] *hotāram adhvaryur agnīd yajamānaś cānvārabhante*

‘The Adhvaryu, the priest kindling the fire and the sacrificer touch the Hotṛ calling the offering [with the words]: “O Sahadeva!”.’

Again, a passive does not suit the context; CALAND (in ed. VaikhŚS, ad loc., fn. 6) conjectures *upahvayamānām* against all mss. In the parallel ĀpŚS passage (*upahūyamānām anvārabhante* ‘*dhvaryur āgnīdhraḥ patnī ca*’) a passive is, at first glance, more appropriate: *upahūyamānām* agrees in gender with *Idā* (offering), the object of invocation (= passive subject), and can thus be translated as a passive (CALAND: ‘während die *Idā* vom Hotṛ herangerufen wird, fassen ihn der Adhvaryu, der *Āgnīdhra* und die Herrin des Hauses an’). However, the syntax of the whole sentence, and, particularly, the syntactic position of the accusative *upahūyamānām* (‘(they) touch [the Hotṛ] for (?) the *Idā*, which is being invoked’?) remains unclear.

One should also mention the compound with *sam-upa* attested in *samupa-hūyeraṇ* (DrāhyŚS 4.3.13), for which the parallel passage of the closely related LāṭyŚS (2.3.12) reads *samupa-hvayeraṇ*.

Finally, (-)*hūya*-^{te} occurs for (-)*hvaya*-^{te} in Epic Skt. (see OBERLIES 2003: 243, fn. 2).

At first glance, the easiest way to account for this abnormal transitive usage of *hūya*-^{te} (never recorded in grammars) would be to treat *hūya*-^{te} as a scribal error for *hvaya*-^{te}, due to the similarity of the akṣaras *hū* and *hva*. Yet, it cannot be ruled out that this replacement does not amount to mere graphic confusion. Although the similarity of *hūya*- and *hvaya*- may give rise to the reading of *hūya*- for *hvaya* in some cases, it could be further supported by the analogy with the (equally late) transitive -ya-present *sūyate* derived from the phonologically similar root ²*sū* ‘generate, beget’ (for which see GOTŌ 1991: 698 and Chapter IV, s.v.). Evidence is too scant for positing the transitive pres. *hūya*-^{te} ‘call’; at best, it could have become a secondary (and semi-graphic) variant of the regular *hvaya*-^{te}. Note, incidentally, that this marginal and very rare formation may have been one of the reasons of the rarity of pass. *hūyá*-^{te}

⁷⁹⁵ KEITH: ‘recite’.

after the RV.⁷⁹⁶

Other passives

The participle *huvāná-* is employed both in transitive and intransitive (passive) constructions, cf.:

(RV 7.30.3cd)

nṛ̥y āgnīḥ sīdad ásuṛo ná hótā 'huvānó átra subhágāya devān

‘Agni sits down, the Hotar, like the Asura, calling the gods hither for the beloved [sacrificer].’

(RV 10.112.3cd)

asmābhir indra sākhibhir huvānáḥ 'sadr̥cīnó mādayasvā niṣádya

‘O Indra, called by us, friends, exhilarate together [with us], having sit down.’

While transitive usages undoubtedly instantiate root aorist participles (cf. 1pl.aor.med. *áhūmahī* RV 6.45.10), the attestations of *huvāná-* employed in the latter, passive, usage must belong to the paradigm of the passive aorist (see KULIKOV 2006b: 55f.)

hṛ̥ ‘bring, take’: *hriyá-^{te}* (*hrīya-^{te}*)⁷⁹⁷

AV (12.5)^{3x}, YV^m + (also with preverbs)

accented: AV +

• pass.

pass. of quasi-denom. [*pratihāra-* ⇒ *prati-hṛ̥* ‘chant *pratihāra*’]:

prati-hriya-^{te} JB, JŚS 17:22.3

⁷⁹⁶ It would be tempting to assume that the syntactically abnormal form *hūyāmānam* at RV 4.23.3, discussed above, belongs here as well – in that case, it could be rendered as ‘the one who calls’, without emendation (analysis (3)). It is very unlikely, however, that the late and marginal transitive present *hūya-^{te}* could occur as early as in family *maṇḍalas*. Note also the suffix accentuation of *hūyāmānam*, which favours its passive analysis.

⁷⁹⁷ In mss. (sporadically) also *hṛy^o* (corrupt); e.g. in AV 12.5.29 (see WHITNEY’s translation, comm. ad loc.); MS 4.8.7:115.15 (ed. SCHROEDER *āhṛyāte*, emended by WHITNEY (1887: ccxxvii); see also MITTWEDE 1986 [Textkr. zur MS]: 183).

The passive *hriyá-te* first appears in the AV, in the passive-rich hymn 12.5 and becomes common in Vedic prose. Examples are:

(AV 12.5.29)

devahetír hriyámāñā [v.l. *hrīy°*, *hṛy°*, *hiy°*], *vyṛddhir hṛtā*

‘[The Brahman’s cow is] a divine missile when being taken, perdition when taken.’

(KB 9.5.16-17)

tau vā itavantau bhavataḥ / hriyamāṇam [ed. ĀnSS, ed. BHATTACHARYA *hrīy°*] *hy agniṁ stauti*

‘These [verses] contain the word “go”, because he praises Agni when being taken.’

hriyá-te is particularly common in compounds with directional preverbs, cf.:

- with *abhí* + *ava* :

(VS 8.59.b)

samudrò ’bhyavahriyámāṇaḥ

‘[Soma is] the sea when being taken down [to the water].’⁷⁹⁸

- with *úd*, *úpa* :

(AV 12.5.34-35)

[34] *ásamjñā gandhéna śúg uddhriyámāñāśīviṣá úddhṛtā*

[35] *ábhūtir upahriyámāñā* [v.l. *hrīy°*, *hiy°*], *pārābhūtir úpahṛtā*

‘[34] [The Brahman’s cow is] discord by smell, pain when being taken [from the fire], a venomous snake when taken [from the fire]; [35] non-existence when being served up, death when served up.’

- with *ud-á* :

(TS 6.2.9.4)

yát tṛtīyaṁ chadír havirdhānāyor udāhriyāte

‘When the third cover is being put on the oblation-holders ...’

- with *pári* :

(ŚB 3.9.2.16)

gúptyai vā etāḥ pári hriyante

‘These [Vasatīvarī-waters] are being carried around for protection.’

⁷⁹⁸ See GONDA 1983c: 25 [53].

The secondary stem variant *hrīya-* occurs alongside the regular *hriya-*, usually as one of variant readings in mss. or, in some cases, even as the only attested reading. *hrīya-^{te}* is encountered, for instance, in AV 12.5.29 (v.l.), 35 (v.l.), KB 9.5 (ed. ĀnSS, ed. BHATTACHARYA), GB 1.2.9:41.12-13 (*hrīyamāṇa-*), 1.3.11:77.5 (v.l.), 1.3.11:77.11 (v.l.), 1.3.12:78.13 (v.l.), 1.3.12:79.4 (v.l.), JŚS 1.24.14 [ed. GAASTRA 23:30.4] (*ā-hrīyamāṇa-*, v.l. [ms. B2]), 1.23.7 [ed. GAASTRA 22:28.5] (*ud-dhrīyamāṇa-*, v.l. [mss. B2, B3, Ba]), 1.18.25 [ed. GAASTRA 17:22.3] (*prati-hrīyamāṇa-*, v.l. [mss. B2, Ba, T2]),⁷⁹⁹ DrāhyŚS 14.3.15 (*saṃhrīya°*, v.l.), 15.1.13 (v.l.), MānŚS 7.2.7.21 (*ā-hrīyamāṇa-*), KauśS 71.12 (*hrīyamāṇam*), VaitS 16.1 (*pari-hrīyāmāṇa-* in all mss., ed. GARBE °*hriy°*), APrāyaśc. 3.2 (*hrīyamāṇa-* and *abhihrīyamāṇa-*, v.l.). The vowel length vacillation may be due to the confusion of the two morphological types, *Criyá-* (*Cṛ* roots) and *Crīyá-* (*Cri* roots); see s.v. *śri* and KULIKOV 2005a for further details and discussion.

Quasi-denom. passives

The quasi-denominative *prāti-hṛ* ‘chant pratihāra’ (a part of *sāman*, usually functioning as a response to *prastāva*),⁸⁰⁰ should be treated separately from other compounds of *hṛ* (see Appendix II for details). An example of the corresponding passive is:

(JB 1.140:2-3 = JŚS 1.18.25)

*pratihāra eva +pratihriyamāṇe*⁸⁰¹ *vāk ity udgātā brūyāt*

‘While the pratihāra is being sung, the Udgātar should speak [the word]

vāc.’⁸⁰²

⁷⁹⁹ Note that ms. B2 (B²) of the JŚS consistently reads °*hrīy°* against °*hriy°* in ms. B1 (B¹).

⁸⁰⁰ For a general discussion of quasi-denominatives and their passives, see Appendix II.

⁸⁰¹ Thus emended in CALAND’s script, see BODEWITZ 1990: 251, note 25; ed. RAGHU VIRALOKESH CHANDRA reads *pratihriyamāṇaḥ*. The corresponding JŚS sūtra also has the correct reading (*pratihriyamāṇe*, v.l. °*hrīy°*).

⁸⁰² For the syntax of this passage, see OERTEL 1926: 292; KEYDANA 1997: 136.

II. Middle -ya-presents with root accentuation

***iṅg* (*aṅg*)** ‘move, stir’: -*iṅgya*-^{te} (-*áṅgya*-^{te})

Simplex ŚB 4.1.2.25 = 26(*ániṅgyamānāni* ≈ ŚBK 5.1.2.15 *ánejantaḥ*)(+);
+ *páli* ‘envelop’ ŚB 2.3.3.12 (ed. WEBER *paly-áṅgyamāna*-; other eds.
(⁺)*paly-áṅgamāna*-), 3.9.2.16 (*paly-aṅgyante*)
accented: ŚB 2.3.3.12
• anticaus. (← pass.?)

The secondary root *iṅg*, genetically related to *ej* ‘move’, goes back to the unattested present formation with the nasal infix, **inágmi* / **iñjánti* (WACKERNAGEL 1890: 296 [= Kl.Schr. I, 659]; MAYRHOFFER, EWAia I, 186).⁸⁰³ Its only transitive formation is the -*áya*-causative *iṅgaya*-^{ti} RV +.

The root variant *aṅg*, attested only in the compounds with *páli* (‘envelop’) and *ví*, has probably emerged by dissimilation: °y-i° → °y-a° (HOFFMANN apud GOTŌ 108, fn. 81; cf. also MAYRHOFFER, EWAia I, 186).⁸⁰⁴ Most likely, both root variants synchronically belong together, which is indirectly supported by the fact that the corresponding -*ya*-presents are all found within the same text (ŚB).

The only unambiguously accented form is derived from the *a*-variant:

⁸⁰³ According to JAMISON 80, 109, the -*áya*-present *iṅgáya*-^{ti} is the denominative formation derived from the unattested nominal stem **-iṅgá-*, built to the nasal present **inákti*.

⁸⁰⁴ Other suggestions on the origin of *iṅg/aṅg* are less likely. According to KUIPER (1937: 136f.; 1952: 96 [= Sel.Wr., 281]), *iṅg* is based on the reduplicated present **h₂i-h₂ng-*, with the secondary shortening of *ī*. Improbable is the hypothesis of the phonetic change *a > i* before nasal consonants, proposed by CHARPENTIER (1919: 22ff.).

(ŚB 2.3.3.12)

*sá yáthā rathopasthé tíṣṭhan / upářiṣṭād rathacakré palyáṅgyamāne
upāvēkṣetaivám parástād arvācīno 'horātré upāvēkṣate*

‘And as, standing in the seat of a chariot, one would look downwards from above at revolving chariot wheels, thus one would look downwards from thither at day and night [replacing each other] hither.’

The mss. reading *palyáṅgyamāne* is adopted in ed. WEBER. Indian editions (ed. SĀMAŚRAMĪ [B.Ind.], ed. Kalyan-Bombay, ed. Kāśī, ed. ŚĀSTRĪ) read *palyáṅga*^o (which is marked as a conjecture only in ed. Kāśī), apparently taking this form as a class I present participle, but the present **-āṅga-^{te}* does not exist. Both the root accentuation and the non-passive (anticausative) meaning favour the class IV analysis of this formation. For two other formations non-passive interpretations are also possible:

(ŚB 3.9.2.16)

*gúptyai vā etāḥ pári hriyante; / agníḥ purástād áthaitāḥ samantám pály
aṅgyante, nāṣṭrā rákṣāṁsy apaghnátyaḥ*

‘These [Vasatīvarī-waters] are being carried around for protection; Agni is in front [of the sacrificial ground], and these [waters] move around on all sides, repelling evil spirits [and] Rakṣases.’⁸⁰⁵

(ŚB 4.1.2.25 = 26)

tāni vā āniṅgyamānāni śere / ā tṛtīyasavanāt

‘They (sc. cups and stone) repose without moving until the third [Soma-]pressing.’

Since all middle -ya-presents with root accentuation are old formations, attested from the early Vedic period (RV, AV) onwards, one may assume that *iṅgya-^{te}* (*-aṅgya-^{te}*) has originally been created as the passive of the causative *iṅgáya-^{ti}* (which accounts for its recent character: causative passives first appear in Vedic prose), and subsequently was interpreted as a class IV non-passive present, in analogy with -ya-presents of motion (see Chapter C.II.2.2).

⁸⁰⁵ See RÖNNOW 1927: 59 on this passage.

īr ‘move’: *īrya*^{te}

Simplex ⁺JB 2.42^{2x}:4, 5 (ed. RAGHU VIRALOKESH CHANDRA *īryate*);

+ vy-*áva* TS^p 7.1.5.4;

+ *ud* Ep.+ (also in act. part. *ud-īryant-* MBh.⁸⁰⁶); + *abhy-ud* AVParīś. 64.4.8;

+ *ní* ‘fall’ (of a tree) MS^p 3.9.3^{3x}:116.2, 3, 5

(+ *ví* MS^p 2.1.8^{2x}:9.13, ed. VON SCHROEDER *vīryeta*, read with CALAND ⁺*dīryeta*; see Chapter III, s.v. *dī*)

accented: MS^p 3.9.3:116.2, 3

• anticaus. / (← pass.?)

The secondary root *īr* is built upon the present *īrte*, which, in turn, goes back to the reduplicated stem **Hi-H(e)r-* (cf. BEEKES 1979: 9; MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 105),⁸⁰⁷ later reinterpreted as a class II root present. The intransitive present *īrya*^{te}, based on this root (attested from Vedic prose onwards), occurs in the Saṃhitās in the following passages:

(MS 3.9.3:116.2-5)

*vājro vāi yūpas. tasmād vā imé lokā nīryamāñād bibhyatīśvaró hy èṣó
'sānto nīryamāña imāṃl lokān hūṃsitor. yád āha: divam āgreṇa mā
hiṃsīr, antárikṣam mādhyena, prthivyāḥ sám bhava, bhrājaṃ gacchéti,
śamāyaty evá. śāntá evá nīryata, eṣāṃ lokānām áhiṃsāyai*

‘The sacrificial post is vajra. These worlds are afraid of it, when it falls (or: is being fell), since this Lord, if unappeased, will hurt these worlds, when falling. If [the priest] says: “Do not hurt the heaven in the beginning, the air in the middle, become [belonging] to the earth, go to the splendour” – verily, [he thus] appeases [it]. Thus it falls (or: is being felled) appeased, so as not to hurt these worlds.’⁸⁰⁸

(TS 7.1.5.3-4)

tád antárikṣam ||3|| vyávairyata. tasmād rudrā ghātukā, anāyatanā hí.

⁸⁰⁶ See OBERLIES 2003: 265, with fn. 1, and 396.

⁸⁰⁷ *īrte* can also be explained differently, without recourse to the reconstruction level, as the middle counterpart of the active reduplicated present *īyarti*, built on the model *bibharti* : *bibhr̥te*, i.e. ***iy-r̥-te* → ***iy-ir-te*, later contracted to *īrte* (INSLER 1967b: 255ff.).

⁸⁰⁸ Cf. GELDNER ad RV 6.56.3. For a discussion of the sense and ritual context of this passage, see HOUBEN 2001: 284.

tásmād āhuḥ: śīthilāṃ vái madhyamám áhas trirātrasya, ví hí tát aváiryatéti

‘Then the atmosphere split. Therefore the Rudras are murderous, for they have no support. Therefore they say: “Verily, the midmost day of the three-day night is not fixed; for it split”.’

The simplex passive is attested only in the JB (2x):

(JB 2.42:4-5)

⁺*sa taṃ viṣvaṃcam* ⁺*īryata iti* [...] *vyāno ha vā etaṃ viṣvaṃcam* ⁺*īryate*⁸⁰⁹
 “‘It moves into him in all directions”, thus [one says] [...], since the vyāna-air moves into him in all directions.’

īrya^{-te} is qualified by WHITNEY (1885b [Roots]: 10) as the passive of the secondary causative *īráya*^{-ti},⁸¹⁰ but the root accentuation attested in the MS (2x) favours the non-passive analysis of this formation. In any case, non-passive (anticausative) translations are possible for all occurrences; see ALBINO 1999: 6, fn. 7. Note also that *nīryamāṇa*- corresponds to the non-passive participle *patantam* (that can only mean ‘falling [tree]’, not ‘being fell’) in the parallel Sūtra passage (MānŚS 1.8.1.11), which also supports the anticausative analysis.

Like another secondary ‘-ya-present of motion, *iṅya*^{-te} (*-aṅya*^{-te}), discussed above, *īrya*^{-te} may originate in the passive of the transitive-causative present *īráya*^{-ti}, subsequently re-analysed as a class IV non-passive present, in analogy with the (phonologically similar) -ya-presents of motion, such as *rīya*^{-te}, *īya*^{-te}.

rj ‘direct, stretch’: *rjya*^{-te} (*ṛjyant*-)

rjya^{-te} :

abhí ... rjyate RV 1.140.2;

(*ṛjyant*-)

RV 6.37.2, 6.37.3 (*ṛjyantaḥ*)

(GB^m 1.1.9:8.5 v.ll. *rjyagbhūtam*, *rjyadbh°*, *rgyrgbh°*; ed. MITRA *rjyad*

⁸⁰⁹ Conjectures by FRENZ 3; see also EHLERS 8. Ed. RAGHU VIRI/LOKESH CHANDRA reads *īryate* in both cases.

⁸¹⁰ For this formation, see INSLEER 1967b: 253f.; JAMISON 124.

bhūtam; ed. GAASTRA ⁺*ṛcy ṛg bh^o*)
 accented: RV
 • anticaus.

The middle -ya-present *ṛjyate* ‘directs, stretches’ is a hapax, attested in the late RV:

(RV 1.140.2a)

abhí dvijánmā trivṛd ánnam ṛjyate

‘The twice-born one (sc. Agni) directs (himself) towards the threefold food.’

ṛjyate is the intransitive (anticausative)⁸¹¹ counterpart of the nasal present (3pl.act. *ṛñjánti*, 3pl.med. *ṛñjáte*, part. *ṛñjánt-* etc., mostly employed transitively⁸¹²), probably built in analogy with class IV intransitive presents of verbs of motion, such as *pádyā^{-te}*, *īyā^{-te}* (see Chapter C.II.2.2). Another formation that may have (partly) triggered creating the hapax *ṛjyate* is the passive *sṛjyā^{-te}*, which can easily be depassivized and frequently occurs with the non-passive meaning (‘is set free’ → ‘runs’); see GELDNER 1901 [VSt III]: 27ff. (but cf. also NEISSER’s (1924: 186) criticism); SANTUCCI 1982 and Chapter I, s.v. *sṛj*.

The stem *ṛjyant-* is attested twice, in the adjacent verses of the RVic hymn 6.37:

(RV 6.37.2ab)

pr^aó dróṇe hárayaḥ kármāgman ' punānáśa ṛjyanto abhūvan

‘In the wooden vessel the reddish brown [streams] (= dun horses) went to their work; purifying themselves, they became stretched [in running].’

(RV 6.37.3bc)

índram sucakré rath_iyāśo áśvāḥ

abhí śráva ṛjyanto vaheyuḥ

⁸¹¹ Thus rendered by most translators: ‘eilt ... los’ (GELDNER), ‘se précipite’ (RENOU, EVP XII, 31), ‘кидается’ [rushes] (ELIZARENKOVA). GOTÖ (in WITZEL et al. 2007: 261) translates this present as ‘wird ausgestreckt’, taking it as a passive (‘wohl als Passiv zu faktitivem *ṛñjánti*, *ṛñjáte* spontan gebildet (Augenblicksbildung)’; see WITZEL et al. 2007: 702), but this analysis is rather unlikely.

⁸¹² See JOACHIM 61; HETTRICH 2007: 144ff. For a discussion of the syntactic behaviour of the thematic and athematic forms, see KULIKOV 1995: 104ff.; 2000a: 199ff. On the syntax and semantics of *ṛñjate* etc., see also TUCKER 2002.

‘May the horses yoked to the chariot convey Indra on [the chariot] with good wheels towards the glory, stretching themselves (forwards).’

This form, regarded by many scholars as belonging to the same paradigm as *rjyate*,⁸¹³ displays some features uncommon for -ya-presents and therefore should be treated separately (JOACHIM 61f.). In particular, active -ya-presents are usually not opposed to transitive-causative presents with nasal affixes. Furthermore, the trisyllabic stem (*ṛjīyant-*) attested in both occurrences is exceptional for -ya-presents which almost never occur distracted (see ARNOLD 1905 [Metre]: 100; SEEBOLD 1972: 287ff.). HOFFMANN (apud JOACHIM 61f.; see also TUCKER 2002: 280, fn. 10.) saw in this form the compound *ṛjī-yant-* (‘geradeaus gehend’)⁸¹⁴ – which accounts for the trisyllabic character of the stem. Built as a nominal compound, *ṛjīyant-* could have been assessed as an active present participle derived from the root *rj*, and paradigmatically connected with *rjyate*. The secondary relationship between these two formations could be strengthened by the similarity of the syntactic constructions, cf. *abhī* in RV 1.140.2 and 6.37.3. Although *rjyate* does not occur accented, its non-passive meaning (as well as the form *ṛjīyant-*, secondarily included into the paradigm of *rj*) enables to reconstruct the non-passive (class IV) root accentuation: ^(*)*ṛjya-te*.

The unclear form *rjya[t]* (v.l.) in an unidentified mantra, quoted in GB 1.1.9:8.5 (*rjyadbhūtam* [v.l. *rjyagbh°*, *rgyrghbh°*] *yad asṛjyat, edam* ‘niveśanam anṛṇam dūram asya’), hardly belongs with ^(*)*ṛjya-te/(ti)*. Ed. MITRA (p. 6, l. 10) reads *rjyad bhūtam...*, and this reading is adopted by BLOOMFIELD (VC, 287), SHARMA (1959/60: 85f.) and PATYAL (1969: 11, note 2). SHARMA’s interpretation is inconsistent and improbable: at the beginning of the lemma, *rjyadbhūtam* is hesitantly translated as “die Welt **anordnend**”, at the end – as “als diese Wohnstatt (*niveśanam*) ... geschaffen wurde, **wurde** die Welt (*bhūtam*) **angeordnet** (? *rjyad*, augmentlose 3. Sg. Imperf. Akt. ?)”; thus it remains unclear whether the form is taken as a participle or injunctive, transitive or passive. More probable is PATYAL’s (1969: 11) interpretation (‘the **moving** existent (world) created by that

⁸¹³ See e.g. GRASSMANN 1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 281; WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]: 14; GELDNER 1901 [VSt III]: 27ff.; NEISSER 1924: 186; GONDA 1956: 158f. [= Sel.St. I, 422f.]; LUBOTSKY 1997a [RVWC]: 385.

⁸¹⁴ Cf. also Yāska’s (10.1.3) explanation of *ṛjyantaḥ* as *ṛjugāminaḥ* and Sāyaṇa’s glosses *ṛjugamanāḥ* (ad 6.37.3), *ṛju gacchantāḥ* (ad 6.37.2); see GELDNER 1901 [VSt 3]: 28.

(Brahman) is its debtless (i.e. its own) wide(-expanded) dwelling’). In any case, the form in question (*ṛjyat?*) cannot be passive (“die Welt wurde angeordnet”), nor transitive (“die Welt anordnend”).⁸¹⁵

kā ‘long (for), yearn, desire’: *kāyamāna*-

RV 3.9.2

accented: +

• tr. (intr./tr.?)

The stem *kāya*- is attested in the middle participle *kāyamāna*- (RVic hapax).⁸¹⁶

(RV 3.9.2)

kāyamāno vanā t_uvām ' yān mātṛr ājagann apāḥ

nā tát te agne pramṛṣe nivartanam ' yád dūrē sánn ihābhavaḥ

From the formal point of view, the stem *kāya*- is ambiguous. It may be based on the root *kā* < **keh*₂,⁸¹⁷ thus belonging with the middle perfect *cake* (thus JOACHIM 67f.; MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 334; KÜMMEL 2000: 142f.; LIV 343). Alternatively, *kāya*- might be connected with the set root *kan*ⁱ ‘rejoice’, as its class IV present (cf. *jan*ⁱ - *jāyate*).⁸¹⁸ However, as NARTEN 94f. points out, the individual verbal systems of these two roots as well as their syntactic and semantics can be neatly distinguished.⁸¹⁹ In contrast to *kan*ⁱ, which only

⁸¹⁵ Ed. GAASTRA conjectures ⁺*rcy ṛg bhūtam*, but this reading hardly makes better sense (SHARMA: “im Lied (*rci*) als Lied geworden”?).

⁸¹⁶ I have greatly benefited from discussing the interpretation of the relevant passage with W. KNOBL, to whom my sincere thanks go.

⁸¹⁷ See e.g. PERSSON 574f.; MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 334.

⁸¹⁸ Thus WACKERNAGEL 1896 [AiG I]: 15 (hesitantly). A number of translations connect, in fact, the form *kāyamāna*- with this root, cf. GELDNER: ‘Wenn du, der du an den Hölzern deine Freude hast ...’. Against the analysis of *kāya*- as a class I present based on a *ṛ*-root, i.e. of the type *gā(ṛ)* ‘sing’ – *gāy-a-ti*, see PERSSON 574, fn. 3.

⁸¹⁹ Accordingly, MAYRHOFER (EWAia I, 296f., 334) considers the roots *kan*ⁱ (‘Gefallen an etwas finden, sich freuen’) and *kā* (‘begehren, gern haben’) as genetically unrelated: “Von *Kā* ist *KAN*ⁱ in Konstruktion, Semantik und Herkunft verschieden.”

builds active forms (perfect *cākán-* and sigmatic aorist *akānīṣ-*) and is employed intransitively, *kā* forms the middle perfect (*ák*) *cake*, *cakāná-*, which is mostly constructed with an accusative (see, in particular, HETTRICH 2007: 26ff.). This favours the former analysis of *kāyamāna-*, as a middle participle of the *-ya*-present built on the root *kā*, connected with the accusative *vaná*.⁸²⁰ Accordingly, the construction in pāda a should be interpreted transitively:

‘When you, longing for wood, had entered your mothers, the waters, then your return, O Agni, [was] not to be forgotten,⁸²¹ when you, [though] being far away, [in fact] were here [in the wood].’

janⁱ ‘be born, arise’: *jāya^{-te}*
(*janya^{-te}* Cl.Skt.)

RV + (also with preverbs)

accented: RV +

• anticaus. (pass.: *janya^{-te}* Cl.Skt.)

The present *jāya^{-te}* is well-attested from early Vedic onwards and, as its Avestan (Gāthās) cognate *zaiia-* shows, is one of the oldest Indo-Iranian middle *-ia*-presents. Together with other middle forms of the root *janⁱ* (pf. *jajñé*, medio-pass. aor. *ájani*, sigm.aor. *ájaniṣṭa*,⁸²² etc.; see, for instance, CARDONA 1967: 762ff.; INSLEY 1968a: 313f. et passim; KÜMMEL 1996: 43f.), it is employed in the non-passive intransitive⁸²³ (anticausative) usage

⁸²⁰ *vaná* is taken by most translators as an accusative (GELDNER; RENOU, EVP XII, 57; JOACHIM 66ff.; ELIZARENKOVA). Since neither of the two roots occurs constructed with an instrumental (W. KNOBL, p.c.), OLDENBERG's (Noten ad loc.) interpretation of this form as an instrumental is hardly possible.

⁸²¹ The infinitive *pramṛṣe* is employed here in a passive construction, with the nominative subject *nivārtanaṃ*; on such constructions with infinitives in *-tavāi* (*-tave*) and *-e*, see DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 415, 422.

⁸²² On the genesis of the sigmatic aorist *ájaniṣṭa* and its relationship with *ájani*, see CARDONA 1967: 762ff.; INSLEY 1995.

⁸²³ Collocations like *etám prājātiṃ prājāyata*, *yám idám prajāḥ prajāyante* (TB 3.11.9.5), erroneously qualified by LOWE (1987: 98f.) as a “causative expression”, are in fact intransitive constructions with the content accusative, common with some

(see, e.g., LIV 163f., with note 2), whilst the noun referring to the one who gives birth typically surfaces in the ablative.⁸²⁴ Examples are:

(RV 6.7.3a)

tuvád vípro jāyate vājīy āgne

‘From you, O Agni, is born the inspired one, the prize-winner.’

(ŚB 5.3.5.17)

agnér vāi dhūmó jāyate, dhūmād abhrām, abhrād vṛṣṭiḥ

‘Verily, from the fire the smoke arises, from the smoke the cloud, from the cloud the rain.’

According to the opinion widely spread in earlier Indo-European and Indo-Iranian studies, *jāya*^{-te} (as well as its Iranian cognates) is the original passive, with the secondary accent shift in Vedic;⁸²⁵ similar statements still occur in the recent studies, although more rarely.⁸²⁶ There are no sufficient reasons for such an analysis, however. Although a passive interpretation (‘is born by smb.’) is possible *per se*, it cannot be supported by the features of *jan*ⁱ. Note, above all, the lack of constructions with the instrumental of the one who begets (i.e. of the type **tvāyā vípro jāyate*),⁸²⁷ which would be

intransitive verbs (see Chapter A.I.3 and SEN 1927: 360), i.e.: ‘He (sc. Prajāpati) proliferated in proliferative power, in which now the creatures proliferate.’

⁸²⁴ For this usage of the ablative, cf., in particular, OERTEL 1926: 95ff.; 1942b: 143f. [= Kl.Schr. I, 516f.]; SEN 1928: 154; for examples from Upaniṣads, see WECKER 1906: 52f. For a detailed survey of syntactic patterns (with the ablative, genitive, locative) attested with *jan*ⁱ in Vedic prose, see especially OERTEL 1938: 6ff. [= Kl.Schr. II, 1016ff.] and RENOU’s review (1941).

⁸²⁵ Cf. WHITNEY 1889 [SktGr]: 273, §761b (“altered passive”); MACDONELL 333, §444a (“transferred to the radically accented *ya*-class”).

⁸²⁶ E.g. in MAYRHOFFER’s grammar (1965b: 93) [albeit not consistently, see HAUSCHILD 1965: 216]; cf. also HARTMANN 1954: 186f.; ETTER 1985: 215, fn. 290; 245; KELLENS 126ff., note (15); KOZIANKA 2000: 246; WERBA [VIA I] 288 (“intr. Pr. [= Pass.]”). This passive analysis of *jāya*^{-te} may be (partly) due to the influence of the deceptive passive morphology of its European translations, such as Eng. ‘is born’, German ‘ist geboren’, Fr. ‘est né’; see Kulikov 2001: 14f.

⁸²⁷ KOZIANKA’S (2000: 246, fn. 8) analysis of the instrumental *nṛbhiḥ* at RV 6.48.5 as a passive agent is based on misinterpretation of the passage: *sāhasā yó mathitó jāyate nṛbhiḥ* ‘*pṛthivyā ādhi śānavi*’ (the one = Agni,) who is produced (by means of

typical for a true passive (see HOCK 1985-86: 90, fn. 5). As JAMISON (1979a: 137) rightly points out, the ablative does not express agents in the strict sense. Most likely, *jāya-te* belonged with anticausatives, not with passives, from the very beginning.⁸²⁸

The secondary stem variant *janya-*, allowed by Pāṇ. 6.4.43 alongside with *jāya-* (see RENOU 1930 [GrS]: 434f., §312;⁸²⁹ KIPARSKY 1979: 136f., with fn. 66; WERBA [VIA I] 288; SALOMON 1986: 43), appears in late Skt.; according to KIPARSKY, *janya-te* is employed in the passive usage properly speaking.

trā ‘protect, rescue’: *trāya-te*

Simplex RV +;

+ *pari* VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 4.84 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 4.95:10 (= CALAND 1928: 213 [= Kl.Schr., 513]))

accented: RV +⁸³⁰

• transitive

also in nom. deriv.:

-aka-: *trāyaka-* ‘protecting’ VaikhDhS 3.15:145.6⁸³¹

The present *trāya-te*, well-attested from early Vedic onwards, occurs constructed with the accusative and ablative, as well as, very rarely, in absolute constructions. Examples are:

whirling) by men, is born on the top of the Earth’. Of course fire is produced by whirling (*manth*; see Ch. B.I, s.v.), but it is not born by men!

⁸²⁸ See also CARDONA 1967: 764 on the fundamental intransitivity of the verb *jan*ⁱ (‘come into being’).

⁸²⁹ According to RENOU, “refait sur *janati* et en soi non probant”. In fact, this secondary *-ya*-present is rather based on the “causative” *-āya*-stem *jan-āya* (W. KNOBL, p.c.).

⁸³⁰ The abnormal accentuation in *trāyamāṇā-* (a plant name, lit. ‘protecting’), attested in AV 6.107.1, 8.2.6, may be due to substantivization of this participle; see WHITNEY ad AV 8.2.6.

⁸³¹ See WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 148, §47b and WERBA [VIA I] 292 on other nominal derivatives built on the (secondary) root variant *trāy-*.

(RV 7.16.8c)

tām̐s trāyasva sahasya druhó nidáḥ

‘Protect them from deceit, from blame, O powerful one (= Agni).’

(RV 7.35.10a)

śám no deváḥ savitā trāyamāṇaḥ

‘For our good luck [may be] the protecting god Savitar.’

Although *trāya^{-te}* is traditionally treated as a ‘-ya-present, it does not fit into any of the semantic groups of the class IV middle presents, its position in this class being isolated. Nevertheless, there is no historical evidence for considering y part of the root (*trāi-*, thus e.g. FRANKE 1897: 177, fn. 1).

dīp ‘shine, blaze’: *dīpya^{-te/(ti)}**dīpya^{-te}*

Simplex AV 10.7.2, 10.7.4 +;

+ *ava* ĀśŚS 3.10.9;+ *úd* MS^p +; + *praty-úd* ŚB 6.6.2.13, JB;+ *prá* ŚB 9.2.3.37 (+)*dīpya^{-ti}*

Simplex MaitrU 6.35 +;

+ *úd* ŚBK 5.4.1.28^{2x} (*úd-dīpyati* ≈ ŚBM 4.3.4.33 *dīpyamāna-*)accented: YV +⁸³²

• anticaus.

The secondary root *dīp*, built upon the causative stem *dīpáya-*, has early been reanalysed as a primary root (see JAMISON 164, fn. 122; NARTEN 1987a: 155 [= Kl.Schr. 1, 373], fn. 13; MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 728 [with bibl.]; II, 823); cf. nominal derivatives such as *dīpti-* etc. (see LIEBERT 1949: 84). The present *dīpya^{-te}* based on this root is one of the few middle ‘-ya-presents which first appear after the RV, and does not belong to the main semantic groups of the class IV present (see Chapter C.II.2.2). Examples are:

⁸³² With the erroneous accentuation in ŚB 14.6.1.10 (= BĀUM 3.1.10 = BĀUK 3.1.8) *dīpyáte* (mss.).

(AV 10.7.2a)

kásmād áṅgād dīpyate agnīr asya

‘From which of his members does Agni blaze?’

(TS^m 4.7.13.4.i)*ayám agnīr vīrátamo vayodhāḥ ' sahasríyo dīpyatām áprayuchan*

‘Let this most manly, strength-bestowing, thousandfold, attentive Agni shine here.’

(MS^p 1.6.5:95.4-5)*agnér vái sṛṣṭásya téjā úd adīpyata*

‘The splendour of Agni, when he was created, blazed up (from him).’

dīpya^{-te} becomes very common in the Brāhmaṇas, especially in the ŚB, where it is employed as a cover-term glossing a variety of other verbs in quotations, including not only verbs of lightening or burning (*śuc*, *dī*, etc.), but also such semantically unrelated verbs as *mand* ‘become exhilarated’ or *úd-r* ‘raise’; cf. JAYASURIYA 1957: 163f.; JAMISON 1987: 174f., with examples.

Active forms

The only active form (with *úd*, with the same meaning as middle) appears in Vedic in the ŚB (Kāṇva):

(ŚBK 5.4.1.28 ≈ ŚBM 4.3.4.33)

yád vái kíṃca devátāyām abhyādádhati, bhūyo-bhūyo vái sá ténód dīpyati

‘For when he bestows anything to a deity, thereby that [deity] shines more and more.’

For post-Vedic (Epic) attestations of active forms, see, in particular, OBERLIES 2003: 446f.

²*pat* ‘rule; possess’: *pátya*^{-te}

Simplex RV–YV^m;

+ *abhí* RV 10.132.3, (?) AVP-Kashm. 13.14.17 *abhi-patyamāne* ≈

AVP-Or. 13.9.1.[5] *abhi-paśyamāne*⁸³³

accented: RV +

• intransitive/transitive (I/T)

The present *pátya*⁻^{te} ‘rule, possess’ is an old denominative based on the -i-stem *pāti*- ‘lord’ (i.e. **poti-e-*; cf. SZEMERÉNYI 1964: 365f.; MAYRHOFER, EWAia II, 72), early reinterpreted as a -ya-present.⁸³⁴ By virtue of its semantics, this verb could not be grouped with -yá-passives, which may account for its root (non-passive) accentuation.⁸³⁵

pátya⁻^{te} is attested with the accusative of the possessed object or with the locative (‘rule over smth.’) as well as in objectless constructions (for details, see HETTRICH 2007: 94ff.). Examples are:

(RV 1.84.9cd)

ugráṃ tát patyate śáva ' indro aṅgá

‘Indra possesses this terrible force, indeed.’

(RV 3.54.11ab)

híraṇyapāṇiḥ savitā sujihvās ' trír ā divó vidáthe pátyamānaḥ

‘The golden-handed Savitar, with the excellent tongue, three times a day ruling over the sacrifice.’

(RV 10.113.7d)

indro mahnā pūrváhūtāv apatyata

⁸³³ Both readings are semantically possible: *mahāntaṃ lokam abhipaśyamāne / abhipatyamāne* ‘watching / ruling over the great world’; cf. HOFFMANN’s (1970: 67 [= Aufs. 2, 522], fn. 7) translation of the Kashmir version (*abhipatyamāne*): ‘die ihr euch einer großen Welt bemächtigt’.

⁸³⁴ As MEILLET repeatedly pointed out (e.g. 1898: 139; 1900: 308), one might expect the denominative **patīyáte*, which does not exist, however. In order to account for the actually attested formation, he connected it with the unattested root stem **pot-*. However, as SZEMERÉNYI (op. cit., 378f.) explained, MEILLET’s objection does not hold for Proto-Indo-European, from which the formation in question dates: *pátyate* must represent an older denominative type (**poti-e-toi*), not a -ye/o-denominative.

⁸³⁵ GELDNER (1898: 755), relying upon Sāyaṇa’s glosses on RV 3.56.5 *pátyamānāḥ* (*āgacchantyo bhavanti*) and 3.54.11, suggested that the root could have been confused with ¹*pat* ‘fly, fall’, i.e. that in some passages it was understood as a verb of motion (e.g. *trír ā divó vidáthe pátyamānaḥ* RV 3.54.11b ‘dreimal des Tages zu dem Priesterkonvent eilend’) and thus was secondarily grouped with the middle -ya-presents of motion (see Chapter C.II.2.2).

‘Through his greatness Indra possessed of the first oblation.’

pátya^{-te} becomes less frequent in the young mantras and disappears in Vedic prose.⁸³⁶

***pad* ‘fall, move’: *pádya*^{-te/(ti)}**

pádya^{-te}:

RV + (also with preverbs)

accented:

pádya:- RV +

-padyá:- ŚB 11.1.6.30 (*āpadyáta*), 14.1.4.9^{2x} (ed. WEBER *ánipadyamāna*- [= RV 1.164.31 = 10.177.4 = VS 37.17], v.l. *ánipadyámāna*-)

padya^{-ti}:

+ *ā* ĀrṣB 1.6, PraśU 2.3 (impv. *mā* ... *āpadyatha*, for °-*ta*; ed. BÖHTLINGK °*paddhvam*);

+ *prá* (RVKh. 4.2.7 mss. *prapádyanti*, ed. AUFRECHT °*nte*; AVP 7.13.10-Or., mss. *prapadyanti*, ed. DIPAK BHATTACHARYA, ed. GRIFFITHS °*nte*), TĀ 10.43.1 = MNU 17.1 [= ed. VARENNE 277] *prapadyāmi*, MānGS 2.13.6.g *-padyeyam*;

(+ *vi* ĀrṣU ed. BELVALKAR 1.14 *-padyat*, TSUJI (1957: 21f.) °*padyet* – *-yet*-optative)⁸³⁷

• anticaus.

pass. of caus.: *-pādya*^{-te}

+ *pra* ‘make enter, bring (into)’ AB 1.30.20, KB +

The intransitive *pádya*^{-te}, well-attested from the RV onwards, is a typical representative of the middle *-ya*-presents, refers to a variety of types of motions, mostly coming about spontaneously and directed downwards (falling, lying down, etc.; see STRUNK 1977: 979; GOTÖ 280, fn. 650).

⁸³⁶ Cf., in particular, KpS^m 29.5:133.7 (≈ VS 27.16c = MS^m 2.12.6:150.9 = KS^m 28.17:277.18 = TS^m 4.1.8.2.f), where the original *pátyamānāḥ* (attested in the other Saṃhitās of the YV), being probably unfamiliar to the redactors of the text, has been replaced with *pacyamānāḥ* (see OERTEL 1934b: 192 [= Kl.Schr. I, 622]).

⁸³⁷ ChU 3.17.6 *pratipadyet* in ed. SENART (against *pratipadyeta* in other eds.) is a misprint of the editor, corrected by CALAND (1931b: 153).

Examples are:

(AV 3.19.3a)

nīcāiḥ padyantām ádhare bhavantu
‘Let [our enemies] fall, let them become inferior.’

(ŚB 11.1.6.32)

ékam hy ètásya parvātha; yád apárvakam syāt, prátṛṇṇam vaivá tīṣṭhel
lāmbeta vā. tásmād etád úc ca tīṣṭhati pádyate ca
‘For that [male organ] has one joint; and if it were jointless, it either
would only stand erect, or it would [only] hang down. But thus it both
stands erect and falls down.’ (see HOFFMANN 1974: 20 [= Aufs. 1, 332],
fn. 12).

Examples with preverbs (mostly specifying the direction of motion) are:

- with *ápa*:

(AV 4.28.5a)

yáyor vadhān nápapádyate kás caná
‘From whose (sc. Bhava and Śarva’s) deadly weapons nobody escapes ...’

- with *áva*:

(AV 5.17.7)

yé gárbhā avapádyante ' jágad yác cāpalupyáte
vīrá yé tṛhyánte mithó ' brahmajāyá hinasti tán
‘What embryos are aborted, what leaving creatures are torn away, what
heroes are shattered by each other – them the Brahman’s wife injures.’⁸³⁸

Some compounds are constructed with the accusative nominal, which is
not a true direct object, however,⁸³⁹ cf.:

- with *á*:

(ŚB 1.6.4.18)

sò 'sya vyáttam á pádyate
‘He enters into his open mouth.’

(ŚB 11.1.6.30)

átha yát sviṣṭakṛte sárveṣāṃ havīṣāṃ samavadyáti, tásmād yát kíṃcemán

⁸³⁸ For a discussion of this passage, see Chapter I, s.v. *tṛh*.

⁸³⁹ See Chapter C.II.1.3.2 and S. SEN 1927: 369f. (with examples of constructions
with *áti-pad*, *á-pad*, *práti-pad* and some other compounds).

prāṇān āpadyāta,⁸⁴⁰ *etām evā tát sārvaṃ samāvaiti*
 ‘... and because for Sviṣṭakṛt he cuts portions from all sacrificial dishes,
 therefore, whatever enters these [channels of the other] breathings, meets
 in [the channel of] that [breathing].’

- with *prá*:

(AV 5.6.11)

indrasya gṛhò 'si; tám tvā prá padye
 ‘You are Indra’s house; to you I go forth.’

Compounds with *ní* are employed in the idiomatic sense ‘lie down with
 a sexual partner, copulate’, cf.:⁸⁴¹

(RV 10.162.5abd)

yás tvā bhrātā pátir bhūtvā 'jāró bhūtvā nípadyate
 [...] *tám itó nāśayāmasi*
 ‘We drive away the one who, having become [your] brother, husband,
 having become [your] lover, copulates with you.’

(AV 14.2.32)

devā ágre n₁y āpadyanta pátinīh ' sám asprśanta tan₁vās tanúbhih
 ‘In the beginning the gods lay with their wives; they touched bodies with
 bodies.’

Active forms

The only active occurrence in the mantras (probably a corrupt form) is
 attested in RVKh. [ed. SCHEFTELOWITZ] 4.2.7a (mss.) *yé tvāṃ devī*
prapádyanti ‘the ones who approach you, O goddess ...’; ed. AUFRECHT
 [10.127.7a] emends to ⁺*pádyante*; see also SCHEFTELOWITZ, ad loc., p. 112
 and OERTEL 1931c: 238 [= Kl.Schr. I, 613]. Likewise, the form *prapadyanti*
 attested in the Orissa mss. of AVP 7.13.10 should be emended to
⁺*prapadyante*; see GRIFFITHS 2009: 393. The earliest reliable active
 occurrence (also with the preverb *pra*) appears in late Vedic:

⁸⁴⁰ This is the only occurrence of *padya-te* with suffix accentuation. The erroneous
 accentuation does not originate in the passive semantics (cf. MINARD (1956: 337,
 [§]913, fn. a): “*padyáte* n’a de passif que l’accent”), but may be triggered by the
 adjacent *avadyáti* (LUBOTSKY, p.c.).

⁸⁴¹ See, in particular, FORSSMAN 1996: 52f.; SCARLATA 298.

(TĀ 10.43.1 = MNU 17.1 [= ed. VARENNE 277])

sadyojātaṃ prapadyāmi

‘I seek refuge with the newly-born one (sc. Śiva).’

Other few active occurrences are post-Vedic, for instance:

(ĀrṣB 1.6)

... *sthāṇuṃ vārchati gartaṃ vā padyati, pra vā mīyate*

‘... he reaches immobility, or comes to a hole (= misery), or perishes.’

(PraśU 2.3)

*mā moham āpadyatha*⁸⁴²

‘Do not fall into delusion.’

The form *-padyat* in ĀrṣU (ed. BELVALKAR 1.14: *vīva padyad ārtim ṛcchet* ‘he would perish, he would run into misfortune’), which should probably be read *+padyet* (TSUJI 1957: 21f.), may represent a *-yet*-optative; see KULIKOV 2006d: 34.

Caus. pass.

The passive *pādya-te*, built to caus. *pādāya-ti/te* RV^{1x} + (see JAMISON 148), first appears in the RVic Brāhmaṇas (AB, KB). An example is:

(KB 9.6.7-8)

atha pūrvayā dvārā rājānaṃ pra pādayanti | tasmin prapādyamāne, tam asya rājā varuṇas tam aśvineti

‘Then they make the king (sc. Soma) enter through the eastern door; while he is being made enter, [he recites to him]: “The king Varuṇa [follows] this [mental power] of his, the Aśvins [follow it] ...” [RV 1.156.4].’

-i-aorist

For the *-i/-ran*-aorist (3sg.inj. *pādi* RV–YV^m, 3pl. *apadran* RV 6.20.4) and other forms attested in the same intransitive usage as *pādya-te*, see NARTEN 167; INSLEER 1968a: 315ff. et passim; KÜMMEL 1996: 70.

To conclude the discussion of the root *pad*, one should mention that in some formations (causative, some nominal derivatives) it was secondarily replaced with *pat* and *path* in the texts of the Śāṅkhāyana school (KB, ŚŚS);

⁸⁴² *mā* is impossible with indicative, but forms in *-tha* sometimes substitute for the regular imperatives in *-ta* in the Upaniṣads; see SALOMON 1991: 52f. Ed. BÖHTLINGK (1890: 182) suggests a heavy and improbable conjecture *+paddhvam*.

see HOFFMANN 1965b: 181f. [= Aufs. 1, 172f.]. This replacement does not occur in the *-ya*-present *pádya-te*, but is attested in the medio-passive *-i*-aorist *āpāti* ‘he approached’ KB 14.2.28⁸⁴³ (for *āpādi*); see HOFFMANN, *ibid.* Cf. also the secondary synonymy of *ava-pad* and *pat* in the sense ‘be discharged’ (of an embryo), noticed by HOFFMANN (1965b: 190 [= Aufs. 1, 181], fn. 6).

***pyā* ‘fill, swell’: (-)pyāya-^{te}**

pyāya-te :

Simplex TB^m 3.10.1.1;

+ *ā* RV +; + *anv-ā* MS^p 2.2.7:21.11, ŚBK 1.1.4.14;

+ *pra* RV 9.67.28, AVP 5.7.7 (Kashm. *prā*), AVŚ 4.15.11 *prā pyāyatām* = AVP 5.7.10⁸⁴⁴ (Kashm. ms. *prā*^o; ed. BARRET, Or. *pra*^o ≈ RV 5.83.6b [tr.] *prā pinvata*), TS^p 1.6.11.4^{2x}

accented: RV +

• anticaus.

pyāya-ti :

(AVP-Kashm. 3.25.2 ms. *pāhet*, improbable WHITNEY [ad AVŚ 4.11.4], BARRET, RENO ⁺*pyāyet*; ed. RAGHU VIRA ⁺*pyāyayet* ≈ AVP-Or. [all mss.] *ā* ... *pyāyeti* [= *-pyāya-iti?*], ed. DURGAMOHAN BHATTACHARYA and ed. DIPAK BHATTACHARYA ⁺*pyāyeta* ≈ AVŚ 4.11.4 *ā* ... *pyāyayati*), Up.-Sū.^m

The intransitive present *pyāya-te* almost exclusively occurs in compounds with the preverb *ā* and, less frequently, with *prā*. The majority of the mantra occurrences are imperatives (*-pyāyasva*, *-tām*, *-ntām*) and participles, as, e.g., in:

(RV 1.93.12b)

ā pyāyantām usrīyā havyasūdaḥ

‘Let [our] reddish [cows], providing the oblation, become filled up [with milk].’

⁸⁴³ Ed. LINDNER *āpati*, v.l. *āyāti*.

⁸⁴⁴ The Kashmirian ms. has the long *ā* in the preverb in both cases (*prā pyāyasva*, *prā pyāyatām*), but ed. BARRET conjectures *a* (*pra pyāyasva*, *pra pyāyatām*), and this reading is supported by both the Orissa mss. and the Śaunakīya recension, which invariably read *prā*.

Indicative forms are rare in early Vedic (-*pyāyase* RV 10.85.5, -*pyāyate* AVP 7.19.8, RVKh. 5.3.4 = TĀ^m 1.9.6). The earliest attestation of an indicative form (2sg.med.) is:

(RV 10.85.5ab)

yāt tvā deva prapībanti ' tāta ā pyāyase pūnaḥ
 'When they drink you, O god (sc. Soma), then you swell again.'

The only simplex form (the substantivized participle *pyāyamānā*), attested in a TB mantra,⁸⁴⁵ is a calendar term – the name of the seventh of the 15 nights of the bright fortnight, preceded by *āpyāyamānā*, which seems to differ from the simplex *pyāyamānā* by the inchoative meaning:

(TB^m 3.10.1.1)

... *āpyāyamānā; pyāyamānā; pyāyā ...*
 '... [the night in which the moon] begins to swell; [the night in which the moon is] swelling; [the night in which the moon is] swollen ...'

Active forms

The form ⁺*pyāyet* (AVP-Kashm. 3.25.2), hesitantly conjectured by WHITNEY (ad AVŚ 4.11.4) for Kashm. ms. *pāhet* and adopted by BARRET and RENOU (1957a: 66; 1957b: 92), is improbable. Consider the Śaunakīya recension:

(AVŚ 4.11.4ab)

anaḍvān duhe sukṛtāsya lokā ' āinaṃ pyāyayati pāvamānaḥ purāstāt
 'The draft-bull gives milk in the world of the virtue; Pavamāna fills him from the front (or: from the east).'

An -āya-causative is syntactically possible in the context, but does not suit the metre. The Paippalāda mss. attest the impossible forms *pāhet* (Kashm.) and *pyāyeti* (Or.). Ed. RAGHU VIRA proposes a compromise reading between the Śaunakīya and the Kashmir versions: ⁺*pyāyayet*. WHITNEY's conjecture ⁺*pyāyet* would be metrically more attractive, but the active inflection (with the causative meaning?) is impossible with the stem *pyāya-* in Vedic. Ed. DURGAMOHAN BHATTACHARYYA, and, subsequently, ed. DIPAK BHATTACHARYYA conjecture ⁺*pyāyeta*, which does not suit the syntax of the sentence, however (unless one assumes that *pyāya-*^{le} can be employed

⁸⁴⁵ Cf. WERBA [VIA I] 444.

transitively, which is unlikely). Note also that optative forms from the stem *pyāya-* do not occur elsewhere. It remains unclear which form underlies the attested readings, but it can hardly be a *-ya*-present.

Forms with the active inflection first occur in post-Vedic texts. Some active forms are employed transitively, resulting probably from haplology of caus. *-pyāyayati*, as, e.g., in VārŚS 1.2.1.7 *āpyāyadhvam aghnyā devebhyā indrāya bhāgam ity āpyāyati*⁸⁴⁶ “‘Swell, O cows, O share [of gods], for the gods, for Indra!’” [MS^m 1.1.1:1.3 ≈ KS^m 1.1:1.2 ≈ TS^m 1.1.1.1.d etc.] – with this [mantra] he makes [them] swell.⁸⁴⁷

The 3pl.impv.act. form *āpyāyantu* is attested in the introductory prayer of a few post-Vedic Upaniṣads (KenaU^m, AvyaktaU^m), quoted also in PārGS [ed. STENZLER] 3.16 = [ed. BĀKRE] 3.15.23: *āpyāyantu mamāṅgāni* [PārGS *me 'ṅgāni*] *vāk prāṇas cakṣuḥ śrotam* ... ‘let my limbs, my voice, my breath, my eye, my ear swell strong ...’ (see DUMONT 1940: 340, with fn. 3); BÖHTLINGK (1896b: 11) conjectures the middle imperative ⁺*āpyāyantām* (for the PārGS).

Caus. pass.

For the causative passive *-pyāyyá-^{te}* (VS, ŚB +), see Chapter I, s.v.

budh α ‘(a)wake’; β ‘perceive, notice’: *búdhya-^{te}*

búdhya-^{te}:

(α/β):

Simplex (α) RV, AV, JB 3.197:7 [ed. CALAND §197] +;

(β) KB [ed. LINDNER] 26.4, 26.5^{2x} (not in ed. SARMA) +;

+ *úd* (α) RV 10.101.1, VS 15.54 = 18.61 (= ŚB^m 8.6.3.23 (or (β)?) ≈ 9.5.1.47) ≈ TS^m 4.7.13.5m = MS^m 2.12.4:148.6 = KS^m 18.18:278.18 = KpS^m 29.6:134.8;

+ *prāti* (α) RV 4.51.10, AVŚ 12.1.62, AVP 2.38.2, 10.6.2, ŚB 14.4.2.21 (= BĀUM 1.4.21 = BĀUK 1.4.10), ŚĀ 5.3 = 6.20 +;

(β) AB 2.31.2^{2x}, ŚBK 5.3.4.7, JB;

⁸⁴⁶ Thus in some mss. and in ed. CALAND. The correct reading *āpyāyayati* is found in another ms., studied by KASHIKAR (1961: 235).

⁸⁴⁷ For similar examples of the haplology *-pyāyayati* → *pyāyati* in late texts (Ep., Cl. Skt.), see KUIPER 1987: 152, 193.

(α):

+ *prá* AV 14.2.75, YV^p, ŚB +;+ *ví* RVKh. 2.11.2 (= ManB 1.1.11 = PärGS 1.5.11 [with *vī*] ≈ ĀpM 1.4.8 = HirGS 1.19.7 [with *prá*])

(β):

+ *ánu* AV(P), TS^p 1.6.7.8, KS^p 34.7:40.19, KS^p 6.6:55.13 = KpS^p 4.5:43.5, KS^p 30.7:189.3, KS^p 13.10:191.22, ŚB, TB, KB 9.2.4 [ed. LINDNER 9.1], JB, (Lost-Br., p.35, 1.9 [ŚātyB, Fragm. XI] *anvava-budhyanta* (?) ≈ JB 3.127:1 *anv-abudhyanta*) +;+ *ava* VaikhŚS 20.37:321.6 (*ava-budhyeran* ≈ HirŚS 15.8.15 *anu-budhyeran* ≈ ĀpŚS 9.18.16 *ava-budhyeta*) +;

accented: RV +

búdhya^{ti}:Simplex (α) +AV 19.67.3 ed. ROTH/WHITNEY +*búdhyema*⁸⁴⁸ (mss. *bú(d)dhema*, *búdhrema*) (+);+ *pra* MānŚS 2.1.3.11 (*pra-budhyant-*) (+)⁸⁴⁹

The present *búdhya*^{te} is well-attested in the intransitive usage α ('(a)wake') from the RV onwards (in particular, in the negative participle *ábudhyamāna*- 'unawakening').⁸⁵⁰ Examples are:

(RV 10.101.1ab)

úd budhyadhvaṃ sámanasaḥ sakhāyaḥ ' sám agnīm indhvaṃ bahávaḥ sánílāḥ

'Wake up unanimously, O companions, kindle the fire, the numerous relatives.'

(RV 1.29.3ab)

ní śvāpayā mithūdṛśā ' sastām ábudhyamāne

'Put the two who appear alternately⁸⁵¹ (or: look differently⁸⁵²) to sleep; let

⁸⁴⁸ Probably under the influence of the adjacent active optatives *páśyema*, *bhávema* etc. (INSLER 1975b: 7, fn. 13; GOTÖ 220).

⁸⁴⁹ For Epic attestations of active forms, see OBERLIES 2003: 470.

⁸⁵⁰ Cf. JAMISON 1982/83: 9ff.

⁸⁵¹ Cf. SCARLATA 231f.: 'abwechselnd schauend; abwechselnd sichtbar' (?); 'Da Indra diese zwei [weiblichen Wesen] einschläfern soll, ist die natürlichste Annahme wohl die, dass sie sich mit Schlafen und Wachen abwechseln. Oder ist einfach

them sleep unawakening.’

(RV 4.51.10cd)

sṛyonād ā vaḥ pratibúdhyaṁānāḥ ' suvīrṇasya pátayaḥ sṛyāma
 ‘Awakening towards you⁸⁵³ from the comfortable [couch], may we
 become possessors of good sons.’

(RV 5.3.6abcd)

vayám agne vanuyāma tṛvótā ' vasūyávo havíṣā búdhyaṁānāḥ
vayám samaryé vidátheṣṇv áhnām ' vayám rāyā́ sahasas putra mártān
 ‘May we, O Agni, with your help, desiring wealth, awakening, with the
 oblation, we, in the competition at the daily sacrificial distributions, win
 over [other] mortals by means of wealth, O son of power.’⁸⁵⁴

As GOTÖ 218ff. rightly points out, *búdhya*^{-te} is opposed in the RV to the transitive class I present *bódha*^{-ti} ‘heeds, perceives, notices’ (see also HETRICH 2007: 108ff.). After the RV, *bódha*^{-ti} almost disappears (except for imperatives, attested in mantras and verses). *búdhya*^{-te} takes over its function (β) and thus can be employed both intransitively and transitively.⁸⁵⁵ Simplex and compounds with *práti* occur in both usages. The compound with *úd* is intransitive, except for, perhaps, a passage in the ŚB where a mantra from the VS is quoted:

ausgedrückt, dass sie verschieden aussehen: die eine hell, die andere dunkel?’.

⁸⁵² Thus JAMISON (1982/83: 9).

⁸⁵³ Or: ‘at your [call]’ (thus RENOU EVP III, 72).

⁸⁵⁴ For the two last passages, cf. also GELDNER's and RENOU's translations. GELDNER: ‘Indem wir vom behaglichen (Sitze) aus euch **heranwachen**, wollen wir Besitzer guter Söhne werden’; ‘Wir wollen von dir, o Agni, begünstigt, nach Gut strebend, mit Opfer (dich **heran**)wachend, ... die (anderen) Sterblichen überbieten’; RENOU: ‘Pussions-nous, **nous réveillant** à votre (appel) d’une couche agréable, devenir les possesseurs d’hommes utiles!’ (EVP III, 72); ‘Nous (autres), ô Agni, puissions nous l’emporter, étant favorisés par toi, étant avides de biens, **nous éveillant** avec l’oblation ...’ (EVP XIII, 20). Some interpreters erroneously take these occurrences as transitive-causative – thus GRASSMANN (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 908f.) for 4.51.10 (‘erwecken’) and VELANKAR (2003: 52, 140) for 5.3.6 (‘rouse’).

⁸⁵⁵ The Avestan cognate *būδiia-* is also attested in both usages; see GOTÖ 220f., fn. 466.

(ŚB 8.6.3.23)

*úd budhyasvāgne prāti jāgṛhi tvám iti / imám etád agním āhóc cainaṃ
búdhyasva, prāti cainaṃ jāgṛhīti*

‘ “Awake, O Agni, be watchful” [VS 15.54[a] ≈ TS^m 4.7.13.5.m = MS^m 2.12.4:148.6 ≈ KS^m 18.18:278.18 = KpS^m 29.6:134.8], thus he says to this Agni, “wake up (towards him?) (or: take notice of him?) and be watchful in front of him!” ’

The accusative pronoun *enam* in the seemingly transitive construction *úc cainaṃ búdhyasva* is probably a mechanic anticipation of *enam* in the next sentence, as the variant of the mantra attested in the TS and ^UKS (*úd budhyasvāgne, prāti jāgṛhy enam* ‘wake up, O Agni, be watchful in front of him!’) clearly shows.⁸⁵⁶

The compounds with *prá* and *ví* are employed in usage *α*, compounds with *ánu* (‘notice; meditate, contemplate’; see GONDA 1965: 352f.) – in usage *β*. Examples are:

(MS 3.2.2:17.16 ≈ TS 5.2.2.6 ≈ KS 19.12:15.12 = KpS 31.2:149.21)

tásmāt prajāḥ suptvā púnāḥ prá budhyante

‘Therefore, having slept, the beings awaken again.’

(RVKh. 2.11.2d (= ManB 1.1.11 = PārGS 1.5.11 ≈ ĀpM 1.4.8⁸⁵⁷ = HirGS 1.19.7 = BaudhGS 1.4.2))

*páutram ānandám abhí ví [ĀpM, ĀpGS, BaudhGS, HirGS prá]
budhyatām iyám*

‘Let her (sc. the mother) experience (lit.: wake towards) the joy of [possessing] offspring.’

(AV 9.1.24)

prajāpaté ’nu mā budhyasva

‘Prajāpati, take notice of me.’

Note that *búdhya-^{te}* perfectly suits two of the main semantic groups of the middle ‘-ya-presents in both usages, i.e. *α* (‘awaken’) and *β* (‘notice’). The former belongs with verbs of change of state (group R1), while the latter should be grouped with the verbs of mental activities (R3); see Chapter C.II.2.

⁸⁵⁶ I am thankful to W. KNOBL for valuable comments on this passage.

⁸⁵⁷ Cf. WINTERNITZ 1892: 54f.

-i-aorist

The “passive” aorist *ábodhi*, *ábudhran/m* occurs in the intransitive usage α only; for this and other formations of the IVS, see NARTEN 178f.; INSLEER 1968a: 315f. et passim; GOTÖ 217ff.; KÜMMEL 1996: 74f.

man* α ‘think’; β ‘respect’: *mánya-^{te}

mánya-^{te} :

RV + (also with preverbs)⁸⁵⁸

accented:

mánya-^{te} RV +;

manyá-^{te} : *manyāśai* ŚB 14.6.9.26 = BĀUM 3.9.26 (= BĀUK 3.9.25),
manyáte ŚB 14.9.2.7 [thus mss. A., M.; ed. WEBER *mányate*] (= BĀUM 6.2.7
 = BĀUK 6.1.7)⁸⁵⁹

• transitive, reflexive; (passive (post-Vedic))

manya-^{ti} :

(*ati manyanti* AVP-Kashm. 18.26.3 [ms. error, read with AVŚ 10.8.35
atyámanyanta], ⁺*manyāni* ChU 8.12.5, according to SALOMON (1981: 97);
 most eds. *manvāni*, ed. BÖHTLINGK, ed. SENART ⁺*manavai*);

abhi-manyanti MuṇḍU 1.2.9; *ava-manyant-* BaudhŚS^v 29.8:380.13;

(*manyet* ViṣṇuSmṛ. 30.47 (≈ VāsDhS 2.10 = HirDhS 1.1.18 *manyeta*) – *-yet*-optative?)

⁸⁵⁸ *āti*, *adhi*, *ānu*, *abhí*, *ava*, *abhy-ava*, *pari*, *sam* (GOTÖ 1997a: 1016).

⁸⁵⁹ The mss. of the late parts of the ŚB (= BĀU) often give corrupt accents, especially in its last chapter (cf. ed. WEBER, crit.app., p. 1186ff.). For *manyáte* attested at ŚB 14.9.2.7 in two mss. (A. M.; see ibid., p. 1182), ed. WEBER emends *mányate* (thus also BĀUM 6.2.7, ed. BÖHTLINGK); another occurrence is left without emendation in both ed. WEBER and ed. BÖHTLINGK:

(ŚB 14.6.9.26 (= BĀUM 3.9.26 = BĀUK 3.9.25))

āhallikéti hovāca yājñavalkyo, yātraitād anyātrāsmán manyāśai

““O madman (?)”, Yājñavalkya said, “if you were to believe that this (sc. the heart) is elsewhere than in us ...”

Like the former occurrence, this must be a ms. error. WHITNEY (1890: 415) and VWC-Br. II, 1131a, with fn. a, conjecture ⁺*mányāsāi*.

also in: °manyá- RV_I +:

(α) ‘considering oneself Q’ (e.g. in *punya-manyá-* MS ‘considering oneself good’);

(β) ‘respecting’ (in *punar-manyá-* RV 1.117.14)

pass. of desid. ‘doubt’: ⁽⁺⁾*mīmāṃsyámāna-*

AVŚ 9.6.24 (mss., ed. ¹ROTH/WHITNEY *mīmāṃsámāna-*; transl. WHITNEY, notes ad. loc. ⁺*mīmāṃsamāna-* or ⁺*mīmāṃsyámāna-*; ed. ²ROTH/WHITNEY/LINDENAU, Vorwort, p. XIV ⁺*mīmāṃsamāna-* (?) ≈ AVP 16.113.1 (*mīmāṃsyamāna-*))

(ĀśŚS 11.2.6 *mīmāṃsyamāna-*: fut. of desid.?)

The verb *man* is attested in two different usages (JOACHIM 121; GOTŌ 1997a: 1016ff.; KÜMMEL 2000: 362ff.; HETTRICH 2007: 123ff.):

(α) ‘think, consider, believe’ (JOACHIM: “nicht (ein) Denkvorgang, sondern eher eine Haltung, Einstellung”), with the accusative of the opinion or conception. This usage is attested, foremost, with the ‘-ya-present *mānya-^{te}* and the sigmatic aorist (*āmaṃsta*, *maṃsi* etc.).⁸⁶⁰ The common syntactic patterns are: [i] ‘X_{NOM} thinks (that) P’, where P typically is a direct speech construction, often concluded by *iti*; [ii] the bi-accusative construction ‘X_{NOM} considers/believes Y_{ACC} to be Z_{ACC}’;⁸⁶¹ and [iii] in the case where X is referentially identical with Y, the binominative intransitive (reflexive) construction ‘X_{NOM} considers/believes him-/herself to be Z_{NOM}’.⁸⁶² Examples are:

⁸⁶⁰ For the paradigmatic connection of the -ya-present and sigmatic aorist, see HARDARSON 1993: 106., fn. 49; GOTŌ, *ibid.* Instructive is the mantra AV 7.20.2ab ≈ VS 34.8 etc., quoted below, where the YVic Saṃhitās attest pres.subj. *mānyāśai* instead of sigm.aor.subj. *māṃsase* in the AV.

On possible genetic relationships between the root and sigmatic aorists of *man*, see INSLEER 1995: 96ff.

⁸⁶¹ The 3-valent syntactic pattern results from the split of one semantic argument (= P in the 2-valent pattern i) into two syntactic arguments, i.e. the subject of opinion (Y = that one of whom / what X thinks) and the content of the opinion properly speaking (= Z). For such a co-existence of the 2-valent and 3-valent patterns (resulting from subject-to-object raising: *X believes that [Y is Z] ⇒ X believes Y to be Z*), typical of putative verbs (*believe, think*, etc.); see e.g. POSTAL 1974; APRESIAN 1986.

⁸⁶² For a survey of constructions with *man*, see OERTEL 1941: 88ff. [= Kl.Schr. II, 1457ff.].

[i] 'X_{NOM} thinks (that) P':

(RV 8.93.5)

ád vā pravṛddha satpate ' ná marā iti manyase

utó tát satyám ít táva

'Or if you, O great one, O mighty lord, think: "I shall not die" – also that is true with you, indeed.'

(RV 7.2.7b)

mānye vām jātavedasā yājadhyai

'I think of worshipping you, the two Jātavedases.'⁸⁶³ (P = an infinitive construction)

[ii] 'X_{NOM} considers/believes Y_{ACC} to be Z_{ACC}':

(RV 5.9.1c)

mānye tvā jātavedasam

'I believe you to be Jātavedas.'⁸⁶⁴

[iii] 'X_{NOM} considers/believes him-/herself to be Z_{NOM}':

(RV 8.48.6cd)

āthā hí te máda á soma mānye ' revām iva prá carā puṣṭím ácha

'Because of being now intoxicated by you, O Soma, I consider myself like rich. Go forward toward prosperity!'

(ŚB 6.1.1.15)

tāsmād u haitád yáḥ sárvaḥ kṛtsnó manyate, gāyati vaivá gītē vā ramate

'And therefore whosoever considers himself quite perfect, either sings or delights in song.'

Most likely, to the latter subtype also belongs the construction with two accusatives in RV 5.6.1, interpreted by some scholars as an example of usage β ('respect, keep in mind'; see below):

(RV 5.6.1a)

agnīm tám manye yó vásuḥ

GELDNER translates: 'Den Agni **habe** ich **im Sinn**, der der Gute ist'; similarly LUDWIG 1876 [RV übers.]: I, 371 ('Agni, den **mein** ich der der gute...') and, very freely, OGUIBÉNINE 1988: 47 ('A cet Agni j'**offre ma pensée**

⁸⁶³ DELBRÜCK (1869: 88): 'ich richte meinen sinn auf das euch-verehren.'

⁸⁶⁴ VELANKAR (2003: 58, 151) groups this occurrence with RV 5.6.1 (on which see below) and translates: 'I meditate upon you as the omniscient god'.

excitée...). More in the vein of the meaning α ('think', rather than 'respect') are translations suggested by OLDENBERG (1897: 379) ('I **think of** that Agni who is a Vasu...'), RENOUE (EVP XIII, 22) ('Cet Agni qui est un Vasu, je **pense à lui...**'), ELIZARENKOVA ('Я **думаю** о том Агни, который добр ...') and VELANKAR (2003: 55, 145) ('I **meditate on/upon** Agni who is a god ...'). Although none of these translations is semantically improbable, for system-related reasons it is preferable to consistently group all bi-accusative constructions (pattern α.ii) together and to translate the passage in question as 'I regard Agni as the one who is good.'

The binominative constructions of the type (α.iii) are often rendered as agentless passives: 'X is considered/believed (to be) Z' ('X gilt als Z'),⁸⁶⁵ cf. e.g. GELDNER's translation of RV 4.29.2:

(RV 4.29.2)

*ā hí śmā yāti nár̥yas cikitván ' hūyámānaḥ sotṛbhīr úpa yajñām
suvásvo yó ábhīrur mányamānaḥ ' suṣvāṇēbhīr mādati sám ha vīráiḥ*
'Denn der Mannhafte (sc. Indra – LK) kommt aufmerksam herbei, wenn
er von den Soma-pressenden zum Opfer gerufen wird, mit schönen
Rossen, der für furchtlos **gilt** und mit den pressenden Männern zusammen
zechet.'⁸⁶⁶

Such interpretations probably rely upon the seeming parallelism with the agentless passives of the verbs such as *dṛś* 'see' (*dṛśyá-te* 'appears') and *vac* (*ucyá-te* 'is called'), q.v., i.e.:

⁸⁶⁵ Cf. JAMISON 150.

⁸⁶⁶ Likewise GRASSMANN (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 990ff.); ELIZARENKOVA ('(тот,) кто, **сбивая** бесстрашным, / Пирует...'). To quote a few more examples of passive translations:

(RV 1.129.5de)

néṣi ṇo yáthā purā ānenāḥ śūra mányase
'Lead us as before. (For) thou **art considered** sinless, O hero' (KLEIN 1992: 68);
likewise ELIZARENKOVA: 'Ты **считаешься** безгрешным, о герой!'

(ŚB 14.9.2.7 (= BÄUM 6.2.7 = BÄUK 6.1.7))

yásmin va útkrānta idāṃ śārīraṃ pāpīyo mányate, sá vo vásiṣṭha íti
'The one of you after whose going off this body **is thought** to be worse off, he is
the most excellent of you' (HUME 1931: 158); 'Bei welchem von euch, wenn er
austritt, dieser Körper in einem schlechteren Zustand befindlich **gehalten wird**, der
ist der beste von euch' (ICKLER 1973: 126).

‘X_{NOM} calls Y_{ACC} Z_{ACC}’ : ‘Y_{NOM} is called Z_{NOM}’
 (e.g.) *They call (vac, tr.) Indra the lord*⁸⁶⁷ *Indra is called (ucyate) the lord*⁸⁶⁸

‘X_{NOM} considers Y_{ACC} (to be) Z_{ACC}’ : *['Y_{ACC} is considered (to be) Z_{ACC}']
 (e.g.) *They consider (man) Indra the lord*⁸⁶⁹ **[Indra is considered (manyate) the lord]*

The parallelism is incomplete, however, and passive translations ('Y_{ACC} is considered Z_{ACC}') should be rejected. GOTŌ (1988: 313; 1997a: 1016, with fn. 77) correctly renders such occurrences as 'sich halten für etw.'⁸⁷⁰ and rightly points out that GRASSMANN's ('gelten für, erscheinen wie, sich zeigen') and JAMISON's ('is considered, appears to be') translations are impossible. In fact, 'sich halten für etw.' exemplifies a typical reflexive construction (X and Y are referentially identical). Since passive usages are impossible for root-accented -ya-presents, the alleged syntactic parallelism 'calls' (vívakti) : 'is called' (ucyáte) = 'considers' (mányate) : (?) 'is considered' (mányate?) cannot be supported by the accentuation of the corresponding -ya-present. Theoretically, one might assume that the passive meaning 'is considered' would be expressed by the suffix-accented *manyá-^{te}, but such a derivative was hardly possible: no verbal root forms both a transitive middle -ya-present and a -yá-passive in Vedic.⁸⁷¹

⁸⁶⁷ Cf. RV 5.52.16.

⁸⁶⁸ Cf. RV 8.13.9 (quoted in Chapter B.I, s.v. *vac*).

⁸⁶⁹ Cf. RV 8.96.4.

⁸⁷⁰ *mányamānaḥ* in RV 4.29.2 was correctly translated as reflexive already by LUDWIG (1876 [RV übers.]: II, 104): 'der **sich** im besitze treflicher rosse **weisz**...'; cf. also WÜST 1958: 56, note 18.

⁸⁷¹ For a few rare examples of -yá-passives derived from the roots which form active -ya-presents, see Chapter C.III.4. Passives counterparts of the middle -ya-presents of mental activities constructed with accusatives (*budhya-^{te}* 'perceive' etc.) first appear in post-Vedic (Ep., Cl.) texts.

One of the earliest examples of the passive usage *manya-^{te}*, belonging with type (β) (on which see below), is found in the NārSmṛ.:

(NārSmṛ.15-16.8)

*pāruṣye satī saṃrambhād' utpanne kṣubdhayor dvayoḥ
 sa manyate yaḥ kṣamate' daṇḍabhāg yo 'tivartate*

'In the case of violence arisen from agitation, if both [parties] are agitated, the one who calms down **is respected**, [and the one] who [keeps] violating is to be

The compounds of *mánya-*^{te} (some of which show idiomatic semantic shifts), also belong to type α, cf.:

- with *āti* ('consider oneself superior, disdain'): ⁸⁷²

(RV 6.52.2a)

āti vā yó maruto mánate no

'Or the one who considers oneself superior to us, O Maruts...'

(AVŚ 10.8.35c = AVP 18.26.3c)

*yá āhutim atyámanyanta*⁸⁷³ *devāḥ*

'The gods who neglected the offering ...'

- with *ānu* ('X_{NOM} assents, grants Y_{ACC} to Z_{DAT}'):

(AV 6.131.2a)

ānumatē 'nv idám manyasva

'O Anumati, assent to this.' (cf. GONDA 1938: 80f.; 1959: 374)

(AV 7.20.2ab ≈ VS 34.8[ab] = ^AKS^m 13.16:199.13 = TS^m 3.3.11.3-4.m)

ān_{uv} id anumate tvám ' mámsase [YV *mányāśai*] *śám ca nas kṛdhi*

'O Anumati, you shall assent to [this sacrifice]; and grant us well.'⁸⁷⁴

(ŚB 9.3.4.5 = 9.4.1.1 etc.)

yásmai vāi rājāno rājyám anumányante, sá rājā bhavati; ná sá yásmai ná

'Verily, the one to whom noble people grant royal power becomes the king; not the one to whom [they do] not.' (cf. RAU 1957: 70)

In usage (β), attested, above all, with the present *manuté* (class VIII in the traditional classification, originally, a -nu-present: **mṇ-nu-tai*) and root aorist (*ámata*, *ámanmahi* etc.), *man* is typically constructed with the accusative or genitive of the deity or his/her aspects (power, name, greatness), meaning 'respect, remember with respect'. An example is:

(RV 4.1.16a)

té manvata prathamám náma dhenóḥ

punished.'

⁸⁷² See HOFFMANN 1957: 93 [= Aufs. 2, 429].

⁸⁷³ AVP-Kashm. *atimanyanti* (with the erroneous active ending), AVP-Or. *atīmanvanta*.

⁸⁷⁴ On this mantra, see AITHAL 1986: 144f.

‘They remembered the first name of the cow.’

The paradigmatic division of the two subsystems of the IVS of *man* (α : ‘-ya-present, sigmatic aorist; β : -nu-present, root aorist) is not consistent, however: ‘-ya-presents are found (although rarely) in usage β . In particular, a few occurrences of the part. *mānyamāna*- appear as members of the opposition *mānyamāna*- vs. *āmanyamāna*- ‘respecting vs. non-respecting [the god]’, and thus can hardly be grouped with type α , cf.:

(RV 1.33.9cd)

āmanyamānāñ abhī mānyamānair ' nīr brahmābhir adhamo dāsyum
indra

‘You have over[come] the ones who are not respecting [you] with those who are respecting [you]; with Brahmans you have blown away the dasyu, O Indra’.

Although some scholars rendered *mānyamāna*- in such usages as ‘thinking’, ‘understanding’ or the like (meaning α , absolute transitive construction),⁸⁷⁵ these translations seem forced and less likely than ‘respecting’; see especially LÜDERS 1929: 285 [= Phil.Ind., 593], fn. 1 (‘die [Indra] achtenden / nicht achtenden’) and INSLEER 1967a: 262, with fn. 3.

Stanza 2.12.10 attests the same usage:

(RV 2.12.10ab)

yāñ śásvato mātīy éno dādhanān ' āmanyamānāñ chār_uvā jaghāna

Here, again, most translators saw an objectless construction of the type α .i: ‘not understanding / realizing [this]’, cf. e.g. LUDWIG 1876 [RV übers.]: II, 55 (‘alle, die große sünde vollbracht haben, eh sie **es dachten**’); GELDNER (‘Der alle, die großen Frevel begehen, mit seinem Geschosse erschlagen hat, ehe sie **sich dessen versehen**’),⁸⁷⁶ EDGERTON 1965: 53

⁸⁷⁵ Cf. e.g. RENO (EVP XVII, 13): ‘tu l’em(portas) sur ceux qui **ne comprennent pas** à l’aide de ceux qui **comprennent**’ (cf. also RENO (1939a: 172f. [= Choix I, 54f.], fn. 1): ‘ceux qui **ne comprennent pas** (leur destin)’); H.-P. SCHMIDT (1968: 209): ‘die Nichtdenkenden’ and ‘die Denkenden’; ELIZARENKOVA: ‘Ты о(держал) верх над **неразумными** с помощью **разумных**’; WITZEL (see WITZEL et al. 2007: 63): ‘... bliest du die **Gedankenlosen** durch die **Gedankenvollen**’.

⁸⁷⁶ Similarly, HILLEBRANDT 1913: 40; LOMMEL 1955: 53 (‘da sie es nicht vermeinten ...’); THIEME 1964: 23 (‘... als sie es nicht vermuteten ...’); KÜMMEL 2000: 597; JEŽIĆ in WITZEL et al. 2007: 369 (‘... ehe sie es vermuten ...’). In the same vein, RENO (1938: 13): ‘les porteurs de la grande crime inconscients de leur sort’;

(‘... before they **know it**’); RENOU, EVP XVII, 58 (‘tous ceux ... qui ont assumé une grande faute, (mais) **ne** (le) **croyaient** pas (possible)’); ELIZARENKOVA (‘Кто каждого, совершающего великий грех, / Поразил копьем – **не успел** тот (это) **осознать**’). However, such translations seem rather forced; furthermore, the meaning ‘suppose, realize, know’, used in some of these translations (GELDNER, EDGERTON, ELIZARENKOVA), cannot be expressed by the verb *man*. The occurrence in question can hardly be treated separately from the preceding one, and LÜDERS/INSLER’s interpretation appears most attractive:

‘[Indra], who, with his missile, struck all those committing a great offense, [all] those not respecting [him]...’⁸⁷⁷

Likewise, the nominal derivative °*manyá-*, based on the *-ya*-present *mánya-^{te}*, attests both meanings α and β. Most common is pattern (α.iii), which is attested in nominal compounds with the second member °*manyá-*, meaning ‘considering oneself Q’, such as *punya-manyá-* MS ‘considering oneself good’; see WACKERNAGEL 1905 [AiG II/1]: 179. Type β seems to underlie the earliest occurrence of °*manyá-*, in RV 1.117.14 *yuvám tigrāya ... punarmanyáu* ‘you (sc. Ásvins), benevolent (lit. respecting again) towards Tugra.’

Still more common are instances of the root aorist employed in usage α (that is, against the general distribution: sigmatic aorist in usage α; root aorist in usage β). Cf., in particular, 1pl.med.subj. *mānāmahe*, well-attested in both usages, as in:

(RV 8.61.11a)

ná pāpāso manāmahe

‘We do not consider ourselves bad.’⁸⁷⁸

(RV 1.24.1ab)

kāsya nūnām katamāsyāmftānām ' mānāmahe cāru devāsya nāma

‘Who is the god, who is the one among the mortals, whose pleasant dear

differently in his later translation (in EVP XVII, 58).

⁸⁷⁷ On the evolution of the meaning of *mānyamāna-*, see also RENOU 1939a: 172f. [= Choix I, 54f.], fn. 1.

⁸⁷⁸ Differently KÜMMEL (2000: 363): ‘nicht als Schlechte wollen wir **gedenken**’.

name we now remember?⁸⁷⁹

Further examples are quoted by HARÐARSON (1993: 104ff., fn. 49), see also KÜMMEL's (2000: 362ff.) criticism and HETTRICH 2005 for discussion.

The frequent confusion of usages α and β with subj. *mānāmahe* might be explained as follows. Given the scarcity of subjunctives derived from both present stems, i.e. *mānya-* and *manó-/manu-* (forms attested in the RV are: 3sg. *-manyāte*, *manāvate* 1x; 1sg. *manāvai* 1x),⁸⁸⁰ one may assume that the lacking plurals (unattested in later texts as well) were supplied by the aorist subjunctives. For the *-nu*-stem this development appears particularly easy: *mānāmahe* could have been secondarily connected with the 1pl.med.ind. form *manmahe* (with the loss of the suffix vowel *u*; see GOTÖ, op.cit., 1017, fn. 82), i.e. interpreted as a subjunctive derived from the stem *man(u)-*.

The Avestan cognate of *mānya-te*, i.e. *mainiia-*, attested from the Gāthās onwards, is employed in both usages, α and β , corresponding to *mānya-te* and *manuté*.⁸⁸¹ Thus, the rare occurrences of *mānya-te* in usage β may represent an archaic feature, going back to Proto-Indo-Iranian, when the underlying *-ja*-present could be employed in both usages (as in Avestan); usage β of the nasal present *manuté* may be an Indo-Aryan innovation.

Active forms

Active forms, first attested in post-Vedic texts⁸⁸² and remaining exceptional

⁸⁷⁹ For the expression *nāma man-* 'remember a/the name', see GONDA 1970: 42, 91ff.

⁸⁸⁰ Note also the total absence of 1 pl.med. subjunctives from *-ya*-stems in the RV.

⁸⁸¹ Cf. BARTHOLOMAE 1904 [AirWb]: 1121ff. In (α) e.g.: *taēca aiiarə mainiēnte yaṭ yārə* Vd 2.41 'they consider the day [that] what [is] the year'; *nmānəm hō maniiāēta para.daṭṭō* Vd 18.28 'he will consider the house to be gifted'; in (β): *yōi nōiṭ aśm mainiiaṇtā* Y 34.8 '[those] who do not respect truth'; *rātqm nəmaṇhō ... maniiāi* Y 43.9 'I shall respect the gift of reverence'; see especially INSLEY 1975a [Gāthās]: 189f.

⁸⁸² AVP-Kashm. 18.26.3 *-manyanti* (quoted above) is a ms. error.

The active subjunctive *manyāni* ChU 8.12.5, adduced by SALOMON (1981: 97), does not exist. Mss. read the abnormal form *manvāni*, which is the only active occurrence of the present *manute* (see ed. MORGENROTH, ad loc. and GOTÖ 1997a: 1017, fn. 88):

(ChU 8.12.4-5)

[4] ... *atha yo vededaṃ jighrāṇīti, sa ātmā; gandhāya ghrāṇam. atha yo vededaṃ abhivyāharāṇīti, sa ātmābhivyāhārāya vāg. atha yo vededaṃ śṛṇ(a)vānīti, sa ātmā;*

until Epic Skt. (when they become more frequent; see GOTÖ 1997a: 1016), are employed in the same usage as the corresponding middles, as e.g. in:

(MuṇḍU 1.2.9b)

vayaṃ kṛtārthā ity abhimanyanti bālāḥ

‘They think [like] children: “We have accomplished our aim!”’ (cf. SALOMON 1981: 97)

The form *manyet*, attested at ViṣṇuSmṛ. 30.47, may be a -yet-optative; see KULIKOV 2006d: 50f.

Desid. pass.

The passive of the desiderative *mīmāṃsa*^{-te} (with the idiomatic meaning ‘doubt’) is attested once in the AV. The Śaunakīya recension gives the corrupt form *mīmāṃsāmānasya*:

(AVŚ 9.6.24 = AVP 16.113.1)

sá yá evāṃ vidvān ná dviṣānn aśnīyān ná dviṣatō ’nnam aśnīyān ná mīmāṃsitāsyā ná mīmāṃsāmānasya

Suffix accentuation is impossible in the desiderative stem *mīmāṃsa*-, which can only have the accent on the reduplication syllable. WHITNEY, ad loc., hesitates between emending the accentuation (⁺*mīmāṃsamānasya*) and the stem (⁺*mīmāṃsyāmānasya*).⁸⁸³ WHITNEY’s translation follows the former

śravaṇāya śrotam. [5] atha yo vededaṃ manvānīti, sa ātmā; mano ’sya daivaṃ cakṣuḥ

‘[4] ... And the one who knows “I shall smell this” – that is the Self (Ātman); the nose is for smelling. And the one who knows “I shall utter this” – that is the Self; the voice is for uttering. And the one who knows “I shall hear this” – that is the Self; the ear is for hearing. [5] And the one who knows “I shall think this” – that is the Self. The mind is his divine eye.’

This occurrence belongs to type (α) (‘think’), so that one might expect here a 1sg.subj. form made from the -ya-stem, i.e. ⁺*manyai* (whence probably SALOMON’s compromise conjecture ⁺*manyāni*). This form is not attested, however. By contrast, the 1sg.med.subj. form from the -nu-stem *manāvai* (which ed. BÖHTLINGK and, subsequently, ed. SENART conjecture for the text) does occur (RV 10.52.1 and repetitions; see GOTÖ, ibid., with fn. 87). The active inflection may be due to the influence of the adjacent active subjunctives *jighrāṇi*, *abhivyāharāṇi*, *śṛṇvāni*; see BÖHTLINGK, op.cit., 108; GONDA 1957c: 281 [= Sel.St. III, 229]; GOTÖ, ibid., fn. 88.

⁸⁸³ See also CHARPENTIER 1912: 113 and GOTÖ 1997a: 1020, fn. 107 (“Akzentfehler oder vielmehr für ⁺*mīmāṃsyāmānasya*”); WERBA [VIA I] 215 and HEENEN (2006:

reading:

‘He who knowing thus, shall partake, not hating, he shall not partake the food of one hating, not of one that is doubted, nor of one **doubting** (?)’.⁸⁸⁴

However, the latter reading (⁺*mīmāṣyāmānasya* ‘of one being doubted’) is supported by the Paippalāda recension, which reads *mīmāṣyamānasya*.⁸⁸⁵ The *-tā*-participle *mīmāṣitā*, abs. *mīmāṣitvā*- KS^p and other derivatives built on the desiderative stem *mīmāṣ-* (see GOTÖ 1997a: 1019f.) show that it has been early reinterpreted as a secondary root (quasi-root), probably due to the idiomatic meaning change (‘try to think’ → ‘doubt’). The passive meaning (‘being doubted’) perfectly suits the context. Note also the common co-occurrence of *-tā*-participles and corresponding present passive participles derived from the same root in the AV, e.g., in 12.5.33 (*paryākriyāmāṇā ... paryākr̥tā*), 12.5.34-35 (*uddhriyāmāṇā ... úddhrtā*, *upahriyāmāṇā ... úpahrtā*; see Chapter B.I, s.v. *hr̥*).

In contrast to the AVic *mīmāṣ[y]āmāna-*, the same stem attested in ĀśŚS 11.2.6 (*talpe vodake vā vivāhe vā mīmāṣyamānāḥ ...*) seems not to belong with desiderative passives (contra GOTÖ 1997a: 1020, WERBA [VIA I] 215). The context virtually rules out a passive interpretation (cf. MYLIUS’ translation: ‘Diejenigen, welche über das Beilager oder Wasser(riten) oder die Hochzeit **im Zweifel sind** ...’). Most likely, this is a future form built on the desiderative stem (*°māṣya°* ← **°māṣ-sya°*, i.e. ‘[those] who will doubt ...’); see s.vv. *yabh*, *rabh* and *rudh* and Chapter C.II.1.2.3 on this rare and late formation.

200) adopt the latter reading.

⁸⁸⁴ Likewise, HENRY (1894: 100): ‘L’homme instruit de ce mystère ne mangera pas point la nourriture de celui qu’il hait ni celle de celui qui le hait, ni de celui qu’il soupçonne ni de celui qui le **soupçonne**’; ELIZARENKOVA (2007: 65): ‘Кто так знает, пусть не ест (пищу у того), кого он ненавидит, пусть не ест пищу у того, кто его ненавидит, ни у того, кто вызывает сомнения, ни у того, кто **сомневается** (в тебе)’.

⁸⁸⁵ This reading is adopted by WERBA [VIA I] 215 and HEENEN (2006: 200).

¹*yā* ‘drive (fast), speed’: *īya-te*
(i ‘go’: -īyate)

RV + (also with preverbs)⁸⁸⁶

accented:

īya-te : RV +

īyá-te : (MS^m 2.6.11:70.12, v.l. [in three mss.] *īyámāna-*),⁸⁸⁷ ŚB^v 14.7.1.14 = BĀUM^v 4.3.14 (= BĀUK^v 4.3.13)⁸⁸⁸

• anticaus.

Apart from a few RVic occurrences of the passive *īya-te* ‘be implored, requested’ (²*yā*; see Chapter IV, s.v.), all attestations of the intransitive present *īya-te* (well-attested in the RV, less frequent in Vedic prose) belong with the verb ¹*yā* ‘drive’. *īya-te* typically expresses fast motion (racing) of a deity, usually driving on his/her car (see HOFFMANN 1968c: 371 [= Aufs. 1, 211], fn. 4; INSLEY 1968b: 2, fn. 3; 1972b: 96ff.; 1975 [Gāthās]: 163; EINOO 1984: 592). Examples are:

(RV 1.144.2cd)

apām upásthe víbhr̥to yád āvasad ’ádha svadhā adhayad yābhir īyate
‘When [Agni] dwelled in the lap of the waters, distributed [over different places], he sucked his own forces, by means of which he moves.’

(RV 5.55.1c)

īyante ásvaiḥ suyámeh̥ir āśúbhiḥ
‘They (sc. the Maruts) speed with their swift horses of easy control.’
(INSLEY 1972: 97)

⁸⁸⁶ Particularly, with *antár, pári*.

⁸⁸⁷ Ed. VON SCHROEDER reads *īya°*, as in the ms. of the Pp.; VS 10.19.a has *rīyamāna-*; see s.v. *rī*.

⁸⁸⁸ This occurrence shows no passive semantics:

(ŚB 14.7.1.14 = BĀUM 4.3.14 (= BĀUK 4.3.13))

svapnāntá uccāvacám īyámāno ’rūpāṇi devāḥ kurute bahūni
‘Being in the state of sleep, going up and down, a god takes many forms of appearance.’

The erroneous accentuation (not rare in the BĀU) may be due to the analogy with the phonologically similar ‘-yá-presents (*jyā/jī : jīyá-te*, etc.); see Chapter C.II.3.6.

Cf. also an example of construction with the goal accusative:

(RV 1.161.1b)

kīm īyate dūtṛyām kád yád ūcimá

‘For the sake of which message does he (sc. Agni) speed?’⁸⁸⁹ What [was that] what we have said?’

The morphological structure and paradigmatic status of the present *īya-te* within the system of the present classes are unclear and have been subject of debate; see MEIER 1931: 39f.; INSLEER 1972: 96ff.; JOACHIM 138f. for a survey and references. To begin with, one should mention BÖHTLINGK/ROTH’s (PW I, 775) and GRASSMANN’s (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 201) analysis of *īya-te* as an intensive of *i* ‘go’, which is certainly impossible, foremost, in view of its root accentuation.⁸⁹⁰ Most scholars take this formation as a class IV present of the root *‘yā* ‘drive’ (cf. WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]: 7; VON NEGELEIN 1898: 37; MACDONELL 1910: 332f. and 1917: 218; VERBA [VIA I] 424) or *i* ‘go’ (INSLEER 1972b; LUBOTSKY 1997a [RVWC]: 270). The most detailed argumentation for the class IV analysis is given by INSLEER, op.cit. Historically, this present is probably related to the transitive-causative pr. *inóti/invati* ‘sets in motion’; cf. INSLEER’s assumption that *īya-te* has arisen as the intransitive counterpart of *inóti/invati* on the model *kṣīyate* ‘disappears’ ~ *kṣīṇāti* ‘destroys’.⁸⁹¹ Synchronically, however, *īya-te* seems to belong with the derivatives of the root *‘yā* ‘drive’ rather than with *inóti/invati*. JOACHIM 138f. rightly points out that the subject of *īyate* (typically, a god: Agni, Indra, Pūṣan) is never the same as the object of the transitive *inóti/invati* (goods, wealth; also an adept set in motion by a god); on the other hand, *īyate* and *yāti* occur in similar contexts, cf. RV 1.161.1 (quoted above) and RV 1.12.4b *yád agne yási dūtṛyām* ‘when you, O Agni,

⁸⁸⁹ For this construction, see GARCÍA RAMÓN 1995: 106f.; GOTÖ in WITZEL et al. 2007: 287, 722 (‘Zu welcher Botschaft eilt er?’). Impossible is ETTER’s (1985: 147, fn. 386) analysis of this occurrence as a passive of *‘i* ‘send’ (‘Welche Botschaft wird ausgesandt?’ or ‘Wird eine Botschaft ausgesandt?’). This verbal root does not form *-yá*-passives.

⁸⁹⁰ See esp. WHITNEY 1892: 288; INSLEER, op.cit., 99.

⁸⁹¹ Less likely seems the analysis of *inóti* as going back to an unattested hypothetical **ināti* (suggested already by BENFEY (1875: 198 [= Kl.Schr. I, 323])): we usually observe the opposite development, i.e. class V presents are secondary as against the class VII and IX presents of the same roots; cf. *kṣīṇāti* (RV +) ~ *kṣīṇóti* (AV +), *ṛṇáddhi* (RV +) ~ *ṛdhnóti* (RV₁ +), *jínāti* (RV +) ~ *jínóti* (JB); see SCHMID 1955: 11ff.

speed with message...’.

Relying upon the parallelism of *īyate* and *yāti*, JOACHIM proposes an alternative analysis of *īyate* as a reduplicated present of the root ¹*yā* ‘drive’ (i.e., presumably, **Hi-HīH-toi* > *īyate*, with the subsequent thematization). This analysis is morphologically possible and JOACHIM’s philological argumentation appears quite convincing. However, even given the assumption that *īyate* goes back to a reduplicated present, such a formation was morphologically opaque and could have easily be reinterpreted as a class IV present, in analogy with phonologically similar *kṣīyate*, *jīyate* (note esp. the root *jī/jyā*). Synchronically, *īyate* can only be grouped with ‘-*ya*-presents.

Besides *īya-te* ‘drive’, which can only belong to the root ¹*yā*, whatever the derivational history of this formation, one should mention a few isolated middle present forms of the compound *adhi-i* ‘learn’ (√*i* ‘go’; see Chapter IV, s.v.). In late Vedic and post-Vedic texts, the root *i* was secondarily lengthened in this compound,⁸⁹² which yields, in particular, 3pl.med. *adhīyate* (instead of **adhi-yate*), opt. *adhīyāta*, etc.; see GOTÖ 1990: 1002, fn. 90. Such forms could be reanalyzed as derivatives of the root *ī* (*yā*) on the class IV model, and subsequently grouped with the verb ¹*yā* (*i*) ‘drive (fast), speed’ – whence the rare class IV present forms (cf. EDS III, 1696): 3pl.med. *adhīyante* GB 1.1.28:20.14, JUB 3.1.4.2 [ed. OERTEL 3.4.2] (not mentioned in GOTÖ 1990), Gr̥Sū.;⁸⁹³ opt. *adhīyeta* VārŚS 1.1.3.5 (see GOTÖ 1990: 1003, with fn. 94).⁸⁹⁴ An example is:

(JUB 3.1.4.2 [ed. OERTEL 3.4.2])

tasmād bahvr̥cā udite nivīdam adhīyante

‘Therefore the Ṛgveda-scholars learn the nivīd-formula when [the sun] has risen.’

In conclusion, it should be pointed out that the class IV analysis is not the only possible interpretation for forms like *adhīyante*, at least from the formal point of view. On the basis of the morphological model *kṣi* ‘dwell’ – *kṣiyā-ti*, such forms might equally be treated as class VI presents. The choice between the two analyses cannot be made on purely formal grounds, but

⁸⁹² Perhaps under the influence of such forms as act.part. *adhīyant-*; see WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1957 [AiG, Nachtr. zu I]: 55; OBERLIES 2003: 208, fn. 6.

⁸⁹³ E.g. at BhārGS 3.8:75.14 (noticed by SALOMONS in the introduction to her ed., p. xxix; SALOMONS conjectures **adhīyate* against all mss.).

⁸⁹⁴ For Epic attestations of this secondary present, see OBERLIES 2003: 208f. and 392.

indirect arguments in favour of the former (class IV) interpretation are furnished by the semantic and syntactic features of *adhīya-te*. Specifically, the meaning ‘learn’ perfectly fits one of the three main semantic subclasses of the middle non-passive ‘-ya-presents, namely verbs of mental activities constructed with the accusative, such as *būdhyā-te* ‘perceive’, *mānya-te* ‘think’, *mṛṣya-te* ‘forget’, etc. (see Chapter C.II.2.2). This semantic feature may even have triggered rebuilding of the original root present (3pl.med.) *adhīy-ate* → *adhī-ya-nte*.

The secondary middle -ya-present *adhīya-te* ‘learn’ is homonymous with the post-Vedic (DhSū.+) passive ‘be learnt’; see Chapter IV, s.v. *i*.

rādh ‘succeed, be successful’: *rādhyā-te*

rādhyā-te :

Simplex [i] ‘X_{NOM} is successful for Y_{DAT}’ AV 11.3.11, 12.1.2 = MS^m 4.14.11:233.11, AVP 17.29.5^{2x}, VS 1.5 = TS^m 1.5.10.3 = TB^m 3.7.4.7, 8 etc. (*rādhyatām* ≈ MS^m 4.9.24:137.13 *rādhyāsam*), TĀ^m 9.10.1 (= TaiU^m 3.10.1)^{3x}, KauśS^m 79.18;

[ii] ‘Y_{NOM} succeeds’ ŚB 6.1.2.13;

+ *apa* ‘become wrong’ JB (+)

accented: AV, ŚB

• anticaus.

rādhyā-^{ti} :

Simplex [ii] DhSū. +

The intransitive present *rādhyā-te* ‘succeed, be successful, be favourable’⁸⁹⁵ is semantically and syntactically similar to the ‘-yá-present *ṛdhyā-te* (see Chapter III, s.v.). Both intransitive presents are constructed with the subject of some (divine) values, associated with success and prosperity (cf. pattern [i_{itr.}] of *ṛdh*), and with the dative of the recipient of success (cf. pattern [ii_{itr.}]): [i_{itr.}] ‘X_{NOM} is successful for Y_{DAT}’. Both *ṛdhyā-te* and *rādhyā-te* are opposed to class V transitive-causative presents (*ṛdhnóti*, *rādhnóti*), for which see OERTEL 1926: 32ff. In spite of the obvious phonological similarity,

⁸⁹⁵ For the meaning of *rādh*, see, in particular, JANERT 1956: 60f.; GONDA 1989b: 149ff. (with bibl.); LIV 499f., with note 2.

the two roots may be etymologically unrelated.⁸⁹⁶ Yet we cannot rule out that their semantic and syntactic properties could be secondarily assimilated under the influence of the morphophonological model $CR(C)/CR\bar{a}(C)$, represented by such pairs as $i/\bar{y}\bar{a}$ ‘go’, $p\check{i}/py\bar{a}$ ‘swell’.

Unlike $\acute{r}dhy\bar{a}$ -^{te}, which is well-attested in Vedic prose, $\acute{r}\bar{a}dhy\bar{a}$ -^{te} almost exclusively occurs in post-RVic mantras, from the AV onwards. Examples of the earliest mantra attestations are:

(VS 1.5.a = TS 1.5.10.3.h = TB 3.7.4.7 ≈ MS 4.9.24:137.13 etc.⁸⁹⁷)
*ágne vratapate vratām carīṣyāmi; tác chakeyaṃ; tán me rādhyatām*⁸⁹⁸
 ‘O Agni, lord of vows, I shall perform this vow; may I accomplish it; let it be successful for me.’⁸⁹⁹

(AV 12.1.2d = MS 4.14.11:233.11)
pṛthivī naḥ prathatām, rādhyatām naḥ
 ‘Let the earth extend for us, let [it] be favourable for us.’⁹⁰⁰

(AV 11.3.11)
iyám evá pṛthivī kumbhī bhavati rādhyamānasyaudanásya, dyáur apidhānam
 ‘The vessel for the rice, when it is being well cooked, is this earth, [its] cover [is] the heaven.’

The last example appears in the context of the cosmogonic hymn AV 11.3, where the cooking pot is compared to the earth, its cover to the heaven, and the rice-dish to the universe (cf. GONDA 1968a: 304f. [= Sel.St. III, 442f.]). Note that in both clauses the nominal predicate (marked with *evá* in the first clause) precedes the subject, contra the interpretation suggested by all translators.⁹⁰¹

⁸⁹⁶ There is no mention of their possible connection in MAYRHOFER, EWAia, s.vv.; but cf. GONDA 1989b: 158, with fn. 50; RENOU, EVP XV, 38.

⁸⁹⁷ In particular, in a number of Gṛhya-Sūtras; see PILLAI 1958: 299f.

⁸⁹⁸ The MS variant has the 1sg. precative form instead (*téna rādhyāsam*) and thus displays a different syntactic pattern [ii], with the subject of the recipient of success (‘through it let me be successful’ (?)); see below on ŚB 6.1.2.13.

⁸⁹⁹ See GONDA 1989b: 151.

⁹⁰⁰ See GONDA 1966b: 23; 1989b: 151.

⁹⁰¹ Cf. WHITNEY: ‘This very earth is the vessel (*kumbhī*) of the finishing (*rādh*) rice-dish, heaven the cover’; HENRY (1896: 107): ‘Et la Terre que voici est l’écuelle du

Three occurrences of the present in question in the late mantra TĀ 9.10.1 (= TaiU 3.10.1) are rendered by some translators as passives. The passage runs:

(TĀ 9.10.1 (= TaiU 3.10.1))

etad vai mukhato 'nnañ rāddham / mukhato 'smā annañ rādhyate;
etad vai madhyato 'nnañ rāddham / madhyato 'smā annañ rādhyate;
etad vā antato 'nnañ rāddham / antato 'smā annañ rādhyate

In the eds. of the TĀ, the three occurrences of the verbal form have a horizontal stroke beneath the first syllable with no vertical svarita stroke above the last syllable (*rādhyate*), but the notation “*rādhyate*” hardly represents a real accentuation (*rādhyáte?*). Nevertheless, it may have prompted passive translations, such as, for instance: ‘This food, verily, being prepared (*rāddha*) [for the suppliant] at the beginning, for him (sc. the giver) food **is prepared** at the beginning...’ (HUME 1931: 292); likewise BOETZELAER 1971: 188 (‘If, verily, this food (is) successfully prepared from the best sort, food **is successfully prepared** for him from the best sort...’); ed. ANGOT, p. 492 (‘La nourriture est-elle préparée éminemment, c’est pour lui qu’elle **est préparée** éminemment’). This passive meaning is not attested for *rādhyáte*, however, and I see no good reasons to treat these occurrences separately from other mantra attestations quoted above; cf. especially *rādhya-* ‘(being) favourable’ in AV 11.3.11, also with the subject of food.⁹⁰² The passage in question undoubtedly represents the same usage:

‘This food, verily, (already?) favourable at the beginning, is favourable for him at the beginning ...’ etc.⁹⁰³

rādhya-^{te} almost disappears in Vedic prose (apart from mantra glosses), the simplex occurs only in a ŚB passage and shows a different syntactic pattern [iii] (with the subject of the recipient of success):

(ŚB 6.1.2.13)

só 'gnīm abravīt: tvám mā sám dhehīti. kíṃ me táto bhaviṣyātīti. tváyā

Brouet qui vient à bien, et le Ciel est son couvercle’. — I am thankful to M. ALBINO and W. KNOBL for valuable comments on the interpretation of this passage.

⁹⁰² Note also that Śaṅkara glosses this form with the non-passive (active) -ya-present *sam-sidhyati* ‘is/becomes successful’.

⁹⁰³ Cf. DEUSSEN (1897: 238): ‘... die Nahrung, die jenem zu Anfang Erwähnten gediehen, die wird auch demjenigen zu Anfang gedeihen...’.

*mā cakṣāntai. yó vái putráṇāṃ rādhyate, téna pitáraṃ pitāmahaṃ
putráṃ páutram ā cakṣate*

‘He (sc. Prajāpati) said to Agni: “Restore me!” – “What will I have [for that]?” – [said he]. – “They will call me after you. Verily, whichever of the sons succeeds [in life], after him they call the father, the grandfather, the son and the grandson”.’⁹⁰⁴

The new syntactic construction may indirectly point to the fact that *rādhyā-^{te}* has become (almost) unfamiliar in Vedic prose (ousted by *ṛdhyá-^{te}*); pattern [ii] could have emerged under the influence of the quasi-synonymous active -ya-present *púṣya-^{ti}* ‘prosper’ (see Chapter V, s.v.).

The influence of *púṣya-^{ti}* may also account for the active inflection of *rādhyati* in DhSū., which shows yet another usage, with the subject of a human being. This construction is probably based on [ii], rather than on [i]:

(ĀpDhS 1.12.12)

tad anuvartamāno narakāya rādhyati

‘[The one] who lives according to this [rule] is fit for hell.’

-i-aorist

For the -i-aorist *árādhi*, employed in the same usage as *rādhyā-^{te}*, but dating from the earlier period (RV +), see GONDA 1989b: 150ff.; KÜMMEL 1996: 91f.; for the sigmatic aorist inj. *rādhiṣṭa* (in the same usage), see INSLER 1995: 95. For a survey of the IVS of *rādh*, see KÜMMEL 2000: 422f.

rī ‘whirl, swirl’: *rīya-^{te}*

Simplex RV 1.85.3, 1.135.7, 10.53.8, VS 10.19.a (= ŚB 5.4.2.5)
(*rīyamāṇa-* ≈ MS^m 2.6.11:70.12 *īyamāṇa-*, v.l. *īyá°* ≈ ^UKS^m 15.7:214.20
īyamāṇa- ≈ TS^m 1.8.14.2k *saṃ-cárant-*);

+ *ā* RV 1.30.2, 10.40.9;

+ *prá* RV 5.7.8

accented: RV, VS

• anticaus.

The meaning of the root *rī* (< PIE **HreǵH-*) was convincingly

⁹⁰⁴ For this legend, see GONDA 1986: 49, with fn. 9.

determined by PRAUST (2000b: 1-74) as ‘whirl, swirl; make whirl, set in turbulent motion’; see also LIV 305f., with note 1a. The intransitive present *rīya-te* (opposed to the nasal transitive-causative present *riṇāti*, according to the common paradigmatic pattern; see KURYLOWICZ 1928: 208; INSLER 1972: 100ff.; JOACHIM 22)⁹⁰⁵ occurs six times in the RV and disappears in later texts (only one occurrence in a YVic mantra; note that only the VS [with the ŚB] attests *rīyamāṇa-*, while other Saṃhitās use different verbs of motion). Examples are:

(RV 1.135.7d)

vī sūnīṭā dādṛṣe rīyate ghṛtām

‘The generosity has appeared, the ghee is swirling.’

(RV 10.40.9c)

āsmāi rīyante nivanēva sīndhavaḥ

‘The rivers whirl towards him as unto a valley.’ (see INSLER, *ibid.*)

For the parallelism in uses between the verbs *rī* and *lī*, see the next lemma.

lī α ‘dissolve, disappear’; β ‘adhere, cling’: *līya-te*

līya-te :

α ‘dissolve, melt, disappear’

Simplex Smṛ. +;⁹⁰⁶

+ *vī* RVKh. 5.17.3-4^{2x} ≈ AV 20.134.3-4^{2x} ≈ ŚŚS^m 12.23.1, KS^p

15.5:212.7, MaitrU 6.35 (ed. COWELL, ed. VAN BUITENEN *vlīyante*, ed. “32 Up.” [ĀnSS 29]

vlīy°, v.l. *līy°*, read with ed. “18 Up.” *vi līy°*) +; + *anu-vī* ŚB 14.5.4.12 (= BĀU 2.4.12);

+ *pra-vī* MuṇḍU 3.2.2 (*pravilīyanti*) +;

⁹⁰⁵ Middle forms of this nasal present can be employed both transitively (3sg. *nī riṇīte* RV 1.124.7, 5.80.6, 9.71.2) and intransitively (3pl. *riṇatē*, part. *nī-riṇānā-* RV 9.14.4); see BRADKE 1885: 26.

⁹⁰⁶ Uncertain is the attestation of the simplex in ViṣṇuSmṛ. 20.27: *te ’pi kālena līyante* (thus ed. JOLLY against the reading *nīyante* attested in most mss.), translated by JOLLY as “[they] continually perish by the act of Kāla” (JOLLY) (or, rather: ‘even they disappear by virtue of Time’ (?)). The reading *nīyante*, adopted in ed. KRISHNAMACHARYA, is not impossible (‘they are carried away (?) by Kāla’), cf. KORNEEVA (2007: 109): ‘даже их уносит Время’.

+ *prá* AB 2.14.2^{2x}, ŚB 14.2.2.54 (+); + *ni-pra* (?) AVP 17.12.5 (ms. *-līyanti*, ed. BARRET ⁺*-līyante*)

β ‘adhere, cling, settle’

Simplex MānŚS^v 10.3.7.1 (= MānŚulbS^v 3.7.1), Yā. 6.28⁹⁰⁷ +;

+ *abhi* Ep., Cl.;⁹⁰⁸

+ *praty-ā* KB 15.6.9, 11, 13 [ed. LINDNER 15.5^{3x}];

+ *ni* ‘settle (in a hidden place), hide oneself’ AB 3.22.7^{2x}, ŚB 5.6.2

accented: ŚB 14.5.4.12

• anticaus.

-līya-^{ti}: (AVP-Kashm. 17.12.5), MuṇḍU 3.2.2 +

Although most dictionaries and grammars group together all occurrences of the present *līya-^{te}* (cf. e.g. WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]: 148), one should distinguish between two usages, (α) ‘dissolve’ and (β) ‘adhere, cling’ (both anticausative). As GOTŌ 279 shows, originally *līya-^{te}* could only be employed in usage α (‘dissolves’: ²*lī*), while the class I present *lāya-^{te}* was employed in usage β (‘clings’); in the Brāhmaṇas, *līya-^{te}* has replaced *lāya-^{te}*. According to GOTŌ, these two usages represent synchronically distinct roots. To discuss the adequacy of this lexicographic solution, consider first the Vedic attestations of usages α and β.

The meaning α ‘**dissolve**’ is attested for the compounds with *vī* and *prá*. The only clear mantra attestation is found in a Kuntāpa hymn. The relevant passage is attested in a few slightly different versions:⁹⁰⁹

(AV 20.134.3-4, 6)

[3] *ihéththá prág ápāg udág adharák sthálīpāko ví līyate*

[4] *ihéththá prág ápāg udág adharák śá vai sprṣṭá ví līyate*

[...]

[6] *ihéththá prág ápāg udág adharág aśiślikṣuṃ śiślikṣate*⁹¹⁰

⁹⁰⁷ See WERBA [VIA I] 315.

⁹⁰⁸ For this post-Vedic compound, its attestations and meaning in the Epics and Classical texts, see KNOBL 2007b: 59ff.

⁹⁰⁹ Another supposed attestation of this present in the AVP (Kashm. 17.12.5 *-līyanti*) is unclear. The passage is obscure and perhaps corrupt (*athodanasya suptasya sukhahastāni pra līyanti* [ed. BARRET *atho* ⁺*janasya suptasya sukhahastā ni pra* ⁺*līyante*]), but the preverb *pra* seems to point to usage α.

⁹¹⁰ Thus in ed. ¹ROTH/WHITNEY; ed. VISHVA BANDHU reads *ákṣilīlī púc chílīyate*, mss.

(RVKh. 5.17.3-4)

ihetthā prāg apāg udag adharāk sthālīpāko vi līyate
ihetthā prāg apāg udag adharāk silīpuccho vi līyate

Yet another variant of this mantra occurs in the ŚŚS:

(ŚŚS 12.23.1)

ihetthā prāg apāg udag adharāk sthālīpāko vi līyate
ihetthā prāg apāg udag adharāk ślīlīpuṭ chlīlīṣate

While the beginning line poses no difficulties, the last part is obscure in all versions. As CALAND (transl. ŚŚS, ad loc.) explains, the concluding words, attested in a number of variant readings (AV, ed. ¹ROTH/WHITNEY *āśīślikṣum śīślikṣate* ≈ RVKh. *silīpuccho vi līyate* ≈ ŚŚS *ślīlīpuṭ ślīlīṣate*) represent a magic formula – ‘*ājijñāsenyāḥ* verse’,⁹¹¹ which is morphologically unclear⁹¹² and can be left untranslated. The mantra can be tentatively rendered (after CALAND) as follows:

‘Here, then, in the east, the west, the north, the south, the mess of boiled rice dissolves. Here, then, in the east, the west, the north, the south, *ślīlīpuṭ ślīlīṣate* / *āśīślikṣum śīślikṣate* / *silīpuccho vi līyate* [dissolves].’

Attestations of usage *α* in Vedic prose are:

(KS 15.5:212.7)

tat svayaṃ mūrchatī, svayaṃ mathyate, svayaṃ vi līyate

‘That (sc. the milk) coagulates by itself, is churned [into butter] by itself, melts by itself.’⁹¹³

(ŚB 14.2.2.54)

sá yád vānāspatyāḥ syāt, prā dahyeta; yád dhiraṇmāyaḥ syāt, prā līyeta

‘If it (sc. the vessel) were made of wood, it would burn up; and if it were

pūcchi līṣate, pūkṣṇī līṣate, puślīṣate, etc.

⁹¹¹ *vi līyate* in RVKh. 5.17.4 may be a *lectio facilior*, perhaps triggered by *vi līyate* in the preceding line.

⁹¹² WHITNEY apparently saw here two forms (an *-u*-adjective and 3sg.med.) made from the desiderative stem derived from *śliṣ* ‘adhere, stick’ (for this verb, see Chapter V, s.v.), but it cannot be ruled out that they belong in fact to *lī* (attested in verses 3 and 4): ⁺*līlīṣu-* (or mss. *līlīpu-*) and ⁺*līlīṣate*.

See also SHARMA 1959/60: 120f., 280 for etymological suggestions.

⁹¹³ For this passage, see Chapter I, s.v. *manth*.

made of gold, it would dissolve.’ (see RAU 1973: 23f.)

(AB 2.14.2)

sā vā eṣā reta eva yad vapā. preva vai reto līyate, preva vapā līyate
 ‘Verily, this omentum is seed. The seed dissolves (disappears) as it were,
 the omentum dissolves (disappears) as it were.’

(ŚB 14.5.4.12 (= BĀU 2.4.12))

sā yāthā saindhavakhilyā udaké prāsta udakām evānuvilīyeta
 ‘Like a lump of salt, thrown into the water, dissolves along that very
 water ...’,⁹¹⁴

The same usage is attested in the following Upaniṣadic passage:

(MaitrU 6.35)

tasminn eva yajamānāḥ saindhava iva v(i)līyante

Editions disagree in the reading of the verbal form: ed. COWELL, and subsequently ed. VAN BUITENEN, read *vlīyante*, ed. “32 Up.” [ĀnSS 29] also gives this form, with v.l. *līyante*; ed. “18 Up.” has *vi līyante*. Both COWELL and VAN BUITENEN (p. 150) translated the form in question as ‘sink’,⁹¹⁵ which, in my opinion, is incorrect. In fact, salt does not sink in water, it dissolves. *vlīyate* ‘crushes, collapses’ does not display this meaning (see Chapter IV, s.v.), but it is attested for *līyate* (also with *vī*) in another Upaniṣadic passage, BĀU 2.4.12, quoted above. Thus, the reading *vi līyante* seems most probable for MaitrU 6.35:⁹¹⁶ ‘in it the sacrificers disappear/dissolve like salt [dissolving in water]’ (thus MÜLLER 1884: 336; DEUSSEN 1897: 360; see also TSUI 1955: 95).

Usage β ‘adhere, cling, settle’ first occurs in the Brāhmaṇas, with the preverbs *praty-ā* and *ni*. The relevant passages are:

- with *praty-ā*:

(KB 15.6.9 [ed. LINDNER 15.5])

pavamāne stūyamāne hotāraṃ mṛtyuḥ pratyālīyata
 ‘While the Pavamāna was being chanted, death clung to the Hotar.’⁹¹⁷

- with *nī*, with the idiomatic meaning ‘settle (in a hidden place), hide

⁹¹⁴ For this passage, see, in particular, HANEFELD 1976: 100ff.

⁹¹⁵ COWELL: ‘in that (ocean) the worshippers are drowned’; VAN BUITENEN: ‘in it (sc. UD; see VAN BUITENEN, p. 56f. – LK) the sacrificers sink as in a sea.’

⁹¹⁶ See F.M. MÜLLER 1884: 336, fn. 2.

⁹¹⁷ See OERTEL 1926: 290; KNOBL 2007b: 60f.

oneself’.⁹¹⁸

(AB 3.22.7)

tad yathaivādaḥ snuṣā śvaśurāl lajjamānā nilīyamānaity, evam eva sā senā bhajyamānā nilīyamānaiti

‘Just as there (i.e. in real life) a daughter-in-law keeps shying away and hiding herself from the father-in-law, so also that army [of the enemy] keeps breaking up and hiding itself.’

(ṢB 5.6.2)

yadā [...] madhūni vā nilīyante

‘... or if bees settle (in a hidden place)⁹¹⁹ [in the house].’

Noteworthy is the fact that both usages of *līya*-^{te}, i.e. (α) ‘dissolve’ and (β) ‘cling’, belong to two of the three main semantic groups of the middle ‘-ya-presents: R1 (change of state) and R2 (motion and body posture); see Chapter C.II.2. Thus, the case of *līya*-^{te} is essentially parallel to that of *būdhya*-^{te} ‘wake; perceive’ and *dhriyá*-^{te} ‘stay, decide’. Both the primary (‘wake’, ‘stay’) and secondary (‘perceive’, ‘decide’) meanings of these presents fit into the three semantic types: R1 and R3 (mental activities) in the case of *būdhya*-^{te}, R2 and R3 in the case of *dhriyá*-^{te}, and R1 and R2 in the case of *līya*-^{te}. This parallelism indirectly supports the interpretation of usages (α) and (β) as belonging to one lexical unit, rather than to distinct roots/verbs.

Note, furthermore, that the rise of usage β could also be partly due to the similarity of the verbs *rī* and *lī* (noticed by NEISSER (1893: 142 [= Kl.Schr., 102])),⁹²⁰ which are phonologically, paradigmatically (both are opposed to the transitive presents with the nasal suffix – *riṇāti*, *lināti*) and, to some extent, semantically similar; cf. RV 1.61.13 *niriṇāti śátrūn* ‘he scatters the enemies’ and RV 10.84.7 *śátravaḥ párájītāso ápa ní layantām* ‘let the defeated enemies disappear away’.

Active forms

Active forms are secondary and occur from the post-Vedic (“principal”)

⁹¹⁸ Cf. JOHANSSON 1927: 17.

⁹¹⁹ GÖRÖ 279, fn. 649: “ ‘oder [wenn] die Honigtropfen sich verkriechen’, d.h. wenn die Bienen an einer versteckten Stelle im Haus ihre Waben anbringen; *madhūni* vielleicht etwa mit der Bedeutung ‘Bienenschwärme’.”

⁹²⁰ “*lī* ist das alische seitenstück zu *rī*.”

Upaniṣads onwards⁹²¹ (cf. FÜRST 1916: 21; SALOMON 1981: 98), in particular, in:

(MuṇḍU 3.2.2cd)

paryāptakāmasya kṛtātmanas tu ' ihaiva sarve pravilīyanti kāmāḥ

‘But of him whose desire is satisfied, who is a perfected soul, all desires disappear even here (sc. on earth).’

vāś ‘bellow’: *vāśya*^{-te} (AV (mostly) *vāśya*^{-te})

Simplex AVŚ 12.5.20 ≈ AVP 16.142.4 (v.l. *vāśy*^o; Or. mss. *vāsy*^o, Kashm. [16.142.6] ms. *vācy*^o), AVP 5.31.1 (Or. mss. *vāsyate*, Kashm. ms. *vācy*^o; ed. BARRET, ed. BHATTACHARYA ⁺*vāśy*^o) (≈ KauśS 62.21 *vāśy*^o), AB 5.27.6^{2x} ≈ ŚB 12.4.1.12 (*vāśyeta*) ≈ APrāyaśc. 2.4 (mss. *vāsyet*, ed. VON NEGELEIN *vāśyet*), JB 2.417:13, JUB 3.3.2.2 [ed. OERTEL 3.13.2] +;

+ ā AVP 7.6.7^{2x} (Or. mss. *vāsy*^o; Kashm. ms. *vādhy*^o and *vābhy*^o);

+ ud MānŚS 3.5.11 (*ud-vāśyamāna*- ≈ ĀpŚS 9.17.6 *vāśyeta*);

+ *prati* PB, LāṭyŚS

accented: AV, ŚB

• intr. [activity]

vāśya^{-ti} :

APrāyaśc. 2.4 (*vāśyati*, *vāśyet* [mss. *vāsy*^o]), ⁺JGS 2.7:32.7 (mss. ^o*vāśapec*^o, ed. CALAND

⁺*vāśye*[t])

The intransitive present *vāśya*^{-te} first appears in the AV (4x). Most of the AVic occurrences are forms built on the stem *vāśya*-:

(AVŚ 12.5.20 ≈ AVP 16.142.4 [Kashm. 16.142.6])

*vāśyamānābhi*⁹²² *sphūrjati*

‘[The Brahman’s cow] thunders when bellowing.’

(AVP 5.31.1c (≈ KauśS 62.21))

*upa vatsaṃ srjata vāsyate*⁹²³ *gauḥ*

⁹²¹ Not counting AVP-Kashm. 17.12.5 *-līyanti*, mentioned above, which must be a corrupt form.

⁹²² V.l. *vāśyamānābhi*; AVP-Or. mss. *vāśyamānā vi*, Kashm. ms. *vācy*^o, ed. BARRET, ed. BHATTACHARYA ⁺*vāśy*^o.

⁹²³ Thus in all Orissa mss.; Kashm. ms. *vācy*^o; KauśS *vāśy*^o. Ed. BARRET, ed. BHATTACHARYA and LUBOTSKY (2002: 137) conjecture ⁺*vāśy*^o.

‘Lead (pl.) the calf near: the cow lows.’ (LUBOTSKY 2002: 137; see also GONDA 1965: 204f.)

(AVP 7.6.7cd)

*ā tvā śīsur vāsyatām ā kumāra ' ā vāsyantām*⁹²⁴ *dhenavo nityavatsāḥ*
 ‘Let the calf bellow towards you, let the young one [bellow] towards [you]; let the constantly calving cows bellow towards [you].’

By contrast, all occurrences attested outside the AVic tradition have *ś* in the root, cf. ŚB 12.4.1.12 (≈ AB 5.27.6 etc.) quoted in Chapter B.I, s.v. *duh*.

Apparently, *vāsyā-* is a (nearly) regular stem variant in the AV and should not be regarded as a ms. error.⁹²⁵ The change *ś* → *s* in the AV, noticed by WACKERNAGEL (1896 [AiG I]: 225f.), has never been a subject of special discussion. A detailed analysis of this phenomenon goes beyond the scope of this study, but a few short remarks on its conditions would be in order. The change *ś* → *s* is not limited to the present *vāśyate* and a nominal derivative of *vāś* (*vāsitām* AVŚ 5.20.2, AVP 6.10 (a few times), AVP 8.20.4 etc.), but also occurs in other roots. It appears to be particularly common before *i/y*, cf. *asyate* ($\sqrt{2}as$ ‘eat’) (AVŚ 5.19.5, AVP-Or. 5.40.1 = 6.22.9 etc.), *sīyate* ($\sqrt{1}śī$ ‘fall’) (AVP 6.15.3), *sām ... syāmi* (AV 3.19.2), *sām śyāmi* (AV 3.19.5) ($\sqrt{1}śā$ ‘sharpen’). While *s* stands for *ś* quite consistently in such formations as *vāśyate*, *asyate*, it never occurs in apparently identical phonological contexts in formations like *nāśyati* ‘perish’, *pāśyati* ‘looks’. The difference between these two groups of forms is obvious: *nāśyati*, *pāśyati* etc. are well-attested in the RV, whereas *vāśyate*, *asyate*, *sīyate* first appear in the AV.⁹²⁶ Most likely, the existence of RVic *ś*-forms, well-known to the authors and redactors of the AVic hymns, blocked the application of the change *ś* → *s*. This assumption seems to point to the phonetic character of this phenomenon, rather than to its purely graphic nature.

⁹²⁴ The Orissa mss. read *vāsy°* in both cases; Kashm. has *vādhy°* and *vābhy°* in c and d, respectively; all editions conjecture *+vāśy°*. For a detailed discussion of this passage and another possible conjecture (*+veśyatām* / *+veśyantām*), see GRIFFITHS 2009: 312ff.

⁹²⁵ Ed. BHATTACHARYA inconsistently emends to *+vāśyate* in AVP 5.31.1 (against all mss.), but retains the mss. reading in AVP 7.6.7 (although underlining the corresponding akṣara), mentioning *vāsy°* in his crit.app.

⁹²⁶ The stem *śyā-* occurs only in the late RV (2x in RV 1.130.4).

Active forms

Active forms are post-Vedic (APrāyaśc. 2.4 *vāśyati*, *vāśyet* [mss. *vāsy*^o], ⁺JGS 2.7:32.7 mss. ^o*vāśapec*^o, ed. CALAND ⁺*vāśye*[*t*]).

III. Middle *-ya*-presents with fluctuating accentuation

ṛdh ‘succeed, be successful, go well’: *ṛdhyá^{-te}*⁹²⁷

Simplex MS^(m) 2.2.9:22.13 = PB^(m) 6.10.12, YV^p, ŚB, PB, JB 1.92:3, KauśS^m 45.16 +;

+ *vi* ‘X_{NOM} is deprived of Y_{INS}, is precluded from Y_{INS}, loses Y_{INS}’ YV^p +;⁹²⁸

⁹²⁷ The stem variant *ṛddhya^{-te}* is sporadically attested in some mss., in particular, in KS 34.17:48.9-10 (ms.), KāṭhĀ 3.199:76.8-9, 3.234:100.15. The gemination of a consonant (especially often *t* and *dh*) after a short vowel before *y*, *v*, *r* occasionally occurs in mss., in particular, in the Kashmirian mss. of the RV; see SCHEFTELOWITZ 1907: 112ff.; DUMONT 1962: 52.

⁹²⁸ The stem *ṛdhyā-* (with the abnormal sandhi *ṛdhyā- ← vi + ṛdh-*) is attested in two adjacent passages of the PB (6.7.14, 15), cf.:

(PB 6.7.15)

yadi pratihartāvacchidyate, paśubhir yajamāno ṛdhyate

‘If the Pratihartar is hurt, the sacrificer is deprived of his cattle.’

DEBRUNNER (1957 [AiG, Nachtr. zu I]: 149) groups this form with other instances of loss of *y*, such as *tryeṇī / treṇī* ‘an drei Seiten bunt’; see WACKERNAGEL [AiG I], 267f., §232a. The same irregular sandhi is found once in the *-ta*-participle of this compound (*ṛddhā vā* PB 6.9.26). All other occurrences of *vi + ṛdhyā^{-te}* in the PB (9x: PB 9.8.16; 9.9.13; 16.5.2; 6.1; 8.7; 131.2; 18.11.1-3) as well as the second attestation of the *-ta*-participle (*vyṛddham vā* PB 6.9.23) has the regular sandhi *vyṛ^o*. In addition, *ṛddhau* occurs in SVB 3.9.5 (thus ed. BURNELL; ed. SHARMA reads *vyṛddhau*). The sandhi *vi + ṛ → vṛ-*, peculiar to some mss. of the PB (as well as, probably, to some other texts within the Sāmavedic tradition) may have been introduced in order to simplify the difficult sequence *vyṛ-*; for details, see KULIKOV 2006c.

(+ *ni* : *nyṛddhyate* KāṭhĀ^P 3.199:76.8-9, v.1.; ed. WITZEL *vy-ṛddhyate*);
+ *sám* (mostly in [i_{intr.}]) ‘Y^{luck, wish}_{NOM} (in Z_{INS/LOC}) is successful’) RV
10.85.27, RVKh. 2.10.7 +;

accented:

ṛdhyá-te : TS^{1x}, ŚB^{1x}, (KāṭhĀ^{1x})

ṛdhyātai TS 6.5.6.2, *vy-ṛdhyai* ŚB 2.1.2.4, (*ṛddhyate* KāṭhĀ
3.234:100.15, ms.; ed. WITZEL *+ṛdhyate*)

ṛdhyá-te : TS^{1x}, MS^{1x}, ŚB^{1x}, ŚBK^{1x}

ṛdhyáte TS 1.5.2.2, *vy-ṛdhyáte* ŚBK 7.5.1.6, *vy-ṛdhyéta* MS
3.10.5:137.2, *sam-ṛdhyáte* ŚB 4.1.4.1

-ṛdhyá-ti :

+ *sam* ChU 7.14.2 (+)

• anticaus.

The syntax and semantics of the transitive class V present *ṛdhnóti* (RV 1.18.8 +),⁹²⁹ have been discussed at length by OERTEL (1926: 32ff.), whose analysis I essentially follow. The basic syntactic pattern is: [i_{tr.}] ‘X_{NOM} realizes, makes successful, obtains Y^{luck, wish}_{ACC}’, where Y may be either the cognate (etymological) accusative *ṛddhim*, or a noun referring to a wish or luck, prosperity, etc.⁹³⁰

The syntactic pattern of the corresponding intransitive present *ṛdhyá-te* is: [i_{intr.}] ‘Y^{luck, wish}_{NOM} (in Z_{INS/LOC}) is realized, is successful, fulfilled (for X_{DAT})’. It is attested for the simplex, which first appears in young mantras (see on MS 2.2.9 etc. below), and for the compound with *sám*. Although a passive interpretation is theoretically possible for [i_{intr.}] (‘Y is realized, obtained (by X)’), the lack of an overtly expressed instrumental passive agent in the construction⁹³¹ favours the non-passive (anticausative) analysis: ‘Y becomes successful’ etc. Moreover, the existence of constructions, where X surfaces in the dative (as in ŚB 4.1.4.1 quoted below), as well as of the impersonal pattern [ii_{intr.}] (for which see below), virtually rules out a passive

⁹²⁹ For the class VII present of the same root (*ṛnádhat*, *ṛndhánt-* RV), see JOACHIM 63f.

⁹³⁰ For a rich collection of examples of this and other transitive patterns attested with *ṛdhnóti* (*ṛddhim ṛdhnóti* ‘he obtains success’, *kāmam ṛdhnóti* ‘he realizes [his] wish’, etc.), see OERTEL, *ibid.*

⁹³¹ For THIEME’s passive interpretation of RV 10.85.27, see below.

analysis.⁹³² Examples are:

(KS 34.17:48.9-10)

ṛdhyante ha vā asya stomā, ṛdhyate yajña, ṛdhyate yajamānāya, ṛdhyate prajāyā, ṛdhyate paśubhya, ṛdhyate brahmaṇe ...

‘Verily, his praises are successful, his sacrifice is successful, there is success for the sacrificer, there is success for [his] offspring, there is success for [his] cattle, there is success for the brahman ...’

(AV 4.36.4d)

sám ma ākūtir ṛdhyatām

‘Let my intention be successful.’ (or: ‘Let (my) intention be successful for me’)

(VS 26.2.b)

ayám me kāmāḥ sám ṛdhyatām

‘Let this wish of mine succeed ...’

(ŚB 4.1.4.1)

sá yád evá mánasā kāmáyata: idám me syād! idám kurvīyēti – sá evá krátur; átha yád asmái tát samṛdhyáte, sá dáḁṣaḥ

‘Whenever one wishes anything in one’s mind: “This should be mine! I should do this!” – that is mental power; and whenever that succeeds for him, that is adroitness.’⁹³³

To the same pattern belongs the only RVic attestation of *-ṛdhya-te*, in the wedding hymn 10.85:

(RV 10.85.27a ≈ AV 14.1.21a)

ihá priyám prajāyā [AV prajāyāi] te sám ṛdhyatām

Some interpreters render this sentence as passive; cf., above all, THIEME (1958: 156ff. [= Kl.Schr. I, 167ff.]): ‘May luckily be reached what is dear by thy (the bride’s) progeny (by thee begetting progeny)’.⁹³⁴ GRASSMANN, GELDNER, RENOU (1956: 86) and ELIZARENKOVA give non-passive

⁹³² Cf. also JOACHIM 64; KÜMMEL 1996: 27. Already WHITNEY (1885b [Roots]: 15) considered the non-passive analysis more likely: “[4.] (pass.?)”.

⁹³³ For this opposition, see GONDA 1972: 27f.

⁹³⁴ This interpretation is followed by MAYRHOFER (EWAia I, 118: ‘möge glücklich erreicht werden’) and LÜHR (1994: 88).

translations, but also translate *prajāyā* as if it were a passive agent.⁹³⁵ Although THIEME's definition of the meaning of *ṛdh* in constructions with the accusative as 'luckily reach [an object]' is essentially correct, his passive analysis of RV 10.85.27 seems unlikely. The instrumental noun rather refers to the scope of prosperity ('succeed in Z_{INS}'), as is the case with some other verbs of prosperity, such as *púṣya-*^{ti},⁹³⁶ i.e.:

'Here let the pleasant [thing] succeed for you in/with respect to [your] offspring.'⁹³⁷

Alternatively, the scope of prosperity can be expressed by the locative,⁹³⁸ as in TS 6.5.6.2, quoted below.

A particular modification of pattern [i] emerges in cases where Y refers to a god (Agni etc.) or to some divine values, as in TS 1.7.3.2 *prajāpatim ṛdhnoti* 'he reaches Prajāpati'; PB 17.8.3 *agnim ... ṛdhnoti* 'he reaches Agni'; ŚB 13.5.1.2 *imāṃ lokāṃ ṛdhnoti* 'he reaches/wins this world' (see OERTEL 1926: 33ff. for numerous examples). In fact, the accusatives *agnīm*, *prajāpatim* etc. refer not to the god properly speaking, but rather to his/her favour, which the adept aims to reach. In such contexts *ṛdhnoti* is (quasi-)synonymous with such verbs as *āpnoti* or *áva-runddhe* and can be translated as 'obtains, reaches': [i'_{tr.}] 'X_{NOM} reaches, obtains, wins Y^{god}_{ACC}' (i.e. Y's favour).⁹³⁹

⁹³⁵ GELDNER: 'Hier soll dir Liebes durch Kinder **zuteil werden**'; likewise, GRASSMANN 1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 289; 1877 [RV übers.]: II, 482; RENO: 'Puissent ici, par les enfants, des choses heureuses t'**advenir**' (see also the earlier RENO's (1938 [HP]: 114) translation for AV 14.1.21; cf. also RENO (1942 [PR]: 79): 'Ce qui t'est cher puisse fleurir ici pour toi, grâce à ta descendance'); ELIZARENKOVA: 'Да **выпадет** тебе здесь **на долю** радость через потомство!' (for the RVic passage) or 'Пусть **выпадет** тебе здесь **на долю** радость для потомства!' (ELIZARENKOVA, forthc., for the AVic passage).

⁹³⁶ Cf. TS 2.1.9.4 = 2.4.6.7 *púṣyati prajāyā paśúbhiḥ* 'he prospers (= abounds) in offspring and cattle' (for details, see Chapter V, s.v.).

⁹³⁷ In this vein LUDWIG (1876 [RV übers.]: II, 536): 'frohes soll dir hier gedeihen an kindern'; cf. also WHITNEY for the parallel AVic verse (14.1.21): 'Let what is dear succeed for thy progeny...' (note the dative *prajāyāi* instead of the instrumental in the RV).

⁹³⁸ Cf. SEN 1930: 73.

⁹³⁹ To this type also belong the constructions with the unexpressed name of the god, which can be easily restored from the context, as in:

In the corresponding intransitive pattern *ṛdhya-te* is constructed with the subject of the god:

[i' intr.] 'Y^{god}_{ACC} (i.e. Y's favour) is reached, obtained'. Cf.:

(TS 1.5.2.2)

yád vā agnīr āhito ná rdhyáte, jyāyo bhāgadhéyaṃ nikāmāyamāno; yád āgneyáñ sárvam bhāvati, sáivāsyá rddhiḥ

'If Agni, being established, is not reached (i.e. his favour is not obtained),⁹⁴⁰ [that means that he is] desiring a greater portion; if [that] all becomes belonging to Agni, that is winning him (i.e. his favour).'

A few occurrences of *ṛdhya-te* in Vedic prose display, at first glance, a different syntactic pattern, cf.:

(TS 6.5.6.2)

tè 'bruvan: váraṃ vṛṇāmahai. yó 'to jāyātā, asmākañ sá éko 'sad. yò 'sya prajāyām ṛdhyātā, asmākam bhógāya bhavād iti

KEITH translates: '... let him who **shall be prosperous** among his offspring ...'; similarly, HOFFMANN (1957: 91f. [= Aufs. 2, 427]): 'Sie sprachen: "Laßt uns einen Wunsch wünschen. Wer daraus geboren wird, der soll einer von uns sein. Wer in seiner Nachkommenschaft **gut geraten wird**, soll uns zu Nutzen werden".'

The same construction (*yaḥ* + pronominal gen. + *prajāyām* + subj. *ṛdhyātai*) occurs at PB 25.6.5 (*yo na[h] prajāyām [ṛ]dhyātai*,⁹⁴¹ *sa etat sattrañ sam āpayāt*), which CALAND translated as 'He who among our progeny will thrive he shall finish this sattra.'⁹⁴²

The translations quoted above suggest that *ṛdhya-te* can also be constructed with the subject of the recipient of success, not with that of

(TS 5.5.2.1)

ṛdhnāvad ít sá, yó metāḥ pūnaḥ saṃcināvat

'He will reach [my (sc. Agni's) favour] who will pile me up again from here.'

Inexact are translations like 'he will thrive who ...' (JAMISON 1991b: 48 (for TS 5.5.2.1) and 62, note 5 (for KS 22.7:64.4)).

⁹⁴⁰ Incorrectly KEITH: 'In that Agni when established does not prosper...'

⁹⁴¹ With CALAND's (1931a, ad loc.) emendations.

⁹⁴² Cf. also *yo me prajāyām ṛdhyātai* ... in VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 4.82f. (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 4.94a/b/c/d (= CALAND 1928: 211ff. [= Kl.Schr., 511ff.])).

success, (fulfilled) wish etc., i.e. is employed in the same usage as the active -ya-present *púṣya*-^{ti} (see Chapter V, s.v.). This usage is unattested for *ṛdhya*-^{te} outside pattern [yaḥ + pronominal gen. + *prajāyām* + subj. *ṛdhyātai*], which renders KEITH/HOFFMANN/CALAND's interpretation doubtful. The system-related reasons favour an analysis in accordance with pattern [i_{intr.}] (which requires supplying the subject of wish or the like; cf. *vāraṃ* at the beginning of the TS passage). This interpretation is also supported by MS 4.4.6:57.15-16, where *sám ṛdhyate* is constructed with the subject *sá ... kāmāḥ* (*vāraṃ vṛṇīte. sò 'smai kāmāḥ sám ṛdhyate, yát kāmo bhāvati*). In my view, the above passages should be translated as:

‘That [will] which will be fulfilled in his/our offspring, ... [TS] will be for our use / [PB] will make this sattra successful’.

Likewise, one should supply the subject ‘wish’ in the following locative absolute construction with *ánṛdhyamāna*-:

(ŚB 3.6.2.24)

tásmād brāhmáno 'nṛdhyamāne dvitīyaṃ náma kurvīta; rādhnóti haivá ya evaṃ vidvān dvitīyaṃ náma kuruté

‘Therefore a Brahman, if [his wish] is not fulfilled,⁹⁴³ should take a second name; for, verily, the one who, knowing thus, takes a second name, succeeds [in fulfilling his wishes].’⁹⁴⁴

Besides the intransitive pattern [i_{intr.}] (which is particularly common with the compound with *sám*), we find the impersonal construction [i_{intr.}] ‘it goes well with X_{DAT} (in Z_{INS/LOC})’ (see DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 6; OERTEL 1926: 273), cf.:

(MS 2.2.9:22.13 = PB 6.10.12)

... yáḥ kāmáyeta: jáne ma ṛdhyetéti

‘... the one who wishes: “May it go well with me among the people” ...’⁹⁴⁵

(PB 11.5.8)

ṛdhyate 'smai kṛṣau, ya evaṃ veda

⁹⁴³ Inexactly EGDELING: ‘... let a Brâhman, if he prosper [sic!] not ...’

⁹⁴⁴ On this passage and on the significance of a second name, see GONDA 1970: 53f.

⁹⁴⁵ The sentence *jáne ma ṛdhyeta*, albeit not included by BLOOMFIELD into his VC, may be a mantra. One more mantra attestation of the simplex occurs in KauśS 45.16: *yat karomi tad ṛdhyatām* ‘what I do, let it be successful.’ The mantra is not found in the AV in this form; but cf. AV 8.2.13 *tát te kṛṇomi tát u te sám ṛdhyatām*.

‘It will go well in ploughing with the one who knows thus.’

Cf. also *ṛdhyate yajamānāya*, *ṛdhyate prajāyā* etc. in KS 34.17 quoted above.

Obviously, the impersonal construction is a modification of the basic pattern [*i*_{intr.}], with the empty subject ($Y^{\text{luck, wish}}_{\text{NOM}} \Rightarrow \emptyset$).

The compound with *ví*, constructed with the instrumental, exhibits the meaning opposite to (*sám*)-*ṛdhyate* : ‘be bereft, deprived of something’.⁹⁴⁶ The semantic opposition of (*sam*)-*ṛdhyate* and *vy-ṛdhyate* can be illustrated by the following passage:⁹⁴⁷

(ŚB 5.5.4.13)

sárveṇa vā eṣá vy ṛdhyate, yám sómo ’tipávate, sárvaṁ hí sómas. táṁ sárveṇaivá sám ardhayati, sárvaṁ hí sómaḥ

‘Verily, he whom Soma abandons⁹⁴⁸ is deprived of everything, for Soma is everything. He now causes him to be supplied with everything, for Soma is everything.’

As in the case of (*sam*)-*ṛdhyate*, no instrumental passive agent surfaces in the construction, the verb typically refers to a spontaneous process,⁹⁴⁹ and, accordingly, should be taken as non-passive, cf.:

(TS 2.2.1.3-4)

tāv evāsminn indriyám vīryam ||3|| dhatto, néndriyéṇa vīryeṇa vy ṛdhyate

‘Verily they two (sc. Indra and Agni) place power and energy in him, he is not deprived of power and energy.’⁹⁵⁰

(MS 3.10.5:137.1-2)

yát prāśnīyāt, somapīthám hanyād; yán ná prāśnīyāt, somapīthéna vyṛdhyéta

‘If he would eat, he would kill the soma-drink; if he would not eat, he

⁹⁴⁶ For the meaning and syntax of this compound, see WACKERNAGEL 1902: 152 [= KL.Schr. I, 140; OERTEL 1926: 130f.; SEN 1928: 104; GONDA 1951: 26.

⁹⁴⁷ See also KRICK 1982: 540, fn. 1469 on the opposition *vyṛddhi-* ~ *samṛddhi-* (= “Dis-” ~ “Reintegration”).

⁹⁴⁸ Not ‘he who is overflowed by Soma’, as BURROW (1986: 295) translated this compound in the similar passage MS 2.4.1:38.15-16. On the meaning of *āti-pū*, see Chapter I, s.v. *rudh* (ad PB 18.5.6).

⁹⁴⁹ Cf. GONDA 1951: 23.

⁹⁵⁰ On this passage and the meaning of *indriyám vīryam*, see GONDA 1987: 117f.

would be deprived of the soma-drink.⁹⁵¹

(ŚB 2.1.2.4)

ásam iva vái tát yó mithunéna vyṛddhaḥ; sá nén mithunéna vyṛdhyā íti
 ‘Verily, it is a misfortune if one who is precluded from the intercourse
 [with his wife]; he [says]: “Lest I should be precluded from intercourse”.’

The accentuation of *ṛdhyá-^{te}* shows no correlation with the meaning. Accented forms first appear in Vedic prose and show both root and suffix accentuation. It seems that the texts have generalized suffix accentuation (cf. esp. *ṛdhyáte* in TS 1.5.2.2, for which one might expect root accentuation; see Chapter C.II.3.2) – except in subjunctives: TS 6.5.6.2 *ṛdhyātai*, ŚB 2.1.2.4 *vy-ṛdhyai*.⁹⁵²

-i-aorist

For the *-i*-aorist (*ārdhi* YV^p, ŚB) and sigm.aor.med. *vyārdhiṣṭa* (MS^p 2.3.9:37.5, nonce formation; see NARTEN 93f.), attested in the same anticausative usage as *ṛdhyá-^{te}*, see KÜMMEL 1996: 26f.

Active forms

An active form appears only once, in ChU, in the same usage as the regular middle forms (pattern [i_{intr.}]):

(ChU 7.14.2)

sa ya āśāṃ brahmety upāsta, āśayāsyā sarve kāmāḥ samṛdhyanti
 ‘The one who worships Hope as Brahma, through Hope all his wishes
 succeed.’⁹⁵³

For the secondary active inflection in middle non-passive *-ya*-presents, not exceptional in the Upaniṣads, see FÜRST 1916: 27 and Chapter C.VI.1.

⁹⁵¹ For the expression *somapāthéna vy ṛdhyate* ‘[X] is deprived of soma-drink(ing)’, see JAMISON 1991a: 85f.

⁹⁵² MINARD’s (1956: 161f., [§]391, fn. a) statement that the ŚB only attests suffix accentuation (at 4.1.4.1) is incorrect.

⁹⁵³ For this passage, see, in particular, GONDA 1989b: 133.

³*kṣi* (*kṣī*)⁹⁵⁴ ‘perish, disappear’: *kṣīyá*-^{te} ⁹⁵⁵

Simplex RV + ;

+ *ápa* ‘wane (of the moon)’ TS^p 3.5.1.3-4^{2x}, Br. + (also in comp. *apa-kṣīyamāṇa-pakṣá*- ‘the half of the month in which the moon wanes’ ŚB +);

(+ *ava* KauṣU 2.9 *ava-kṣīyasva* (thus ed. RENOUE, ed. “108 Up.”),⁹⁵⁶ read with ed. COWELL, ed. “18 Up.”, ed. FRENZ [p.91, 1.1] *apa-kṣīyasva*⁹⁵⁷ ≈ ŚĀ 4.9 *apa-kṣīyasva*);

+ *úpa* TB 1.1.3.5 (*úpākṣīyata*, ed. MITRA [B.Ind.] erroneously *úpākṣīpyata*)⁹⁵⁸

accented:

kṣīyá-^{te/(ti)} : RV^{1x}, TS^{2x}, ŚB (BĀU)^{2x}, TĀ^{m1x}

kṣīyate TS 1.7.3.4, ŚB 14.4.2.28 (= BĀUM 1.4.28 = BĀUK 1.4.15), *apa-kṣīyati* TĀ^m 1.14.2, *kṣīyante* RV 1.62.12, *kṣīyeta* ŚB 14.4.3.7 (= BĀUM 1.5.7 = BĀUK 1.5.2), *apa-kṣīyamāṇam* TS 3.5.1.3;

kṣīyá-^{te} : AV^{1x}, ŚB^{6x}, TB^{1x}

kṣīyáte AV 12.5.45, *apa-kṣīyáte* ŚB 1.6.3.24, 1.7.2.22, 2.1.3.1 (≈ ŚBK 1.1.3.1 ed. CALAND °*kṣīyá*°, v.l. °*kṣīyá*°), 2.4.4.15, 2.4.4.18, TB 1.5.10.5, *apa-kṣīyamāṇasya* ŚB 10.4.2.17

⁹⁵⁴ Originally, an aniṭ-root. The vowel length (as in part. *kṣīṇá*- AV +) has been introduced secondarily, from the -ya-present *kṣīyá*-^{te}; see M. LEUMANN 1942: 24 [= Kl.Schr., 345]; NARTEN 104f., fn. 269; STRUNK 1967: 62, with fn. 132; LIV 150ff., with notes 16-17.

⁹⁵⁵ Not to be confused with the present *ā-kṣīyá*-^{ti} (with the preverb *ā* and with the active inflection) derived from the root ²*kṣi* ‘dwell’, with the secondary lengthening of *i* before *y* (instead of the regular *ā-kṣīyá*-^{ti}). Such formations are attested, in particular, in texts of the Taittirīya school – for instance, in TB^m 3.7.9.9 = TĀ^m 2.15.1 [ed. MALAMOUD 2.15.4] *ā kṣīyema* (≈ AV 6.117.3 *ā kṣīyema*) ‘may we abide [all the paths]’ (in a formulaic expression). BaudhŚS 16.16:262.12-14^{3x} *ā-kṣīyanti* (≈ AB 4.17.6-7 *ā-kṣīyanti*), the neuter plural form of an active participle attested in the expression *ākṣīyanti* (*ahāni*), is a technical term with an unclear meaning: AUFRECHT hesitantly renders it as ‘stättige umwandelbare Tage’ in his comm. (AB, ed. AUFRECHT, p. 441); KEITH (1920: 209) leaves this word untranslated (‘Ākṣyant days’), noticing that “[t]his word is doubtful” (ibid., fn. 5).

⁹⁵⁶ RENOUE’s (transl. ad loc., note 9) hesitant conjecture ⁺*ava-kṣeṣṭhāḥ* is improbable (M. JEŽIĆ, p.c.).

⁹⁵⁷ Cf. transl. RENOUE, ad loc., note 9.

⁹⁵⁸ See also BÖHTLINGK 1892: 211 [1.1.3.6].

-kṣīya-^{ti} :

apa-kṣīyati, āpa-kṣīyati TĀ 1.14.2⁹⁵⁹

- anticaus.

The intransitive present *kṣīya-^{te}* typically denotes spontaneous destruction, waste or decay, which favours an anticausative interpretation ('perish, disappear, waste'), although in some cases a passive analysis ('is destroyed [by smb.]') cannot be ruled out.⁹⁶⁰ Accentuation does not depend on the meaning. Most of the suffix-accented occurrences are attested in the ŚB (6x); forms with root accentuation occur in the RV (1x) and TS (2x) as well as in the late ŚB (= BĀU).⁹⁶¹ Examples of the simplex are:

- with **root accentuation**:

(RV 1.62.12ab)

sanād evā tāva rāyo gābhastau ' nā kṣīyante nōpa dasyanti dasma

'Even from old the wealth in your hand does not disappear, is not exhausted, O wondrous one (sc. Indra).' (cf. INSLEY 1972: 100)

(TS 1.7.3.4)

kṣīyate vā amúṣmiṁ loké 'nnam

'Verily, food perishes in yonder world.'⁹⁶²

(ŚB 14.4.2.28 (= BĀUM 1.4.28 = BĀUK 1.4.15))

*yādi ha vā āpy ānevaṁvin mahāt pūṇyaṁ kārma karóti, tād dhāsyāntatāḥ
kṣīyata evā [...] śa yā ātmānam evā lokām upāste, nā hāsyā kārma*

⁹⁵⁹ The two supposedly active forms attested in the AVP-Kashm. (ms.), *apa kṣīya* (in AVP-Kashm. 5.14.6a *apa kṣīya duritam aham*; BARRET hesitantly conjectures ⁺*kṣīye*) and *kṣīyat[i]* (in AVP-Kashm. 6.3.8c; adduced by RENO 1957a: 67, fn. 1; 1957b: 83 as an active -ya-present 'destroy'), are ms. errors, as the Orissa mss. show. Read with AVP-Or. [5.14.5d] ⁺*mukṣīya duritād aham* 'I would like to be released from danger' (A. GRIFFITHS apud LUBOTSKY 2002: 76); AVP-Or. [6.3.8c] *yusmān devīr deva ā kṣīyatīndur* [mss. and ed. BHATTACHARYA *kṣīya*°] 'in you, o Goddesses, dwells the heavenly drop' (see GRIFFITHS 2009: 44ff.).

⁹⁶⁰ Cf. MINARD 1956: 315, [§]859, fn. a; GARCÍA RAMÓN 1990: 12 and 19, note 19.

⁹⁶¹ Cf. GARCÍA RAMÓN 1990: 19, note 19. Incorrect is MINARD's (1956: 143, [§]339) statement: "ŚB. ne connaît que le divādi [= class IV = root accentuation – LK]". Inexactly also KÜMMEL (1996: 31): "Mit Passivakzent [= suffix accentuation – LK] ... nur einmal im AV belegt."

⁹⁶² On this passage, see, in particular, EINO 2004: 46.

kṣīyate

‘Even if the one who does not know this performs a great holy work, that [work] of his perishes at the end. [...] The work of the one who worships only the Self as [his true] place does not perish.’⁹⁶³

(ŚB 14.4.3.7 (= BĀUM 1.5.7 = BĀUK 1.5.2))

pūruṣo vā ākṣitiḥ, sā hīdām ānnaṃ dhiyā-dhiyā janāyate kármabhir. yád dhaitān ná kuryāt, kṣīyeta ha

‘Verily, a person is imperishableness, for he produces this food by continuous meditation as [his] work. If he should not do this, [the food] would disappear.’

- with **suffix accentuation**:

(AV 12.5.45)

*avāstúm enam ásvagam áprajasam karoty, aparāparaṇó bhavati, kṣīyáte*⁹⁶⁴

‘[The Brahman’s cow] makes him without abode, without home, without progeny; he becomes without succession (?); he perishes.’

The compound *apa-kṣīyate*, attested from Vedic prose onwards, denotes waning of the moon (cf. THIEME 1941: 102 [= Kl.Schr. I, 27]),⁹⁶⁵ – that is, a spontaneous process, which rules out a passive interpretation.⁹⁶⁶ Again, both suffix-accented and root-accented forms occur in this usage:

(TS 3.5.1.3-4)

amúm apakṣīyamāṇam ānv āpa ||3|| kṣīyeta

‘He would waste after this waning [moon].’

(TB 1.5.10.5)

candrāmā vāi pañcadaśāḥ,| eṣá hí pancadaśyām apakṣīyáte, / pañcadaśyām āpūryáte

‘The moon represents the Pañcadaśa [stoma], for it decreases until the fifteenth [day of a half month = the day of new moon] and increases until the fifteenth [day of a half month = the day of full moon].’

⁹⁶³ See GONDA 1966: 106.

⁹⁶⁴ For INSLEER’s (1987: 62) emendation **kṣīyate*, see Chapter C.II.3.2.1.

⁹⁶⁵ Also in the compound *apakṣīyamāṇa-pakṣá-* (ŚB +) ‘the half of the month in which the moon wanes’; see WILLMAN-GRABOWSKA 1927-28: I, 8; II, 116f., 225.

⁹⁶⁶ Cf. GONDA 1951: 22f.

(ŚB 1.7.2.22)

yá evāpūryáte táṃ devā upā́yan; yò 'pakṣīyáte tám ásurāḥ

‘The gods entered upon the [half-moon] which waxes; the Asuras [upon] the one which wanes.’

(ŚB 2.1.3.1)

yá evāpūryáte 'rdhamāsāḥ sá devā; yò 'pakṣīyáte sá pitarāḥ

‘The half-moon which increases [represents] the gods; that which decreases [represents] the fathers.’

Cf. also ŚB 1.6.3.24, 2.4.4.15, 2.4.4.18, 10.4.2.17.

-i-aorist

For the *-i*-aorist (inj.) *kṣāyi* and the injunctive middle form of the sigmatic aorist *kṣeṣṭa* (both occurring in post-RVic mantras in the same anticausative usage as *kṣīyá-te*), see KÜMMEL 1996: 30f.

Active forms

For the forms *apakṣīyati*, *āpakṣīyati*, attested in TĀ 1.14.2 (with the secondary active inflection), see below, s.v. *pṛ̥*.

chid* ‘break, cut off’ : *chidyá-te

Simplex RV 2.32.4 +;

+ *āpa* AB 1.13.15, ŚB 3.7.1.9, 3.7.1.24 +;

+ *āva* TS^p, PB, JB, JUB 3.1.3.1 [ed. OERTEL 3.3.1] +; + *vy-āva* ŚB(K),

ŚB 13.1.6.3 ≈ TB 3.8.9.5, JB, GB 2.6.6:251.5 +;

+ *ūt* AĀ 1.2.4 +;

+ *ví* ‘interrupt’ YV^p, ŚB, TB, JB, GB +

accented:

chidyá-te : TS^{1x}, ŚBK^{1x}

vi-chidyāmānam TS 3.2.1.3, *vy-ava-chidyai* ŚBK 2.8.3.18, mss. (ed.

CALAND ^{+o}*chidyái* – unnecessary conjecture)

chidyá-te : MS^{2x}, ŚB^{3x}

chidyáte MS 4.5.2:65.1, *ví ... chidyáte* MS 1.4.11:59.11, *vi-*

chidyāmānam ŚBM 7.1.2.11 = ŚBK 8.8.3.11, *vy-ava-chidyáte* ŚBM 6.6.4.11

= ŚBK 8.6.4.9, ŚBM 6.8.2.11 = ŚBK 8.8.1.24

• anticaus. / (pass.)

The present *chidyá-^{te}* typically denotes spontaneous breaking or splitting, i.e. belongs to the anticausative type ('breaks [by itself]') in most occurrences; unconvincing is KÜMMEL's (1996: 41f.) statement that (all) occurrences should be treated as passives ('patientiv'). Examples are:

(RV 2.32.4c)

śīvyat_uv āpaḥ sūcyāchidyamānayā

'Let [Rākā] sew her work with a needle which does not break.'

(AV 9.9.11d ≈ RV 1.164.13d)

sanād evā nā chidyate⁹⁶⁷ sánābhiḥ

'Even from old [the axle] does not break with its nave.'

(MS 1.4.11:59.11-12)

yád ānāptaṁ, ví yajñás chidyáte, kṣódhuko yájamāno bhavati

'If [something in the sacrifice is] unreached, the sacrifice is interrupted, the sacrificer becomes hungry.'

(ŚBM 6.6.4.11 = ŚBK 8.6.4.9)

sárvebhyo vā eṣá etāṁ kāmēbhya ā dhatte. tát yád evāsyātra kāmānāṁ vyavachidyáte 'gnān ānugate, tát evāitāt sám tanoti sám dadhāti

'It is for [the obtaining of] all his wishes that this [sacrificer] builds this [fire] for himself. And whatever part of his wishes is here cut off when the fire goes out, that he joins together and mends by this [building of the fire].'

For some (rarer) occurrences a passive interpretation is possible, but even in such cases the boundary between these two usages cannot be drawn with accuracy, cf.:

(TS 3.2.1.2-3)

[...] *pávamānaṁ ví ||2|| chindyāt; táṁ vichidyamānam adhvaryóḥ prāṇó 'nu ví chidyeta*

'[...] he would interrupt the Pavamāna; after it (sc. Pavamāna) being interrupted, the breath of the Adhvaryu would [also] be interrupted.'

(MS 4.5.2:64.18-65.1)

yán nopaśṇuyād, badhirāḥ syād; vācó hí chidyáte

⁹⁶⁷ RV *nā śīryate*.

‘If one would not listen, one would become deaf; for [by not listening to a sound (*vāc*)] one becomes cut off from the [faculty of] speech (*vāc*).’

(ŚBM 7.1.2.11 = ŚBK 8.8.3.11)

néd imāṃ pitāraṃ prajāpatiṃ vichidyāmānaṃ páśyāni

‘Lest I should see the father Prajāpati being torn to pieces.’

Note, furthermore, that *chidyá-^{te}* does not occur constructed with the instrumental of the agent, which also favours the non-passive analysis.

As is clear from the examples quoted above, the accentuation of *chidyá-^{te}* does not depend on the meaning. Suffix accentuation occurs in MS and ŚB, root accentuation – in TS (1x). The only root-accented occurrence in the ŚB (Kāṇva recension) is the subjunctive *vyava-chidyai*:

(ŚBK 2.8.3.18)

néd asmān mithunād vyavachidyā iti

“‘Lest I should become cut off from this intercourse!’.”

CALAND conjectures suffix accentuation (*°chidyā°*) contra all mss.,⁹⁶⁸ probably in analogy with suffix accentuation attested elsewhere in the ŚB. As will be argued below (Chapter C.VI), the accent placement in subjunctives and optatives of -yá-presents often differs from that in indicatives and participles, and CALAND’s emendation may therefore be unnecessary.⁹⁶⁹

-i-aorist

For the -i-aorist (*áchedi*, *chedi* RV +) and the injunctive middle form of the sigmatic aorist (*chitsi* etc.), attested in post-RVic mantras in the same anticausative usage as *chidyá-^{te}*, see KÜMMEL 1996: 41f.⁹⁷⁰

⁹⁶⁸ This reading is also adopted in ed. SWAMINATHAN, with no mention of variant readings.

⁹⁶⁹ Cf. also the root-accented subjunctive *vyádhya* at ŚBM 2.1.2.4.

⁹⁷⁰ For the subjectless construction with the *genetivus personae* attested for -*chedi* in ŚB 10.5.2.13, see OERTEL 1944: 77ff. [= Kl.Schr. I, 546ff.]; ROMANOV 2009: 134.

jyā (*jī*) ‘deprive of, suffer loss, suffer violence’: *jīyá-te*

Simplex RV +;⁹⁷¹

(+ *sām* AVP-Kashm. 16.58.4 *saṃ-jīyate* (≈ AVŚ 11.3.56 [ed. VISHVA BANDHU 11.5.7] *jīyate*), read with AVP-Or. [*sarvasvaṃ*] *jīyate* [A. GRIFFITHS, p.c.])

accented:

jīyá-te : RV^{2x}, SV^{1x}, TS^{1x}, ŚB^{1x} (BĀU)

jīyate RV 9.55.4 = SV 2.328 [= 2.3.2.5.4], RV 10.152.1 (≈ AV 1.20.4 *jīyáte*), ŚB 14.4.3.23 (= BĀUM 1.5.23 = BĀUK 1.5.15), *jīyēran* TS 7.2.1.4

jīyá-te : AV^{3x}, MS^{2x}

jīyáte AV 1.20.4 (≈ RV 10.152.1 *jīyate*), 5.19.6, 11.3.56, MS 1.8.7:126.10, *jīyēta* MS 1.6.10:103.2

• anticaus. / (agentless) pass.

The verb *jyā* (*jī*) is translated by many translators as ‘overpower’.⁹⁷² However, as BURROW (1959) has shown, the primary meaning of *jyā* is ‘deprive [of property]’, which is particularly clear for some Brāhmaṇa contexts (cf., for instance, ŚB 14.4.3.23 and PB 6.7.15 quoted below). The meaning ‘overpower, oppress’ (‘überwältigen, unterdrücken’), recognized for this verb by PW III, 154f. and other dictionaries, is possible in some contexts (cf. also such derivatives as *jyēṣṭha-* ‘superior, greater’), and should probably also be connected with this root (rather than with the supposedly unrelated root ²*jyā*, posited by BURROW; see MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 602f.), but seems to be secondary for this root. In any case, the semantics of violence (‘deprive of property by force, rob’) is present in all or most of the uses.

Below I follow BURROW’s analysis, consistently rendering *jīyá-te* as ‘be deprived of property, be robbed, lose property, suffer loss’. Although this meaning often implies a passive interpretation (‘is deprived of property [by somebody]’), the lack of attestations with the agent instrumental favours a

⁹⁷¹ In the Brāhmaṇas this *-ya*-present only occurs in the PB, KB, JB.

⁹⁷² For instance, by WHITNEY (‘is scathed’ at AV 5.19.6, 11.3.56, etc.); by GELDNER (‘wird überwältigt’ for RV 9.55.4; ‘wird vergewaltigt’ at RV 10.152.1; but also ‘wird ausgeraubt’ for RV 3.59.2); by THIEME (1957: 44ff.): ‘is not overpowered’ (for RV 3.59.2), ‘is not overwhelmed’ (for RV 10.152.1); cf. also RENOU: ‘il n’est pas violenté’ (EVP V, 66 for RV 3.59.2 [contra BURROW; see EVP VII, 10]), ‘(... un être) qui force (la victoire) sans être (lui-même) forcé’ (EVP VIII, 29 for RV 9.55.4).

non-passive (anticausative) analysis for several occurrences (‘suffers loss’). Another piece of evidence for such an analysis is the content accusative construction, which will be discussed below. Accentuation does not depend on the meaning: RV and TS show root accentuation, AV and MS attest accent on the suffix.⁹⁷³ Examples are:

(RV 3.59.2c)

ná hanyate ná jīyate t_uvótaḥ

‘Being helped by you [o Mitra], he (sc. the mortal who serves you) is not slain, not robbed.’ (see BURROW, op.cit., 259; cf. also THIEME 1957: 44ff. [= Op.Mai. I, 238ff.])

- with **root accentuation**:

(RV 9.55.4 = SV 2.328 [= 2.3.2.5.4])

yó jināti ná jīyate ' hānti śátrum abhītya

sá pavaśva sahasrajīt

‘[As one] who deprives of property [and] does not suffer loss; who smites the enemy, having attacked him; purify yourself, [o Soma], O conqueror of a thousand!’

- with **suffix accentuation**:

(AV 5.19.6cd)

pārā tát sicyate rāṣṭrām ' brāhmaṇó yātra jīyāte

‘That kingdom is wasted in which a Brahman is deprived of his property.’⁹⁷⁴ (see BURROW, op.cit., 258)

Note especially the following RVic root-accented occurrence, repeated in the AV with suffix accentuation:

(RV 10.152.1cd = AV 1.20.4cd)

ná yásya hanyāte sákhā ' ná jīyate [AV jīyāte] kádā [AV kadā] caná

‘... whose (sc. Indra’s) companion is not killed, nor ever suffers loss.’⁹⁷⁵

⁹⁷³ The accent difference between RV and AV was noticed by BURROW (ibid., 259: “In intransitive sense there is the fourth class *jīyate* (RV.), for which a passive *jīyāte* (AV.) tends to be substituted”), but his interpretation of this accentual patterning in semantic terms (IVth class vs. passive) is incorrect.

⁹⁷⁴ For the meaning of *pārā ... sicyate* (lit. ‘is poured away’), see Chapter I, s.v. *sic*.

⁹⁷⁵ Cf. also THIEME 1957: 45 [= Op.Mai. I, 239]. WHITNEY (ad AV 1.20.4) does not rule out that *jīyāte* belongs with the root *ji* ‘win’, but this analysis is improbable (see OLDENBERG, *Noten*, ad loc); note also that the passive of *ji* is post-Vedic (see

Consider also the accentuation difference between the TS and MS occurrences in very similar contexts:

(TS 7.2.1.4)

śatāyuh pūruṣaḥ śatēndriyaḥ [...] yadāiṣām pramīyeta, yadā vā jīyerann, āthāikam utthānam; tād dhī tīrthām

‘Man has a life-time of hundred [years] hundred powers. [...] If [one] of them would perish, or if they would suffer loss, then is one time to stop; for that is an appropriate opportunity.’

(MS 1.8.7:126.10-11)

yadā vāi jīyāte,⁹⁷⁶ yadā pramīyāte, yadārtim ārcchāty, āthāgnihotrām sāṃ tiṣṭhate

‘When he suffers loss, when he perishes, when he suffers injury, then the Agnihotra comes to its end.’ (see BURROW, op.cit., 258)

(MS 1.6.10:103.1-2)

yād dhutvā nā juhuyād, vī yajñām chindyāj, jīyēta vā prā vā mīyeta

‘If, having offered [once], he would not offer [again], he would break asunder the sacrifice; he would suffer loss or perish.’ (see AMANO 250, with fn. 644)

From the AV onwards and, particularly, in the Brāhmaṇas, *jīyā-te* can be constructed with the content accusative *sarvajyānīm* (see SEN 1927: 360), meaning ‘be deprived of the whole property, undergo complete confiscation’. Note that content accusative constructions do not passivize, which is additional evidence against the passive analysis of *jīyā-te*. Examples are:

(AV 11.3.56)

nā ca sarvajyānīm jīyāte, purāinaṃ jarāsaḥ prāṇo jahāti

‘[If] he is not deprived of the whole property, breath abandons him before old age.’

(ŚB 14.4.3.23 (= BĀUM 1.5.23 = BĀUK 1.5.15))

tāsmād yady āpi sarvajyānīm jīyata, ātmānā cēj jīvati pradhīnāgād ity āhuḥ

‘Therefore, if someone is deprived of the whole property and lives only

Appendix I).

⁹⁷⁶ DHARMADHIKARI’s (1966: 9) conjecture ⁺*jīryate* is unnecessary; see MITTWEDE 1986 [Textkr. zur MS]: 63.

with his *ātman*, people say: “He has come without rim”.⁹⁷⁷

(PB 25.10.20)

yadā sarvajyāniṃ jīyante

‘When they are deprived of the whole property...’

(PB 6.7.15)

*yadi pratihartāvachidyate, paśubhir yajamāno v[y]ṛdhyate [...]
sarvavedasan deyaṃ; yadi sarvavedasan na dadāti, sarvajyāniṃ jīyate*

‘If the Pratihartar is severed, the sacrificer is deprived of his cattle; [...] [in this case] the sacrificer’s entire property is to be given; if he does not give his entire property, he is deprived of the whole property.’

(PB 16.1.2 ≈ KB 16.9.12-13)

*ya etenāniṣṭvāthānyena yajate, kartapatyam eva taj jīyate vā pra vā
mīyate*⁹⁷⁸

‘If, without having performed this [sacrifice], one performs another, verily, this is falling into a pit: he loses his property, or dies (prematurely).’

(JB 2.422:7 [ed. CALAND §168])

yo vai jīyate, yo hīyate, tam āhur: aploṣṭeti

‘They say about him who is deprived of property, who is abandoned: “He is lost”.’

The last three examples illustrate the co-occurrence of *jīyá-te* with other -ya-presents with fluctuating accentuation, notably *chidyá-te*, *ṛdhyá-te* (PB 6.7.15), *mīyá-te* (PB 16.1.2), and *hīyá-te* (JB); cf. also Sāyaṇa’s gloss *hīyate*

⁹⁷⁷ It is unclear which proverb underlies the passage. Ed. MAUE, p. 98f. conjectures *pradhīnā* <*vīnāgād*> and hesitantly translates “er ist ohne Radkranz gekommen, er hat seinen Radkranz verloren”.

⁹⁷⁸ The KB has ... *tad dhīyate pra vā mīyate*; both -yá-presents (i.e. *hīyate* and *mīyate*) co-occur at KB 25.13.13 [ed. LINDNER 25.14] as well. For both passages ed. ĀnSS and ed. LINDNER read (*tad*) *dhīyate*; CALAND (1918: 26 [= Kl.Schr., 262]) conjectures *+taj jīyate*, in accordance with the PB, and this reading is adopted in ed. SARMA; cf. also CALAND’s comm. in transl. PB, ad loc. As OERTEL (1941: 37f. [= Kl.Schr. II, 1406], fn. 3) argued, this emendation is unnecessary, since *hīyate* makes perfect sense in the context and is well-attested in this usage, cf., in particular, JB 2.422:7 (quoted below) and PB 19.12.8.

For the variants *kartapatyam* / *g°* (thus KB, ed. ĀnSS, ed. LINDNER), see PATYAL 1970a: 109, 112.

for *jīyate* in PB 6.7.15.

tap α ‘become hot, heat (oneself)’; β ‘suffer’;
γ ‘perform austerity’: *tápyá*-^{te}

Simplex (α) RV 1.164.13 +; (β) RV 10.95.17 +; (γ) ‘perform austerity’
AV +;

+ *ánu* (α) AVP 2.5.1 (*anu-tapyantām* ≈ AVŚ 2.12.1 *tapyantām*), (β)
AV–YV^m;

+ *abhi* (α/γ) KB 6.4.5, 8, 11 [ed. LINDNER 6.10^{3x}], JB, JUB 1.2.1.12 [ed.
OERTEL 1.8.12]; (+ *ā* ŚB)⁹⁷⁹;

+ *úpa* (γ) AVŚ 7.61.1-2, AVP 10.12.11;

+ *prati* BaudhŚS;

+ *sám* (α) KS^p 6.6:55.11 = KpS^p 4.5:43.3, ŚB 3.5.3.16, 11.5.2.4 +

accented:

tápya-^{te/(ti)} : VS^{2x}, TS^m (= ĀpM)^{1x}, MS^{1x}, ŚB^{3x}, TB^{2x}

tápyate TB 2.2.9.3, *tápyadhvam*, *tápyasva*^{2x} ŚBM 6.1.3.2-4 ≈ ŚBK
8.1.3.2-4, *tápyamānāya* VS 39.12, *tápyamānā* TS^m 4.3.11.3 (= ĀpM 2.20.35)
(≈ AV 3.10.12 *tapyámānā*), TB 1.4.9.1, *tápyate* [part.act.:dat.sg.] VS 39.12,
anu-tápyamānāḥ MS^m 2.3.8:37.1 (≈ AV 2.35.2 *anu-tapyámānam*, TS 3.2.8.2
anu-tapyámānā)

tápyá-^{te} : AV^{6x}, TS^{m1x}, ŚB^{4x}

tápyáte ŚB 10.4.4.4, 14.8.11.1 (= BĀU 5.11.1), *tápyámāne* AV 2.12.1,
tápyámānā AV 3.10.12 (≈ TS 4.3.11.3 *tápyamānā*), *tápyámānaḥ* AV 11.5.26,
tápyámānasya AV 19.56.5, *tápyámānāsu* ŚB 11.1.6.1, *anu-tápyámānam* AV
2.35.2 ≈ *anu-tápyámānā* TS^m 3.2.8.2 (≈ MS^m 2.3.8:36.20 *anu-tápyamānāḥ*),
upa-tápyámāhe AV 7.61.1, *saṃ-tápyáte* ŚB 3.5.3.16, *sám...tápyáte* ŚB
11.5.2.4

tápya-^{ti} :

(α) VS 39.12 (*tápyate* [part.act.:dat.sg.] ≈ *tápate* TS^m 1.4.35.1 ≈ TĀ^m
3.20 (≈ *tapyatyai* KS-Aśvamedha^m 5.5.6:168.12)), (β) GB 1.1.2:1.11,
1.1.6:5.7, 1.1.12^{2x}:9.16, 10.2 (*atapyat*), VāsDhS +

• anticaus.

⁹⁷⁹ *ā* is a postposition rather than preverb in ŚB 11.5.7.4.

also in nom. deriv.:

-tú-, *-tí-*: *tapyatú-* ‘burning, heat’ RV 2.24.9, *tapyatváí* TS^m 1.4.35.1 ≈ TĀ^m 3.20 (ed. MITRA [B.Ind.] *tapatyái*; ed. ĀnSS 36 *tapyatváí*, v.l. *tapatyái*; ed. MAHADEVA SASTRI *tapyatváí*) ≈ *tapyatyai* KS-Aśvamedha 5.5.6:168.12

pass. of caus. *tāpya-*^{te} :

GB 2.2.6:171.3 (= VaitS 13.30) (+)

The meanings and usages of *tap*, all related to the semantic area of heat (‘become warm, heat; suffer; perform austerity, penance’) have been discussed at length by BLAIR (1961), to which the reader can be referred to for the exhaustive treatment of the derivatives attested in the RV and AV.⁹⁸⁰ In what follows I will only briefly summarize the main usages of *tāpyá-*^{te}, illustrating these with examples from the RV and AV (with some simplifications of the detailed classification given by BLAIR 9ff.):

(α) ‘heat, become warm, be inflamed’ (due to the sun, fire, etc.):

(RV 1.164.13c ≈ AV 9.9.11c)

tásya náḥśas tapyate bhúribhāra

‘Its axle does not heat, [albeit] heavy-burdened.’ (see BLAIR 30)

(AV 2.12.1ad)

dyāvāprthivī ur, v àntárikṣam [...]

tá ihá tapyantāṃ máyi tapyámāne

‘Heaven and earth, the wide atmosphere, [...] let them be hot here [by the sun], while I am being heated [by the funeral fire].’ (cf. BLAIR 36, 108, 117)

KÜMMEL (1996: 48f.; 2000: 213) determines the meaning of *tāpyá-*^{te} as “fientiv-patientiv” and gives both passive and non-passive (anticausative) translations (‘erhitzt werden, heiß werden, sich quälen’). Although some occurrences of type α can indeed be rendered as passives (‘be heated’), there is no sufficient evidence for a passive analysis; note especially the lack of constructions with an overtly expressed passive agent in the instrumental.

(β) ‘suffer, be distressed’:

(RV 10.95.17)

[...] *hṛdayam tapyate me*

‘[...] my heart suffers [from love].’ (see BLAIR 30, 104)

⁹⁸⁰ See also GONDA’s review (1964-65); GOTÔ 160; KÜMMEL 1996: 40f.

(γ) ‘perform austerity, penance’:

(AV 19.56.5d)

tapyámānasya mánasó 'dhi jajñiṣe

‘You are born out of the mind of the one performing penance.’ (see BLAIR 46)

In the latter usage *tapyā-^{te}* can be constructed with the content accusative *tápas*,⁹⁸¹ as in:

(AV 11.5.26)

brahmacārī [...] tápo 'tiṣṭhat tapyámānaḥ samudré

‘The Brahmacārin, performing penance,⁹⁸² stood in the ocean.’⁹⁸³

(AV 7.61.1abc, 2ab)

[1] *yád agne tápasā tápa ' upatapyāmahe tápaḥ*

priyāḥ śrutásya bhūyāśma [...]

[2] *agne tápas tapyāmaha ' úpa tapyāmahe tápaḥ*

While the simplex (in 7.61.2a) poses no difficulties, the meaning of the compound with *úpa* (in pāda b) requires some comments. HENRY (1892: 24) did not distinguish the simplex and the compound with *úpa* in translation.⁹⁸⁴ WHITNEY rightly suggested that there must be some semantic distinction between them, rendering *upatapyāmahe* as ‘we perform additional penance’. Most likely, both the preverb *úpa* and the stylistic figure *tápasā tápaḥ* (on which see HOFFMANN 1960c: 246f. [= Aufs. 1, 117f.]) express here “die

⁹⁸¹ See GONDA 1951: 26. I abstain from a philosophical discussion of the denotate of *tapas* in the AV (creative power etc., certainly related in many ways to heat both in the literal and metaphoric senses; cf. BLAIR, op.cit., 63ff.; GONDA 1966a: 684f. [= Sel.St. III, 421f.]; 1982a: 48ff. [= Sel.St. VI/2, 122ff.]) and on whether this nominal can refer here to an entity which can be heated in the literal sense of the word.

⁹⁸² Thus WHITNEY, KAJIHARA 2002: 122 (‘performing asceticism’) and ELIZARENKOVA (2007: 149, 264). Improbable is BLOOMFIELD’s (1897: 217) passive interpretation: ‘kindled with tapas (creative fervour)’.

⁹⁸³ For this stanza, see KAJIHARA 2002: 120, 128f., 141. It is possible but not necessary to stick to the original syntax by introducing a content accusative in translations, as BLAIR (op.cit., 36ff. and, esp., 73; cf. for AV 7.61.2: ‘Agni, we heat *tapas* in ourselves’) and RENOU (1947: 31, for *tápo 'tapyanta* in ŚB 11.1.6.1: ‘[l’eau] chauffa la chaleur ascétique’) did; cf. MINARD 1949: 105, [§]292, fn. b.

⁹⁸⁴ ‘Nous pratiquons l’austérité’ for both *tápas tapyāmahe* and *tápa úpa tapyāmahe*.

akkumulative Steigerung der asketischen Übung” (W. KNOBL, p.c.).⁹⁸⁵ Accordingly, the passage in question can be tentatively translated as follows:

‘In that, O Agni, we heat ourselves up, heat upon heat, might we become dear to the well-known one [...] O Agni, we heat ourselves, we heat ourselves up.’ (W. KNOBL, p.c.)⁹⁸⁶

tapyā^{-te} can also be constructed with the instrumental *tāpasā*, functionally equivalent to the content accusative *tāpas*, as in AV 7.61.1a quoted above and in the following mantra attested in the AV and YV:

(AV 3.10.12ab = TS 4.3.11.3.h = ^UKS 39.10:127.7)

ekāṣṭakā tāpasā tapyāmānā [TS *tāpya^o*] ‘*jajāna gárbhaṃ mahimānam índram*

‘The sole *aṣṭakā* paining herself with penance,⁹⁸⁷ has produced an embryo, the greatness, Indra.’

There seems to be no clear correlation between accent placement and the meaning (usage) (cf. also GOTÖ 160). In the RV, *tapyā^{-te}* does not occur unambiguously accented, being attested in usages (α) (in maṇḍala I: 1.164.13, 1.185.4; the same meaning attests the only RVic occurrence of the *-i*-aorist *ātāpi*, in RV 7.70.2; see KÜMMEL 1996: 48f.) and (β) (in maṇḍala X: 10.34.10, 10.95.17). The six accented occurrences in the AV have the accent on the suffix and exemplify all the three aforementioned usages and syntactic patterns: (α) ‘be inflamed’ (AV 2.12.1), (β) ‘suffer’ (AV 2.35.2; for a discussion of this passage, see below), (γ) ‘perform austerity’ (AV 19.56.5),

⁹⁸⁵ Cf. also ELIZARENKOVA's (2005: 352 and 540) translation: ‘[...] мы совершаем умерщвление плоти, / Умерщвление за умерщвлением’.

⁹⁸⁶ Cf. also the quotation of this stanza in MānGS 1.1.18 *yad agne tāpasā tapo* ‘*brahmacaryam upemasi* ‘By the fact that we approach, o Agni, with warmth, warmth and the study of the Veda...’ (DRESDEN).

Another AVic (Paippalāda) occurrence of this compound seems to have, in accordance with W. KNOBL's interpretation, the same meaning, with an additional semantic nuance (‘heat oneself up against smb.’):

(AVP 10.12.11)

agne ye mā jighāṃsantīy ‘*agne ye ca dviṣanti mā*

agne ye mopatapyante ‘*teṣāṃ priyatamaṃ jahi*

‘O Agni, those who want to kill me; O Agni, and those who hate me; O Agni, those who heat themselves up [against] me – destroy that which is dearest to them.’

⁹⁸⁷ BLAIR 46, 74: ‘being heated with *tapas*’.

also with the content accusative (AV 7.61.1, 11.5.26) and with the instrumental (AV 3.10.12).

The accentual patterning in the YV is intricate and, most likely, at random. Of the five accented occurrences (all – in the mantras), four have the accent on the root and represent all main usages. Three of them occur in the mantras which are also found in the AV. Mantra TS 4.3.11.3h = AV 3.10.12 (with the content accusative construction) has been discussed earlier. The two remaining attestations are found in an obscure mantra, attested in three versions (AV, TS, MS), differing both in syntax and accentuation:

(AV 2.35.2ab)

yajñápatim řṣaya énasāhur ' nír bhaktaṃ prajā́ anutápyámānam

(TS 3.2.8.1-2c)

yajñápatim řṣaya énasāhuḥ ' prajā́ nír bhaktā anutápyámānā

(MS 2.3.8:36.20)

yájamānam řṣayā énasāhur ' viháya prajā́m anutápyamānāḥ

As KEITH (1914: 248, fn. 3) pointed out, the AVic variant of this mantra, which attests a syntactic pattern with two accusatives ('X_{NOM} declares Y_{ACC} to be Z_{ACC}'), "is an easier construction". It can be translated as follows:

'The řṣis declare that, because of a transgression, the master of the sacrifice is deprived of participation, being distressed about [his] offspring.'⁹⁸⁸

The variants attested in the Yajurveda must result from misinterpretation of the original version. The TS variant, which is closer to the AVic text (and retains the suffix accentuation), could be tentatively rendered as follows:

'The řṣis declare with regard to (?) the master of the sacrifice that, because of a transgression, [his?] offspring is deprived of participation and suffers.'⁹⁸⁹

The syntax of the MS version is even more awkward (perhaps resulting from

⁹⁸⁸ For a detailed discussion of this mantra, see GONDA 1965: 114 and 424. GONDA's translation runs as follows: 'The seers declare the lord of this sacrifice because of his 'sin' excluded (from his portion of good results), distressed about his offspring'.

⁹⁸⁹ KEITH: '... by thy sin creatures are famishing and troubled'; CALAND & HENRY 295: '... par [le fait de son] péché, | les créatures étaient spoliées et plongées dans la détresse'.

contamination of the AV and TS variants), and this mantra variant can hardly be given any reasonable translation.

The two YVic accented occurrences with no AVic parallels, attested in an Aśvamedha mantra, are based on the word play with the root *tap*, and consequently some of them may be nonce formations. The VS version runs:

(VS 39.12)

tápase svāhā. tápyate svāhā. tapyamānāya svāhā. taptāya svāhā

‘To Heat hail! To him who is heating [something] hail! To him who is being heated hail! To him who has been heated hail!’

The form *tápyate* can only be an active participle (dat.sg.m.-n.), but the stem *tapyā-* does not occur with the active inflection elsewhere in Vedic until the late GB. The Taittirīya texts attest a class I active participle (with no parallel in the KS), which could be the original form; in addition, in all versions of the mantra in the Black YV we find *-tu/-ti*-derivatives built from the stem *tapyā-*:⁹⁹⁰

(TS 1.4.35.1 = TĀ 3.20)

śucé svāhā. śókāya svāhā. tapyatvái [TĀ (v.l.) *tapatyái*] *svāhā. tápate svāhā*

(KS-Aśvamedha 5.5.6:168.11-12)

śuce svāhā. śucaye svāhā. tapase svāhā. tapyatyai svāhā

tapyant- (VS) seems to be a nonce formation built as the transitive counterpart of the intransitive *tapyamāna-* and thus replacing the regular transitive *tápant-* – perhaps via the stage of the *-ti*-derivative *tapatyái-*.

In the Brāhmaṇas, *tapyā-*^{te} is most often employed in usages *α* and *γ*. The accentual patterning becomes less random than in the YV. The TB attests root accentuation, the ŚB – suffix accentuation, except for three imperatives with root accentuation in ŚB 6.1.3.2-4. The boundary between

⁹⁹⁰ The noun *tapyatú-* ‘burning, heat’ (epithet of Sūrya, a hapax) is also met in RV 2.24.9. *tapyā-* is thus one of the two Vedic *-ya*-stems (next to *tanya-*; see Chapter V, s.v.), which forms *-tú*-derivatives. For this form, see WACKERNAGEL (1903: 152 [= Kl.Schr. I, 404]); BLOOMFIELD & EDGERTON 1930 [Ved. Var. I]: 169; RENOU 1937b: 7; 1949: 63; 1951: 4; WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II, 2]: 663, §488b; 668, §492b. WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER considered the variant *tapyatyai* secondary; MITTWEDE (1989 [Textkr. zur KS]: 155) suggests here an assimilation (*tapyaty^o* ← *tapyatv^o*); differently RENOU (1949: 63): “la forme *tapyati* ... n’est pas nécessairement fausse”.

usages (α) and (γ) cannot be drawn with accuracy for some occurrences, since the heat (*tāpas*) is regarded as one of the aspects of the ascesis, in particular, in cosmogonic contexts (e.g. in ŚB 6.1.3). Examples are:

– with **suffix accentuation**:

(α):

(ŚB 11.5.2.4)

*múkham evāsyānīkavatīṣṭiḥ, / múkham hí prāñānām ānīkam. úraḥ
sāmtapanīyórasā hí sám iva tapyáte*

‘The offering to [Agni] Anīkavant is his (sc. the sacrificer’s) mouth, for “front” (*ānīka-*) is the mouth of the vital airs. The Sāmtapanīyā offering is the chest, for with regard to the chest (i.e. in the chest) one feels rather hot.’⁹⁹¹

(ŚB 3.5.3.16)

*yadā vāi striyāi ca puṁsās ca saṁtapyáté, ’tha rétaḥ sicyate; tát tátāḥ
prá jāyate*

The last sentence is translated by DELBRÜCK (1888 [AiS]: 5) as ‘wenn der Frau und dem Manne warm wird, dann fließt der Same’; likewise EGGELING (‘for when woman and man become heated, the seed flows’). It was repeatedly quoted in syntactic studies on Vedic as an example of the genitive of experiencer with the verbs of physical state in subjectless (nominativeless) constructions;⁹⁹² in the modern syntactic terminology, they would rather be qualified as constructions with non-canonical (genitive) subject. However, a remarkable feature of this construction, which casts some doubts on this analysis, is the coordination of the alleged genitive noun (*puṁsās*) with the dative of the woman (*striyāi*). Encoding another participant of the situation (supposedly, also an experiencer) with a different case makes the construction in question rather weird. It seems that a better interpretation can be obtained if we assume that *puṁsās* is an ablative referring to the source of the feeling (emotional process), which can be supplied in this construction as the subject of *saṁtapyáte* ‘warms up’ (love, lust), while the second, dative, noun refers to its goal, the woman:

⁹⁹¹ As Sāyaṇa explains, the heating is due to the close proximity of the heart and the digestive fire; differently EGGELING: ‘is confined’.

⁹⁹² See DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 5; OERTEL 1939: 653 [= Kl.Schr. I, 497]; 1944: 72 [= Kl.Schr. I, 541]. In DELBRÜCK’s formulation: “Verba, welche Vorgänge an Menschen bezeichnen, haben den Betroffenen im Acc. oder Gen. bei sich. [...] In P[rosa] erscheint wohl nur der Genitiv”). Cf. also JAMISON 1996: 124.

‘Verily, when [the love] arises (lit. warms up) both from a man and towards a woman, then the semen pours [out] / is poured ...’

(γ), with the content accusative (*tápas*):

(ŚB 11.1.6.1)

tā akāmayanta: kathāṃ nū prā jāyemahīti. tā aśrāmyaṃs, tās tāpo
‘tapyanta. tāsu tāpas tapyāmānāsu hiraṇmāyam āṇḍāṃ sām babhūva
 ‘They (sc. the waters) desired: “How may we now reproduce (ourselves)?”. They toiled, they heated themselves (= performed austerity). While they were heating (= performing austerity), a golden egg was born.’

(ŚB 10.4.4.4)

yád u ha vā evaṃvít tāpas tapyáta ā maithunāt, sārvaṃ hāsyā tát
svargāṃ lokāṃ abhí sām bhavati
 ‘For, when [the sacrificer], knowing thus, practises austerity, including [abstinence] from sexual intercourse, then all of him reaches the heavenly world.’

(ŚB 14.8.11.1 = BĀU 5.11.1)

etád vái paramāṃ tāpo, yád vyāhitas tapyáte
 ‘This is certainly the highest [form of] heat (= asceticism) that a diseased person suffers the heat [of fever].’ (W. KNOBL, p.c.)

– with **root accentuation**:

(TB 2.2.9.3)

yá evaṃ tāpaso vīryāṇi vidvāṃs tapyate, bhāvaty evá
 ‘The one who, thus knowing the [creative] power of heat, heats himself [by practising austerity], he will certainly be [flourishing].’⁹⁹³

(TB 1.4.9.1)

prajā vái ⁺sattrám⁹⁹⁴ āsata tāpas tapyamānā ájuhvatīḥ
 ‘Once, the creatures performed (lit.: were sitting [at]) a sacrificial session [of more than twelve days], performing austerity, without making oblations.’

⁹⁹³ Cf. DEUSSEN (1894: 202): ‘Wer also die Macht des Tapas wissend, dasselbe übt, der bleibt bestehen’.

⁹⁹⁴ Thus emended by W. KNOBL, p.c.; all editions read *sattrám*.

(ŚBM 6.1.3.1-4 ≈ ŚBK 8.1.3.1-4)

[1] *sò 'śrāmyat, sá tápo 'tapyata. tásmāc chrāntāt tepānād āpo 'srjyanta. tásmād pūruṣāt taptād āpo jāyante [...]* [2] *āpo 'bruvan: kvā vayāṃ bhavāméti. tápyadhvam ity abravīt. tā atapyanta, tāḥ phēnam asṛjanta. tásmād apām taptānām phēno jāyate.* [3] *phēno 'bravīt: kvāhām bhavānīti. tápyasvéty abravīt. sò 'tapyata, sá mṛdam asṛjaitād vāi phēnas tapyate, yād apsv āvēṣṭamānaḥ plāvate. sá yadōpahanyāte mṛd evā bhavati.* [4] *mṛd abravīt: kvāhām bhavānīti. tápyasvéty abravīt. sātapyata*

[1] 'He (sc. Prajāpati) toiled, he practised *tapas*.⁹⁹⁵ From him, having toiled, having become hot, the waters were created. Therefore water (= sweat) is born from a man that has become hot. [...] [2] The waters said: "What is to become of us?" – "**Heat yourselves**", [Prajāpati] said. They became hot, they produced foam. Therefore foam is born when water has become hot.⁹⁹⁶ [3] The foam said: "What is to become of me?" – "**Heat yourself**", [Prajāpati] said. It became hot, it produced clay. For this is how foam heats up: it floats while clinging to the water. When beaten [by the water] up [onto the land], it becomes none other than clay. [4] The clay said: "What is to become of me?" – "**Heat yourself**", [Prajāpati] said. It became hot.⁹⁹⁷

Active forms

Apart one attestation of the active participle *tāpyate* in the VS (which clearly instantiate a nonce formation), discussed above, active forms first appear in the late GB, in a cosmogonic context, similar, e.g., to the aforementioned passage ŚB 6.1.3; cf.:

(GB 1.1.2:1.11)

sa bhūyo 'śrāmyad, bhūyo 'tapyad, bhūya ātmānaṃ sam atapat

'He (sc. Brahma) toiled more, he practised more austerity, he heated himself more.'

⁹⁹⁵ EGGELING: 'practised austerity (or became heated)'. Most likely, both meanings are present; cf. GONDA 1982a: 57 [= Sel.St. VI/2, 131].

⁹⁹⁶ On the *genitivus absolutus* constructions in the ŚB, see GAEDICKE 47f., fn. and DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 389f.

⁹⁹⁷ I am thankful to W. KNOBL for valuable comments on the interpretation of this passage.

The abnormal active inflection⁹⁹⁸ could have been introduced under the influence of the adjacent active form *aśrāmyat*.

-i-aorist

The *-i*-aorist *átāpi* is attested in usage α ('heat') – in RV 7.70.2 *átāpi gharmaḥ* 'the vessel has become hot';⁹⁹⁹ in usage γ ('perform austerity') – in TB 2.1.2.1 (cf. DELBRÜCK 1988 [AiS]: 266); see KÜMMEL 1996: 48 for details.

Caus. pass.

The causative passive appears in GB 2.2.6:171.2-3 (\approx VaitS 13.30-14.1) *gharmaṇ tapāmi* [...] *iti gharmaṇ tāpyamānam upāsīta* "I heat the gharma-pot ..." [AVP 5.16.2] – with this mantra he should worship the gharma-vessel being heated up'.

The isolated form *atītape* in RV 8.72.4a (*jām̐y atītape dhánur*) is both morphologically and semantically unclear. Some scholars take it as 3sg.med. of the reduplicated causative aorist employed in the passive sense; thus GELDNER ('Der väterliche Bogen **ist erhitzt worden**'), followed by WATKINS (1969: 89) and JAMISON 148.¹⁰⁰⁰ ELIZARENKOVA's translation is close to GELDNER's, but the form in question is rendered as anticausative: 'Принадлежащий (ему) лук **раскалился**'. DEBRUNNER (1956a: 41) discussed this form at length and explained it as a middle reduplicated (causative) aorist with the irregular 3sg. ending, borrowed from the 1st person, under the influence of 3sg.pf.med. (and stative) with the ending *-e*, common in the passive usage. The analysis of this form as an isolated stative (based on the causative aorist stem *tītap-*) appears to be very likely.

Less plausible is the syntactic analysis suggested by GRASSMANN (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 522), LUDWIG (1876 [RV übers.]: I, 439 and 1881 [Comm. zu I]: 386), and RENOU (EVP XIV, 36 and 106, hesitantly), who take the construction as transitive, with an unexpressed subject; cf. RENOU's

⁹⁹⁸ See BÖHTLINGK 1896d: 13.

⁹⁹⁹ Rather than 'was heated', as translated by some interpreters; cf. GELDNER: 'der Gharmatrank ist ... heiß gemacht worden' (similarly KÜMMEL 1996: 48; SCARLATA 47); VELANKAR (1963: 162): 'the Gharma offering has been heated'; see the discussion at the beginning of the lemma.

¹⁰⁰⁰ Differently MACDONELL 376, §514: reduplicated aorist with the middle ending *-i* (i.e. taken from the passive aorist and added to the thematic stem?).

translation: ‘(Agni) a chauffé l’arc affine (des prières)’.

***dah* ‘burn’: *dáhya*^{-te}**

Simplex RVKh. 3.15.20^{2x}, AV, MS^p 2.1.11:13.5 ≈ ^AKS^p 10.5:130.6-7, ŚBK 3.1.10.1, JB 3.263:7 [= ed. CALAND §207] +;

+ *āti* TS^p 5.5.2.3;

+ *abhi* ŚrSū.;

+ *ni* Kauś^m 83.7 (*ni-dahyatām* ≈ ŚB^m 13.8.1.4 *ní* ... *dhīyātai* ‘may [our sin] be oppressed’);

+ *prá* ŚB;

+ *vi* Sū.;

+ *sám* AB

accented:

dáhya^{-te} : RVKh.^{2x}

dáhyase RVKh. 3.15.20b (VWC-Saṃh. VI, 3915, fn. **p** ⁺*dahyase*), *dáhyamānasya* RVKh. 3.15.20c

dahyá^{-te} : TS^{1x}, MS–KS^{1x}, ŚBK^{1x}

dahyámānā TS 5.5.2.3, MS 2.1.11:13.5 ≈ ^AKS 10.5:130.6-7, *dahyámānāḥ* ŚBK 3.1.10.1

dahya^{-ti} :

Simplex ŚB 5.9.2 (+);

+ *ava* ĀgnivGS 3.10.4:174.8;

(+ *ví* ⁺AV 20.136.8 (ed. ¹ROTH/WHITNEY ⁺*vi-dáhyati*; mss., ed. VISHVA BANDHU *vidā́hya*)

(**pass. of caus.** (?): *-dāhya*^{-te}.)

(+ *ā*?) ChU 6.16.3 (most eds. ^o*ā-dāhyeta*, ed. ĀnSS 63 *dāhyeta*, ed. SENART *dahyeta*; omitted in ed. BÖHTLINGK)

• anticaus., pass.

Traditionally, the present *dahya*^{-te} was grouped together with *-yá*-passives,¹⁰⁰¹ never with class IV *-ya*-presents. On closer examination, however, it turns out that there are no sufficient grounds for a passive

¹⁰⁰¹ Cf. e.g. AVERY 1873: 293; WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]: 71; VON NEGELEIN 1898: 40; MACDONELL 334, §445.

analysis of this formation. On the contrary, a class IV analysis interpretation seems more attractive for a number of reasons.

1. **Semantics and syntax.** Traditionally, *dahya^{-le}* is translated as a passive ('is burnt' or the like), but it is often difficult to judge which of the occurrences are truly passive in sense ('is burnt') and which – non-passive intransitive (anticausative: 'burns [by itself]'). Although a few occurrences (e.g. MS^P 2.1.11:13.5 ≈ ^AKS^P 10.5:130.6-7, ŚBK 3.1.10.1 quoted below) show passive accentuation, most of them can be translated in either way, and the lack of overtly expressed passive agents makes the anticausative analysis as plausible as the passive interpretation. Consider a few typical examples:

(AVŚ 12.4.3c = AVP 17.16.3c)

vaṇḍāyā dahyante grhāḥ

'By [giving] a crippled [cow] the houses [of the giver] are burned¹⁰⁰² / burn down¹⁰⁰³.' (unpleasant consequences of giving defective cows to ṛṣis)

(ŚBM 6.7.4.8 = ŚBK 8.7.4.8 = ŚBM 7.1.1.42 = ŚBK 8.8.2.34)

yád dhí yuktám ná vimucyáte, prá tád dahyate

'... because when the yoked [animal] is not released, it is chafing.'

(ŚB 14.2.2.54)

sá yád vānāspatyāḥ syāt, prá dahyeta; yád dhiraṇmāyāḥ syāt, prá līyeta

'If it (sc. the vessel) were made of wood, it would burn; and if [it] were made of gold, it would melt.' (cf. RAU 1973: 23f.)

2. **The accentuation** of *dahya^{-le}* fluctuates in texts. WHITNEY's (1885b [Roots]: 71) record "Pass. *dahyáte* etc. AV.+" is deceptive. Ironically enough, the only accented form in the AV is ROTH & WHITNEY's conjecture ⁺*vi-dáhyati* (see below), while the actually attested forms with suffix accentuation appear in Vedic prose only. The relevant passages are:

(TS 5.5.2.3)

*prajāpatir agnīm acikīṣata, tám pṛthivy ābravān: ná máyy agnīm ceṣyasé,
'ti mā dhakṣyati. sá tvātidahyámānā ví dhaviṣye*

'Prajāpati tried to pile his fire [altar], the earth spoke to him: "You shall not pile your fire on me, it will burn me excessively. Being burned

¹⁰⁰² Thus WHITNEY ('by a crippled one his houses **are burned**'); BLOOMFIELD 1897: 174 ('his house **is burned**'); LUDWIG 1878: 449 ('... **werden verbrannt** die häuser').

¹⁰⁰³ Thus ELIZARENKOVA 2007: 192 ('Из-за увечной **сгорают** дом').

excessively, I will shake you apart from myself’.

(MS 2.1.11:13.5-6 ≈ ^AKS 10.5:130.6-7)

tām arcīr úd auṣat [KS *sám adahat*]. *sārcīṣā dahyāmānā hradām prāviṣat*

‘The flame burned her (sc. the demoness Kusitāyī [KS Kusidāyī]) up. Being burned by the flame, she entered the lake.’ (cf. SIEG 1902: 103f.)

(ŚBK 3.1.10.1)

sò ’gnīḥ sṛṣṭá imāḥ prajā dāgdhum dadhre. sá imāḥ prajā dāhann abhīyāya. tām imāḥ prajā dahyāmānā ānugamayitum vípeṣṭum dadhre
‘Agni, having been created, decided to burn these creatures. Burning, he went at these creatures. Being burned, these creatures decided to extinguish [and] crush him.’¹⁰⁰⁴

All passages above are built according to syntactic pattern (X_{NOM}) Y_{ACC} *dah_{ACT}* [...] Y_{NOM} (X_{INS}) *dahyá-te*.¹⁰⁰⁵ At first glance, the presence of an instrumental nominal, which corresponds to the subject of the first sentence, favours the passive interpretation ‘Y is being burnt [by X]’. Yet an anticausative translation (‘Y burns [with flame]’) cannot be ruled either.

Furthermore, there are two occurrences with root accentuation attested in the RVKh. Both appear in one passage, which runs as follows in ed. SCHEFTELOWITZ:

(RVKh. 3.15.20)

eṣá te hṛdayeṅgāró ’dīptás te asmi dáhyase
mayá te dáhyamānasyāgnír dāṁśéna na tṛpyatu
bhūmír dāṁśéna tṛpyatu

Pada b was considered corrupt by the compilers of the VWC, which conjectures ⁺*dīptó ’sti, asmín dahyase* (VWC-Samh. VI, 3915, fn. **p**). This drastic emendation hardly makes better sense, however (‘it/he was lightened. (?) You are being burned in it/him.’(?)) In my view, pāda b requires no emendation at all, while pāda d is corrupt, indeed. The stanza is likely to represent a love-spell, and the correct readings are prompted by the following Paippalāda verse of similar content:¹⁰⁰⁶

¹⁰⁰⁴ I am thankful to W. KNOBL for valuable comments on this passage.

¹⁰⁰⁵ Cf. also AVP 9.28.3, quoted in Chapter B.V, s.v. *yas*.

¹⁰⁰⁶ I have greatly benefited from discussing the interpretation of this passage with W. KNOBL.

(AVP-Or. 9.28.10 = AVP-Kashm. 9.25.10)

hṛdaye 'dhi sam idhyatām¹⁰⁰⁷ ' s_uvair māmsebhir eṣa te
agniḥ kāmasya yo mahān ' sa mahyaṁ +randhayāt¹⁰⁰⁸ t_uvā [or: t_uvām]
 'Let this fire of your love, which is great, be inflamed on [your] heart
 with [your] own flesh. It shall subject you to me.'

Obviously, the unclear *dāmséna* in the RVKh.¹⁰⁰⁹ should be emended with AVP-Or. to *+māmséna*; note that the Kashm. ms. has the same error (*dāmsebhir*, for which ed. BARRET conjectures *+damsebhir*). Subsequently, omitting *na* in pāda d, probably written twice by mistake (*+māmséna tṛpyatu*) and adding the avagraha in pāda a (*'ṅāró*), we arrive at the correct reading and interpretation of the passage:

eṣā te hṛdaye 'ṅāró ' dīptás te asmi dáhyase
mayā te dáhyamānasyāgnír +māmséna tṛpyatu
bhūmír +māmséna tṛpyatu
 'This is the coal in your heart. I am lightened up by you, you are burning.¹⁰¹⁰ Let [this] fire of you, who are burning with me, be satiated with [your own] flesh; let the earth be satiated with [your own] flesh.'

Most probably, since all root-accented forms are met in the texts preserved in a bad condition (RVKh., book 20 of the AVŚ), they never were taken by Vedic scholars as sufficient evidence for the existence of a class IV present *dáhya-te*. However, bearing in mind that as few as three suffix-accented occurrences are attested, it would be risky to consider both instances of *dáhya-te* as mere errors. The accentuation of *dáhya-te* can be thus accounted for in two different ways:

- (i) One may assume that *dáhya-te* is accented in accordance with the

¹⁰⁰⁷ Kashm. ms. *ṛddhyatām*.

¹⁰⁰⁸ Thus emended by W. KNOBL, p.c. Or. mss. read *randhayanti* (apparently unclear to BHATTACHARYA and therefore underlined in his ed.). Another possible emendation (which also suggests a subjunctive form, rather than an imperative) may be *+randhayāti tvā* (A. GRIFFITHS, p.c.). BARRET conjectured an imperative form for Kashm. ms. *rundhayātu*, which, in contrast to the subjunctive, does not fit the metrical scheme, however.

¹⁰⁰⁹ Cf. VWC-Saṃh. III, 1562, fn. e: *arthaḥ vyu[tpatti] ca?* 'meaning and etymology?'

¹⁰¹⁰ Note that such a syntactic analysis (*dáhyase* begins a new clause) accounts for the fact that *dáhyase* is accented.

semantic rule prescribed by Indian grammarians (Pāṇ. 6.1.195; though this rule applies only to the verbal roots terminating in a vowel; see Chapter A.I.4): passive ‘be burnt’ with suffix accentuation, non-passive intransitive (anticausative) ‘burn [by oneself]’ with root accentuation (see Chapter A.I.4). In reality, this rule is not confirmed by the actually attested accentual patterning of the (middle) *-ya*-presents: they either always have the accent on the root (class IV), or on the suffix (*-yá*-passives), or, finally, their accentuation fluctuates regardless of the meaning. The only possible parallel case may be the pair *pácyā-te* ‘ripen’ vs. *pacyá-te* ‘be cooked’, but the similarity is incomplete, since the semantic relationship between ‘ripen’ and ‘be cooked’ is more idiomatic than that between ‘burn [by oneself]’ and ‘be burnt’; furthermore, some texts (e.g. ŚB) do not follow this rule consistently; see s.v. *pac* for details. Thus, *dahya-te* would be an isolated instance of a middle *-ya*-present with the semantically conditioned accentuation.

(ii) The distribution of the accented forms in texts is rather close to the one which is actually attested for most of the *-ya*-presents with fluctuating accentuation: root accentuation in RV(Kh.), TS, TB and TĀ, suffix accentuation in AV, MS, KS, ŚB (see Chapter C.II.3.2 for details). Thus, it cannot be ruled out that the correlation between the accentuation and meaning formulated sub (i) is merely accidental and *dáhyā-te* basically follows the same accentual patterning as attested for other *-ya*-presents with fluctuating accentuation (for the only exception, a suffix-accented occurrence in the TS, see below).

Beside these two major features, there are several minor peculiarities which favour grouping *dahya-te* with non-passive middle *-ya*-presents rather than with *-yá*-passives.

3. **Diathesis fluctuation.** As is well-known, in some late Vedic and, especially, post-Vedic texts (e.g., the Upaniṣads, Sūtras) middle *-ya*-presents may appear with the active inflection (although still quite rarely). Such rare instances of active forms occur for several non-passive *-ya*-presents (*rdhya-te*, *tapyā-te*, etc.), but not for *-yá*-passives, which are consistently inflected in the middle in post-Vedic texts, with rare exceptions only (see Chapter C.VI for a synopsis of data and discussion). Under a passive analysis, the active occurrences of *dahya-te* in (late) Vedic (attested already in the Brāhmaṇas (ŚB) and Sūtras; for details, see below) would be an isolated instance of the ‘middle → active’ replacement. This fact, again, favours a non-passive analysis of *dahya-te* as belonging to the *-yá*-class.

4. **Features of the type *tapyā-te*.** Within the *-yá*-class, *dahya-te* exhibits all features of the small group of verbs of heating, which also includes *tapyā-te* ‘become warm, hot, be heated’ and *pacyā-te* ‘be cooked; ripen’; see Chapter C.II.3. Specifically, *dahya-te* (i) belongs to the same semantic sphere (‘heating/burning’), displays (ii) the same paradigmatic patterning (intransitive -ya-presents are opposed to the transitive class I present *dāha-ti* ‘burn’) and (iii) the same root structure (*CaC*). The similarity extends even further, encompassing a few minor peculiarities shared by *dahya-te* and *tapyā-te*: (iv) As mentioned before (sub 3), middle *-yá*-presents first appear with the active inflection in late Vedic and post-Vedic texts (Āraṇyakas, Upaniṣads), but only *tapyā-te* and *dahya-te* are attested with active endings in two late Brāhmaṇas (in GB and ŚB, respectively). (v) Both *tapyā-te* and *dahya-te* occur once with suffix accentuation in the TS: *anu-tapyámānā* (TS 3.2.8.2), *ati-dahyámānā* (TS 5.5.2.3). (vi) Finally, it is worth mentioning that the Middle Iranian cognate of *dahya-te*, Khot. *daj-* ‘ripen’,¹⁰¹¹ displays the same semantic development as attested for another verb of heating, *pacyā-te*: ‘burn/become hot’ → ‘become mature’.

To sum up, there are several good reasons for not grouping the present *dahya-te* with -yá-passives; most of its usages are hardly “more passive” than those of *tapyā-te* and *pacyā-te*. Rather, it belongs with non-passive *-yá*-presents, and forms with suffix accentuation are limited to certain Vedic texts (schools or dialects).

Active forms

The only early Vedic (AV) active occurrence is based on a ROTH/WHITNEY’s conjecture for a corrupt verse in the badly preserved book 20 of the AVŚ:

(AVŚ 20.136.8cd)

*yáthā dāvó +vidáhyat*¹⁰¹²

áṅgāni máma dahyante

‘As a forest fire burns up, so my members are inflamed.’ (a description of the sexual excitement)

The stem *dahya-* does not occur with the active inflection in the Saṃhitās, which renders ROTH/WHITNEY’s conjecture doubtful. In any case, the middle

¹⁰¹¹ O.Khot. 3 sg. *dagyāre* etc.; cf. EMMERICK 1968: 43.

¹⁰¹² Ed. VISHVA BANDHU *yáthā vayo vídāhya*.

form (*vi-dahyate*) is a more probable reading; cf. AVP 19.26.15 *dāvād dahyamānāt* ‘from the burning forest fire’.

The earliest reliable active occurrence appears in the ŚB:

(ŚB 5.9.2)¹⁰¹³

atha yadāsya tārāvarṣāṇi colkāḥ patanti nipatanti dhūmayanti diśo dahyanti ...

‘Then, if for someone star showers or meteors fall, fall down [on the earth and] smoke, if the quarters glow ...’ (a list of bad omens)

Evidence is too scant to decide whether the active inflection could express here the non-passive (anticausative) meaning of (‘the quarters glow by themselves, spontaneously’) or was introduced under the influence of the three adjacent 3pl. active forms, *patanti*, *nipatanti*, *dhūmayanti*. Since the middle *dahya-te* is quite frequent in non-passive uses (see examples at the beginning of the lemma), the latter account is preferable.

Apart from the aforementioned *dahyanti* in the ŚB, indicative active forms are unattested until late Sūtras and late Upaniṣads (ĀgñivGS 3.10.4:174.8 *ava-dahyanti*, MānGS 2.15.6, late Up. *dahyet*); in Epic Sanskrit they become quite common (see HOLTSMANN 1884: 25f., KULKARNI 1942-43: 239, OBERLIES 2003: 192, fn. 2 and 444, as well as Chapter C.VI.1 for discussion).

(Caus. pass.)

The only attestation of the stem *-dāhya-te*, which, in formal terms, might be taken as a passive built on the causative stem,¹⁰¹⁴ is unclear:

(ChU 6.16.2-3 [ed. MORGENROTH 6.16.3-4])

sa satyābhisamḍhaḥ satyenātmānam antardhāya paraśuṃ taptam pratigṛhṇāti. sa na dahyate, 'tha mucyate ||2|| sa yathā tatra nādāhyetaidātmyam idaṁ sarvam ...

‘Der macht eine wahre Aussage, umhüllt sich mit Wahrheit, und greift das heiß gemachte Beil an. Der verbrennt sich nicht, dann wird er frei gelassen. Wie der **sich** dabei nicht **verbrennt**, daraus bestehend¹⁰¹⁵ ist dieses All ...’ (MORGENROTH 1958: 335)

¹⁰¹³ Mentioned in ed. EELSINGH, Inleiding, p. xxxiv, among “grammaticale bizonderheden”.

¹⁰¹⁴ Thus, e.g., WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]: 71.

¹⁰¹⁵ For *aitadātmyam*, see MORGENROTH 1958: 489ff.

Although a number of editions (e.g. ed. LIMAYE & VADEKAR [“18 Up.”]) read *nāḍāhyet*^o in (3), the length of the root vowel and of the preceding *ā* (in *nā*^o) is suspect. First, *dah* is not attested with the preverb *ā* (see e.g. GOTÖ 174f.); second, the causative meaning¹⁰¹⁶ makes little sense in the context. Note furthermore that the meaning of *nāḍāhyeta* seems to be the same as that of *na dahyate* in the preceding sentence. Accordingly, some editions emend the length of *a* in one or both cases. Ed. ĀnSS emends *nā* and reads *na ḍāhyeta*;¹⁰¹⁷ in contrast, ed. SENART reads the short *a* in the root: *sa yathā tatra nā dahyeta, etad-ātmakam idaṁ sarvam*. Raṅgarāmanuja glosses *nāḍāhyeta* with *na dahyate* in his comment, thus considering both *ā*’s secondary. Finally, ed. BÖHTLINGK considers the first clause (including the unclear form in question) corrupt and simply omits it,¹⁰¹⁸ which can hardly be an acceptable solution.¹⁰¹⁹

Most likely, *ā* is secondary in both cases, but the exact reasons of the lengthening are unclear.¹⁰²⁰

dṛ̥ (/dṛ̥/) ‘crack, split, break, burst’: *dṛ̥yá-te*

Simplex TS^p 7.5.5.2^{2x} ≈ KS^p 34.4:38.13, +MS 2.1.8^{2x}:9.14, 15, ŚB 4.5.10.7^{2x}, PB, JB;

+ *áva* ‘cleave’ ŚB 7.2.1.8, KauśS 120.1;

+ *nir* GB 2.6.14:267.6;

¹⁰¹⁶ Thus EDGERTON (1965: 178): ‘he would ... not be caused to be burned’.

¹⁰¹⁷ Likewise, in ed. LIMAYE & VADEKAR *ā* in *nā* is considered secondary, but their conjecture suggested in a note (*nā* for +*naḥ*, as in RV 10.34.8 (?)) is improbable: *nā namante* [Pp. *nā namante*] in RV 10.34.8, mentioned by LIMAYE & VADEKAR, probably represents *nā ā-nam*^o; see GOTÖ 193, fn. 359.

¹⁰¹⁸ “Ich habe den Anfang *sa yathā* usw., der übrigens auch verdorben ist, weggelassen, weil ich diese Worte nicht mit dem Folgenden in irgend einen erträglichen Zusammenhang zu bringen vermag” (ed. BÖHTLINGK, S.106). The reading and translation of this passage suggested in ed. BÖHTLINGK are as follows:

sa ya eṣo ’ñimaitad ātmakam idaṁ sarvam, tat satyam

‘Alles hat jene feinsten Bestandtheile zu seinem Wesen, es ist das Wirkliche ...’

¹⁰¹⁹ Cf. SENART’s remark ad loc.: “Böhtlingk applique des remèdes trop hardis et, il faut l’avouer, trop commodes”.

¹⁰²⁰ Perhaps triggered by the adjacent *yathā*: *na dahyeta* [*a*] *tha* : *yathā* ... *nāḍāhyeta*.

- + *pári* ‘become ill’¹⁰²¹ TS^p 2.3.12.1;
 + *pra* AB 6.35.1;
 + *ví* ŚB 14.3.2.1 (also in *avidriyá-* ‘non-breaking’ RV 1.46.15) +
 accented:
dīrya-te : TS^{2x}, +MS^{2x}
dīryeta TS 7.5.5.2^{2x}, +*dīryeta* MS 2.1.8^{2x}:9.13, 14
dīryá-te : ŚB^{4x}
dīryéta ŚB 4.5.10.7^{2x}, *ava-dīryáte* ŚB 7.2.1.8, *vi-dīryáte* ŚB 14.3.2.1
 • anticaus. / (pass.)
 (-*dīrya-ti* (?):
 AV 19.9.8, mss. *ávaṭīryatīḥ*, ed. ROTH/WHITNEY +*avatīryatī*,
 LINDENAU (in ed. ²ROTH/WHITNEY/LINDENAU, Vorwort, p. XVIII)
 +*avadīryatī* (?)

also in nom. deriv.:

-*á-*: °*driyá-* (in *avidriyá-* ‘non-breaking, unbreakable’ RV 1.46.15)

The root *dṛ̥/dṛ̥* originally belonged to the aniṭ type (see, in particular, NARTEN 145, with fn. 401; MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 701ff., with bibl.; PRAUST 2000a; LIV 119f., note 1 s.v. **der-*); cf. sigmatic aor.subj. *dārṣat*, *darṣasi*, root aor. *dárt*, pf.part. *dadṛvāms-*, agent nominal *dártar-/dartár-*, etc. Traces of the -ya-present built on the original aniṭ-variant can be found in the compound *ā-dṛ̥*, with the idiomatic meaning ‘heed, care’ (pres. *ā-driya-te*, see Chapter I, s.v.), as well as in the isolated noun *avidriyá-* ‘uninterrupted’ (RV 1.46.15).¹⁰²²

The intransitive present *dīryá-te*, based on the more recent seṭ root variant *dṛ̥*, could have developed the seṭ morphology under the influence of the synonymous ‘-yá-present *śīryá-te* ‘collapse’, see below s.v. *dīryá-te* typically refers to a situation when a (sacrificial) vessel receives a crack or bursts, i.e., usually, a spontaneous process – which favours an anticausative interpretation. Suffix accentuation occurs in the ŚB; forms with the accent on the root (all – optatives) are attested in the TS and MS. Examples are:

(ŚB 4.5.10.7)

yádi kaláśo dīryétānu lipsadhvam íti brūyāt [...] sá yády anītāsu

¹⁰²¹ Cf. JOHANSSON 1917: 151, with fn. 2.

¹⁰²² See WACKERNAGEL 1905 [AiG II/1]: 179f.

dákṣiṇāsu kalāśo dīryéta, tátṛāpy ékām evā gām dadyāt

‘If the vessel cracks, he should say: “Try to catch up with [the soma (while it is still spilling)].” [...] And if the vessel cracks before the dakṣiṇā [cows] have been led up, already then he should give a single cow.’¹⁰²³

(ŚB 14.3.2.1)

vī vā eṣā prajāyā paśúbhir ṛdhyate yāsya gharma vidīryáte

‘Verily, the one whose gharma-vessel cracks is deprived of offspring and cattle.’

(ŚB 7.2.1.8)

yātra vā asyā avadīryáte, yātra vāsyā oṣadhayo ná jāyante, nīrṛtiḥ hāsyái tād grhṇāti

‘On whatever [part of] this [earth] there is a cleaving, or in whatever part of it plants are not produced, verily this [part] of it Nirṛti seizes upon.’

(TS 7.5.5.2 ≈ ^UKS 34.4:38.13-14)

yádi prātaḥsavané kalāśo dīryeta, vaiṣṇavīṣu śipiviṣṭāvatīṣu stuvīran

‘If the bowl cracks at the morning pressing, they should sing verses addressed to Viṣṇu Śipiviṣṭa.’

The two other root-accented forms are conjectured by BÖHTLINGK (apud DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 296) and CALAND (1902: 97 [= Kl.Schr., 134]) for the following MS passage:

(MS 2.1.8:9.12-14)

*yádi purā saṁsthānād +dīryetādyā varṣiṣyātīti [...] yádi cirām iva +dīryeta, nāddhā vidmēti*¹⁰²⁴

¹⁰²³ For this construction, cf. OERTEL 1926: 216.

¹⁰²⁴ Quoted by CALAND as “[MS] II.1.8 (S. 9, [Zeilen] 14, 15)”; recte 13, 14. CALAND gives no accents; I leave root accentuation, as in the ed.

BÖHTLINGK/DELBRÜCK/CALAND’s conjecture is also adopted in RAU 1972: 18, with fn. 6.

Another conjecture, ⁺*śīryeta*, suggested by BÖHTLINGK in pw IV, Nachtr., 298, is less likely. OERTEL (1926: 195f.) adopts the reading of ed. SCHROEDER, taking the form in question as a compound (*vi-īryeta*), but his causative passive translation (‘if it (= the vessel) should be caused to go to pieces (= break into pieces)...’) is forced, and the context is typical for verbs of destruction such as *dīryá-^{te}*. See MITTWEDE 1986 [Textkr. zur MS]: 77 for bibliography and detailed discussion; see now also AMANO 455, with fn. 1840.

‘If [the vessel] would crack¹⁰²⁵ before the end [of the sacrifice], [he should say] thus: “It will rain today”. [...] If it would be cracking kind of slowly, [he should say] thus: “We do not know for certain [when it will rain]”.’

Active forms

Active forms are unattested, except for the form ⁺*avadīryatī*, hesitantly conjectured by WHITNEY for AV 19.9.8:

śám no bhúmir ⁺*vépamānā* ⁺*śám ulkāñihitaṃ ca yāt*

śám gāvo lóhitakṣīrāḥ ⁺*śám bhúmir* ⁺*avadīryatī*

The mss. read the corrupt and morphologically impossible *ávatīryatīḥ* (Pp. *ávatīr-yatīḥ* makes no sense), for which ed. ¹ROTH/WHITNEY conjectures *avatīryatīḥ*, “which is at least grammatical, though hardly intelligible” (WHITNEY). WHITNEY’s translation (‘Weal for us be the quaking earth and weal what is meteor-smitten; weal be the red-milked kine, weal the earth when **cleaving down**’) and the reading adopted in ed. ²ROTH/WHITNEY/LINDENAU (see Vorwort, p. XVIII) is based on Sāyaṇa’s reading *avadīryatī* (glossed with *avadīryamāṇā*). Note, however, that the stem *dīrya-* first appears in Vedic prose and does not occur with the active inflection.

pac α ‘cook’; β ‘ripen’: *pácyá-^{te}*

Simplex (α/β) RV + ;

+ *úd* (β) KS^p 23.4:79.7 (*ut-pacyante*, v.l. ^o*paśya^o*) ≈ KpS^p 36.1:188.9 (ms. ^o*padya^o*, ed. RAGHU VIRA ⁺^o*pacya^o*)¹⁰²⁶;

¹⁰²⁵ CALAND: ‘wenn der Krug einen Riss bekommt’.

¹⁰²⁶ The relevant passage runs:

(KS^p 23.4:79.7 ≈ KpS^p 36.1:188.9)

tásmād ūrdhvā óṣadhaya út pacyante

OERTEL (1934a: 22f. [= Kl.Schr. I, 653f.]) calls in question RAGHU VIRA’s conjecture (“was soll $\sqrt{pac + ud}$ bedeuten?”) and amends the KS reading in accordance with the KpS (ms.): *utpadyante* ‘sie erheben sich = wachsen in die Höhe’; this conjecture is accepted by MITTWEDE (1989 [Textkr. zur KS]: 113). Although the compound *út-pacya-^{te}* does not occur elsewhere, the meaning β of *pac* (‘ripen’) suits well the

+ (*abhi-*)*sam* (β) PB 21.15.3

also in nom. deriv.:

-*pacyá-* (in *akṛṣṭa-pacyá-* ‘ripening on unploughed ground’ AV 5.29.7 +¹⁰²⁷)

accented:

pacyá-^{te} : β ‘ripen’ RV^{1x}, ŚB^{1x}, TB^{1x}, +RVKh.^{1x}

pacyate RV 1.135.8, TB 1.8.5.4, +RVKh. 5.22.3 (ed. SCHEFTELOWITZ *pacyate*, read with HOFFMANN (1976: 570f.) +*pacyate* (≈ AV 20.136.3, ed. ¹ROTH/WHITNEY +*padyate*, ed. VISHVA BANDHU °*śadyate*, v.l. °*śānyate*), *pacyāmānaḥ* ŚB 11.5.7.1

pacyá-^{te} : α ‘be cooked’ RV^{1x}, RV-VS-TS-MS^{1x}, RV-AV^{1x}, AV^{2x}; β ‘ripen, be digested’ MS^{1x}, ŚB^{11x}, ŚBK^{1x}

(α): *pacyáte* RV 6.29.4, *pacyāmānāt* RV 1.162.11 = VS 25.34 = TS 4.6.8.4 = MS 3.16.1:182.16, *pacyāmānam* RV 8.69.14 = AV 20.92.11, *pacyāmānā* AV 5.19.4, 12.5.32;

(β): *pacyáte* ŚB 7.2.2.5, 7.4.2.1, 11.2.7.32, 14.8.10.1 (= BĀUM 5.10.1 = BĀUK 5.9.1), *pacyānte* MS 1.6.5:93.16, ŚB 4.3.1.14, 4.3.1.17, 9.1.1.3, ŚBK 4.2.1.21, *pacyéta* ŚB 7.2.4.17^{2x}, *pacyāmānaḥ* ŚB 10.6.1.8, *pacyāmānāḥ* ŚB 7.5.2.2

• α: anticaus. / (pass.); β: anticaus.

The present *pacyá-^{te}* is attested in two distinct, albeit undoubtedly related, usages: α ‘cook, be cooked’ and β ‘ripen’. This formation is mentioned in several grammars of Vedic and Indo-European studies as the (only) example of a *-ya*-present which exhibits a correlation between accent placement and meaning,¹⁰²⁸ and therefore is of particular interest for the present study. The relevant passages are:

context (‘the plants (lit.) ripen up’ ≈ ‘grow up’), and the reading °*pacya*° (as in the KS) is not impossible. Note that *pacyá-^{te}* ‘ripen’ is common with the subject of the plant(s), tree(s), etc., whereas *út-padya-^{te}* occurs only twice in the Brāhmaṇas, with the subject of Agni Sviṣṭakṛt (in ŚB 1.7.3.20) or *stotrāṇi* (in JB 2.164:8).

¹⁰²⁷ See WACKERNAGEL 1905 [AiG II/1]: 179.

¹⁰²⁸ See e.g. GONDA 1951: 98; RENOU 1952: 292; THUMB/HAUSCHILD 1959: 335; HOFFMANN 1976: 571; GOTÖ 253, fn. 398.

(RV 1.135.8d)

*sākāṃ gāvaḥ sūvate pácyate*¹⁰²⁹ *yávaḥ*

‘At the same time the cows give birth, the barley ripens.’

The two other root-accented occurrences (in the Brāhmaṇas) reveal idiomatic meanings developed from ‘ripen’:

(TB 1.8.5.4 ≈ ^UKS 12.9:171.22-172.1)

sómo ’sy! áśvībhyāṃ pacyasva, sárasvatyai pacyasvéndrāya sutrāmṇe pacyasvéty āha | etābhyo hy èṣā devātābhyaḥ pácyate

‘ “You are Soma! Become mature for Áśvins, mature for Sarasvatī, mature for Indra Sutrāman (= well-protecting)” – he said; since for these deities it (sc. surā-drink) **becomes mature**.’¹⁰³⁰

(ŚB 11.5.7.1)

*prajñā vārdhamānā cāturo*¹⁰³¹ *dhārmān brāhmaṇām abhinīṣpādayati; brāhmaṇyam, pratirūpacaryāṃ, yáso, lokapaktīm. lokāḥ pácyamānas*¹⁰³² *catúrbhir dhārmair brāhmaṇāṃ bhunakty: arcáyā ca dānena cājyeyátayā cāvadyátayā ca*

‘The growing intelligence gives four duties to a Brāhmaṇ: learning activity, suitable life conduct, fame, education of the people. The people, when **being educated** (lit. becoming mature),¹⁰³³ grant the Brāhmaṇ with four privileges: with expression of respect, gifts, non-harming (his) property and life.’¹⁰³⁴

Besides, one should mention an unaccented (in spite of its position in a subordinate clause) occurrence in the RVKh., for which HOFFMANN (1976: 570f.), relying upon the aforementioned correlation between accentuation and meaning, conjectured accent on the root:

¹⁰²⁹ For this structure (two accented verbal forms adjacent to each other), see KLEIN 1992: 60ff.

¹⁰³⁰ Said of the alcoholic drink becoming mature. For details of the surā preparation, see OORT 1995: 224ff. et passim. I would like to thank Marianne OORT for valuable clarifications on the issue.

¹⁰³¹ Ed. WEBER *catúro*.

¹⁰³² E. LEUMANN (1892: 23) considered suffix accentuation in this form secondary, with no arguments.

¹⁰³³ PW IV, 355: ‘die heranreifende, sich ausbildende Welt’.

¹⁰³⁴ See WEBER 1868: 40f.; RAU 1977: 350f.

(RVKh. 5.22.3ab ≈ AV 20.136.3ab)

*yád álpikā s_uválpikā ' +karkandhukéva +pácyate [AV +pádyate (?)]*¹⁰³⁵
 'Wenn die Kleine, ganz Kleine wie eine Brustbeere reif wird...'
 (HOFFMANN)¹⁰³⁶

Forms with suffix accentuation are attested both in usages *α* and *β*. Most of the Saṃhitā occurrences (except MS) are employed in the sense *α* 'be cooked', cf.:

(RV 1.162.11abc = VS 25.34[abc] = TS^m 4.6.8.4.1 = MS^m 3.16.1:182.16-183.1 = ^UKS-Aśvamedha^m 5.6.5:177.17-18)

yát te gātrād agnínā pacyámānād ' abhí súlaṃ níhatasyāvadhāvatī
mā tát bhūmyām ā śriṣan mā tñeṣu
 'Let that which flows down from your limb (= leg), being cooked on fire, when you are spit on the spike, not stick to the ground, and not to the grass.'

(RV 6.29.4ab)

sá sóma āmiślatamaḥ sutó bhūd ' yásmín paktīḥ pacyáte [...]
 'That Soma is pressed as most easily mixing, with which [, when being pressed,] cooked food is being cooked [...]' (W. KNOBL, p.c.)

(RV 8.69.14cd)

bhinát kanīna odanám ' pacyámānam paró girā
 'The young one (sc. Indra) split [the mountain and took] the rice porridge which was being cooked beyond the call [of Indra]¹⁰³⁷ (or: in the mountain)¹⁰³⁸.'

(AV 5.19.4ac)

brahmagavī pacyámānā [...] téjo rāṣṭráśya nír hanti
 'The Brahman's cow, when being cooked, [...] smites the splendour of a kingdom.'

¹⁰³⁵ ROTH/WHITNEY's conjecture for the corrupt mss. readings °śádyate, °śányate.

¹⁰³⁶ For a detailed discussion of this verse, see Chapter IV, s.v. *yabh*.

¹⁰³⁷ Thus OLDENBERG, Noten ad loc. OLDENBERG takes *girā* as an instrumental and explains pāda d, *pacyámānam paró girā*, as "der über sein Wort hinaus gekocht wurde", i.e. "[e]r hat vielleicht verboten ihn zu kochen; da es doch geschieht, zerstört er ihn".

¹⁰³⁸ Thus GELDNER, who takes *girā* as a locative.

(AV 12.5.32)

aghāṃ pacyāmānā, duṣvāpnyam pakvā

‘[The Brahman’s cow is] evil when being cooked, nightmare – when cooked.’

By contrast, the only accented occurrence in the MS which is not a RVic repetition, as well as all ŚB occurrences, display meaning β:

(MS 1.6.5:93.15-17)

*tād yé vánapátaya āraṇyā ādyam phalam bhūyiṣṭham pacyānte,*¹⁰³⁹
tāsya parṇābhyāñ yavamāyaś cāpūpó vrīhimāyaś ca
saṃgṛhyopāśyādhéyaḥ

‘Then one should take, throw down and put the apūpa-cake made of barley and that made of rice with the leaves of a forest tree which ripen [so as to provide] the most abundant edible fruit.’¹⁰⁴⁰

The ŚB occurrences with suffix accentuation (8× in the ŚBM + 1× in the ŚBK with no parallel in the ŚBM) are:

(ŚB 7.2.2.5)

nedīya ít sṛṇyāḥ pakvām éyād iti, yadā vā ānnaṃ pacyáté, ’tha tát
sṛṇyópa caranti

‘“May the ripe [crop] come still nearer to the sickles” – for, when food grows ripe, they approaches it with the sickle.’

(ŚB 7.4.2.1)

iyám u vā ānnam, asyāñ hí sárvam ānnaṃ pacyáte
‘... and food is this [earth], since on her all food ripens.’

(ŚB 11.2.7.32)

śarád brahmā; tásmād yadā sasyām pacyáte, bráhmaṇvatyaḥ prajā ity
āhuḥ

‘The Brahman (*brahmán-*) is the autumn; therefore, when the corn ripens, they say: “The offspring are provided with Brahman (*bráhmaṇ-*)”.’

¹⁰³⁹ It is interesting to note that only one of the mss. used by SCHROEDER gives the accent, while others leave the form unaccented.

¹⁰⁴⁰ Cf. DELBRÜCK (1888 [AiS]: 267): “welche zur meisten Frucht heranreifen”. For the construction ‘X^{plant}_{NOM} Y^{fruit}_{ACC} pacya-te’ (lit.) ‘X ripens with respect to Y’ (i.e. ‘Y ripens on X’, ‘Y of X ripens’), see SCHROEDER 1879: 199; SCHROEDER’s edition of the MS, Einleitung, p. XVI; AMANO 223, fn. 482. Note that *phalam* is an accusative of relation (or result), not a direct object; see Chapter A.II.3.

(ŚB 4.3.1.14)

*etāv evā vāsantikau: sā yād vasantā ōṣadhayo jāyante vānaspátayaḥ
pacyānte, téno haitāu mādhuś ca mādhasaś ca*

‘These two [months] are vernal: because in spring plants arise and trees
(i.e. fruits on trees) ripen, therefore these two are Madhu and Mādhava.’

(ŚB 4.3.1.17)

*etāv evā śāradāu: sā yāc charādy ūrg rāsa ōṣadhayaḥ pacyānte, téno
haitāv iṣās corjās ca*

‘These two [months] are autumnal: because in autumn food, juice and
plants ripen, therefore these two are Iṣa and Ūrja.’

(ŚB 9.1.1.3)

*ubháyaṃ v etād ānnaṃ, yāj jartílā, yāc ca grāmyāṃ yāc cāraṇyāṃ: yād
āha tīlās téna grāmyāṃ, yād ākrṣṭe pacyānte tēnāraṇyāṃ*

‘And these wild sesame seeds are two kinds of food: both a domestic and
a wild [kind]: inasmuch as they are sesame seeds, they are domestic;
inasmuch as they ripen on untilled [land], they are wild.’

(ŚB 7.2.4.17)

*yāt kṛṣṭā evā vápen nākrṣṭe, kṛṣṭā evānnaṃ pacyéta nākrṣṭé; 'tha yād
ākrṣṭa evā vápen ná kṛṣṭé, 'kṛṣṭa evānnaṃ pacyéta ná kṛṣṭé*

‘If he would only sow on the ploughed [ground], not on the unploughed
one, food would only ripen on the ploughed [ground], not on the
unploughed one; and if he would only sow on the unploughed [ground],
not on the ploughed one, food would only ripen on the unploughed
[ground], not on the ploughed one.’

(ŚBK 4.2.1.21)

yadā hí supákty ōṣadhayaḥ pacyānte

‘For when the plants ripen well ...’

Two or three of the suffix-accented ŚB occurrences attest a particular
submeaning of β, ‘be digested’ (of food), which must have developed from
‘be cooked’ (see R. MÜLLER 1952: 278, fn. 56):

(ŚB 14.8.10.1 (= BĀUM 5.10.1 = BĀUK 5.9.1))

*ayām agnír vaiśvānaró, yò 'yām antālḥ pūruṣe, yénedām ānnaṃ pacyáte,
yād idām adyáte, tásyaiśá ghóṣo bhavati, yām etát kárṇāv apidhāya
śṛṇóti*

‘This Agni Vaiśvānara, which is inside a person, with which this food,
that is eaten, is being cooked/digested, of that [fire] there is this noise,

which one hears after covering one's ears in this way.¹⁰⁴¹

(ŚB 7.5.2.2)

*yád v evòkhāyām / yónir vā ukhā, paśávaḥ paśuśīrṣāṇi; yónau tát paśún
prāti ṣṭhāpayati. tásmād adyámānāḥ pacyámānāḥ paśávo ná kṣīyante,
yónau hy ènān pratiṣṭhāpáyati*

‘And as to why [he puts the heads] in the fire-pan: verily, the fire-pan is a womb, and the heads of the sacrificial animals are animals; thus he establishes animals in the womb. Therefore animals, [albeit] being eaten and digested, do not waste, for he establishes them in the womb.’

(ŚB 10.6.1.8)

tásmāt távaiśá sutò ’dyámānāḥ pacyámānó ’kṣīyamāṇo gṛhēṣu tiṣṭhati

‘Therefore this pressed [Soma] of yours keeps being eaten and digested in [your] houses, without [ever] wasting.’

It seems that the MS and ŚB have generalized suffix accentuation in *pacya-te*; the only ŚB exception (ŚB 11.5.7.1 *pácyamāna-* ‘being educated’) may be due to the idiomatic meaning.

pṛ̥ (pūr̥) ‘fill, become/grow full’: *pūryá-te*

Simplex RV 1.51.10, AVP 5.40.7,¹⁰⁴² VS 5.28 (= ŚB 3.6.1.21) (*pūryethām* ≈ TS^m 1.3.1.2m = 6.2.10.5 = KS^m A2.12:17.9 = A3.3:24.6 = U25.10:118.3 = U26.5:127.18 *ā-pr̥nethām* ≈ KpS^m 2.6:18.15 = 2.10:20.8 = 40.3:225.1 = 41.3:238.4 *ā-pr̥ñātām*), MS^p 4.3.5:44.12, ŚB, TB 3.10.1.1, ŚĀ 6.8 +;

+ *abhi* BaudhŚS 3.16:87.13, VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 4.12 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 4.28a:1 (= CALAND 1928: 133 [= Kl.Schr., 433]¹⁰⁴³));

+ *ā* ‘increase, wax (of the moon)’ ŚB, TB 3.10.1.1, AB 2.11.10, 11, PB 25.10.6, 25.10.10, JB + (also in comp. *āpūryamāṇa-pakṣá-* ‘the half of the month in which the moon waxes’ AB 4.27.8, ŚB, JB 1.49:11 +);

¹⁰⁴¹ On this passage and the understanding of food digestion in the Indian context, see R. MÜLLER 1952: 278ff.

¹⁰⁴² WEBER’s (1895: 839) hesitant conjecture *pūryamāṇaiḥ* for AVŚ 18.1.54 *pūryāṇaiḥ* (secondary reading for RV 10.14.7 *pūrvyébhiḥ* ‘along the ancient [paths]’) is improbable.

¹⁰⁴³ Ed. CALAND *abhipūryamāṇa(pakṣaḥ)*.

- + *ut* JB 3.218^{2x}:6;
 + *prāti* MS^p 3.2.2:17.11 (+);
 + *sám* ‘overfill’ ŚB 14.9.1.2 (= BĀUM 6.1.2 = BĀUK 6.2.2), ChU

accented:

pūrya^{-te/(ti)} : RV^{1x}, MS^{1x}, TB^{m2x}, TĀ^{m2x}
pūryamāṇam RV 1.51.10, *pūryamāṇā*, *ā-pūryamāṇā* TB^m 3.10.1.1, *ā-pūryati* TĀ^m 1.14.1^{2x}, *prati-pūryeta* MS 3.2.2:17.11

pūryá^{-te} : MS^{1x}, ŚB^{12x}, TB^{1x}
pūryáte MS 4.3.5:44.12, ŚB 11.2.4.5, 14.4.2.5 (= BĀUM 1.4.5 = BĀUK 1.4.3), 14.5.1.5 (= BĀU 2.1.5); *ā-pūryáte* ŚB 1.6.3.17, 1.6.3.24, 1.7.2.22, 2.1.3.1, 2.4.4.18, 2.4.4.19, 8.4.1.10, TB 1.5.10.5, *ā-pūryámāṇasya* ŚB 10.4.2.17, *saṃ-pūryáte* ŚB 14.9.1.2, ed. WEBER (v.ll. *sāṃ-pūryatā*^o, *saṃ-pūryate* ≈ BĀUM 6.1.2, ed. BÖHTLINGK ⁺*saṃ-pūryátai* ≈ ChU 5.3.3 *saṃ-pūryate*)

- pūrya*^{-ti} :
ā-pūryati TĀ 1.14.1^{2x} (+)
 • anticaus.

The two closely related roots ‘fill’, viz. *pṛ̥* (e.g. in the nasal presents *pṛ̥ṇāti*, *pṛ̥ṇá*^{-ti/te}) and *pūr̥*, have been discussed at length by ALBINO (1999). The secondary non-ablauting root *pūr̥* (e.g. in caus. *pūr̥áya*^{-ti} AV +, redupl.aor. *pūpurantu*; see JAMISON 149) has been extracted from the participle *pūr̥ná*- ‘full’ (see ALBINO 1999: 12; KÜMMEL 2000: 305, with fn. 512; 325ff.; LIV 482f., with note 21). From the formal point of view, *pūryá*^{-te} can belong to either of these two as a regular formation,¹⁰⁴⁴ but system-related features favour the connection with *pūr̥* (ALBINO, op.cit., 10f.). Note that the -áya-causative is attested from the AV onwards and perhaps did not exist in the times of the RV. On the other hand, *pūryá*^{-te} first appears in the late RV; instead, the early RV attests the thematicized middle nasal present *pṛ̥ṇa*^{-te} in the intransitive usage [‘fill oneself, become full’] (RV 3.50.1 *pṛ̥ṇatām*, RV 7.37.1 *pṛ̥ṇadhvam*).¹⁰⁴⁵ Thus, the opposition tr. *pūr̥áya*^{-ti} (AV+) ~ intr. *pūryá*^{-te} (late RV / AV+) replaces the old pair tr. *pṛ̥ṇāti*, *pṛ̥ṇá*^{-ti} (RV+) ~ intr. *pṛ̥ṇa*^{-te} (RV–YV^m) – which can serve as an additional argument for connecting the -yá-present *pūryá*^{-te} with *pūr̥*, rather than with *pṛ̥*.

¹⁰⁴⁴ Cf. JOACHIM 110: to *pṛ̥*.

¹⁰⁴⁵ Also in AV 19.61.1 (*pṛ̥ṇasva*) and in a YVic mantra quoted below (TS, KS *ā-pṛ̥ṇethām* ~ KpS *ā-pṛ̥ṇātām*); for details, see KULIKOV 1995: 109f.; 2000a: 203ff.

The present *pūryá-^{te}*, quite rare in the Saṃhitās (three attestations in the mantras: RV^{1x}, AVP^{1x}, VS^{1x}; ¹⁰⁴⁶ two in the MS^p, becomes common in the Brāhmaṇas. Although most of the accented occurrences have the accent on the suffix and are traditionally treated as passives (cf. e.g. WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]: 100; JOACHIM, *ibid.*), only few can be considered true passives (‘be filled [by somebody]’). The majority of forms show the non-passive (anticausative or reflexive) meaning ‘become full, be filled [by itself], fill oneself’, regardless of the accentuation. Examples are:

(RV 1.51.10cd)

ā tvā vātasya nṛmaṇo manoyúja ' ā pūryamāṇaṃ avahann abhí śrávaḥ
 ‘The mind-yoked [horses] of Wind, O manly-minded one, conveyed you
 to glory, growing full [with soma and strength].’ ¹⁰⁴⁷

(AVP 5.40.7a)

punaḥ pūryatām yad +adanty¹⁰⁴⁸ asya
 ‘What they eat of it (sc. rice-gruel), let [that] fill up again.’ (see
 LUBOTSKY 2002: 182)

Instructive is the YVic mantra attested in a number of variants, only one of which (VS) has the *-ya*-present:

(VS 5.28.b (= ŚB 3.6.1.21) ≈ TS 1.3.1.2.m (= 6.2.10.5) = KS ^A2.12:17.8-9 =
^A3.3:24.6 (≈ ^U25.10:118.13 ≈ ^U26.5:127.17-18) ≈ KpS 2.6:18.15 = 2.10:20.8
 (= 40.3:225.1 = 41.3:238.4) ≈ JB 1.72:11) ¹⁰⁴⁹

ghṛtēna dyāvāpṛthivī pūryethām [TS, KS *ā pṛṇethām*, KpS *ā pṛṇātām*, JB
ā pṛṇīthām]

‘Heaven and Earth, become full with [JB enjoy] ghee.’ ¹⁰⁵⁰

Most likely, in the young mantras, *pūrya-^{te}* was not yet well-established,

¹⁰⁴⁶ Besides, one should mention one occurrence in a young mantra quoted in two Gṛhya-Sūtras (see APTE 1940-41: 180 [42]): *ūnam me pūryatām* (ĀśGS^m 2.2.3 = PārGS^m 2.16.3) ‘may what is empty in me become full!’

¹⁰⁴⁷ I follow the interpretation suggested by W. KNOBL (p.c.).

¹⁰⁴⁸ Conjecture by BHATTACHARYA; mss. °*ahaṇtv* *asy*°; Kashm. ms. *adantasy*°; see LUBOTSKY 2002: 182.

¹⁰⁴⁹ See BLOOMFIELD & EDGERTON 1930 [Ved. Var. I]: 50; ALBINO, *op.cit.*, 9f.

¹⁰⁵⁰ For this mantra, see, in particular, CALAND & HENRY 96f.; GONDA 1974a: 97; 1983d: 30.

being in competition with the older intr. pr. *pṛṇa-te* (see above).¹⁰⁵¹ It becomes more common in Vedic prose. Examples are:

(MS 3.2.2:17.11-12)

yádi bhásma pratipūryetāpsú prā veśayed, āpo vā agnér yóniḥ
‘When the ashes grow full [in the vessel],¹⁰⁵² one should make them enter the waters; since the waters are Agni’s birth place.’

(ŚB 11.2.4.5)

udānā evā pūrṇāmā, udānéna hy āyām pūruṣaḥ pūryāta iva
‘The full moon is the up-breathing, for it is by the up-breathing that this man becomes full, as it were.’

(ŚB 14.9.1.2 (= BĀUM 6.1.2 = BĀUK 6.2.2) ≈ ChU 5.3.3)

*véttha yáthemāḥ prajāḥ prayátyo vipratipádyantā3? iti [...] véttha yáthāsáu lokā evāṃ bahúbhiḥ pūnaḥ-punaḥ prayádbhir ná sampūryātā3?*¹⁰⁵³ *iti*

‘“Do you know, how these beings on passing away separate in different directions?” [...] “Do you know, how yonder world does not overfill with the many [beings] who continually pass away?”’

(ŚB 14.4.2.5 (= BĀUM 1.4.5 = BĀUK 1.4.3))

*tāsmāḍ ayām ākāśā striyā pūryāta*¹⁰⁵⁴ *evā. tāṃ sām abhavat, táto manuṣyā ajāyanta*

¹⁰⁵¹ The athematic form *ā-pṛṇātām* (KpS) seems to be secondary as against the thematic *ā-pṛṇethām* in the TS and KS.

¹⁰⁵² *bhásman* can refer in such contexts both to a vessel with ashes and to its content, i.e. to the ashes proper; cf. a similar Sūtra passage:

(VārŚS 2.1.3.31)

yady ukhā bhasmanā pratipūryeta ...
‘When the cooking-vessel is filled with ashes...’

¹⁰⁵³ Ed. WEBER reads an indicative form with suffix accentuation (cf. also BĀUK, ed. SENART *saṃ-pūryate*) against v.l. *sām-pūryātā3* with accent on the preverb. BÖHTLINGK conjectured the subjunctive *+saṃpūryātai* (*+saṃpūryātā3y iti* in sandhi) for both Upaniṣads (BĀUM and ChU), in analogy with the subjunctives in the adjacent clauses; see also Chapter C.IV.1.

¹⁰⁵⁴ For the (at first glance) unmotivated accentuation of the verbal form in construction with *evā* (thus WHITNEY 1890: 415), see WHITNEY 1896: 226, §598a; WEBER 1873: 76; MAUE, ed. BĀUK, p.66, note 32 (with bibl.).

‘Therefore this space is filled by/with a woman. He copulated with her; therefrom human beings were born.’

Note that even in the latter case, the instrumental noun with which *pūryāte* is constructed refers to the non-active substance fulfilling the space, rather to an agent (as WECKER 1906: 35 suggested), and therefore can hardly be considered an instance of the passive usage.

(ŚB 14.5.1.5 (= BĀU 2.1.5))

sá yá etám evám upāste, pūryāte prajāyā paśúbhiḥ

‘He who worships him thus is filled with offspring and cattle.’

Note that in the latter example *pūryāte* is synonymous with another ‘-yá-present, *ṛdhya-te* (q.v.).

A good deal of occurrences are compounds with *ā* referring to the waxing half-moon.¹⁰⁵⁵ Obviously, both *ā-pūryāte* and its pendant *āpa-kṣīyate* ‘waned’ (see s.v. ³*kṣi*) denote spontaneous processes and should be qualified as anticausatives. Examples are:

(MS 4.3.5:44.11-12)

yád dvé ávare dvé páre, tán mithunám. yát pūryāte ’nyām nānyām, tán mithunám

‘When the two preceding [halves of the full moon day, sc. Anumati and Rākā] and the two following [halves of the new moon day, sc. Sinīvālī and Kuhūs] [are taken], this is a (complete) pair; when [the moon] wanes on one [night] and does not on the other, this is a (complete) pair.’¹⁰⁵⁶

Other relevant passages (ŚB 1.7.2.22, 2.1.3.1) are quoted above, s.v. ³*kṣi*; cf. also ŚB 2.4.4.18, 2.4.4.19, 8.4.1.10, 10.4.2.17.

The same usage is attested for the only TB occurrence with suffix accentuation (1.5.10.5, quoted above, s.v. ³*kṣi*). Apart from this single occurrence, Taittirīya texts (TB, TĀ) attest root accentuation in *pūryā-te*. Two of the accented forms, attested in the TĀ (with the irregular active inflection), will be discussed below; the two other (in the TB) are calendar terms – the names of the eleventh and twelfth of the 15 nights of the bright fortnight of

¹⁰⁵⁵ Also in the compound *apakṣīyamāṇa-pakṣā-* ‘the half of the month in which the moon wanes’; see WILLMAN-GRABOWSKA 1927-28: I, 17; II, 116f., 225.

¹⁰⁵⁶ *mithuná-* = a pair, the opposite members of which form one single unit when taken together; see INSLEER 1971b: 164ff.; DANGE 1976, esp. p. 201.

the month recited by the priest when placing the bricks of the fire-altar:¹⁰⁵⁷

(TB^m 3.10.1.1)

... *āpūryamāṇā; pūryamāṇā* ...

‘... Āpūryamana (i.e. [the night in which the moon] begins to become full); Pūryamana (i.e. [the night in which the moon] becomes full); ...’

The difference in accentuation (TB 1.5.10.5 *āpūryāte* ≈ TB 3.10.1.1 (*ā*)*pūryamāṇā*) may result from a secondary distinction between terminological and non-terminological uses.

To sum up, there is no correlation between the meaning and accent placement. Forms with suffix accentuation occur, foremost, in the ŠB; forms with root accentuation appear in the RV and TB–TĀ. The MS attests both accentuations: the suffix accentuation occurs in an indicative form, while the root accentuation is attested for an optative form.

Active forms

The two active forms in the late book I of the TĀ are employed in the same usage as the regular middle forms, the active inflection undoubtedly being secondary:

(TĀ^m 1.14.1-2)

asáu yá āpūryati, sá sárveṣāṃ bhūtānāṃ prāṇáir āpūryati ||1|| [...] asáu yo ‘pakṣīyati, sá sárveṣāṃ bhūtānāṃ prāṇáir āpa kṣīyati

‘This [Āditya], who is being filled, is filled with breaths of all beings; [...] That one who wanes, wanes with breaths of all beings.’

The second occurrence (in the main clause) must be unaccented (NARTEN, apud ALBINO, op.cit., 9, fn. 25).

For post-Vedic (Epic) active forms, see OBERLIES 2003: 241, 265 and 467.

-i-aorist

The *-i*-aorist *-apūri* (VādhS 4.86a^{3x}: 2, 10, 17 (= CALAND 1928: 201f. [= Kl.Schr., 501f.])) and the sigmatic aorist *-apūriṣṭhāḥ* (in TĀ^m 1.14.2, adjacent to *āpūryati*; see NARTEN 173) are both derived from the secondary root *pūr* (see ALBINO, op.cit., 8) and attest the same intransitive usage as the present *pūryá*^{1e}. *-apūri* occurs in the VādhS in direct speech, preceded by impf. *pūryata* in narrative contexts:

¹⁰⁵⁷ See also Chapter II, s.v. *pyā*.

(VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 4.70 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 4.86a:1-2, 8-10, 16-17))
*prātaḥsavane somena rājñābhiṣūyamāṇenā pṛthivy apūryata; te devā
 abruvan: pṛthivī nvā anenāpūri. [...] tena vai mādhyandine
 'bhiṣūyamāṇenāntarikṣam apūryata; te devā abruvann: antarikṣam nvā
 anenāpūri. [...] ... tṛtīyasavane ... dyaur apūryata; te devā abruvan: dyaur
 ... °āpūri*
 'During the morning-pressing the earth became full with Soma the King;
 these gods said: "Now the earth became full therewith." During the
 midday pressing the air space became full ...'; etc.

***bhid* 'split': *bhidyá*^{-te}**

Simplex RVKh. 2.1.6, AVP, YV^p +;
 + ā ĀpŚS (*ā-bhidyeta*¹⁰⁵⁸);
 + *nir* 'burst' (of a an egg) JB, AĀ, ChU 3.19.1;
 + *prā* AVP 19.20.12 = 20.40.2, KS^p 29.4:172.9 = KpS^p 45.5:271.7, ŚB
 11.4.1.5^{2x} ≈ GB 1.3.7^{2x}:71.4-6, ŚB 11.4.1.12^{2x} ≈ GB 1.3.9^{2x}:74.2, 4, KaṭhU
 6.15;
 + *vī* AV 20.131.1 (*vī bhidyate* ≈ RVKh. 5.15.10 *nī bhajyate*);
 + *sam* KS^p 27.3:141.12 = KpS^p 42.3:249.20¹⁰⁵⁹
 accented:
bhidyá^{-te} : RVKh. 1^x, TS^{2x}
bhidyate RVKh. 2.1.6, *bhidyeta* TS 5.1.9.2-3^{2x}
bhidyá^{-te} : MS^{2x}, ŚB^{10x}, ŚBK^{1x}, KaṭhĀ^{1x}
bhidyáte ŚBM 6.6.4.8 = ŚBK 8.6.4.7, ŚB 8.7.2.16, 9.1.2.12, KaṭhĀ
 3.234:100.15, *bhidyéta* MS 1.4.13:62.19, 3.1.8:11.2, ŚBM 6.6.4.8 = ŚBK
 8.6.4.7, ŚB 9.1.2.12, 12.4.1.6, 12.4.1.11, 12.4.2.6, *bhidyéyātām* ŚBK
 4.9.4.15, *pra-bhidyánte* ŚB 11.4.1.5^{2x}
 • anticaus. / (pass.)

¹⁰⁵⁸ The active form *ā-bhidyeta* quoted in VWC-Sū. I, 533a is a misprint.

¹⁰⁵⁹ The nominal *udbhijja*- ChU, AiU 'sprouting' (of a plant) is not based on the hypothetical verbal stem *udbhidyá*- 'hervorbrechen, hervorschießen', as SCHEFTELOWITZ (1913/14: 140) suggested, but represents a compound (*udbhid-ja*- 'durch Hervorspriessen [*ud-bhid-*] entstanden [-*ja-*]'); see WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/1]: 548, §407.

The present *bhidyá-te* first appears in post-RVic mantras (RVKh., AV(P)), e.g. in:

(RVKh. 2.1.6)

*āstikavacanāṃ śrútvā 'yaḥ sárpo na nivártate
śatádā bhidyate mūrdhní ' śiṃśávrkṣaphalāṃ yathā*
'The snake which hears pious (?) speech disappears and splits its head
into thousand pieces (lit. splits in its head), like a fruit of the śiṃśa-tree.'

For AV 20.131.1 *ví bhidyate* (≈ RVKh. 5.15.10 *ní bhajyate*), see s.v. *bhañj*.

In Vedic prose, *bhidyá-te* is employed in more or less the same contexts as the synonymous *chidyá-te* and *dīryá-te* (the former of which is also phonologically similar), i.e. typically denotes damaging the sacrificial vessels and other processes of spontaneous destruction (cf. on compounds with *nír* and *prá* below), which favours a non-passive (anticausative) interpretation for most contexts. Accent placement does not depend on the meaning: root accentuation is attested in the TS (and RVKh., see the example quoted above), suffix accentuation – in the MS, ŚB¹⁰⁶⁰ and KaṭhĀ. Examples are:

(TS 5.1.9.2-3)

*bráhmanā vái eṣā yájuṣā sámbhṛtā; yád ukhā sá yád bhidyetártim ā
rcchet ||2|| yájamāno, hanyetāsyā yajñāḥ. [...] yádi bhidyeta, táir evá
kapālaiḥ sám sṛjet*
'The pan is gathered together with holy power and the yajus (sacrificial
formula); for if it would split, the sacrificer would be ruined, and his
sacrifice destroyed. [...] If it would split, he should unite [clay] with the
selfsame potsherds.'¹⁰⁶¹

(MS 1.4.13:62.19)

átha yásya kapālaṃ bhidyéta, tát sám dadhyāt
'And if someone's bowl would split, he should mend it.'¹⁰⁶²

(MS 3.1.8:11.2)

yád dhí mitráyāparitā bhidyéta, púnaḥ káryā syāt

¹⁰⁶⁰ See KÜMMEL 1996: 77, fn. 132.

¹⁰⁶¹ See RAU 1972: 31 on the similar passage KS 19.7:8.16-18.

¹⁰⁶² Lit. '... whose dish would break, that [vessel] one should mend'. For this passage and the construction with the *genetivus commodi*, see DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 10; OERTEL 1938: 79f. [= Kl.Schr. II, 1089f.].

‘If [the ukhā-vessel], not given up to Mitra’s protection, would split, one should make it anew.’¹⁰⁶³

Note especially the similarity of the contexts where TS *bhidyeta* and MS *bhidyéta* appear, which rules out any semantic correlation with the accent fluctuation.

Examples from the ŚB are:

(ŚBM 6.6.4.8 = ŚBK 8.6.4.7)

yády eṣòkhā bhidyéta, yábhinā návā sthāly urubilī syāt, tásyām enaṃ paryā vaped. ārchati vā eṣòkhā, yā bhidyáté ’nārto iyāṃ devatā

‘If this fire-pan would split, he should put that [fire in the pan] into a vessel which should be unbroken, new, with a wide opening. For the pan which is broken, indeed, suffers injury, [but] this deity (sc. Agni) is uninjured.’

(ŚB 8.7.2.16)

nā bhinnāṃ nā kṛṣṇām úpa dadhyāt | ā rcchati vā eṣā yā bhidyáte

‘He should lay down neither a broken [brick] nor a black one; verily, the one which split suffers injury.’

(ŚB 9.1.2.12)

yádi nā bhidyéta, bhéttavái brūyād; yadā hy èva sā bhidyáté, ’tha tám śúg ṛchati yāṃ dvéṣṭi

‘If it (sc. the stone or the pot) would not split, he should order to split it; for only when it splits, then the pain enters the one whom he hates.’

bhidya-te is the only ‘-yá-present which occurs accented in the KaṭhĀ:¹⁰⁶⁴

(KaṭhĀ 3.234:100.15)

yásya mahāvīró bhidyáte ...

‘The one whose Mahāvīra[-vessel] splits ...’

The non-passive (anticausative) analysis also holds true for the compound with *nír*, which denotes the bursting of an egg (see FALK 1994a: 16) as, for instance, in JB 3.361:5, 6 [CALAND §212] (for which see HOFFMANN 1970: 64ff. [= Aufs. 2, 520ff.]; GONDA 1984: 15).

¹⁰⁶³ See RAU 1972: 25ff. [449ff.].

¹⁰⁶⁴ Apart from *ṛddhyate* KaṭhĀ^p 3.(234):100.15 (ms.), for which WITZEL conjectures ⁺*ṛdhyate*; see s.v.

The compound *prá-bhidya-te* expresses destruction in general, thus being synonymous with *prá-mīya-te* (q.v.):

(ŚB 11.4.1.5)

*sá vái gautamasya putra vṛtó jánaṃ dhāvayet, | yás tád
darśapūrṇamāśáyor vidyād, yásmād imāḥ prajā́ adántakā́ jáyante,
yásmād āśāṃ jáyante, yásmād āśāṃ prabhidyánte, [...] yásmād āśāṃ
púnar uttamé váyasi sárva evá prabhidyánte*

‘Only he, O son of Gautama, may drive about amongst people as a chosen [priest], who knows that [element] in the full and new moon sacrifices, from which these creatures here are born toothless, by which their [teeth] arise, by which their [teeth] decay, [...] by which, in the last stage of life, they all decay again with them.’

-i-aorist

For the -i-aorist inj. *bhedi* (1x) and middle inj. of sigm.aor. *bhitthāḥ* (1x), both attested in YVic mantras in the same anticausative usage as *bhidyá-te*, see KÜMMEL 1996: 76f. Note that the paradigmatic pattern is precisely the same as for the derivatives of the phonologically similar root *chid*, q.v. (*chidyá-te* RV + :: *áchedi*, *chedi* RV +, sigm.aor. *chitsi* etc. AV +), but formations of the root *bhid* are younger and thus may have been created analogically.

¹*mī* ‘damage, diminish, violate, perish’: *mīyá-te*

Simplex RV 2.8.3, AVP 13.10.11, YV^p +;

+ *prá* ‘die’ RV 5.79.10, AVP, YV^p +;

(+ *ud* ChU 8.6.5 *ud ... mīyate*, ed. BÖHTLINGK ⁺*ud ... nīyate*, read probably with DEUSSEN, ed. SENART etc. ⁺*m īyate*)¹⁰⁶⁵

accented:

mīyá-te : RV^{2x}, TS^{7x}, TB^{3x}, TĀ^{2x}

mīyate RV 2.8.3, TS 6.2.2.5, *pra-mīyase* RV 5.79.10, *pra-mīyate* TS 2.6.9.6, 7.2.7.2, TB 1.4.6.5, 1.6.8.3, TĀ 10.64.1^{2x}, *pra-mīyante* TS 2.2.2.5,

¹⁰⁶⁵ SHARMA (1959/60: 77) hesitantly reads *unmīyamāna-* for KS^p 34.15:47.2 (ed. SCHROEDER ⁺*unnīya*^o); read with mss. and NARTEN 1965: 59 [= Kl.Schr. 1, 49] *unmīvyamāna-*; see Chapter IV, s.v. *mīv* for details.

pra-mīyeta TS 7.2.1.4, 7.2.7.1, *pra-mīyeraṇ* TS 2.2.2.4, *pra-mīyamāṇaḥ* TB 1.3.10.2

mīyá-te : MS^{4x}, ŚB^{1x}, ĀpM^{1x}

mīyáte ŚB 2.6.1.3, *pra-mīyáte* MS 1.8.7:126:10, 2.3.5:32.7, 2.5.11:63.15, 3.4.7:53.11, *pra-mīyātāi* (v.l. *pra-mīyātām*) ĀpM 1.8.5

• anticaus.

(-*mīya-ti*) : GB 2.1.4:147.12 mss., ed. MITRA *pra-mīyet*; read with ed. GAASTRA ⁺*pra-mīvet*)¹⁰⁶⁶

The homonymous present *mīya-te* is shared by the IVSs of several distinct verbs. Apart from the passives of ¹*mi* ‘fix’ and ²*mā* ‘measure’ (the latter of which seems to be post-Vedic; see Chapter I, s.vv.), other occurrences of *mīyá-te* display the meanings belonging to the semantic area of damage and might be connected with the verbs ²*mi* (in notation of MAYRHOFER, EWAia, *MAY*²) ‘change’, ⁽¹⁾*mī* ‘damage, diminish’ (*MAY*¹)¹⁰⁶⁷; cf. the two RVic attestations:

(RV 2.8.3c)

yásya vratám ná mīyate

(RV 5.79.10)

etāvad véd uṣas t_uvám¹ bhūyo vā dátum arhasi
yá stotṛbhyo vibhāvar_y¹ uchántī ná pramīyase
sújāte áśvasūnrte

THIEME (1941: 89, 107f. [= Kl.Schr. I, 14, 32f.]) attempted to connect both occurrences with ²*mi* (pres. *maya-te*) ‘täuschen’, but his translations are rather forced – e.g., for RV 5.79.10: ‘Soviel oder noch mehr sollst du schenken, die du, o Edle, Pferde als Geschenk habende, den Sängern erstrahlende, nicht getäuscht wirst (= du, deren Absicht zu schenken nicht vereitelt wird), wenn du aufleuchtest’.¹⁰⁶⁸ Although there is an area of overlapping between the meanings ‘change’ and ‘damage, diminish’, and some formations can be indeed connected with either of the two roots (see MAYRHOFER, EWAia II,

¹⁰⁶⁶ For the meaning of *pra-mīv* (‘veranlassen’), see NARTEN 1965: 58 [= Kl.Schr. I, 48].

¹⁰⁶⁷ See GONDA 1936: 171 [= Sel.St. III, 11].

¹⁰⁶⁸ See also H.-P. SCHMIDT (1958: 41), who follows THIEME in his translation of RV 2.8.3: ‘dem das Gelübde nicht getäuscht wird’.

316f.; RENOUE, EVP III, 41, 81),¹⁰⁶⁹ generally, these two verbs can be neatly distinguished both semantically and paradigmatically. In particular, *maya-te* RV^{1x}, MS^{plx} ‘(ver)tauschen’ (GOTÖ 240f.) belongs to ²*mī*,¹⁰⁷⁰ while *mīyā-te*, together with its transitive-causative counterpart *minā-^{ti}*, belongs, in all its occurrences, to ⁽¹⁾*mī* ‘damage, diminish etc.’,¹⁰⁷¹ as convincingly shown by INSLEER (1972: 100, with fn. 19), JOACHIM 125ff., GOTÖ 241 (cf. also MAYRHOFER, EWAia II, 314ff.; KÜMMEL 1996: 82f.) – contra THIEME 1941. Correspondingly, the two RVic occurrences quoted above should be translated as follows:

(RV 2.8.3) ‘Whose (sc. Agni’s) vow is not violated...’¹⁰⁷²

(RV 5.79.10) ‘So much or even more you, O Uṣas, must give, O bright one, who do not diminish, while shining for [your] praisers, you, nobly born, bounteous in horses.’ (see INSLEER, *ibid.*)¹⁰⁷³

The same holds true for the attestations in later texts: *mīyā-te* typically refers to processes of diminishing, decrease or death, usually coming about spontaneously (as in RV 5.79.10) – which favours anticausative interpretations for most of the occurrences (‘diminish, decrease [by oneself]’), although in some rarer cases *mīyā-te* can be rendered as an agentless passive (cf. RV 2.8.3). There is no correlation between the type of usage and accent placement;¹⁰⁷⁴ the RV (cf. examples above) and the texts of the Taittirīya school attest root accentuation,¹⁰⁷⁵ while the MS and ŚB have

¹⁰⁶⁹ JOACHIM 125ff. reckons the nasal transitive present *mināti* to both roots ¹*mī* ‘mindern, hinschwinden’ and ²*mī* ‘(ver)tauschen’. By contrast, in LUBOTSKY 1997a [RVWC]: 1076f. all occurrences of *mināti* are connected with ¹*mī* ‘diminish’.

¹⁰⁷⁰ LUBOTSKY (1997a [RVWC]: 1071): $\sqrt{mi-2}$ ‘?’.

¹⁰⁷¹ It is unclear whether we have to posit a separate homonymous root ²*mī*, as in LUBOTSKY 1997a [RVWC]: 1077 ($\sqrt{mī-2}$ ‘to (ex)change’), attested in the reduplicated present *mimītaḥ* etc.

¹⁰⁷² Cf. GELDNER: ‘dessen Gebot nicht übertreten wird’; RENOUE: ‘lui dont on n’abolit point le décret’ (EVP XII, 46).

¹⁰⁷³ Cf. also RENOUE: ‘toi qui [...] ne perds (rien de ton éclat)’ (EVP III, 78; with criticism on THIEME’s interpretation, *ibid.*, 81). Uṣas metes the time, thus diminishing the (remaining) life-time of the living beings, without diminishing herself; see ROESLER 1997: 100.

¹⁰⁷⁴ See KÜMMEL 1996: 82; contra MINARD 1956: 143, [§]340.

¹⁰⁷⁵ Except for one occurrence in the post-Vedic ĀpM (1.8.5).

suffix accentuation.

mīyá-^{te} can also be employed in the impersonal usage, constructed with the *genetivus personae* (OERTEL 1926: 130; 1944: 75ff. [= Kl.Schr. I, 541ff.]), as in:

(MS 4.1.2:3.12 = TB 3.2.2.5)

nāsyātmano mīyate yá evāṁ véda

‘There is no diminishing with regard to the body of the one who knows thus.’¹⁰⁷⁶

Such constructions are not always easy to distinguish from those with *yát* as subject (OERTEL 1944: 76 [= Kl.Schr. I, 542]), cf.:

(ŚB 2.6.1.3)

yád u caivāsyātrātmanó ’caraṇena hanyáte vā mīyáte vā, tād u caivāsyaiténa púnar ā pyāyate

‘Whatever of his is destroyed or diminishes here through his own unrighteous conduct that swells thereby for him.’ (for this passage, see THIEME, op.cit., 95 [= Kl.Schr. I, 22]; HOFFMANN 1955: 82 [= Aufs. 1, 54])

In Vedic prose, *mīyá-^{te}* becomes particularly common in compounds with *prá*, meaning ‘perish, die’¹⁰⁷⁷ (cf. THIEME, op.cit., 93ff. [= Kl.Schr. I, 20ff.]), cf.:

(TS 6.2.2.4-5)

añśúr-añśús te deva somāpyāyatām ity āha. yát ||4|| evāsyāpuvāyáte, yán mīyate, tād evāsyaiténāpyāyati

“‘May every shoot of yours, O god Soma, swell”, – he says. Whatever of it becomes spoiled, whatever diminishes, that he makes swell thereby.’¹⁰⁷⁸

(TS 2.2.2.3-4)

yásya gāvo vā púruṣā ||3|| vā pramīyeran, yó vā bibhīyāt ...

‘[The one] whose cows or men perish, or who is afraid...’

(TB 1.4.6.5)

ārtiṃ vā eté ní yanti, yéṣāṃ dīkṣitānāṃ pramīyate

‘If [one] of those who have been consecrated dies, they go down to

¹⁰⁷⁶ Note that the same usage is attested for *chidyá-^{te}* and -i-aor. -*achedi* (see s.v.).

¹⁰⁷⁷ Cf., in particular, AVP 16.5.4 *pramīyante* ≈ AVŚ 8.2.24 *mriyante*.

¹⁰⁷⁸ Erroneously KEITH: ‘he purifies’.

perdition.¹⁰⁷⁹

(TS 2.6.9.6)

yadā́ hí pramī́yaté, 'themām upāvasyāti

'... because when [the sacrificer] dies he has recourse to this [earth].'

(MS 2.3.5:32.7-8)

yó vái pramī́yaté, 'gnīm tāsya śārīraṃ gáchatī, sómam̐ rásaḥ

'Verily, the body of the one who dies, goes to Agni, his essence – to Soma.'

(MS 3.4.7:53.11)

yásyāgnír úkhyo 'nugáchatī, yáthā putró jātāḥ pramī́yaté

'If someone's fire, being in a cauldron, extinguishes, [this is] like [his] son, just born, dies.'

Cf. also TS 7.2.1.4 and MS 1.8.7:126.10-11 quoted above, s.v. *jyā*.

Apart from the well-attested compound with *prá*, *mī́yá*¹⁰⁸⁰ does not occur with other preverbs in Vedic. The only instance of the compound with *ud*, encountered in a difficult ChU passage, seems to be a corrupt form:

(ChU 8.6.5)

*atha yatraítad asmāc charīrād utkrāmaty, athaitair eva raśmibhir
ūrdhvam ākramate. sa om iti vā hod vā mīyate*

The passage is discussed at length by BÖHTLINGK (1897a: 91f.); HILLEBRANDT (1915: 104 [= Kl.Schr., 194]; MORGENROTH (1958: 181, 368, 504f.; 1980-81: 289ff.). The meaning 'perish' (thus interpreted by indigenous commentators, cited by MORGENROTH, *ibid.*) hardly suits the context. Most scholars emend the form in question: BÖHTLINGK (in his ed. of ChU) conjectured *sa om iti* ⁺*vāha*, *ud vā nīyate*;¹⁰⁸⁰ DEUSSEN (1897: 194), and subsequently all other interpreters (HILLEBRANDT, SENART, GELDNER 1928: 151, fn. 857) read *om īyate*.¹⁰⁸¹ Most plausible is GELDNER's conjecture

¹⁰⁷⁹ For the absolute genitive in this construction, see OERTEL 1926: 127.

¹⁰⁸⁰ 'Man sagt entweder Om oder **wird** (ohne Om gesagt zu haben) **hinaufgeführt**.'

¹⁰⁸¹ DEUSSEN: *sa om iti vā ha ūrdhvam īyate* '... dann steigt er entweder [oder, als Nichtwissender, auch nicht] mit dem Gedanken an *Om* in die Höhe'; HILLEBRANDT: *sa om iti vāha ūrdhvam īyate* '*om* ist das Fahrzeug, er eilt empor'; likewise SENART: '... il est emporté vers les régions supérieures' (note that a passive interpretation of *īyate* is impossible: the verb *i* 'send' forms no -yá-passive). DEUSSEN's conjecture was rejected by RENOU (1955b: 102, with fn. (1)), who translated 'soit qu'il dise *om*, soit

(to which MORGENROTH subscribes): *sa om iti vāho dvāram īyate*. As MORGENROTH suggests, the last sentence may be a later interpolation (gloss). His translation runs:

‘Und wenn er aus diesem Leib auszieht, dann steigt er an eben diesen Strahlen empor. (Mit dem Wort *om* als Wagen erreicht er die Pforte).’

-i-aorist

For the -i-aorist *āmāyi* (MS^p-KS^p, ŚB) and sigm.aor.med. (*meṣṭa* etc. AV+), both attested in the same anticausative usage as *mīyá-te*, see KÜMMEL 1996: 81f.

muc* ‘release, become free, escape’: *múcyá-te

Simplex RV + ;
 + *āti* YV^p + ; + *anv-āti* MS^p 1.4.6:54.1 (ed. SCHROEDER *nvátimucyate*, read with GELDNER’s transcript *’nvátimucyate*),¹⁰⁸² 4.7.7:102.2 (≈ KS^p 30.7:189.8 *abhy-ati*^o); + *abhy-ati* KS^p 30.7:189.8 (≈ MS^p 4.7.7:102.2 *anv-āti*^o), JUB 1.9.3.4 [ed. OERTEL 1.30.4];
 + *úd* RVKh. 2.11.4, AV 14.1.57, MS^p, KS^p 45.4:270.21, AB +;
 + *nír* AV 12.2.12, VS 5.39 +; + *vi-nir* PraśU 5.5;
 + *pari* (*pari-mucyate* MaitrU, ed. VAN BUITENEN 4.0/4.3 [= ed. COWELL 6.34] ≈ *prati-mucyate* MaitrāyanyU 4.[2].10, KauśS 139.28;
 + *prá*¹⁰⁸³ AVP 5.28.1, Br. +; + *sam-pra* KB, GB;¹⁰⁸⁴
 + *prāti* TĀ-Andhra 34^{2x} +;
 + *ví* AV 6.112.3 (ed. VISHVA BANDHU *ví...mucyantām*, ed.

qu’il disparaisse (entendez: sans rien dire)’, pointing out that the same compound must be attested in the “actif-factitif” *ún mimīyāt* at RV 10.10.9 (‘abolir, faire qu’(il) n’existe point’). However, RENOU’s interpretation of this RVic form is untenable, since it belongs to another root, ²*mī* ‘(ex)change’ (‘(ver)tauschen’).

¹⁰⁸² See MITTWEDE 1986 [Textkr. zur MS]: 54; AMANO 145, with fn. 32..

¹⁰⁸³ *prá-muc* is a technical term ‘for releasing the sacrificial animal from the post before killing eat’ (LUBOTSKY 2002: 123).

¹⁰⁸⁴ For *pra ... saṃ-pra-mucyante* in KB 5.3.10 (ed. SARMA ^o*mucyate*) (≈ GB 2.1.21:158.5 *saṃ-pra-mucyant[e]*), RENOU (1933: 69, fn. 2) reads *pra ... mucyante*.

ROTH/WHITNEY °*muñcantām*, v.l. °*mucyatām*), AVP 4.14.3 +; + *anu-vi* JB 2.203:13

accented:

múcyā-te : RV^{1x}, RVKh.^{2x}, AV^{1x}, TS^{2x}

múcyase RV 1.31.4, *múcyate* RVKh. [ed. SĀTAVALEKAR] 26.23, TS 2.1.4.7, *múcyeta* TS 2.1.4.6, *múcyātai* AV 8.8.6, *pra-múcyate* RVKh. [ed. SĀTAVALEKAR] 26.14

mucyá-te : AV^{3x}, ŚB^{9x}, ŚBK^{3x}

mucyáse AV 8.8.16, *mucyáte* AV 10.1.32, *mucyánte* ŚB 12.4.1.1, *mucyéta* ŚBK 5.1.1.21 (≈ ŚBM 4.1.1.26 *apa-dhāvet*), *mucyātai* ŚB 2.6.2.12, *mucyādhvai* ŚB 14.6.8.12 = BĀUM 3.8.12 (≈ BĀUK 3.8.12 *mucyedhvam*), *mucyámānaḥ* AV 12.2.12, *ati-mucyáte* ŚB 3.4.3.8, *nir-mucyéta* ŚB 2.3.1.6^{2x} ≈ 2.5.2.47 ≈ 4.4.5.23 ≈ 4.6.9.13 ≈ 11.2.6.13, *pra-mucyánte* ŚB^v 14.7.2.9 (= BĀUM 4.4.9 = BĀUK 4.4.7) (≈ KathU 6.14), *vi-mucyáte* ŚBM 6.7.4.8 = ŚBK 8.7.4.8 = ŚBM 7.1.1.42 = ŚBK 8.8.2.34, *vi-mucyánte* ŚBK 3.4.3.8, 4.4.3.7, *vi-mucyámānaḥ* ŚB 14.6.11.1 (= BĀU 4.2.1)

-mucyā-ti :

pári-mucyanti TĀ^v 10.10.3 (= TĀ-Andhra^v 12.4 = MNU, ed. VARENNE 230) ≈ MuṇḍU 3.2.6 (≈ late Up.) +

• anticaus.

The intransitive present *múcyā-te* typically occurs in the non-passive (anticausative or reflexive) usages,¹⁰⁸⁵ with the meaning ‘become free, released; free, release oneself’, particularly often in religious contexts: ‘be released from sin, evil, etc.’ (see RODHE 30ff. et passim). Although a passive interpretation (‘be released [by smb.]’) is possible in some cases, this -ya-present never occurs with an overtly expressed passive agent, and in many cases a passive analysis can be safely ruled out by the context – as, in particular, in constructions with the subject of the god (Agni, Sūrya), who becomes free by him-/herself, not by an external force (cf. AV 10.1.32, 12.2.12 below); see especially HOCK 1985-86: 86f.¹⁰⁸⁶

Accentuation does not correlate with the meaning: root accentuation is

¹⁰⁸⁵ Contra HILL 53f., who unconvincingly explains this ‘-yā-present as “ein relativ spät nach produktivem Muster gebildetes Passiv”.

¹⁰⁸⁶ Note that the passive morphology of the common English translation of *mucyate*, i.e. ‘is released, is freed’, is deceptive and often conceals the non-passive semantics (‘becomes free’), without suggesting an external agentive force.

attested in the RV (with RVKh.), TS and AV (1x, in a subjunctive form), suffix accentuation – in the AV (3x) and ŚB.¹⁰⁸⁷ Examples are:

- with **root accentuation**:

(RV 1.31.4cd)

śvātrēṇa yát pitṛór mucyase páry ' á tvā pūrvam anayann āparam púnah
 ‘When you (sc. Agni) were released from both parents by force, they brought you eastward, [then] again westward.’

(TS 2.1.4.6-7)

sò 'manyata: yó vā imám ālābheta, mucyetāsmāt pāpmāna iti [...]
aindrēṇendriyám ātmán dhatte, mucyate pāpmāno ...
 ‘He (sc. the bull) thought: “Who would offer this, he would be released from this sin”. [...] By offering to Indra he bestows power on himself, he becomes released from sin ...’¹⁰⁸⁸

(AV 8.8.6cd)

tēna śātrūn abhí sārvaṇ nṛy ūbja ' yāthā ná mucyātai katamās canāiṣām
 ‘With this [net] entangle, [o Indra], all [our] enemies, so that no one of them will escape.’

Relying upon the prevalent suffix accentuation of *mucya^{te}* in AV (see examples below), WHITNEY (ad loc.) emended the accent (⁺*mucyātai*).¹⁰⁸⁹ It will be argued below (Chapter C.II.3.2.2 and C.IV) that this emendation is unnecessary.

- with **suffix accentuation**:

(AV 8.8.16ab)

imá uptā mṛtyupāśā ' yān ākrāmya ná mucyāse
 ‘These fetters of the death are spread, stepping into which you are not released.’

¹⁰⁸⁷ Cf. MINARD 1956: 171, [§]413, fn. d. KÜMMEL (1996: 84) gives only two AVic occurrences, without mentioning the suffix accentuation in the ŚB.

¹⁰⁸⁸ See JAMISON (1991b: 55) for this passage.

¹⁰⁸⁹ “All the mss. accent *mucyātai*, which, though supported by the usage of sundry Vedic texts (including even RV.), was emended in our edition to agree with the Atharvan accentuation elsewhere.” Unlikely is HENRY’s assumption (1894: 62) that the original reading was *móci*, later glossed with *mucyātai*.

(AV 10.1.32)

*yáthā sūryo mucyáte támasas pári ' rátriṃ jáhāt_iy uśásaś ca ketún
eváhám sárvaṃ durbhūtám ' kártraṃ kṛtyākṛtā kṛtám ' [...] jahāmi*
'As the sun is freed out of darkness, quits the night and the ensigns of the
dawn, so may I escape all evil-natured magic made by the witchcraft-
maker.'¹⁰⁹⁰

(AV 12.2.12cd)

mucyámāno nír énasó ' 'mog asmāṃ áśast_iyāḥ
'[Agni], being released out of sin, has released us from the curse.'¹⁰⁹¹

(ŚB 2.6.2.12)

... tát u hy evá śám iva, yó mṛtyór mucyátai nāmftāt
'... for, verily, that is happiness [to the one] who would be released from
the death, not from the immortality.'¹⁰⁹²

(ŚB 14.6.8.12 (= BĀUM 3.8.12 ≈ BĀUK 3.8.12))

*bráhmanā bhagavantas, tát evá bahú manyadhvaṃ, yád asmán
namaskāreṇa mucyádhvai [BĀUK mucyédhvam]¹⁰⁹³*
'O venerable Brahmans, estimate it as a great thing if you escape from
him by making a reverence.'

Cf. also with preverbs:¹⁰⁹⁴

- with *áti*:

(ŚB 3.4.3.8)

*tátho eváśá etád agnér evá rūpám bhavati, téna rákṣāṃsy atimucyáte,
téna svargám lokaṃ sám ásnute*
'And thus, verily, he becomes like Agni, thereby he escapes the Rakṣases,
[and] thereby reaches the heavenly world.'

¹⁰⁹⁰ See RODHE 77.

¹⁰⁹¹ See RODHE 150.

¹⁰⁹² See GONDA 1989b: 82.

¹⁰⁹³ RENOU (1937a: 27) gives the accent (*mucyédhvam*), but chapter 3 of the BĀUK in the recension Kāṇva is not edited with accents so far.

¹⁰⁹⁴ On the meaning of compounds with preverbs (*áti* etc.), mostly nearly identical with the meaning of the simplex, see RODHE 27; EDGERTON 1947: 219.

- with *nír*:

(ŚB 2.3.1.6; cf. also 2.5.2.47, 4.4.5.23, 4.6.9.13, 11.2.6.13)

*sá yáthāhis tvacó nirmucyéta, | evám rātreḥ pāpmāno nír mucyate; yáthā
ha vā áhis tvacó nirmucyétaivám sárvasmāt pāpmāno nír mucyate, yá
evám vidvān agnihotrām juhóti*

‘As a snake becomes free from its skin, so [he] is free from night, from sin; and, verily, as a snake becomes free from its skin, so the one, who, knowing thus, performs the Agnihotra sacrifice, becomes free from all sin.’¹⁰⁹⁵

- with *prá*:

(ŚB^v 14.7.2.9 (= BĀUM 4.4.9 = BĀUK 4.4.7) ≈ KāthU 6.14)

*yadā sārve pramucyānte ' kāmā yē 'sya hṛdī sthitāḥ [BĀU, KāthU śritāḥ]
átha mártyo 'mṛto bhavaty ' átra bráhma sám ásnute*

‘When all desires which are dwelling in his heart are cease (lit. are released), then a mortal becomes immortal and attains Brahman here (i.e. in this world).’¹⁰⁹⁶

-i-aorist

For the -i-aorist *amoci* RV +, see KÜMMEL 1996: 83.

Active forms

The only (late) Vedic active form occurs in an Upaniṣadic verse, in chapter 10 of the TĀ (= MNU), quoted also in the MuṇḍU and some late Upaniṣads:

(TĀ^v 10.10.3 = TĀ-Andhra^v 12.4 (= MNU, ed. VARENNE 230]) ≈ MuṇḍU 3.2.6cd)
te brahmaloke tu parāntakāle ' parāmṛtāḥ¹⁰⁹⁷ pari mucyanti sarve

The meaning of the verse, misunderstood by some translators,¹⁰⁹⁸ is correctly explained by WELLER (1953b: 553 [= Kl.Schr. 1, 111], with fn. 2-3):

‘Sie alle, die im letzten Tode den Tod überwandten, werden in Brahman

¹⁰⁹⁵ See RODHE 72, fn. 14.

¹⁰⁹⁶ On this passage, see, in particular, BOUY 2000: 187f.

¹⁰⁹⁷ TĀ °mṛtāt (erroneous reading).

¹⁰⁹⁸ Misunderstandings were caused by the erroneous reading of the TĀ (*pārāmṛtāt*; cf. also Sāyaṇa’s gloss *avyākṛtāt*); cf. TUBINI for Kaivalya-Up. 4: ‘... sont tous libérés de ce qui est au delà de la mort.’

Welten befreit.¹⁰⁹⁹

The active ending is secondary, for the regular °*mucyante* (see FÜRST 1916: 27f.; MuṇḍU, ed. HERTEL, Einleitung, S. 35; WELLER, *ibid.*, fn. 3).

For post-Vedic (Epic) active forms, see OBERLIES 2003: 241 and 484.

ric α ‘empty’; β ‘surpass’; γ ‘leave (over)’: *ricyá-^{te}*

Simplex (α) TS^p 1.7.5.1 +;

+ *āti* (β) ‘X_{NOM} surpasses Y_{ACC}’ RV (+); (γ) YV^p +; + *upāti* BaudhŚS^m 18.15:360.11 ≈ 26.31:316.7; (+ *abhy āti* YV^p +)¹¹⁰⁰;

+ *úd* (β) RV 7.32.12;

+ *prá* (β) RV 2.1.15, 2.22.2, ‘become totally emptied’ (?) TĀ 2.16.1;

+ *vi* (α) ‘be emptied, purged’ LāṭyŚS 8.10.9¹¹⁰¹

accented:

ricyá-^{te} : TS^{7x}, TB^{9x}, TĀ^{1x} (?)

ricyate TS 1.7.5.2, TĀ 2.16.1, *ricyamānām* TS 1.7.5.1, *ati-ricyate* TS 3.4.1.1, 3.4.1.4, 7.1.5.6, 7.5.5.2, TB 1.4.5.1^{2x}, 1.4.5.2, 1.4.5.3, 1.4.5.4, 1.6.5.5, *ati-ricyeta* TB 1.4.5.4^{2x}, *abhyāti-ricyate* TB 1.2.5.4, *abhyāti-ricyātai* TS 2.3.6.1

ricyá-^{te} : MS^{6x}, MS-KS^{1x}, ŚB^{12x}, ŚBK^{5x}

ricyáte ŚB 12.8.2.1, *ati-ricyáte* MS 1.11.9:171.10-11 = KS 14.10:209.6, MS 2.2.8:21.15-16, 4.1.2:3.5, 4.6.4:84.15, 4.7.4:98.15, 4.7.9:104.18-19, 4.8.5:112.2, ŚB 1.4.1.38 (≈ ŚBK 2.3.4.28 *pari-śiṣyáte*), 3.9.3.34, 6.3.3.26, 12.2.3.6, 12.2.3.7, ŚBK 2.3.4.28 (≈ ŚBM 1.4.1.38 *āti-riktam*), 2.8.2.8 (≈ ŚBM 1.9.1.18 *āti-riktam*), 5.6.4.7, *ati-ricyéta* ŚB 4.5.10.8^{4x}, *ati-ricyéran* ŚB 8.7.2.16, ŚBK 5.7.2.3, *abhy-ati-ricyáte* ŚB 3.9.3.34, ŚBK 3.2.8.6

• anticaus. / (pass.)

The meaning of the Vedic verb *ric* (together with its IE source **leik^u-*) has been determined by MEISER (1993: 305ff.), followed by HETTRICH (1995: 68f.), as ‘verlassen, freimachen, wegräumen’ (= α); for a survey of the

¹⁰⁹⁹ See also RODHE 104.

¹¹⁰⁰ *abhí* can be considered a postposition (‘be redundant **with regard to** smth.’) in most cases.

¹¹⁰¹ On this passage, see BURROW 1986: 295.

system of the meanings of this verb and its syntax, see also KÜMMEL 1996: 92f., with fn. 169; 2000: 425ff.; LIV 406ff.; HETTRICH 2007: 160ff.

The relatively rare simplex is employed in the meaning ‘be emptied, become empty’, cf.:

(TS 1.7.5.1)

*dhruvām vāi rīcyamānām yajñó ’nu*¹¹⁰² *ricyate*

‘Verily, after the Dhruvā being emptied / becoming empty, the sacrifice is being emptied / becomes empty.’

(ŚB 12.8.2.1)

ricyāta iva vā eṣā yāḥ sómena yájate; vīva hy āsya vittām védo háranti

‘The one who performs the Soma-sacrifice is, as it were, emptied out; for his wealth and prosperity go, as it were, away [from him].’

In compounds with *āti* (in the RV), *úd, prá, -rícyá-*^{1e} is employed in the sense (β) ‘go beyond, surpass [some limit], predominate’,¹¹⁰³ with the accusative of limit¹¹⁰⁴ or with the ablative of the basis of comparison.¹¹⁰⁵ Constructions with the ablative are more common,¹¹⁰⁶ but *-ya*-presents are attested only with the accusative or in objectless constructions, cf.:

(RV 8.92.14c = 8.92.22c)

ná tvām indráti ricyate

‘No[thing] surpasses you, O Indra.’

(RV 7.32.12ab)

úd ín n_{uv} āsya ricyaté ’ ’mśo dhānam ná jigýúṣaḥ

‘Verily, his share surpasses [everything], like the prize of a winner.’

(RV 2.1.15ab)

tvām tām sām ca prāti c_aāsi majmán_aāgne sujāta prá ca deva ricyase

‘You are like [all] these and equals them in greatness, and you even surpass [them], O god Agni, O well-born one.’

¹¹⁰² *ānu* functions as a postposition in this passage.

¹¹⁰³ For the meaning of this compound, see, in particular, KNOBL 2007b: 65.

¹¹⁰⁴ “Akkusativ der Erstreckung” (HETTRICH 1995: 68).

¹¹⁰⁵ “Ablativ des Ausgangs- bzw. Vergleichspunkts” (MEISER, op.cit.). See also BICHLMEIER 2000: 54f.

¹¹⁰⁶ See MEISER, op.cit., 307, with fn. 109; HETTRICH 1995: 66ff., for a list of the RVic passages.

Compounds with *úd* and *prá* do not appear after the RV (except for one occurrence with *prá* in the TĀ, with a different meaning),¹¹⁰⁷ but *áti-ricya-te* becomes very common in Vedic prose, employed, above all, in the technical sense (γ), to refer to the sacrificial portion which is left over (see GONDA 1983b). Examples are:

- with **root accentuation**:

(TS 7.5.5.2 ≈ ^UKS 34.4:38.14-16)

yád vái yajñásyātirícyate, víṣṇuṃ tác chipiviṣṭám abhy áti ricyate; tád víṣṇuḥ śipiviṣṭó 'tirikta evātiriktaṃ dadhāti

‘Whatever in the sacrifice is redundant, is redundant with regard to Viṣṇu Çipiviṣṭa; verily Viṣṇu Çipiviṣṭa places the redundant in the redundant.’
(KEITH)

(TB 1.4.5.1)

yásya prātaḥ-savané sómo 'tirícyate ...

‘If someone’s soma is left over after the morning pressing ...’

The passage TB 1.2.5.4 is quoted in Chapter B.I, s.v. *rabh*.

- with **suffix accentuation**:

(MS 1.11.9:171.10-11 ≈ ^AKS 14.10:209.6-7)

yád vái yajñásyātirícyáte, 'múm tām lokám abhyáti ricyate

‘Whatever of the sacrifice is left, is left for the yonder world.’¹¹⁰⁸

¹¹⁰⁷ The passage runs:

(TĀ 2.16.1)

ricyata iva vā eṣá préva ricyate, yó yājáyati práti vā gṛhnāti

MALAMOU (1977: 129) translates: ‘En vérité, il est comme abandonné, il **est** comme **deserté**, celui qui prête ses services de sacrificateur ou bien qui reçoit salaire’. The difference between the simplex and compound is thus explained in accordance with indigenous commentaries: “Selon Bh[ṛ]ḥa Bhāskaramiśra] et S[āyaṇa], le verbe simple désigne le dommage quel le pécheur subit ici-bas (*dehaksaya*, amenuisement du corps, Bh; perte de sa bonne réputation, S). Avec le préverbe *prá*, *ricyate* évoque la perte dont les effets se feront sentir dans l’au-delà, la perte de mérite, *puṇyakṣaya*, qui entraîne la perte de *puṇyaloka*” (ibid., p. 196).

In my view, *prá* could be used here as an intensifying preverb – as in the substantives like *prápitāmaha*- ‘great-grandfather’ (cf. MONIER-WILLIAMS 689), i.e.: ‘Verily, the one who arranges a sacrifice or obtains salary is as if he were emptied, as if he **were totally emptied**’.

¹¹⁰⁸ Cf. AMANO 426, with fn. 1672.

(MS 2.2.8:21.15-16)

sá índro 'bravīd: yád atiricyáte, tán māméti

'Then Indra said: "What is left over, that is mine".'

(ŚB 3.9.3.34)

áyuṅgāyuṅgā ékadhanā bhavanti. [...] dvandvám áha mithunám prajānanam; átha yá eṣá éko 'tiricyáte, sá yájamānasya śríyam abhyāti ricyate

'The Ekaadhana pitchers are always of uneven number. [...] Now two and two [i.e. an even number] means a productive pair; and the one that is left over, is left over for the sacrificer's property.'

(ŚBM 6.3.3.26 = ŚBK 8.3.2.36)

*yád vái rétaso yónim atiricyáte,*¹¹⁰⁹ *'muyá tád bhavati*

'Whatever [part] of the semen exceeds the womb, this [part] gets lost.'

In all its usages ('become empty', 'surpass', 'be left over'), *ricyá-^{te}* denotes spontaneous processes and thus belongs to the anticausative (non-passive) type; for some contexts passive interpretations are possible, but less probable.¹¹¹⁰ There is no correlation between accent placement and meaning: root accentuation is attested in the texts of the Taittirīya school (TS, TB, TĀ), suffix accentuation – in the MS, KS and ŚB.

-i-aorist

For the -i-aorist inj. *reci* RV^{1x} and sigm.aor. middle forms *rikthāḥ* etc. RV + (both in the same anticausative usage as *ricyá-^{te}*), see KÜMMEL 92f.

lup* 'damage, rip (off), tear, omit': *lúpyá-^{te}

Simplex TS 3.2.9.5, TB^m 2.8.8.2, PB 24.1.4^{2x}, (MaitrU 3.2 (= 6.30), ed. COWELL, ed. "108 Up." *lupyamānaḥ* ≈ ed. VAN BUITENEN [3.2/2], MaitrāyaṇyU 3.2 *lolupyamānaḥ*)¹¹¹¹ +;

¹¹⁰⁹ Evidence from the Kāṇva recension is lacking; ed. SWAMINATHAN leaves both *atiricyate* and *yónim* unaccented.

¹¹¹⁰ Unconvincing is KÜMMEL's (1996: 93) statement that both interpretations are equally possible.

¹¹¹¹ The form occurs in a list of negative qualities: ... *asthiraś cañcalo (lo)lupyamānaḥ saspr̥ho vyagraś ca°* '... unstable, movable, volatile, greedy and

+ *ápa* AVŚ 5.17.7 = AVP 9.15.7, AB 3.19.14;

+ *anv-ava* PB 6.13.2;

+ *pari* HirŚS 2.7.68 +;

+ *vi* AB 6.2.6 +

accented:

lúpya^{te} : TS^{1x}

lúpyeta TS 3.2.9.5

lupyá^{te} : AV^{1x}, TB^{m1x}

lupyáte TB^m 2.8.8.2, *apa-lupyáte* AV 5.17.7

• anticaus. / pass.

The relatively rare intransitive present *lupyá*^{te} is attested from the AV onwards with a variety of meanings, such as ‘be damaged, ripped off (with *ápa*), torn’, denoting situations when the integrity of an object is damaged by stripping of its cover (stripping off the caul of an embryo), tearing away some part of it, etc.; see the detailed JAMISON’s description (1991a: 189ff.) of the compound *ápa-lup*; for the meaning of *lup*, see also MAYRHOFER 1966: 160 [= Kl.Schr., 101]. The damage expressed by *lupyá*^{te} may come both spontaneously or triggered by some external force; correspondingly, both anticausative and passive interpretations are possible.

lupyá^{te} occurs only twice in the Saṃhitās, but becomes more common in the Brāhmaṇas. Both Saṃhitā occurrences are accented: the AVic form has the accent on the suffix, the Taittirīya form bears the accent on the root:

eager ...’; for this passage see also Chapter B.I, s.v. *vah*. The reading of the MaitrāyaṇyU (*lolupy*^o) seems to be original. The meanings of the word family *lolupa*-/*lolubha*- (which belongs, semantically, to *√lubh*, not to *√lup*; the voiceless consonant in *lolupa*- results from the reanalysis of the nom.sg. form *lolup* as derived from *lup*; see WACKERNAGEL 1918: 381 [= Kl.Schr. I, 300], fn. 1; WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1930 [AiG III]: 322; MAYRHOFER, KEWA III, 117f.; OBERLIES 1996: 134, fn. 52), i.e. ‘volatile, desirous, covetous’, suit the context much better than that of *lupyamāna*- (‘being damaged’?). The final syllable *-lo* of the preceding word could have triggered the haplology *lolup*^o → *lup*^o. It is unclear which form have underlied the reading attested in the MaitrāyaṇyU: morphologically, *lolupyamāna*- is the participle of the -ya-intensive, which is unattested elsewhere (although int. *lolupa*^{te} does occur in the Upaniṣads; in particular, in MaitrU 7.9); but the reasons of the substitution of *lolupyamāna*- for the original *lolupa*- (?) are unclear (perhaps, under the influence of the participle *uhyamānaḥ* / *tṛpyamānaḥ* at the beginning of the sentence).

(AVŚ 5.17.7 = AVP 9.15.7)

yé gárbhā avapádyante ' jágad yác cāpalupyáte

vīrá yé tṛhyánte mithó ' brahmajāyá hinasti tán

‘What embryos are aborted, what leaving creatures get disposed of, what heroes are shattered by each other – them the Brahman’s wife injures.’¹¹¹²

(TS 3.2.9.5)

yád ardharcāl lúpyeta, yáthā dhāvadbhyo hīyate

‘If [the response] would be omitted after the half-verse, [that] would be as when one is left behind those who are running’.¹¹¹³

Note that *lúpyá-^{te}* co-occurs in this passage with another ‘-yá-present, *hīyá-^{te}*. Another instance of such a co-occurrence is attested in AB 6.2.6, quoted below, s.v. *hā*.

The only accented occurrence in the TB (in a mantra) belongs to the anticausative type, but has the accent on the suffix – perhaps, under the influence of the two adjacent -yá-passives:

(TB^m 2.8.8.2)

yád adyáte lupyáte yát paropyáte ' śatatamī śā tanūr me babhūva

‘What is being eaten, [what] is being damaged, what is being thrown aside, this has become my hundredfold body.’

Note also that the form in question occurs in the mantra portion of TB, which exhibits a different accentual patterning as compared to that observed in the prose portion (cf. also s.vv. *tap* and *śī*).

-i-aorist

The early post-Vedic -i-aorist (injunctive) -*lopi*, corresponding to the ‘-yá-present *lúpyá-^{te}*, occurs in a young mantra quoted in three Śrauta-Sūtras of the Taittirīya school (ĀpŚS 1.12.13 ≈ BhārŚS 1.12.10 ≈ VaikhŚS 3.7:38.6): *sāṃnāyyaṃ mā vilopi* ‘the Sāṃnāyya-milk oblation should not perish’; the same intransitive usage is attested for the middle sigmatic aorist optative (with the negation *mā*) *vi-lopsīya* (ChU 3.16.2, 4, 6) ‘may I not perish’, which is a nonce formation, probably created on the basis of *vilopi*; see NARTEN 230.

¹¹¹² For a discussion of this passage, see Chapter I, s.v. *tṛh*.

¹¹¹³ On the meaning of *hīyá-^{te}*, see below, s.v. *hā*.

śiṣ ‘leave (over)’: śiṣyá-^{te}

Simplex AV 15.12.11, GB 1.2.4:35.12, ŚrSū. +;
 + *āti* TS^p, ŚBK (ŚBK 5.6.5.1 *ati-śiṣyate* ≈ ŚBM 4.5.8.1 *ati-ricyate*, ŚBK 4.3.1.12 *aty-aśiṣyata* ≈ ŚBM 3.3.1.13 *aty-aricyata*), ChU +;
 + *áva* TB 3.7.6.20, ŚB 14.8.1.1, ŚB 4.6.2;
 + *úd* ⁺AVŚ 2.31.3 (mss., ed. VISHVA BANDHU, ed. ¹ROTH/WHITNEY *ucchīṣātai* [≈ AVP-Or. mss. *ucchāiṣātai*, ed. BHATTACHARYA ⁺*ucchīṣātai*], transl. WHITNEY ⁺*ucchīṣātai*, ed. ²ROTH/WHITNEY/LINDENAU ⁺*ucchīṣyātai*, read ⁺*ucchīṣyātai*), AVP 8.15.7 (Or. *ud aśiṣyanta*, Kashm. ^o*ntu*),¹¹¹⁴ YV^p +;
 + *pāri* AV 15.12.7, Br. +; + *sam-pari* VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 1.19 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 3.16:1 (= CALAND 1926: 16f. [= Kl.Schr., 318f.)));
 + *sam* JB 2.183:4 [CALAND §144]

accented:

śiṣyá-^{te} : ⁺AV^{1x}, TS^{2x}, TB^{3x}

ava-śiṣyate TB 3.7.6.20, *uc-chīṣyate* TB 1.1.9.3, 3.8.2.3, *uc-chīṣyeta* TS 5.7.3.4, 6.2.7.5, ⁺*uc-chīṣyātai* AV 2.31.3

śiṣyá-^{te} : MS^{1x}, ŚB^{10x}, ŚBK^{4x}

ati-śiṣyáte ŚBK 5.6.5.1, *ati-śiṣyánte* ŚBK 5.6.5.8, *uñ-śiṣyáte* MS 3.2.7:25.18, *uc-chīṣyáte* ŚB 13.1.1.1, *pari-śiṣyáte* ŚB 3.1.1.3, 3.8.3.25, 3.8.3.35, ŚBK 1.3.1.28 ([*yát srucí pari-śiṣyáte*] ≈ ŚBM 2.3.1.39 [*sá yát srucí pariśināṣṭi*]), 2.3.4.28 (≈ ŚB 1.4.1.38 *ati-ricyáte*), *pari-śiṣyánte* ŚB 1.3.3.4, 3.5.2.8, 3.5.4.19, 3.6.1.13 = 3.7.1.6, 3.8.2.7, *pari-śiṣyéta* ŚB 3.8.4.5

(śiṣyá-^{ti} :

śiṣyēt VaikhŚS 21.4:325.2; *pary-ava-śiṣyēt* GB 1.2.14:47.12 (= VaitS 11.5); *uc-chīṣyēt* BhārŚS 7.3.9 – -yet-optatives)¹¹¹⁵

• anticaus. / (pass.)

The present śiṣyá-^{te} occurs only a few times in the mantras (AV), but

¹¹¹⁴ For this passage, see Chapter B.V, s.v. *rup*.

¹¹¹⁵ [*na*] *śiṣyati* in AVP-Or. 1.21.4 both in ed. DURGAMOHAN BHATTACHARYYA and ed. DIPAK BHATTACHARYYA (for which Kashm. reads *tena śudhyati*; see Chapter IV, s.v. *śu(n)dh*) results from an erroneous analysis of the future *naśiṣyati* ‘it will disappear’. Cf. already WHITNEY for the corresponding Śaunakīya passage 6.83.3 (contra Sāyaṇa’s commentary); VWC-Saṃh. III, 1782, fn. f; RENOU 1964a: 428; ZYSK 1985a: 224.

becomes very frequent in Vedic prose, particularly common as a technical term referring to the situation where a portion of sacrifice is left over, i.e. in the same usage as *āti-ricya-te* (see s.v.).¹¹¹⁶ Thus, as in the case of *ric*, most of the occurrences belong to the anticausative (non-passive) type. The accentuation does not depend on the meaning, cf. esp. the following pair of very similar passages from the Brāhmaṇas:

(ŚB 13.1.1.1)

yád ājyam ucchiṣyáte, téna raśanām abhyajyá datte

‘Whatever butter is left, having anointed a rope with this [butter], he takes it.’

(TB 1.1.9.3)

yád ājyam ucchiṣyate, téna samídho ’bhyájyá dadhāti

‘Whatever butter is left, having anointed fuel with this [butter], he puts [it].’

Forms with root accentuation are attested in the Taittirīya texts, forms with suffix accentuation – in the MS and ŚB. Examples are:

- with **root accentuation**:

(TS 5.7.3.4)

yád ājyam ucchiṣyeta, tásmin brahmaudanám pacet

‘In the butter which is left over he should cook a rice-dish for the Brahman.’

(TS 6.2.7.5)

yát prókṣaṇīnām ucchiṣyeta, tát dakṣiṇatá uttaravedyái ní nayet

‘What is left of the sprinkling waters, that he should pour to the south / right of the Uttaravedi-altar.’ (cf. JAMISON 1991a: 61)

(TB 3.7.6.20)

tríṣ phalíkriyámāññānām, | yó nyaṅgó avaśiṣyate, rákṣasām bhāgadhéyam, āpas tát prá vahatād itáh

‘Which [portion] of the three times cleansed (i.e. separated from husk) [grains] is left adhering, that is the share of the Rakṣases; let the waters carry that forward from here.’¹¹¹⁷

¹¹¹⁶ For the technical and ritual sense of *ucchiṣṭá-* ‘what is left out, remnant’, see GONDA 1968a: 304f. [= Sel.St. III, 442f.]; MALAMOU 1972.

¹¹¹⁷ Or: ‘O waters, do carry that off’ (assuming that *āpas* is a vocative).

(TB 3.8.2.3)

yád ājyam ucchīṣyate, tásmin raśanāṁ ny ùnatti
‘What melted butter is left, in that he dips the rope.’

- with **suffix accentuation**:

(MS 3.2.7:25.18-26.1)

yá sókhāyā ádhi mṛd uñśīṣyáte, tásyā etāṁ kuryāt
‘What clay is left from the pan, of this one should make it.’

In the ŚB, the compound *úc-chīṣya-te* is replaced with *pári-śīṣya-te*, as in:

(ŚB 3.1.1.3)

etád dha tv èvā sámṛddham devayájanaṁ, yásya devayajanamātrām
paścát pariśīṣyáte
‘... but this sacrificial ground is successful, indeed, if a space [sufficient]
for [another] sacrificial ground is left to the west [of the sacrificial
ground].’¹¹¹⁸

(ŚB 1.3.3.4)

átha yáḥ prókṣanyaḥ pariśīṣyánte, tábhir oṣadhīnām mūlāny upanínayati
‘Then he pours the sprinkling water which is left on the roots of the
plants.’

Most instructive for the analysis of the accent patterning is the only accented occurrence of the compound *úc-chīṣya-te* in the AV. Both ed.¹ ROTH/WHITNEY and ed. VISHVA BANDHU read the passage in question as follows:

(AV 2.31.3cd)

śīṣṭān áśīṣṭān ní tirāmi vācā yáthā krímīṇām nákir ucchīṣātai

WHITNEY translates:

‘Those [worms], left [or] not left, I draw down by my spell, that no one of
the worms be left.’

The form *°śīṣātai* is morphologically impossible, since neither class VI presents nor middle thematic aorists are derived from this root. Note, furthermore, that middle subjunctives of thematic aorist are practically unknown in Vedic. In accordance with the intransitive syntax of the pāda, one might expect a -ya-present; accordingly, WHITNEY (transl., ad loc.)

¹¹¹⁸ For this passage, see CALAND & HENRY 7.

conjectured ⁺*ucchiṣyātai*, thus also amending the accent. LINDENAU (ed. ²ROTH/WHITNEY/LINDENAU, Vorwort, p.IX) mentions this conjecture, but does not give accent (⁺*ucchiṣyātai*, with a question mark).¹¹¹⁹

As in the similar case of ⁺*mucyātai* at AV 8.8.6 (for mss. *múcyātai*, see s.v.), the accent conjecture is likely to rely on WHITNEY's assumption that the AV exhibits suffix accentuation in certain *-ya*-presents, where some other texts (above all, the RV) show root accentuation. This opinion is essentially correct, as will be argued below (see Chapter C.II.3.2), but there are some exceptions to this regularity. In particular, subjunctives and optatives often retain root accentuation in those texts which, as a rule, introduce suffix accentuation in *-yá*-presents, i.e. in the AV, MS and ŚB (see Chapter C.IV). In my view, both WHITNEY's conjectures are unnecessary, and, as in the case of AV 8.8.6 *múcyātai*, we should read ⁺*ucchíṣ[y]ātai*.

(Active forms)

Forms with the active inflection do not occur. *pary-ava-śiṣyet* (GB 1.2.14:47.12 = VaitS 11.5), *uc-chiṣyet* (BhārŚS 7.3.9) and *śiṣyet* (VaikhŚS 21.4:325.2) are *-yet*-optatives; see KULIKOV 2006d: 28ff.

śī ‘fall’: śīyá-^{te}

- (α) ‘fall (down)’: ‘come out’ (of hair, teeth etc., as a sign of decay);
- (β) ‘fall’ (of precipitations: snow, dew etc.)

Simplex (α) AVP 6.15.3 (Or. *sīyate*, Kashm. ms. ^o*cīyate* [apud ed. EDGERTON] or ^o*śīyate* [apud ed. RAGHU VIRÁ]; both ed. ⁺*śacīpate*), TB^m 3.7.14.4-5^{bis} = TĀ-Āndhra^m 45 (= MNU, ed. VARENNE 388) *śīyatām* (≈ ManB 1.5.1 *sūyatām*), ŚB 7.4.2.11, ŚB 13.2.6.8, TB 3.9.4.4 +; (β) TS 1.5.1.1, TB 3.12.7.2-3^{3x};

¹¹¹⁹ This form did not escape from scholarly attention. WHITNEY (1889 [SktGr]: 307, §849) groups it with thematic aorists but explains as “doubtless misreading for *śīyātai*”. NEGELEIN and MACDONELL quote it twice, under *-ya*-passives (NEGELEIN 1898: 40, fn. 3; MACDONELL 334, fn. 5: *śiṣyātai* [without the accent mark]) and under thematic aorists (NEGELEIN, op.cit., 33; MACDONELL 372: *śīyātai* [with fn. 8: “probably a corrupt reading for the passive *śiṣyātai*”]). WHITNEY's (1885b [Roots]: 173) analysis of this form as belonging with root aorists is hardly possible.

- + *āti/áva* (α) TS^p 1.8.1.1 *ava-śīyante* ≈ MS^p 2.6.1:64.1 *ati-śīyante* ≈ KS^p 15.1:209.14 *ati-śīyante*, MS 2.6.1:64.6 = 4.3.1:39.11 *ati-śīyante* ≈ KS 15.1:210.2 *ava-śīyante*;
- + *ati* (α) ‘fall beyond, surpass’ JB 2.110:12, ChU 3.12.2-3^{3x};
- + *apa* (α) ‘fall away’,¹¹²⁰ AVP 20.62.9^{2x} (Or. mss. *apa śīyate*, *apa śīyatām*; KNOBL 2007b ⁺*śīy°*);
- + *áva* (α) AV 18.3.60 ≈ TĀ^m 6.4.1, MS^p 4.3.7:46.16-17, ŚBM 5.2.3.2 ≈ ŚBK 7.1.1.2, JB 1.1:4, 2.82:13 [CALAND §129] (*ava-śīyate*, v.l. [°]*śīryate*) +;
- + *upa* (α) ‘fall towards, come up’ JB 2.81^{4x}:1-7 [CALAND §129] +;
- + *niḥ* (α) ‘become rattled’ KauS 83.4;
- + *vi* JB^v 3.247:9, 11 +
- accented:
- śīya-te* : TS–TB^{1x}, MS^{2x}, ŚB^{1x}, TB^{1x}
- ati-śīyante* (α) MS 2.6.1^{2x}:64.1, 6, *ava-śīyante* (α) TS 1.8.1.1 = TB 1.6.1.1, ŚB 13.2.6.8, TB 3.9.4.4
- śīyá-te* : ŚB^{1x}, TB^{m3x}
- śīyānte* (β) TB 3.12.7.2-3^{3x}, *ava-śīyānte* (α) ŚBM 5.2.3.2 ≈ ŚBK 7.1.1.2
- anticaus.

In the Indian tradition, the present *śīyá-te* is treated as a derivative of the root *śad/śat* (Pāṇ. 7.3.78), together with caus. *śātáyati* ‘makes fall’,¹¹²¹ pf. *śaśāda*, *śeduḥ*; nominal derivative *śada-* ‘falling’, etc.).¹¹²² Although,

¹¹²⁰ For this compound, its AVic attestations and meaning, see KNOBL 2007b: 56, 67.

¹¹²¹ According to INSLEER (1987: 60f.), here may also belong the -áya-present *śāyaya* (*śāpayā* ?) attested in an AVic spell against witchcraft:

(AV 4.18.4ab)

sāhasradhāman víśikhān' vígrīvāṃ chāyayā t_avām

The reading *chāyayā* is adopted in ed. ²ROTH/WHITNEY/LINDENAU; ed. ¹ROTH/WHITNEY and ed. VIŚVA BANDHU read *chāpayā*. WHITNEY connected the form in question with the root *śī* ‘lie’ (‘O thou of thousand abodes (?), do thou make them lie, crestless, neckless’); this interpretation is followed by JAMISON 134f. Differently INSLEER: ‘Do make them **fall** with broken crests and necks’.

¹¹²² See WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]: 170, 173; WACKERNAGEL 1896 [AiG I]: 88, §79ay; DEBRUNNER 1957 [AiG, Nachtr. zu I]: 6; RENOU 1961: 400, § 280; MINARD 1956: 188, [§]472, fn. b; HOFFMANN 1960a: 16 [= Aufs. 1, 92]; DESHPANDE 1992: 19f.; WERBA [VIA I] 447.

historically, *śad/śat* and *śī* cannot be related¹¹²³ (see MAYRHOFER, EWAia II, 606f.), they are alike in meaning and usage, co-occur in some passages (cf. JB 2.81-82, 2.110:12-13 quoted below; see OERTEL 1935: 169 [= Kl.Schr. I, 378]; HOFFMANN 1960a: 16, 36 [= Aufs. 1, 92, 112]) and, synchronically, seem to belong together, as suppletive formations.

śīyá-te typically refers to spontaneous, uncontrollable falling, dropping, and thus clearly belongs to the non-passive (anticausative) type. Examples are:

(AVP 6.15.3)

yas te sītābhagaḥ kṣetre 'yā +rāddhir¹¹²⁴ yac ca sīyate¹¹²⁵
atho yā (+)niṣṭhā¹¹²⁶ te kṣetre 'tāṃ ta ādiṣi brahmaṇā
 'What of your [grain] is the share of the furrow in the field, what has succeeded and what falls, and what is your crop in the field: [all] that of yours I have taken by means of [this] ritual formula.'¹¹²⁷

(TS 1.8.1.1 (= TB 1.6.1.1) ≈ MS 2.6.1:64.1-2 ≈ ^UKS 15.1:209.14-15)¹¹²⁸

yé pratyāñcaḥ śamyāyā avaśīyante [MS, KS *śamyām atīśīyante*], *tāṃ nairṭām ékakapālam*
 'The [grains] which fall down to the west of the pin (*śamyā*) [MS, KS: beyond the pin] [he offers] as [a cake] on one potsherd for Nirṭi.'

(ŚBM 5.2.3.2 ≈ ŚBK 7.1.1.2)

sā yé jaghānena śamyāṃ piṣyāmāñānām avaśīyante piṣṭāni vā taṇḍulā vā, tānt sruvé sārthāṃ sām vapati

¹¹²³ FAY's (1920: 156, fn. 40) account of *śad/śat* as 'determinative' variants of *śī* is improbable.

¹¹²⁴ Conjecture by BHATTACHARYA; Or. mss. *rādvir*, Kashm. ms. *°rāddhir*.

¹¹²⁵ Kashm. ms. *°śa cīyate*, ed. EDGERTON, and subsequently ed. RAGHU VIRA, erroneously conjecture *+śacīpate*. For the AVic phonetic change *ś* → *s* before *i/y* (especially in those formations which do not occur in the RV, as is the case with *śīya-te*), see Chapter II, s.v. *vāś* and KULIKOV 2008 [2009]: 138, fn. 2.

¹¹²⁶ For *niṣṭhā*. In Kashm. ms. the pāda ends in *niṣṭhā te*; Or. reads *niṣṭhāyate*, which cannot be a correct form of *sthā* (one might expect *niṣṭhīyate*, but passives of the compound *ni(h)-ṣṭhā* are not attested) and violates the metre.

¹¹²⁷ For a detailed discussion of this passage, see GRIFFITHS 2009: 184f. (with a somewhat different interpretation).

¹¹²⁸ For the variants of this passage attested in the Saṃhitās and Sūtras of the YV (BaudhŚS, ĀpŚS etc.), see TSUJI 1964: 4.

‘And whatever [portion of the grain], being ground, [be it] flour or grains, falls down behind the pin, these he throws together into the spoon.’

(ChU 3.12.3)

yā vai sā pṛthivīyaṃ vāva sā yad idam asmin puruṣe śarīram. asmin hīme prāṇāḥ pratiṣṭhitā, etad eva nātiśīyante

‘Verily, as to the earth, this is that what this body is in this man. Since in this [body] these vital breaths are grounded, they do not certainly fall beyond this [body].’¹¹²⁹

Note that *āti-śīya-te* and *áva-śīya-te* in the contexts above are (nearly) synonymous with another ‘-yá-verb, *āti-ricya-te* ‘surpass’ (also constructed with the accusative of the limit, see s.v. *ric*).

In some contexts, *śīyá-te* expresses spontaneous obtaining of goods, prosperity, or success,¹¹³⁰ as in:

(TB^m 3.7.14.4-5^{bis} = TĀ-Āndhra 45 (= MNU, ed. VARENNE 388) ≈ ManB 1.5.1)

parṇāṃ vānaspāter ivābhiḥ naḥ śīyatām [ManB *sūyatām*] *rayīḥ*
‘Let wealth fall unto us like a leaf [falls down] from a tree.’¹¹³¹

(JB 2.81:1-4, 7, 2.82:13 [CALAND §129 (without translation)])

[2.81] *athaiṣa upāśadaḥ / kaśyapo vā akāmayata: upopa mā prajāḥ paśavaḥ śīyerann, upopa prajāyā paśubhiḥ prajāyeyeti / sa etaṃ yajñam apaśyat / tam āharat / tenāyajata / tato vai tam upopa prajāḥ paśavo śīyanta, upopa prajāyā paśubhiḥ +prajāyata*¹¹³² / *upopa ha vā enaṃ prajāḥ paśavaḥ śīyanta, upopa prajāyā paśubhiḥ prajāyate ya evaṃ veda* [...] *yad v evaiṣaikaikā stotryopāśīyate, tasmād upāśadaḥ* [...] [2.82] [...] *yad v evaiṣaikaikā stotryāvaśīyate, tasmāc chadaḥ*

[2.81] ‘Now, this is increase (upāśada). Kaśyapa wished: “May offspring and cattle increase for me [lit.: fall to me]. May I proliferate in offspring

¹¹²⁹ For this passage, see GONDA 1954: 18 [= Sel.St. II, 355].

¹¹³⁰ Cf. CALAND 1903: 63 and GOTÖ 2000: 104ff. on the opposition *upa-śīyate* “es kommt hinzu” – *ava-śīyate* “es fällt ab” in the BaudhŚS.

¹¹³¹ See also BÖHTLINGK 1898: 86 (on the quotation of this mantra in HirGS 1.28.1). Inexactly VARENNE: ‘Que pareille à la branche d’un arbre **s’étende** sur nous la prospérité’. For the variant of this mantra attested in the late ManB, with the secondary *sūyatām* for *śīyatām*, see Chapter IV, s.v. ²*sū*.

¹¹³² Thus in one of the mss.; ed. RAGHU VIRA/LOKESH CHANDRA reads *prajāyata*.

and cattle”. He saw this sacrifice. He took it. He performed a sacrifice with it. Then offspring and cattle fell to him; he proliferated in offspring and cattle. To the one who knows thus offspring and cattle fall, he proliferates in offspring and cattle. [...] Verily, each time when one stotra-verse is added [lit.: falls to], that causes an increase. [...] [2.82] Verily, each time when one stotra-verse is omitted [lit.: is dropped], that causes decay.¹¹³³

Another important usage of this present can be labelled ‘falling as a result of aging or decaying’: *śīyá-te* is said of hair, teeth etc. coming out, processes of erosion, decay, etc. This meaning is attested, in particular, for the simplex (in the ŚB, TB), compounds with *áva* and *niḥ*¹¹³⁴ (see KUIPER 1934: 236):

(MS 4.3.7:46.16-17)

saṁvatsarāyūṣam enaṁ karoti. tásmād rājasūyābhiṣiktasya jarāsā dántā áva śīyante

‘[The year] makes him one year older. Therefore, because of old age, the teeth of one who has performed Rājasūya, fall off.’

(ŚB 7.4.2.11)

prajāpater vísrastasya yāni lómāny áśīyanta, tā imá óṣadhayo ’bhavan
‘The hair of Prajāpati, which fell down¹¹³⁵ when he was disjointed, became these plants.’

(JB 1.1:4)

tasya vai mathyamānasya bhasmāvaśīyate [v.l. °śīryate]

‘While it [= the lower piece of kindling wood] is churned [by the upper piece of wood], some borings fall down.’¹¹³⁶

To this usage also belong both occurrences with root accentuation

¹¹³³ Cf. also PB 19.3.3; BaudhŚS 18.45:401.1ff. (see GOTÖ 2000: 104ff.).

¹¹³⁴ Cf. KauśS 83.4 *dve niḥśīyamāne nīlalahite sūtre* ‘two rattled (= very old), a blue and a red, (ritual) threads’.

¹¹³⁵ Inexactly EGGELING: ‘were lying’.

¹¹³⁶ I follow BODEWITZ’s (1973: 19) translation, contra OERTEL (1926: 121): ‘Of this (fire), as if it is being churned out the ashes fall down’. As BODEWITZ (ibid., 21f., note 4) explains, *bhasma* cannot denote ‘ashes’, but rather refers to some kind of wooden dust falling of the wood sticks during the churning, a product of erosion.

attested in the Brāhmaṇas, in two very similar passages in the ŚB and TB:¹¹³⁷

(ŚB 13.2.6.8)

yáthā vái haviṣó 'hutasya skándet / evám etát paśó skandati, yásya niktásya lómāni śīyante

‘Just as [some part] of an oblation which has not [yet] been offered may be spilled, even so [some part] of a victim is spilled whose hair falls out after it has been wetted.’

(TB 3.9.4.4)

yáthā vái haviṣo gṛhītásya skándati / evám vā etád áśvasya skandati, yád asyopākṛtasya lómāni śīyante

‘Just as [some part] of an oblation which has not [yet] been offered may be spilled, even so [some part] of the horse is spilled when the hair of this [horse] prepared [for the sacrifice] falls out.’

Although such usages cannot be regarded as instantiating a separate meaning of *śī*, representing quite a natural semantic development of the basic meaning ‘fall’ (cf. German *Verfall*, Dutch *verval*, Rus. *ynaðok*), they deserve special attention. The semantics of decay and destruction may have developed under the influence of the phonologically similar ‘-yá-presents *kṣīyá-te* ‘perish, disappear’, *mīyá-te* ‘perish’.

Finally, in a number of contexts, *śīyá-te* exhibits a particular meaning (β), ‘fall (congealing)’, said of precipitations, such as snow, hail, dew etc. This usage is represented, in particular, by a few occurrences in the texts of the Taittirīya school:

(TB 3.12.7.2-3)

sárvām dhúniṃ, sárvān dhvaṃśán, himó yác ca śīyáte – ||2|| sárvās táḥ;

sárvān mārīcīn vítatān, nīhāró yác ca śīyáte – sárvās táḥ;

sárvā vidyútaḥ, sárvānt stanayimūn, hrādúnīr yác ca śīyáte – sárvās táḥ

‘[Having made into sacrificial bricks] every roaring river, all the waterfalls (?), and all [that water] which **falls** / (**freezes**?) [as] snow – all these [bricks]; all the rays of light that are spread [in the air], and all [that] which **falls** [as] mist – all these [bricks]; all the lightnings, all the thunders, and all [that] which **falls** [as] hail – all these [bricks].’ (formulas recited by the adhvaryu placing sacrificial bricks of the fire-altar)

¹¹³⁷ See OERTEL 1926: 121.

(TS 1.5.1.1-2)

*sò 'rodīd; yád árodīt, tád rudrásya rudratvām; yád áśrv áśīyata, tád ||1||
 rajatām hīraṇyam abhavat*

'He (sc. Agni) wept; in that he wept is the Rudra-ness of Rudra; the tear that **fell/froze**¹¹³⁸ became silver.'

Such occurrences are connected by many scholars with another root, *śyā* 'freeze, congeal'. PW VII, 325 took *śīyá-^{te}* in TB 3.12.7.2-3 as a passive of this root ('gefrieren machen'). INSLER (1987: 61) essentially follows this interpretation; cf. his translations 'when the snow freezes' (for TB 3.12.7.2 *himó yác ca śīyáte*), 'when the tear froze (congealed)' (for TS 1.5.1.1; *ibid.*, fn. 19); likewise MAYRHOFFER, EWAia I, 643 and 660f.;¹¹³⁹ WERBA [VIA I] 412; LIV 331f. A different translation of the TB form ('fall') was given in DUMONT's translation (1951: 671), which I essentially follow; GEROW (1973: 229) has convincingly demonstrated that the meaning 'freeze, coagulate' is by no means suggested by the context.¹¹⁴⁰

In formal terms, both analyses are possible (*śīya-^{te}* can belong to either), but the former has a number of drawbacks. Given the assumption that *śīya-^{te}* means 'freeze', we will hardly be able to account for the co-existence of two competing and phonologically distinct -ya-presents within the same IVS, i.e. *śīya-^{te}* and *śyāya-^{ti}* (KS^p–KpS^p, ŚB; see Chapter IV, s.v. *śyā*). According to INSLER (*op.cit.*, 61f.), *śīyate* has been replaced by *śyāyati* under the influence of the phonologically similar *styāya-^{te}* VS 'become stiff, solid' (INSLER reconstructs the active inflection: **styāyati*). In my view, this hypothesis cannot be proved:

1) First of all, we do not find parallels for such a replacement. Laryngeal roots (*CṚH*, *C(R)aH*) can form -ya-presents either according to the ablauting type (cf. *jīyáte*, *pūryáte*, *vīyáte*, etc.) or with the full root grade (cf. *trāyate*, *pyāyate*, *mlāyati*, etc.), but never follow both morphophonological patterns.¹¹⁴¹ Furthermore, even the rare and marginal pair *sphāyate* // *sphīyate*

¹¹³⁸ Impossible is KEITH's passive translation: 'was shed'.

¹¹³⁹ Hesitantly: "Einige zu *śīy°* gestellte *śī°*-Formen mögen zu *ŚYĀ* gehören".

¹¹⁴⁰ Cf., in particular, his remark (*ibid.*, fn. 6) on TS 1.5.1.1: "The meaning 'coagulate' is suggested because the 'tears' turn into gold and silver; on the other hand, what could be more normal than a tear 'falling'!"

¹¹⁴¹ The only possible exception is the root *sphā* 'swell, fatten', but the full grade present *sphāyate* is a Vedic hapax (AVP 8.11.11), while *sphīyate* is post-Vedic (SVB); *trāyate* (RV +) 'rescues', *prā-tūrya-^{te}* (TB 2.5.1.3) 'is prolonged' and *tūrya*

follows the opposite direction of replacement, i.e. ‘non-ablauting’ → ‘ablauting’; and, in any case, such competing formations do not co-occur within a chronological period, as *śīya-te* and *śyāya-ti* did in Vedic prose.

2) The present *styāya-te*, under the influence of which, as INSLEER assumes, this replacement may have happened, could not serve as the morphophonological model for at least two reasons:

(2.i) Both *śīya-te* and *styāya-te* are only attested in the middle, and one might expect that the newly built full grade stem *śyāya-* would also take middle endings (**śyāya-te*) – but this is not the case. INSLEER therefore is forced to assume that the middle inflection in *styāya-te* is secondary, since “it always appears in fixed collocation *tāt* (or *sá*) *ta āpyāyatām niṣtyāyatām* ‘Let it swell up and become solid for thee’.”

(2.ii) It seems unlikely that a rare (quasi-hapax) -ya-present, attested only in the mantras, could have triggered rebuilding of *śīya-te* in Vedic prose (which has no parallels in the Vedic verbal system).

3) Finally, connecting **all** occurrences of *śīya-te* with one single root *śī* ‘fall’, as GEROW actually suggests (which by no means leads to forced translations), provides a more economic and, therefore, more attractive analysis, by Okkam’s razor.

In the Taittirīya passages under discussion *śīya-te* ‘fall’ is constructed with the subject of the non-rain precipitations (or tears considered as rain). Most likely, the following AVic attestation of *śīya-te* belongs to the same usage:

(AV 18.3.60ab ≈ TĀ^m 6.4.1)¹¹⁴²

śām te nīhāró bhavatu ' śām te pruṣṇáva śīyatām

Misinterpretations of this verse are due to erroneous translation of *pruṣvā* given by WEBER (1896: 273) (‘... sanft lagere auf dich hinab **der Reif**’) and WHITNEY (‘... let the **frost** fall down as weal for thee’). As GEROW shows, *pruṣvā*¹¹⁴³ means ‘drop of water’, and the passage can be translated,

(RV 8.99.5, a hapax and nonce formation) ‘overcome’ (?) do not belong together, and, in any case, are not synonymous, as *śīya-te* and *śyāya-ti* are supposed to be, according to INSLEER.

¹¹⁴² The TĀ variant runs: *śām te nīhāró varṣatu ' śām u pṛṣváva śīyatām* [v.l. *pṛṣṭháva*]. The form *pṛṣvā* (*pṛṣṭhā*) is secondary.

¹¹⁴³ The TĀ form *pṛṣṭhā* is secondary.

following INSLEER:

‘Let the cool drop fall down nicely for thee (said to a frog).’¹¹⁴⁴

The accentual patterning of *śīyá-te* is quite intricate and in many cases does not follow the rule that works for most other ‘-yá-presents. In particular, the MS only attests root accentuation, and one of the two accented ŚB occurrences also has the accent on the root (‘fall (of hair)’), while another (‘fall down’) bears the accent on the suffix. The TB attests suffix accentuation in the mantra portion, which is similar to the distribution observed for *tápyá-te* (*tapyá-te*: TS^{m1x}, *tápya-te*: TB^{p2x}) and *lúpyá-te* (*lupyá-te*: TB^{m1x}, *lúpya-te*: TS^{p1x}); see Chapter C.II.3.2.2.

The position of *śīyá-te* among middle -ya-presents is rather uncertain. On the one hand, it shares some features with the root-accented -ya-present *pádya-te*; cf., in particular, the phonologically similar active perfects *śaśāda*, *papāda*, corresponding to these middle -ya-presents. Note also that all accented occurrences of *śīya-te* in the Saṃhitās attest the root accentuation (*śīyá-te*). On the other hand, the phonologically and semantically similar ‘-yá-presents, such as *kṣīyá-te* ‘perish, disappear’ or *mīyá-te* ‘perish’, could assimilate *śīya-te* to the core members of the ‘-yá-class (verbs of destruction or decay; see Chapter C.II.3) and thus give rise to fluctuating accentuation – in contrast to other (quasi-)synonymous verbs of motion/falling, such as *pádya-te*.

To conclude this lemma, a few remarks on the etymological connections of *śīyá-te* will be in order. *śīyá-te* is generally regarded as lacking cognates outside Indo-Aryan.¹¹⁴⁵ The phonologically similar root *śī* ‘lie’ (stative *śāye* etc.; see KÜMMEL 1996: 109f.), compared by some scholars with *śī* ‘fall’ (cf. e.g. WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]: 173; THIEME 1929: 44), is qualified by

¹¹⁴⁴ This stanza, employed in the funeral ritual, has been discussed at length by BLOOMFIELD (1890: 342ff.). According to BLOOMFIELD, “after the fire has consumed the corpse, water is poured upon it in order to extinguish it. Then furthermore certain water-plants are put there. In addition to these a frog [...] is put upon the place where the fire has burned. These, as representatives of life in the waters, are symbolically supposed both to prevent and to extinguish fire”.

¹¹⁴⁵ KUIPER’s (1934: 236; 1939: 63f. [= Sel.Wr., 219f.]) identification of *śīyate* with GAv. 2pl.impv.med. -*siiōdūm* (in Y 48.7 *paitī rəməm paitī siiō(z)dūm*) is questionable both phonologically and semantically. KUIPER (1939) translated the passage as ‘wendet euch gegen die Grausamkeit’; more likely is LUBOTSKY’s (2001: 34; 2004) analysis of the form in question as derived from the root *siiāzd-* ‘banish, expel’, i.e. ‘banish the fury!’

MAYRHOFER, EWAia II, 614 as etymologically unrelated. Yet, genetic relationships of these two roots are not impossible; see LIV 321, note 1 s.v. ?2.**kei-*. The semantic difference between *śīyāte* ‘falls’ and *śāye* ‘lies’ can be regarded as an example of the stative/dynamic opposition of the type ‘(dynamic event) P’ ~ ‘result of P’. There is at least one similar pair, *stūyāte* ‘is (being) praised’ ~ *stāve* ‘is famous’, which may have served as a morphological model, i.e. *śīyāte* can be tentatively explained as a secondary dynamic present built to the older stative *śāye* (A. LUBOTSKY, p.c.).

śī̄ ‘break (off), split, collapse’: śī̄ryá-^{te}

Simplex RV 1.164.13, AVP 16.120.5, 6, YV^p, ŚB, PB 9.9.13, AĀ 2.1.4^{2x} +;

+ *āpi* KS^p 35.16:62.2 (*api-śī̄ryāte* ≈ KpS 48.14:305.10 *ava-śī̄ryate*), PB 9.9.13;

+ *āva* MS^p 4.8.10:119.7 ≈ KS^p 30.5:187.6-7, KpS^p 48.14:305.10 (*ava-śī̄ryate* ≈ KS^p 35.16:62.2 *api-śī̄ryāte*);

+ *ā* GB 1.2.18:52.7-8;

+ *pra* KS^p 23.4:78.12 = KpS^p 36.1:187.9, KS^p 26.4:126.17-18 = KpS^p 41.2:237.8, JB 2.393:4 [= CALAND §164];

+ *prati* ĀpŚS 18.15.4;

+ *vi* PB 14.9.27, JB 1.353:17 +;

+ *sām* AVŚ 12.4.3ab ≈ AVP 17.16.3, AVŚ 12.4.5, MS^p 3.6.10:74.2 ≈ KS^p 23.6:82.5, KB 11.5.16 ≈ GB 2.3.11:198:15-199.1, PB +

accented:

śī̄rya-^{te} : ŚB^{1x} (BĀU)¹¹⁴⁶

śī̄ryate ŚB 14.6.9.28 (= BĀUM 3.9.28 = BĀUK 3.9.26) = ŚB 14.6.11.16 (= BĀUM 4.2.6 = BĀUK 4.2.4) = ŚB 14.7.2.27 (= BĀUM 4.4.27 = BĀUK 4.4.22)

śī̄ryá-^{te} : MS^{1x}, KS^{1x}

api-śī̄ryāte KS 35.16:62.2, *saṃ-śī̄ryéta* MS 3.6.10:74.2

-śī̄rya-^{ti} :

+ *vi* ChU 5.15.2 (*vyaśī̄ryat*; ed. BÖHTLINGK, ed. SENART⁺ *vyaśarīṣyata*) (+)

¹¹⁴⁶ For MS 2.1.8^{2x}:9.13, 14 *vī̄ryeta* (BÖHTLINGK, pw IV, Nachtr., 298 ⁺*śī̄ryeta*, quoted from MITTWEDE 1986 [Textkr. zur MS]: 77), read ⁺*dī̄ryeta*; see s.v. *dī̄*.

• anticaus. / (pass.)

The intransitive present *śīrya-^{te}* denotes split, collapse and other kinds of damage or destruction and is employed in usages very similar to those in which the (quasi-)synonymous *chīdyá-^{te}*, *đīryá-^{te}* and *bhīdyá-^{te}* (q.v.) occur; cf., in particular, *śīryate* in RVic stanza RV 1.164.13 (quoted below), for which the parallel AVic verse 9.9.11 substitutes *chidyate*. Although passive interpretations ('is broken, split') are possible in some cases, the spontaneous character of the processes (breaking off splinters, collapse of a roof,¹¹⁴⁷ disease) favours anticausative interpretations for most contexts. Examples are:

(RV 1.164.13cd ≈ AV 9.9.11cd)

tásya nākṣas tapyate bhūribhāraḥ ' sanād evā ná śīryate sánābhiḥ

'Its axle does not heat, [albeit] heavy-burdened; even from old it does not break together with its nave.'

(TS 6.1.3.5)

yè 'ntaḥśarā áśīryanta, té śarā abhavan; tác charāṇām śaratvám

'The prongs on the inner side [of Indra's vajra] which broke off became śara-blades; therefore the śara grass [is called] "śara".'¹¹⁴⁸

(ŚB 1.2.4.1)

átha yátra práharat, tác chákalo 'śīryata. sá patitvá śarò 'bhavat; tásmāc charó náma yád áśīryata

'And when [Indra] threw [the vajra], then a splinter broke off. It fell down and became a śara-blade; therefore its name is "śara", for it broke off.'¹¹⁴⁹

(KS 35.16:62.1-2 ≈ KpS 48.14:305.10)

yásya grāvāpiśīryáte [KpS grāvāvaśīryate], paśúbhir vy ṛdhyate

'[The one] whose pressing stone breaks, is deprived of cattle.'

With the preverb *sám*, *śīrya-^{te}* refers to a particular disease, which

¹¹⁴⁷ Cf. KS 30.5:187.6-7 *ava-śīryeta*; see RAU 1983: 58.

¹¹⁴⁸ See the detailed RAU's (1973: 44f.) comments (contra KEITH's erroneous translation) on this passage and on TS 5.2.6.1-2 (which is very similar); cf. also SCHLERATH's (1975: 503, fn. 1 [= Kl.Schr. 2, 538f., fn. 7]) objections and translation of TS 5.2.6.2 *yè 'ntaḥśarā áśīryanta* 'die innen [im Vajra befindlichen] Pfeile, welche zerbrachen'.

¹¹⁴⁹ Cf. RAU, *ibid.*; DAS GUPTA 1975: 46.

afflicts, above all, cattle (cows) and generally proves fatal, cf.:¹¹⁵⁰

(AVŚ 12.4.3ab ≈ AVP 17.16.3ab)

kūṭāyāsyā sám śīryante ' śloṇāyā kāṭām ardati

‘By [giving] a hornless [cow] his [cows] collapse, by [giving] a lame one he dissolves (?) into a pit.’ (unpleasant consequences of giving defective cows to ṛṣis)

(AV 12.4.5cd)

anāmanāt sám śīryante ' yā mūkhenopajīghrati

‘[The cattle] who sniff with their snout [at the cow’s foot-steps] collapse from the anāmana-disease (?).’

(MS 3.6.10:73.17-74.2)

*varuṇāya tvéty apsú magnām; rudrāya tvéti mahādevāhatām; nīrṛtyai tvéty ávasannām; índrāya tvéti vleṣkāhatām, yā vā saṁśīryéta*¹¹⁵¹

“‘You (sc. dakṣiṇā-cow) – to Varuṇa”, – with these words [I assign the dakṣiṇā-cow] sunk in the waters; “‘You – to Rudra”, – with these words the one hit by Mahādeva; “‘You – to Nīrṛti”, – with these words the one which dies of exhaustion; “‘You – to Indra”, – with these words the one strangled by a noose or the one which collapses.’

Cf. also the parallel Kāṭhaka passage:

(KS 23.6:82.3-5)

vāyave tveti, yā naśyati; nīrṛtyai tvety, yāvasīdati; rudrāya tveti, yām rudro hanti, yā saṁśīryate; varuṇāya tveti, yāpsu, yā bleṣkeṇa

“‘You – to Vāyu”, – with these words [I assign the dakṣiṇā-cow], which

¹¹⁵⁰ This meaning is also attested for the -i-aorist inj. *sām śāri* in RV 6.54.7 (cf. KÜMMEL 1996: 113). Note that *sám* in *sám-śīrya-te* expresses the perfective meaning (i.e. refers to a completed event), not the collective (sociative) one; see VON GARNIER 1909: 104f.

¹¹⁵¹ ROTH’s conjecture ⁺*saṁśīryéta* (“*saṁśīryéta* ‘einschrumpft, eintrocknet’, von √*śyā*”; see MS, ed. SCHROEDER, Bd. IV, Correcturen und Conjecturen, p. 310) is improbable (cf. MITTWEDE 1986 [Textkr. zur MS]: 124) for several reasons: 1) The meaning of *śyā* makes no sense in the context. 2) The present *śīrya-te* belongs to the root *śī* ‘fall’, not to *śyā* ‘freeze, congeal’ (see above, s.v.). 3) The compound *sám-śīrya-te* does not occur with the preverb *sám* in Vedic, while *śīrya-te* is well-attested with *sám* (cf. examples below). 4) As MITTWEDE rightly points out, ROTH’s conjecture is not supported by the parallel Kāṭhaka passage, which also reads *saṁ-śīryate*.

perishes; “You – to Nirṛti”, – with these words the one which becomes exhausted; “You – to Rudra”, – with these words the one which Rudra smites or which collapses; “You – to Varuṇa”, – with these words the one which [is killed] in the waters or by a noose.’

Cf. also similar instructions in BaudhŚS 6.8:164.21ff. (where the cow afflicted by this disease [*saṃ ... śīryate*] is assigned to Nirṛti) and PB 11.5.8, 21.14.14, also with the subject of a cow.

The exact meaning of *sām-śīrya^{te}* in such usages crucially depends on the interpretation of the AVic term *anāmaná-*. This unclear word probably denotes a (cow) disease (thus PW I, 185). HENRY (1896a: 204 and 250) connected it with *nāman-* (‘[mal] sans nom’); his interpretation is adopted by ELIZARENKOVA (2007: 192 and 278).¹¹⁵² GONDA’s (1965: 356f.) analysis *an-āmana-* (‘unfriendly disposition’) hardly yields a better solution. Subscribing to HENRY’s assumption that this word incorporates the negative prefix *a-*, I would rather suppose here a derivative of the root *nam* ‘bend’. *anāmaná-* might denote a disease which makes living beings (cattle) unable to bend and move, i.e. paralysis or, more likely, tetanus (lockjaw), which is usually fatal and results in death in a few days; see SHORTT 1876: 71 and 77.¹¹⁵³

Evidence for the accentual patterning of *śīryá^{te}* is rather scant. Alongside with two occurrences with suffix accentuation (one in the MS, one in the KS), there is only one attestation with root accentuation, in the late ŚB (= BĀU):

(ŚB 14.6.9.28 (= BĀUM 3.9.28 = BĀUK 3.9.26) = ŚB 14.6.11.16 (= BĀUM 4.2.6 = BĀUK 4.2.4) = ŚB 14.7.2.27 (= BĀUM 4.4.27 = BĀUK 4.4.22))

sá eṣá néti néty ātmā / ágrhyo ná hí grhyáté,¹¹⁵⁴ *’śīryo ná hí śīryaté*,
*’saṅgó ’sīto ná sajjaté*¹¹⁵⁵ *ná vyáthate*

‘That Ātman [is defined only as] neither [this], nor [that]. [It is] unseizable, for it cannot be seized; [it is] imperishable, [for] it does not

¹¹⁵² Differently WHITNEY: ‘unexpectedly’ (?) (*√man*); see also WACKERNAGEL 1905 [AiG II, 1]: 110; MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 71.

¹¹⁵³ An interesting lexical parallel with this usage of *sām-śīryate* ‘suffers from (lit. is broken by) tetanus (paralysis?)’ is found in Russian *его разбило параличом / разбил паралич* (lit.) ‘he is broken by paralysis’.

¹¹⁵⁴ Mss. *grhyaté*.

¹¹⁵⁵ Mss. *sájjate*, *sájjate*; see Chapter I, s.v. *sa(ñ)j*.

perish; [it is] unattached, unbound, [for] it does not adhere [to anything], it does not move.’

Note that the root accentuation of *śīryate* may also have triggered the irregular root accentuation in *gṛhyaté* and *sājyate* (v.l. *sājate*) (cf. ed. WEBER, crit.app., p. 1182), for which ed. conjectures ⁺*gṛhyáte* and ⁺*sājyáte*.

In spite of the scarcity of accented occurrences, the semantic affinity of *śīrya-te* with *chidyá-te*, *dīryá-te* and *bhidyá-te* enables to group it with ‘-yá-presents.

-i-aorist

For the *-i*-aorist inj. attested in the same anticausative usage as *śīryá-te* (3x in the RV), see KÜMMEL 1996: 113f.

Active forms

An active form is attested in Vedic only once, in the same usage as the regular middle forms:

(ChU 5.15.2)

saṁdehas te vyaśīryad, yan mām nāgamiṣyaḥ

‘Your body would have collapsed,¹¹⁵⁶ if you had not come to me.’

The active ending is undoubtedly secondary (cf. FÜRST 1916: 27), probably due to the active forms which appear in similar constructions in 5.13-16 (*andho ’bhaviṣyaḥ* ..., *prāṇas ta udakramiṣyat* ..., *bastis te vyabhetsyat* ... ‘you would have become blind ..., your breath would have left [you] ..., your bladder would have split ... – [if you had not come to me]’).¹¹⁵⁷ Note, incidentally, that the meaning which I assumed above for *sām-śīryate*, i.e. ‘suffer from a particular disease (tetanus, paralysis or the like)’ perfectly suits the context.

Ed. BÖHTLINGK gives a heavy conjecture (accepted by D. ANDERSEN (1892: 50) and in ed. SENART): conditional ⁺*vyaśarīṣyata* (cf. also BÖHTLINGK 1891: 77). His scenario of replacements of the original form (first changing to ⁺*vyaśīṣyata* due to a copyist’s error and then amending to *vyaśīryat(a)*) seems unlikely, however (cf. also FÜRST 1916: 24); besides, as WHITNEY (1890: 413) pointed out, *śarīṣya-te* is unattested with the long *ī*.

¹¹⁵⁶ WITZEL (1987: 369): ‘would have dissolved’.

¹¹⁵⁷ See WITZEL 1987: 369.

Active forms of this compound (*vi-śīrya-^{ti}*) are well-attested in the Epics. For post-Vedic (Epic) active forms, see OBERLIES 2003: 241, 265 and 526.

hā ‘leave (behind), omit, exclude’: *hīyá-^{te}*

Simplex AV 10.8.15, YV^p +;

+ *áva* RV 10.34.5, KS^p 26.9:134.11 = KpS^p 41.7:244.13;

+ *ní* ‘disappear’ RV 6.52.1, 7.104.10;

+ *ví* ‘separate, select’ ŚB 2.3.3.16, AĀ 3.2.4

accented:

hīyá-^{te} : TS^{4x}, ŚB^{1x}

hīyate TS 3.1.9.6, 3.2.9.5, TS 6.2.4.1^{2x}, ŚB 3.6.2.14 ≈ 3.6.2.15

hīyá-^{te} : MS^{2x}, ŚB^{2x}

hīyáte MS 1.5.13:82.9, *hīyéta* MS 1.5.13:82.10, ŚB 3.8.3.16, *vi-hīyéta* ŚB 2.3.3.16

• anticaus. / (pass.)

The intransitive present *hīyá-^{te}* denotes falling, lagging, staying behind (being left behind), falling behind (in particular, in a race competition), getting lost; see esp. GELDNER 1897 [VSt II]: 160f.¹¹⁵⁸ In some contexts the meaning of *hīyá-^{te}* is rather close to those of two other ‘-yá-presents, viz. *-rícyá-^{te}* (with *áti*) and *-śíśyá-^{te}* (cf. e.g. TS 3.1.9.6, MS 1.5.13 quoted below); however, most often, it refers to undesirable results of mistaken actions. The passive meaning, attested in some contexts¹¹⁵⁹, must be secondary. Rather, this present belongs to the non-passive intransitive (anticausative) type; see, in particular, HOCK 1985-86: 85, fn. 2. Examples are:

(RV 10.34.5ab)

yád ādīdhye ná daviṣāṇy ebhiḥ ' parāyádbhyo 'ava hīye sákhībhyah

‘When I intend: “I will not gamble with them (sc. the gambling nuts) any more, I fall behind the [gambling] partners who are going away [to gamble]” ...’¹¹⁶⁰

¹¹⁵⁸ Cf. also CHARPENTIER 1911: 360, with fn. 1.

¹¹⁵⁹ KÜMMEL 1996: 139f., after NARTEN 285, qualifies this meaning as primary: ‘zurückgelassen werden’ → ‘verloren sein’. See also AMANO 205, with fn. 385.

¹¹⁶⁰ See OLDENBERG, *Noten*, ad loc.

(TS 7.3.1.1)

*yá sthānūṁ hānti, yó bhréṣaṁ nyéti, sá hīyate. sá yó vái daśamé 'hann
avivākyá upahanyáte, sá hīyate*

'He who hits the stump [of a tree], and who comes to harm, falls behind.
Verily, he, who on the tenth day, the Avivākyā, makes a recitation
mistake, falls behind.'¹¹⁶¹

(AB 6.2.6)

*tad āhuḥ: katham abhi śtuyād ity. akṣaraśā3ḥ? caturakṣaraśā3ḥ? [...]
atha yad akṣaraśaś caturakṣaraśo, vi tathā chandāṁsi lupyeran, bahūni
tathākṣarāṇi hīyeran*

'They say: "How one should praise [him]: by syllables (= akṣaras)? by
sets of four syllables?" [...] "And if by syllables or sets of four syllables,
then the metres would thus be interrupted, and many syllables would thus
be omitted".'

Note that in the last passage *hīya-te* co-occurs with another '-yá-present, *lúpyá-te*, which also refers to undesirable results (the interruption of metres and the omission of syllables).

The negative semantics of *hīyá-te* is particularly clear in compounds with *ní* ('be abandoned' → 'disappear' → 'perish'),¹¹⁶² cf.:

(RV 7.104.10d)

ní śá hīyatām tanuvā tánā ca

'Let him be left behind, [the thief] himself and his children.'¹¹⁶³

Less clear is the meaning of the only simplex attestation in the mantra language, in the cosmogonic Skambha hymn AV 10.8:

(AV 10.8.15abc)

*dūré pūrṇéna vasati ' dūrā ūnéna hīyate
mahād yakṣám bhūvanasya mādhye*

WHITNEY's translation ('in the distance it dwells with the full one, in the distance it is abandoned by the deficient one – the great monster in the midst of existence')¹¹⁶⁴ does not render the parallelism of pādas a and b. Since

¹¹⁶¹ See HOFFMANN 1951: 22f. [= Aufs. 1, 32f.].

¹¹⁶² See CHARPENTIER 1917/18: 101.

¹¹⁶³ See NARTEN 1988-90: 149 [= Kl.Schr. 1, 387]. For the emphatic reflexive usage of *tanú-*, see KULIKOV 2000c: 233ff.; 2007b.

¹¹⁶⁴ HENRY (1894: 29) connects *pūrṇá-* and *ūná-* with the waxing and waning moon

pādas a and b must represent the positive and negative members of a pair, and a is more or less clear (\approx ‘he dwells with / profits from what is full’), the sense of pāda b can be tentatively determined as its opposite, i.e. ‘he does not dwell with (\approx he is free from) what is deficient’.¹¹⁶⁵

There is no correlation between the accentuation and the meaning.¹¹⁶⁶ the TS attests root accentuation, while the MS has suffix accentuation; cf.:

(TS 3.1.9.6)

yád yajñavāstáu hīyate, máma vái tát

‘Whatever is left behind on the place of sacrificial ground, that belongs to me (sc. Rudra).’

(TS 3.2.9.5)

yád ardharcāl lúpyeta, yáthā dhāvadbyo hīyate tādṛg evá tát

‘If [the response] were broken off after a half-stanza, then that would be exactly as when one is left behind those who are running.’¹¹⁶⁷

(TS 6.2.4.1)

tēṣāṃ yá unnáyate, hīyata evá sá. [...] yó vái svārthétāṃ yatām śrāntó hīyata, utá sá niṣṭyāya sahá vasati

‘The one of them who takes out [some food] is left behind. [...] Verily, the one who, exhausted, is left behind among those who go on attending their own affairs, sticks behind and lives at [home].’

(MS 1.5.13:82.9)

rudráya hí tát dhīyáte

‘... for this is left over for Rudra.’

In the ŚB, both suffix and root accentuations are attested.¹¹⁶⁸ Two occurrences with the suffix accentuation are optative forms, while the only attestation with the root accentuation is an indicative form, which appears at

(‘Il séjourne avec la pleine lune, [mais] à la distance, et le croissant [aussi] le laisse à distance’), which seems unlikely.

¹¹⁶⁵ Thus translated by LINDENAU (1925: 256): ‘In Fülle wohnt er in der Ferne, / Von Mangel ist er in der Ferne frei...’; RENOU (1956 [HS]: 168): ‘Il réside au loin avec le plein, / au loin il est exempt de déficience’.

¹¹⁶⁶ See KÜMMEL 1996: 139.

¹¹⁶⁷ See also above, s.v. *lup*.

¹¹⁶⁸ Cf. MINARD 1956: 217, [§]576, fn. b.

the beginning of a clause:

(ŚB 2.3.3.16)

*tásyā uttaratá āróhaṇaṁ sainaṁ svargāṁ lokāṁ sám āpayaty. átha yó dakṣiṇatá éty áste, yáthā prátīrṇāyām āgáchet, sá **vihīyéta**, sá tاتا evá bahirdhá syád evāṁ tát*

‘When ascended from the north, it (sc. Agnihotra conceived as a ship) makes him (sc. the sacrificer) reach the heavenly world. But [for] the one who, having come from the south, is sitting down, it would be as if he came [to a ship] when [it] had [already] taken off, and he **were left behind** and remained outside that very [ship].’

(ŚB 3.8.3.16)

*hṛdayam u vái paśúḥ. | tát asyātmāna evāgré ’va dyati. tásmād yádi kīṁcid avadānaṁ **hīyéta**, ná tát á driyeta*

‘The sacrificial animal, on the other hand, is [essentially] the heart. That (i.e. the heart) he first cuts off as a portion of its (the sacrificial animal's) very self. If, therefore, any [other] portion **would [happen to] be left out**, he should not worry about that.’

(ŚB 3.6.2.14 ≈ 3.6.2.15)

*tásmāt táttra sūguptaṁ cikīrṣed; yásya ha gopāñyām apaháranti **hīyate** ha*

‘He should, therefore, try to make [the Soma] be well-guarded then; verily, the one under whose protection they (sc. the Gandharvas) carry [him] off **is excluded** [from Soma] indeed.’

-i-aorist

For the *-i*-aorist *áhāyi*, inj. *hāyi* (AV +), corresponding to the *-ya*-present *hīyá-^{te}*,¹¹⁶⁹ see INSLEY 1968a: 317, with fn. 8; KÜMMEL 1996: 139f.

¹¹⁶⁹ Cf. AV 18.3.9b *mā te gātrā ví hāyi mó sārīram* ‘let not thy limbs, let not thy frame come apart’ (INSLEY 1968a: 317, fn. 8).

IV. Unaccented middle -ya-presents

¹*añc* ‘bend’: -acya-^{te}

+ *ní* (AVP 2.5.3, Or.-mss. *ny-acyatām* ≈ Kashm. *bhy ucy°*; read probably with AVŚ 2.12.2 *ní yujyatām* [thus ed. ZEHNDER]), ⁺KS^p 29.9:179.1 (ed. SCHROEDER ⁺*ny ācyanta*, ms. *nyāśyanta*);

+ *prāti* ‘bend towards’ AĀ 1.4.1;

+ *vi* MānŚS^m 5.1.10.35;

+ *sám* ‘crumble down’ (anticaus.) (?) RV 5.54.12;

+ *sám* & *ví* AVŚ 6.49.2 *sám* ... *ví* ... *acyase*

• anticaus. (refl.?)

As HOFFMANN (1965b: 171ff. [= Aufs. 1, 162ff.]) has demonstrated (see also MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 52f.), ¹*añc* ‘bend’ and ²*añc* ‘bail [water]’ are synchronically distinct roots. HOFFMANN assumes that the latter meaning may have developed from the former, but it cannot be ruled out that these roots go back to different sources. Cf. also KUIPER 1952: 37f. [= Sel.Wr., 222f.] and, especially, p. 46 [= Sel.Wr., 231], fn. 7. -ya-presents are derived from both.

The only occurrence of the -ya-present of ¹*añc* in the Saṃhitā prose (Kāṭhaka) is the compound with the preverb *ní*, meaning ‘bend down’,¹⁵³⁷ which clearly belongs to the non-passive (anticausative) type:

(KS 29.9:179.1-2)

tā enam upāvartanta. tā asmād abibhayus. tā ny ācyanta. tasmāt pašavo nyaknāḥ

‘They (sc. the creatures) approached him (sc. Prajāpati). They were afraid

¹⁵³⁷ For this compound, see JOHANSSON 1927: 25f.; MICHAELS 1978: 160f.

of him. They bent down. Therefore the cattle is bent down.’¹⁵³⁸

Less clear are attestations of -*acya*-^{te} in early Vedic (RV, AV). The only RVic occurrence appears in a difficult stanza:

(RV 5.54.12)

tām nākam [...] ‘*rúṣat píppalam maruto ví dhūnutha*
sám acyanta vṛjánāititviṣanta yāt’ *svāranti ghóṣaṃ vītataṃ ṛtāyávaḥ*
‘This heaven [...] do you, O Maruts, shake for white berry (= rain). [*sám acyanta vṛjánā*], when [they] became violently agitated. They, observing the right way, produce a far reaching noise.’

vṛjánā is both morphologically and semantically unclear: it can be either nom.-acc.pl. or ins.sg., and its referent is obscure. The list of suggested translations is quite impressive: ‘Umhegung, umfriedigter –, befestigter Platz’ (PW VI, 1312), ‘krafftaten’ (LUDWIG), ‘Schluchten’ (GRASSMANN 1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 329), ‘Opfernetze’ (GELDNER 1889 [VSt I]: 147f.), ‘hommes / villages’ (COLINET 1890: 386), ‘общины’ [‘communities’] (ELIZARENKOVA 1999: 67), ‘hamlets’ (F.M. MÜLLER), ‘hürde’ (FOY 1897: 250), ‘Gürtel’ (GELDNER 1951 [RV Übers.], ad loc.), ‘sacrificial plot’ (BLOOMFIELD 1928: 219ff.; RV 5.54.12 is mentioned on p. 222), ‘cercles’ (RENOU, EVP X, 32) or ‘meandre (des rivières)’ = ‘domaine circonscrit (*vṛj-*) par les rivières’ (RENOU, EVP X, 28, 79f.), ‘изгороди’ [‘fences’] (ELIZARENKOVA 1995: 60), ‘the subject, common people’ (VELANKAR 2003: 102, 255); and see, particularly, detailed discussions of this lexeme in FOY, op.cit., 245ff.; BLOOMFIELD, op.cit.; VENKATASUBBIAH 1966; ELIZARENKOVA 1999: 50ff.

GELDNER (1951 [RV Übers.]) analysed *vṛjánā* as an accusative, thus taking the verbal form as transitive-affective (possessive-reflexive), supplying a subject: ‘Sie [sc. die Marut – LK] ziehen ihre Gürtel zu, wenn sie in Feuer geraten sind...’ (explaining in a footnote: ‘Sie gürten sich für den Kampf’). But a transitive analysis of the construction is rather improbable for system-related reasons: the middle -ya-presents are not employed transitively (except for a few verbs of mental activities; see Chapter C.II.2).

Other scholars take *vṛjánā* as a nom.pl. form, i.e. as the subject of the whole construction, but interpretations of the pāda essentially differ from each other. To my knowledge, only in GELDNER’s earlier study (1889 [VSt I]: 147f.), where *vṛjánā* was understood as a sacrificial snare or trap made by

¹⁵³⁸ On Prajāpati and the creatures, see GONDA 1986: 53.

the priest in order to catch gods, *-acyanta* was translated passively: ‘**Zugezogen werden** die Opfernetze, wenn sie (die Marut) anstürmen. Die Priester (*ṛtāyu*) brüllen ihr (als Fangnetz) ausgespanntes Geschrei.’ GELDNER’s translation has not been accepted by other interpreters (for criticism, see especially OLDENBERG 1890: 414 [= Kl.Schr. III, 1921]). All other translations suggest non-passive (anticausative) interpretations:

(1) ‘**collapse**’: GRASSMANN 1876 [RV übers.]: I, 206: ‘**Zusammen stürzen** Schluchten, wenn erregt ihr [sc. Marut] seid...’; likewise GONDA (1951: 47): ‘**crumble down**’ (without translating the whole passage);¹⁵³⁹

(2) ‘**bend**’: OLDENBERG, op. cit. (“Erzittern, Erschüttertwerden, Sichniederbeugen alles Festen”);¹⁵⁴⁰ F.M. MÜLLER (1891: 326): ‘the hamlets *bowed* when the Maruts blazed’; similarly, ELIZARENKOVA (1995: 60 and 559): ‘**Гнутя** изгороди, когда (Маруты) вошли в раж’;¹⁵⁴¹ KRISCH (2006 [RIVELEX 1]: 80f.): ‘zusammenbiegen, drängen’;¹⁵⁴²

(3) ≈ ‘**compress, close**’: PW I, 59 (‘zusammendrängen’); GRASSMANN (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 15 [‘sich zusammendrängen’]); COLINET, *ibid.* (‘Les hommes (litt. villages) **se pressent les uns contre les autres** lorsque vous vous élancez impétueux’; RENOU (EVP X, 32): ‘Les cercles **se referment** quand (les Marut) entrent en transe’; ELIZARENKOVA (1999: 67): ‘**Жмутся** общины, когда (Маруты) вошли в раж’; VELANKAR (2003: 102): ‘When they [sc. the Maruts. – L.K.] blazed forth the common people were massed together (through fear)’.

The presence of the preverb *sām* favours the last interpretation. The meaning of the compound *sām acyanta* can be explained as (lit.) ‘[they] bent together’, i.e. ‘bent so as to become closer to each other, compressed’.

Another mantra occurrence of *-acya^{te}* appears in the difficult AVic (Śaunakīya) verse 6.49.2ab *meṣāⁱ va vāi sām ca ví cōr_{uv} ācyaseⁱ yād uttaradrāv_u ūparaś ca khādatah*, which seems to be a description of the

¹⁵³⁹ A non-passive translation has also been suggested by LUDWIG (1876 [RV übers.]: II, 302; see also 1883: 249), but with an unlikely syntax of the sentence: ‘sie (sc. die Maruts) stürzen sich zusammen, als sie ihre krafttaten blitzen lieszen.’

¹⁵⁴⁰ In the same vein, FOY, op.cit., 250: ‘die hürden werden niedergebogen, wenn sie (die Marut) erregt sind (anstürmen)’; but the passive meaning in the strict sense of the concept (i.e. ‘the hurdles are being bent [be smb.]’) seems less likely.

¹⁵⁴¹ Later this translation was reconsidered by ELIZARENKOVA; see sub (3).

¹⁵⁴² The second meaning rather belongs to group (3).

movements of the pressing stones, in WHITNEY's translation: 'like a ram, thou **art bent** both together and wide apart, when in the upper wood [the upper] and the lower stone devour.'¹⁵⁴³

More problematic is the second AVic (Paippalāda) attestation of this -ya-stem:

(AVP 2.5.3cd)

pāśe sa baddho durite ny acyatām 'yo asmākaṃ mana idaṃ hinasti

The corresponding Śaunakīya half-verse (AVŚ 2.12.2, quoted in Chapter B.I, s.v. *yuj*) has a different verbal form in pāda c: *nī yujyatām*. Accordingly, ed. ZEHNDER reads ⁺*nī-yujyatām* for the Paippalāda and translates as follows:

'Hört dies, Götter, die ihr opferwürdig seid. Bharadvāja soll mir die Preislieder verkünden: "in der Schlinge gefesselt soll der an Fährnis **geschirrt werden**, welcher diese unsere Absicht durchkreuzt".'

The Orissa reading (adopted in ed. BHATTACHARYA) probably

¹⁵⁴³ Similarly, HILLEBRANDT (1891: 154f., fn.1): 'wie ein Widder **bewegst** du **dich hin und her**'; ELIZARENKOVA (2005: 285): 'Как баран, ты **сгибаешься и широко разгибаешься**'. Less probable is LUDWIG's interpretation (1878: 432), who saw here a description of bellows ('wie ein beutel [blasbalg] ziehst du zusammen, weit dann auseinander dich, wenn der oben laufende [*uttaradrāḥ*?] stein und der untere freszen...').

The parallel Kāṭhaka verse, based on this Śaunakīya mantra, reads another verb instead:

(KS^m 35.14:60.10)

meṣā iva yād ūpa ca vī ca cārvati

At first glance, a comparison between two pressing stones and the jaws of a chewing ram is quite appropriate. However, as GOTŌ 135 rightly points out, *cārvati* is unattested elsewhere in Vedic and, moreover, other derivatives of this root occur almost exclusively in Classical Sanskrit. The Kāṭhaka reading is thus secondary and corrupt.

The Paippalāda version (19.31.15ab) appears to be corrupt as well. The Kashmir ms. reads *tveṣaiva siñca ita rorvarṇyate 'un atvarudrātāparis sa sāditi*; BARRET's transcription misses one syllable (*ito rvarṇya*^o; correctly transcribed by WHITNEY in his comm. ad AVŚ 6.49.2); his conjecture ⁺*rjyate* (*tveṣa iva saṃ ca vi corv* ⁺*rjyate* ' ⁺*un uttaradrād uparasya khādati*) is improbable, since the present *rjyate* occurs only in the RV (see Chapter II, s.v.). Ed. RAGHU VIRA emends in accordance with the Śaunakīya recension, which hardly clarifies the sense: *tveṣa iva [vai] saṃ ca vi corv acyate un? uttaradrāv uparasya khādati*.

represents a late scribal error triggered by ${}^+n_iy-ucyatu$ in the concluding stanza of the preceding hymn, 2.4.5 (\approx AVŚ 2.14.3 $n_iy \dot{u}cyatu$; see ed. ZEHNDER, ad loc. and Chapter B.V, s.v. *uc*), i.e. $ni-yujy^\circ \rightarrow n_iy-ucy^\circ$, with the subsequent loss of the stroke for *u*.¹⁵⁴⁴

After the Saṃhitā period, *-acya-te* occurs in the AĀ and in a MānŚS mantra (5.1.10.35).¹⁵⁴⁵ The AĀ passage has been discussed at length and convincingly explained, emended and translated by HOFFMANN (1965: 179f. [= Aufs. 1, 170f.]):

(AĀ 1.4.1)

... *yad vā dutāḥ sambāḥhatamāḥ* ${}^+satyonatamām$ *pratyacyante*...

‘... oder wenn die verbrannten (Finger), obwohl sie äußerst gepeinigt sind, nicht im geringsten gekrümmt werden...’

To conclude, it will be appropriate to consider *-acya-te* from a system-related perspective, in order to determine its position among middle -ya-presents. Although it does not occur accented, the -yá-present derived from the homonymous root $\sqrt{2}aṇc$ (see Chapter I, s.v.) attests the suffix (“passive”) accentuation and semantically belongs with passives, see Chapter I, s.v. Obviously, for this reason, standard grammars and dictionaries, which hold $\sqrt{1/2}aṇc$ for one single root, take all occurrences of *-acyá-te* as passives; cf. WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]: 1f.; MACDONELL 335, §448.

Given HOFFMANN’s analysis of 1aṇc and 2aṇc as synchronically distinct roots, there are no good reasons to extend the passive analysis of *-acyá-te* ($\sqrt{2}aṇc$) to *-acya-te* ($\sqrt{1}aṇc$). No occurrence of this -ya-present can be regarded as unambiguously passive, including the unclear attestations in the AĀ.

Furthermore, there is another consideration against the passive interpretation. While middle -ya-presents with root accentuation are well-attested in all moods and tenses, -yá-passives with secondary endings (i.e. in the injunctive and imperfect) are very rare in early Vedic; the only RVic injunctive of a -yá-passive, viz. *sūyata* ‘is consecrated’ ($\sqrt{1}sū$), occurs in the late maṇḍala X (see Chapter I, s.v.).¹⁵⁴⁶ Thus, *-acyanta* would be the only

¹⁵⁴⁴ I would like to thank Thomas ZEHNDER for a detailed discussion of this verse and variant readings with me.

¹⁵⁴⁵ See GOTÖ 1999: 132, fn. 22.

¹⁵⁴⁶ Cf., for instance, AVERY 1885: 356, 361; see Chapter C.IV.1 for a discussion of this constraint.

injunctive from a passive stem in the family maṇḍalas of the RV.¹⁵⁴⁷

Finally, *-acya-te* fits well in one of the main semantic subclasses of the middle *'-ya*-presents, viz. verbs of motion and body posture (cf., in particular, *-sriya-te* ‘runs, stretches’, *-ṛjya-te* ‘stretches’).

Thus, there are several independent reasons to group *-acya-te* ($\sqrt{1}a\tilde{n}c$) with non-passive middle *'-ya*-presents (class IV), as actually suggested by LUBOTSKY (1997a [RVWC]: 31). This analysis is also adopted by KRISCH (2006 [RIVELEX 1]: 81).

amⁱ (α ‘grasp’); β ‘swear, make alliance’: *-amya-te*

+ *sám* ‘make alliance’ MS^P 2.1.2:2.8 = 2.5.6:55.15

• pass.

The verb *amⁱ* attests two distinct, but genetically related meanings, α ‘grasp, seize’ and β ‘swear’ (the latter mostly with the preverb *sám* and middle inflection); see HOFFMANN 1969b: 193ff. [= Aufs. 1, 288ff.]; JOACHIM 37f.; GOTÖ 1990: 991ff.; MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 97. The corresponding passive (*-amyate*) is attested only for the latter usage (with the preverb *sám*); see HOFFMANN, op.cit., 199 [= Aufs. 1, 294]; GOTÖ, op.cit., 992:

(MS 2.1.2:2.8 = 2.5.6:55.14-15)

saṁvatsaró vā agnír vaiśvānarāḥ. saṁvatsarāya sám amyate

‘Verily, Agni Vaiśvānara is the year. The alliance is made for one year.’

Cf. the parallel passages in the TS and KS, which attest non-passive constructions: ... *saṁvatsarāya vā etáu sám amāte, yáu samamāte* (TS^P 2.2.6.2 ≈ KS^P 10.3:127.5) ‘These two, who make alliance, make indeed alliance for one year’ (see BRERETON 1981: 133f.; GONDA 1984: 39; FALK 1986: 177f.).

¹⁵⁴⁷ For this injunctive, typical of the semantic sphere of Maruts, see HOFFMANN 1967a [Inj]: 127.

i ‘go’: *-īya-^{te}*

+ *adhi* ‘learn’ VāsDhS^v 6.5 +;¹⁵⁴⁸

+ *upa* MS^p 2.2.7:21.6 ≈ KS^p 11.3^{2x}:147.2, 3 (*ānupeyamāna-*);

+ *prati* ‘understand, recognize’ ŚrSū. +¹⁵⁴⁹

• pass.

The fundamentally intransitive verb *i* ‘go’ can only be passivized in some compounds constructed with the accusative.¹⁵⁵⁰ In Vedic prose, a passive is attested only for the compound *ūpa-i*, with the idiomatic meaning ‘approach sexually’ (see GOTÖ 1991: 998):

(MS 2.2.7:21.4-6 ≈ ^AKS 11.3:147.1-3)

prajāpatir vāi sómāya rājñe duhitṛ adadān nākṣatrāṇi. sá rohiṇyām evāvasan, nétarāsu. tá ānupeyamānāḥ púnar agachan

‘Prajāpati gave [his] daughters, the nakṣatras (= constellations), to the king Soma. He (sc. Soma) sexually united with Rohiṇī, not with the others. They [= the other daughters], not being (sexually) approached, went back.’¹⁵⁵¹

For the post-Vedic (Sūtras etc.) attestations of *-īya-^{te}*, see GOTÖ 1991: 998, 1004.

¹*iṣ* ‘seek, wish, desire’: *iṣya-^{te}*

Simplex RV 9.69.1, AVP-Kashm. 5.40.1 = 6.22.9 = 16.71.6 (*iṣyamāṇa-* ≈ Or. [16.71.5] *asyamāṇa-*), VādhS, BaudhŚS +¹⁵⁵²

¹⁵⁴⁸ See GOTÖ 1990: 1004; not to be confused with the isolated (but attested already in late Vedic) middle present forms of *adhi-i* built on the class IV model (see Chapter II, s.v. ¹*yā* (*i*) for examples).

¹⁵⁴⁹ E.g. *pratīyeta* ‘should be understood’ (in ŚŚS 14.3.13 etc.); see GÖHLER 2005: 223.

¹⁵⁵⁰ See SEN 1927: 368f.

¹⁵⁵¹ On this passage, see KLAUS 1986: 146; AMANO 487, with fn. 2038.

¹⁵⁵² See GOTÖ 1993: 127 for exact references. For Epic forms, see OBERLIES 2003: 394.

• pass.

The earliest attestation of the rare passive of ¹*iṣ* ‘seek, wish, desire’ is probably the form *iṣyate* met with in maṇḍala IX of the RV:

(RV 9.69.1d)

āsya vratéṣuv āpi sóma iṣyate

I adopt GELDNER’s interpretation of the verse: ‘Zu den Werken dieses [sc. des Dichters oder des Opfernden (?)] **ist** der Soma **erwünscht**’. Morphologically, this form might also belong to the homonymous root ²*iṣ* ‘send’,¹⁵⁵³ but the meaning ‘is sent’ seems less appropriate in the context; note also that passives in the IVSs of the verbs which build active -ya-presents (cf. *iṣya-ti* ‘send’) are exceptional. The non-passive intransitive interpretations of this form suggested by a number of scholars, in particular, by GRASSMANN (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 222 [‘nachstreben’]; 1877 [RV übers.]: II, 238 [‘... und Soma **folget** seinem Dienst’]), RENOU (EVP IX, 18),¹⁵⁵⁴ GARCÍA RAMÓN (1996: 267),¹⁵⁵⁵ are not supported by the attested usages of *iṣya-ti* (extremely rare in the middle; see Chapter V, s.v.).

For another mantra attestation of the passive *iṣya-te*, in a Paippalāda mantra (5.40.1 = 6.22.9 = 16.71.6, Kashmir ms.), see Chapter I, s.v. *aśi* ‘eat’.

After the AV, the passive *iṣya-te* appears in early post-Vedic texts (where it remains rare). An example is:

(VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 4.47 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 4.13:2 (CALAND 1928: 109f. [= Kl.Schr., 409f.])))

ahar vā iṣṭir, ahnā hi sarve kāmā iṣyante

‘Die Iṣṭi ist der Tag, denn am Tage werden alle Wünsche gewünscht.’ (CALAND)

As rightly pointed out by CALAND, *ibid.* (“Assonanz mit *iṣṭi*!”), the form may have been created under the influence of the noun *iṣṭi-*, thus being an “etymological passive” (see below Appendix II, p. 796).

The passive *iṣya-te* becomes very common from late Sūtras (in particular, Smṛtis) onwards, where it appears in the technical sense ‘be prescribed’ (← ‘be

¹⁵⁵³ Thus GOTŌ 1993: 127, 130, with fn. 74 (hesitantly); LUBOTSKY 1997a [RVWC]: 316.

¹⁵⁵⁴ ‘[L]e soma **se met-en-marche** vers les obligations-rituelles...’. An alternative (absolute transitive) translation of *iṣyate*, proposed by RENOU, *ibid.*, 77 (‘il met en marche (sa propre voix) pour coller (*āpi*) aux *vratā*’), is forced.

¹⁵⁵⁵ ‘... a sus labores **se dirige** Soma’. GARCÍA RAMÓN connects the RVic form with Myc. Gr. *i-je-to*.

desirable'), as, e.g., in ManuSmṛ. 5.119cd *śākamūlaphalānām ca dhānyavac chuddhir iṣyate* 'and for vegetables, roots, fruits the same cleaning is prescribed as for grain'; BaudhGPariś. 2.15.13d:5.31 *na cāvāhanam iṣyate* '...no invocation is prescribed'.

²*iṣ* 'send': -iṣya-^{te}

+ *pra* AVP 16.54.8

• pass.

➡ Chapter V

u (³*vā*) 'weave': *ūya*-^{te}

MS^p 2.4.5:43.7 (*ūyate*, v.1.uy^o), KS^p 23.9^{2x}:85.5, 6 = KpS^p 36.6^{2x}:192.4(+)

• pass.

The passive *ūya*-^{te} appears in Vedic prose (YV). An example is:

(MS 2.4.5:43.6-7)

vāśa iva vāi yajñā ūyate

'Verily, the sacrifice is being woven like clothes.'

The corresponding transitive present is *vāya*-^{ti} (RV +). The -*ta*-participle *utā*- 'woven' (RV +) points to an aniṭ root *u* (< **h₂eu*), but, already in the period of the RV, *vāya*-^{ti} has been reinterpreted as derived from a *Cā* root, probably on the model *dhā* 'suck': *dhāya*-, which has given rise to the root variant *vā*; cf. inf. *vātave* AV, replacing the older inf. *ótave* RV + (see MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 275f.; but cf. also LIEBERT 1957: 14f.; INSLER 1971a: 580, fn. 14).

ukṣ '(be)sprinkle': -ukṣya-^{te}

+ *úd* [i_{pass.}] 'Y^{liquid}_{NOM} is sprinkled' ŚBM 6.1.1.12 = ŚBK 8.1.1.9;

+ *pra* [i_{pass.}] 'Z_{NOM} is besprinkled' ŚrSū.+

• pass.

ukṣ is a ‘two pattern’ verb, constructed either [i] with the accusative of the sprinkled liquid (first object) (cf. RV 1.87.2 *ghṛtām ukṣatā* ‘sprinkle the ghee’) or [ii] with the accusative of the besprinkled object (cf. RV 3.62.16 *ghṛtāir gavyūtim ukṣatam* ‘besprinkle our pasture with ghee’).¹⁵⁵⁶ The passive -*ukṣya*-^{te}, first attested in the ŚB (with the preverb *úd*), occurs in the passive construction corresponding to the former transitive pattern:

(ŚBM 6.1.1.12 = ŚBK 8.1.1.9)

tām samklīśyāpsú prāvidhyat, tāsyaī [...] yád ūrdhvám udáukṣyatedām
tád yád idám ūrdhvám adbhyó ’dhijāyate
 ‘[Prajāpati] compressed it (sc. the earth) and threw it into the waters.
 [That] of it [...] what was sprinkled upwards [became] that what is
 produced above here over the waters.’¹⁵⁵⁷

By contrast, the passive of the compound *prokṣ* (*pra-ukṣ*), which occurs from the Sūtras onwards, attests pattern [ii_{pass.}], with the passive subject of the besprinkled object, cf.:

(VaikhŚS 5.5:56.7-8)

yajamāno ’śiśrema barhir iti prokṣyamānaṃ barhir abhimantrayate
 ‘“We have laid the barhis ...” – this mantra the sacrificer addresses to the barhis
 being besprinkled.’

(Passive forms)

A passive interpretation is proposed by some scholars for the middle class VI present participle *ukṣámāna-* in RV 9.99.5:

(RV 9.99.5ab)

tām ukṣámānaṃ avyāye ’ váre punanti dharṇasīm

Cf. GELDNER’s translation: ‘Den (mit Wasser) **Besprengten** (sc. Soma – LK) läutern sie in dem Schafhaar, den Standhaften’; likewise, RENOU, EVP IX, 53 (‘(Les officiants) clarifient ce (*soma*) arrosé (d’eau) ...’), ELIZARENKOVA. By contrast, GRASSMANN (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 244; 1877 [RV übers.]: II, 272) saw here an absolute (objectless) transitive construction: ‘Sie klären ihn, den **träufelnden** ...’. HAUDRY 395 hesitates between these two analyses (‘arrosant’ / ‘arrosé’).

In my view, this passive interpretation is highly unlikely, above all, for

¹⁵⁵⁶ See HAUDRY 241; GOTÖ 1993: 122, fn. 18.

¹⁵⁵⁷ See DUMONT 1957: 17; KIEHNLE 1979: 4f. for this passage.

system-related reasons: middle class VI presents are not employed in the passive usage.¹⁵⁵⁸ GRASSMANN's absolute transitive is therefore more probable, but makes little sense in the context. Rather, the occurrence in question should be treated as belonging with another (quasi-homonymous) verb, *vakṣ* 'grow, become big': 'they purify the growing (i.e. swelling) [Soma] ...',¹⁵⁵⁹

Unlikely is also the passive interpretation of RV 4.56.2 *devī ... ukṣāmāṇe* in HAUDRY, *ibid.* ('arrosé'): the sentence should be translated either as an absolute transitive ('the two goddesses ... sprinkling [ghee]'; thus, GRASSMANN, GELDNER; cf. also GELDNER's note ad 4.42.4a) or as a reciprocal construction ('besprinkling each other'; cf. GOTŌ (1993: 123, fn. 25): 'sich gegenseitig besprengend, benetzend').¹⁵⁶⁰

ud 'moisten, wet': *udya*^{-te}

Simplex JB 3.238:19;
+ *vī* RV 1.164.47
• pass. (anticaus. ?)

The only early Vedic attestation of the *-ya*-present *udya*^{-te} is found in RV 1.164.47, in a description of the rain-formation:

(RV 1.164.47 ≈ AV 6.22.1 ≈ TS^m 3.1.11.4.t ≈ KS^m 11.9:156.13-14)

kṛṣṇāṃ niyānaṃ hārayaḥ suparṇā 'apó vāsānā dīvam út patanti
tá āvavrtran sádanād ṛtasyā́d id ghṛténa pṛthivī vīy ùdyate

'Along the black route the fallow birds, clothing themselves in the waters, fly up to the sky. They returned from the ṛta's residence; thus the earth is moistened / becomes wet with ghee.'

Both passive and anticausative readings are possible in the context. GELDNER and most other translators take the form as a passive ('dann **wird**

¹⁵⁵⁸ For the rare exception *tujete* (RV 1.61.14) '[they both] are set to panic motion' (probably, for **tuj[y]ete*), see Chapter I, s.v. *tuj*.

¹⁵⁵⁹ Thus suggested already by KIEHNLE (1979: 176), who treats this occurrence as ambiguous: 'Ihn, den spritzenden/wachsenden, reinigen sie ...'. See also GOTŌ 1993: 123, fn. 25.

¹⁵⁶⁰ Ambiguous according to KIEHNLE (1979: 172): 'spritzend'/'wachsend'.

die Erde mit Schmalz **benetzt**').¹⁵⁶¹ By contrast, KEITH gives a non-passive translation for the TS repetition (*pr̥thivī́ ghṛtáir vy ùdyate*): 'Then the earth **is wet** with ghee'.

Note, however, that the parallel verses in the AV and KS¹⁵⁶² have active constructions instead, with overtly expressed agent subjects (the one who sprinkles):

(AV 6.22.1cd)

*tá āvavr̥trant sádanād ṛtasya ād id ghṛtena pr̥thivīm̐ vy ùduḥ*¹⁵⁶³

'They returned from the ṛta's residence (and) then have sprinkled the earth with ghee.'

The same agent can also be supplied in the intransitive construction (i.e. 'the earth is sprinkled [by the fallow birds]'), which favours the passive analysis of the hapax *vy ùdyate*.

Besides this RVic occurrence, the passive *udyate* can probably be found in the following JB passage:

(JB 3.238:19 [ed. CALAND §204])

yogo nodyata iti ta evāyogava iti

CALAND and WITZEL (1986: 195) saw here a passive of the causative *nodaya-ti*. CALAND conjectured ⁺*gā nodyata iti evāgavaḥ* and translated: '... durch die Aussage: „die Kühe werden vertrieben" (?), [entstanden] die Agus'; similarly WITZEL (1986: 195): 'As they said "The team (of horses) is instigated", (therefore) there are these Āyogavas.' Both translations seem forced. More attractive is the interpretation by EHLERS [Unpublished Habilschrift]: *nodyat[e] = na + udyate*, i.e. 'das Joch des Wagens wird jedoch nicht (vom Wasser des Flusses) befeuchtet.'

uṣ 'scorch, burn': -*uṣya-te*

+ *upa* VaitS 24.15, ⁺ĀśŚS 3.6.23 [ed. Hoshiarpur 3.6.24] (*upoyamāna-*, read ⁺*upoṣyamāna-*);

¹⁵⁶¹ Likewise, LÜDERS (1951: 312); BROWN (1968: 218 [= 1978: 73]): 'The earth **is moistened** with fatness.'

¹⁵⁶² Cf. BLOOMFIELD & EDGERTON 1930 [Ved. Var. I]: 49f.

¹⁵⁶³ The Kāṭhaka reads: *ta āvavr̥tran sadanāni rātvī' ghṛtena dyāvāpr̥thivī vy undan*.

+ *prati* PB 7.5.11

• pass.

The late and rare passive -uṣya-^{te} first occurs in the PB:

(PB 7.5.11)

*asurā vai devān pary ayatanta. tata etāv agnī rūrau viṣvañcau stobhāv
apaśyat. tābhyām enān pratyauṣat. te pratyusyamāñā aravanta*

‘The Asuras surrounded the gods. Then Agni saw these two burning,
divergent stobhas. Through these he scorched them. Being scorched, they
howled.’

Another compound of this passive (with the preverb *upa*) is attested in VaitS 24.15 ... *iti vedīm upoṣyamāṇam* ‘... with this [mantra he should address] to the vedi-altar being burned up’.¹⁵⁶⁴ The same compound probably underlies the unclear form *upoyamānam*¹⁵⁶⁵ attested in ĀśŚS 3.6.23 [ed. Hoshiarpur 3.6.24] *tīrthena niṣkramyāgnipaśuketanāny avyavayanto hrdayaśūlam upoyamānam anumantayeran* ... MYLIUS translates: ‘Nachdem sie (alle) auf dem *tīrtha*-Wege hinausgeschritten sind, wobei sie nicht zwischen das Feuer und die Tierkörpertheile getreten sind, mögen sie den sich (aus der Erde) erhebenden Herzbratspieß anreden: ...’ The interpretation of *upoyamāna*- as ‘sich erhebend’ apparently follows the indigenous commentary by Gārgya Nārāyaṇa, where this form is glossed as *udasyamānam*.¹⁵⁶⁶ However, the translation of the passive of *ud-as* ‘throw upwards’ as ‘rising’ is forced and, furthermore, passives of this compound are unattested in the Sūtras. Notice also the heavy emendation which such an analysis requires. By contrast, ⁺*upoṣyamānam* perfectly suits the context (‘they should address a mantra to the spit for the heart [of the sacrificial animal], which is being burned up ...’; cf. the similar VaitS passage quoted above) and can readily be explained by the common graphic error *ṣy* → *y*.

klp ‘arrange, fit’

pass. of caus.: *kalpya-te* (ŚBK -*klpya-te*)

Simplex (ŚvetU 5.9: PW II, 168 (s.v. *kalp*) and ed. HAUSCHILD *kalpyate*; read with other

¹⁵⁶⁴ On this passage, see BLOOMFIELD 1912: 9f.

¹⁵⁶⁵ Cf. VWC-Sū. I, 736b, with fn. c.

¹⁵⁶⁶ The gloss *nikṣipyamānam* ‘being put down’, given by another commentator, Devatrāta (see ed. Hoshiarpur), does not clarify the form in question either.

eds. *kalpate*),¹⁵⁶⁷ LātyŚS 10.9.10 +;
+ *áva* ‘make fit, prepare, employ’ ŚB¹⁵⁶⁸

The passive *kalpya-te*, built to the causative *kalpāya-ti/te* ‘arrange, make fit’ (RV_{X,Vāl.}+; see JAMISON 124f.), first occurs in the ŚB.¹⁵⁶⁹ An example is:

(ŚBM 4.4.1.3 ≈ ŚBK 5.4.3.3)

tād ṛtávaḥ saṁvatsarás tṛtīyasavané pratyákṣam áva kalpyante [ŚBK *áva kḷpyante*]

‘Thus the seasons, the year are overtly made fit¹⁵⁷⁰ at the third pressing.’

The zero grade stem variant *-kḷpya-*, attested in the Kāṇva recension, is ungrammatical (see ŚBK, ed. CALAND, Introduction, p. 48; PATYAL 1994: 115); the passive in question can only be based on the causative (*kalpāya-ti/te* ‘arrange, make fit’; see JAMISON 124f.), not on the primary verb, which is intransitive (cf. *áva-kalpa-te* ‘correspond, etc.’).

***krūḍ* ‘burn’ (?) (of milk)**

pass. of caus.: *krūḍya-te*

KS^P 6.3:51.10 = KpS^P 4.2:38.10 (+)

The origin of the rare verbal root *krūḍ* (with a number of variants: *kūḍ*, *kūl*) is obscure.¹⁵⁷¹ The forms based on the root variant *krūḍ* are: the transitive-causative -aya-present *krūḍaya-ti* (3x) and the corresponding -ya-

¹⁵⁶⁷ ŚvetU 5.9d *sa cānantyāya kalpate* ‘and it (sc. the soul) is partaking of the infiniteness’; for a discussion of this passage and convincing arguments for the reading *kalpate*, see OBERLIES 1998: 104, with fn. 168, 171 (with bibl.).

¹⁵⁶⁸ Note also the parallel forms ŚBK *áva-kḷpyante* ≈ ŚBM 4.6.7.1 *pra-yujyante*.

¹⁵⁶⁹ The form *kalpyamānaḥ* in the mantra KpS^m 2.11:21.9 *imā havyā vahate kalpyamānaḥ* (a repetition of RV 10.16.9 *devébhyo havyāṁ vahatu prajānān*), quoted by OERTEL (1934a: 81f. [= Kl.Schr. I, 712f.]), is an erroneous citation; ed. RAGHU VIRA reads *kalpayāmaḥ*.

¹⁵⁷⁰ EGGELING: ‘attended to’.

¹⁵⁷¹ See esp. KUIPER 1955: 171 (“Origin unknown (probably neither Dravidian nor Munda). The IE etymology [...] is phonetically impossible”); 1958: 349ff. [= Sel.Wr., 51ff.]; 1991a: 75f.; VINE 1990; MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 415.

passive, all attested in book 6 of the Kāthaka (~ book 4 of the KpS), whereof three occurrences (*akrūḍayat*, *krūḍyamānam*, *krūḍayati*) appear in one passage:

(KS 6.3:51.9-11 ≈ KpS 4.2:38.9-11)

*samāne vai yonā āstāṁ sūryaś cāgniś ca. tatas sūrya ūrdhva ud adravat. tasya retaḥ parāpatat. tad agnir yoninopāgrhṇād. ayasā tad **akrūḍayat**. tat **krūḍyamānam** gavi ny adadhāt. tad idaṁ payas. tasmād ⁺atrapv ⁺ayaḥpātram¹⁵⁷² pratidhuk **krūḍayati***

The meaning of the verb has been repeatedly discussed in the literature (for a survey, see, for instance, WERBA [VIA I] 455f.). The translation ‘make thick’ was given by Indian lexicographers and adopted by BÖHTLINGK/ROTH (PW II, 507) (thus also NAVATHE 35 for the Kāthaka occurrences). An alternative (but semantically close) translation, ‘bring to coagulation, curdle’, has been proposed by CALAND (1912: 123 [= Kl.Schr., 211]) (‘gerinnen machen’), and subsequently adopted by a number of scholars; see RAU 1972: 70; 1973 [1974]: 19f.; JAMISON 1991a: 209, cf. RAU’s (1972) rendering of the passage quoted above:

‘In demselben Mutterschoß fürwahr waren Sūrya und Agni. Von dort stürmte Sūrya nach oben. Dessen Samen fiel herunter. Den fing Agni auf in dem Mutterschoße, im Erze. Das [Erz] brachte [den Samen] zum Gerinnen. Diesen zum Gerinnen gebrachten [Samen] legte er [i. e. Agni] in die Kuh hinein. Das ist diese Milch. Daher bringt ein Gefäß aus Erz ohne Zinn[-beimischung] (?) frische Milch zum Gerinnen.’

Both interpretations, ‘make thick’ and ‘curdle’, are conjectures based on assumptions on what can happen to milk or semen (cf. esp. KUIPER’s (1991: 75) criticism). More convincing is the analysis based on the parallel MS passage (1.8.2:117.14ff.), where *vī-daha-^{ti}* and *śoṣaya-^{ti}* correspond to KS *krūḍaya-^{ti}*, which suggests the meaning ‘make [milk] burn (, sticking to the pan)’. This interpretation was proposed by KUIPER (1958: 350 [= Sel.Wr., 52]) and adopted by BODEWITZ (1976: 34) and WERBA, op.cit.,¹⁵⁷³ cf.

¹⁵⁷² CALAND’s (1912: 123 [= Kl.Schr., 211]) emendation for ed. SCHROEDER *atrapvayaḥ pātram*; RAGHU VIRA (in his ed. of the KpS, Introduction, p. 26) and KUIPER (1958: 349f. [= Sel.Wr., 51f.], with fn. 6) read *ayas°*; see MITTWEDE 1989 [Textkr. zur KS]: 51, with bibl.

¹⁵⁷³ Yet another translation, ‘corrode’ (CALAND apud KUIPER 1991: 75; cf. also OBERLIES 1992c: 117, fn. 1), implies that the object of *krūḍayati* (and correspondingly the passive subject of *krūḍya-^{te}*) in the passage under discussion is the pan, not the

BODEWITZ's translation:

‘Sūrya (the sun) and Agni were in the same receptacle (*yonī*). Thereupon Sūrya rose upwards. He lost his semen. Agni received it with an iron receptacle. He made it stick (burn) (to the iron pan). While it was burning (to the pan), he transferred it to the cow. It (became) this milk. Therefore fresh milk which is still warm, sticks to the untinned iron vessel.’¹⁵⁷⁴

cāy ‘observe, respect’: -*cāyya*-^{te}

+ *āpa* TB 2.7.18.1

• pass.

The passive -*cāyya*-^{te} is derived from the secondary root *cāy* extracted from the class I present *cāya*-^{ti} (with the long degree root, probably of the PIE age, see GOTÖ 137; MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 531):

(TB 2.7.18.1)

īndram vāi svā vīso marúto nāpācāyan. | só 'napacāyyamāna etām vighanām apaśyat

‘Verily, his (sc. Indra’s) tribes, the Maruts, did not respect Indra. He, being disrespected, looked at this hammer.’¹⁵⁷⁵

chad ‘cover, veil’

pass. of -*aya*-pres.: *chādya*-^{te}

Simplex JB 1.274:2, ŚGS 3.11.9¹⁵⁷⁶ +;

+ *ava* LātyŚS 1.7.15 = DrāhyŚS 2.3.17;

milk/semen, which seems less probable.

¹⁵⁷⁴ Syntactically more exactly: ‘the untinned iron vessel makes fresh milk burn (= stick to the vessel).’

¹⁵⁷⁵ The form is erroneously analysed by LOWE (1987: 36) as a passive of the causative of *ci* (“not being dropped away”).

¹⁵⁷⁶ Cf. BÖHTLINGK 1896b: 329.

(+ *ā* [refl. caus.] KauṣGS^m 4.2.3 *ā-chādyatām*, °*antām* ≈ ŚGS^m 4.15.10 *ā-chādayatām*, °*antām*)¹⁵⁷⁷

The non-causative transitive present *chādáya*-^{ti} is the only present formation in the IVS; see JAMISON 82 (where it is qualified as an originally primary present); GOTÖ 1997a: 1001. The passive *chādyá*-^{te} is built on this -áya-present. The only Vedic occurrence appears in the JB:

(JB 1.274:2)

*sa yarhi vai prajāpatiḥ prajābhyo vṛṣṭim annādyam prayacchati,
chādyanta ete tarhi*

‘When Prajāpati gives rain [as] food etc. to the creatures, then they become veiled.’¹⁵⁷⁸

jval ‘burn, flame’

pass. of caus.: -*javālya*-^{te}

+ *abhy-ava* ‘light up’ GB 1.3.11:77.6, 1.3.12:78.14 (≈ ŚB 11.5.3.2, 11.5.3.5 *avajyotyāmāna*-)

The passive -*javālya*-^{te}, built to the causative *javālaya*-^{ti}, occurs in the GB and corresponds to another causative passive, *avajyotyá*-^{te} (see Chapter I, s.v. *jyut*) in the parallel ŚB passage:

(GB 1.3.11:76.15-77.6)

*prcchāmi gautameti [...] kiṃdevatyam duhyamānam [...] kiṃdevatyam
abhyavajvālyamānam*

‘I am asking: “O Gautama! [...] To which deity belongs [the milk] when being obtained [by milking]? [...] To which deity belongs [the milk] when being boiled (lit. burned)?”’

¹⁵⁷⁷ See GOTÖ 1997a: 1002f., with fn. 3. The causative reflexive usage (‘sich bedecken’) is perfectly appropriate for middle -*aya*-causatives (see e.g. JAMISON 194ff.), but ungrammatical for -*ya*-passives, and thus the reading attested in the KauṣGS must be erroneous as against that of the ŚGS.

¹⁵⁷⁸ On this passage, see KLAUS 1986: 100f.

***tī̃* (*tī̃r*)** ‘pass; overcome; save’: -*tīrya*-^{te}

+ *prá* TB^m 2.5.1.3¹⁵⁷⁹

• pass.

pass. of (caus.) -*āya*-pres.: -*tārya*-^{te}

JB 3.239:5-6 [ed. CALAND §204] (+)¹⁵⁸⁰

There are four -ya-present stems based on different variants of the root *tī̃*: *tīrya*- RV, *turya*- TĀ, *tīrya*- TB, and *tārya*- JB. Although these formations are historically related, being derived from different ablaut grades of the same PIE root **terh₂*- (MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 629ff.), it is impossible to group them together within one IVS. From the synchronic point of view, we have to distinguish between two roots: (i) *tī̃/tī̃r*, which forms two -ya-passives (-*tīrya*-^{te}, -*tārya*-^{te}), and (ii) *tī̃/tī̃r* (discussed in Chapter V, which has two active -ya-presents with the -u-vocalism).

The main present formations derived from *tī̃/tī̃r* are discussed at length in GOTÖ 160-165. These include:

– the class I present *tāra*-^{ti} ‘pass, cross over’, constructed with the accusative, which refers to a goal, not to a patient (“affizierter Objekt”, in GOTÖ’s terms; see HAUDRY 1977: 318ff.), and thus should be qualified as intransitive with an accusative. An example is:

(RV 6.64.4b)

avātē apās tarasi svabhāno

‘In the windless [atmosphere] you (sc. Uṣas) cross over the waters, O self-luminous one.’

– the class VI present -*tīrā*-^{ti} ‘make pass, cross’, attested only with

¹⁵⁷⁹ AVP-Kashm. 18.27.1 **tīryamāṇa*-, mentioned by RENOU (1957b: 87), is based on BARRET’s hesitant (and quite dubious) emendation for ms. *trīryamāṇa* (*vrādyau vā ida agra āsīt trīryamāṇa eva sat prajāpatiṃ samīrayat*). The corresponding Śaunakīya passage (15.1.1) has *īyamāṇa* instead: *vrātya āsīt īyamāṇa evā; sā prajāpatiṃ sām airayat* ‘a Vrātya there was, just going about; he stirred up Prajāpati’ (WHITNEY); likewise, CHARPENTIER (1911: 376) (‘er war gerade ein herumwandelnder *vrātya*; er heilte den Prajāpati’), RENOU (EVP II, 100) (‘il y avait [...] Vrātya, se mouvant spontanément (*evā*). Il mit en branle (*sām airayat*) Prajāpati’) and GONDA (1986: 81).

¹⁵⁸⁰ For Epic forms, see OBERLIES 2003: 440.

preverbs (*áva, út, prá*, etc.), functions as the transitive-causative counterpart of *tára-^{ti}* (cf. GOTÖ 57), particularly often with the preverb *prá* and with the accusative *āyus* ‘life(time)’, meaning (lit.) ‘make someone’s life(time) safely pass over [obstacles and dangers], reach its natural end’ (see GEIB 1975), cf.:

(RV 1.89.2d)

devā na āyuhṣ prá tirantu jīvāse

‘Let the gods make our life(time) [safely] reach [its natural end], to live.’

– the -āya-causative *tārāya-^{ti}* (RVKh. [ed. SĀTAVALEKAR], AV +) is in competition with -*tirá-^{ti}* and tends to replace it in Vedic prose (see JAMISON 101; GOTÖ 162f.). An example is:

(AV 18.3.10)

vārcasā māṁ pitáraḥ somayāso ' āñjantu devā mādhunā ghṛtēna

cákṣuṣe mā pratarāṇi tārāyanto ' jarāse mā jarādaṣṭiṁ vardhantu

‘Let the soma-drinking Fathers anoint me with splendor, the gods with honey, with ghee; making me pass further on unto sight, let them increase me, attaining old age, unto old age.’ (WHITNEY)

-yá-passives are derived from both transitive stems; both are hapaxes in Vedic. *prá-tīrya-^{te}* is the passive counterpart of *prá-tīra-^{ti}* (cf. GOTÖ 163, fn. 256) and belongs with the passive aorist (inj.) -*tāri*, for which see below. It occurs in a TB mantra:

(TB 2.5.1.3)

āyur ín naḥ prá tīryatām

‘Let our life be [safely] conducted [towards its natural end].’

Less clear is the semantics of the present *tārya-^{te}*. Its only occurrence (in the JB) does not display the expected causative passive meaning ‘be made (caused to) pass, cross over’ or the like. The form appears in the history of Bharatas’ crossing rivers:

(JB 3.239:4-6 [ed. CALAND §204])

*atha yā nadīs tārāyāṁ cakrus, tā imā nadyo ^{+vivasati}¹⁵⁸¹ hottamās
tārāyāṁ cakruḥ | tāsū ha tārāyāṁāsu sindhor apriyam āsa*

CALAND’s translation (‘Die Flüsse die sie überschritten haben, das sind diese Flüsse [...] Als das Heer über diese Flüsse übergesetzt wurde, war das dem Sindhu unlieb’) is inexact, since the supposed passive subject of

¹⁵⁸¹ Emendation by WITZEL (1986: 194ff.).

tāryamāṇāsu (the army) is not referentially identical with the object of *tārayāṃ cakrus* (rivers). More consistent is WITZEL's interpretation (1986: 194ff.):

'Now, the rivers which they (the Bharatas) crossed, they are these rivers here (in our territory). They crossed the ones changing their locations (beds), the Northern ones. When the rivers were being crossed over, it was unpleasant for the Sindhu.'¹⁵⁸²

Under WITZEL's syntactic analysis, the accusative object of the *-aya*-present *tāraya-^{ti}* in the above passage has the same syntactic function as the accusative argument of the non-causative present *tāra-^{ti}* ('X crosses over Y_{ACC}').¹⁵⁸³ However, unlike the accusative argument of the non-causative verb, the accusative object of the *-aya*-present behaves as a direct object, not as a goal accusative, and the construction can be passivized. This syntactic usage seems to be unknown for other occurrences of *tāraya-^{ti}*. Both *tārayāṃ cakrus* and the corresponding *-ya*-passive are hapaxes and probably nonce formations, which may account for their abnormal syntax.

-i-aorist

The passive aorist (inj.) *-tāri* (with *prá*, *ví*), attested in the RV, occurs constructed with the subject *āyus* (e.g. RV 4.12.6 = 10.126.8 *prá tāri ... āyuh*) or, once, with the subject of the person whose lifetime is the subject of the divine care [= the beneficiary of long life] (see GEIB, op.cit., 279f.; JAMISON 1982: 261f. and 270, note 29; GOTŌ 163, fn. 256; KÜMMEL 1996: 49):

(RV 1.119.6d)

prá dīrghēṇa vāndanas tārīy āyusā

'Vandana was brought over (?) with a long life(time).'¹⁵⁸⁴

¹⁵⁸² According to EHLERS, *sindhu*- may refer here to the river in general.

¹⁵⁸³ Theoretically, one might supply a "true" direct object in the first sentence, and the corresponding passive subject in the second – *senā* 'army' or the like: '... they made [their army] cross the rivers ... When [their army] was made cross the rivers ...' (cf. CALAND's translation of the last sentence). This interpretation seems rather forced, however.

¹⁵⁸⁴ In JAMISON's (ibid.) translation: 'Vandana was extended as to long life.'

dabh ‘deceive’: *dabhya*^{-te}

RV 1.41.1, (+JB 1.360:2, ed. RAGHU VIRA/LOKESH CHANDRA *darghyaṃ ta*^o; BODEWITZ 1990 +*dabhyate*; read probably -*dasya*^o)¹⁵⁸⁵

• pass.

As NARTEN (1968: 131 [= Kl.Schr. 1, 93]; 1988-90) has shown (cf. also MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 694ff., 699), *dabh* ‘deceive’ and *dambh* ‘hurt’ are synchronically distinct (and probably even genetically unrelated) roots. The RVic hapax passive *dabhyate* belongs to the former (*dabh*), together with pr. *dabhnóti*, aor. *dabhúh*, pf. *dadābha* etc. The relevant passage runs:

(RV 1.41.1)

yám rákṣanti pracetaso váruṇo mitró aryamá

nú cit sá dabhyate jánaḥ

‘Whom the wise Varuṇa, Mitra, Aryaman protect, – this person is never deceived.’¹⁵⁸⁶

The verb *dambh* ‘hurt’ (attested in the -*áya*-present *dambháya*^{-ti},¹⁵⁸⁷ pf. *dadambha*, aor. *°dambhiṣat*) has no -*yá*-passive. For the only supposed late Vedic (JB) attestation of *dabhya*^{-te}, based on BODEWITZ’s (1990) emendation (translated by BODEWITZ as ‘become deficient’), see Chapter V, s.v. *das*.

diś ‘point (out), prescribe, teach’¹⁵⁸⁸: *diśya*^{-te}

Simplex KB 18.3.1 [*iti*] *diśyate*; ed. ĀnSS, ed. LINDNER *ati-dṛśyate*);

+ *ā* HirŚS 2.3.32 (*ā-diśyamāna*-, v.l. *vyā-diśya*^o);

+ *upa* ‘teach’ JUB 1.13.1.3 [ed. OERTEL 1.40.3] +;

+ *nir* ĀpŚS 24.3.1 +;

+ *pra* KB 18.3.13 *pra-diśyate*, v.l. *prati-padyate*; ed. ĀnSS, ed. LINDNER *pra-dṛśyate*), ŚrSū. +

• pass.

¹⁵⁸⁵ See Chapter V, s.v. *das*.

¹⁵⁸⁶ Cf. also RENOU (EVP V, 110): ‘jamais cet homme n’est-lésé-par-tromperie’.

¹⁵⁸⁷ For this formation, see INSLEER 1969.

¹⁵⁸⁸ For the meaning of the simplex and compounds, see GONDA 1929: 175ff.

The passive *diśya*-^{te} first appears in Vedic prose and remains rare until the Sūtra period. The two earliest attestations are met in a single KB passage:

(KB 18.3.1-6, 13)

pro tv evāśvinasya vibhūtir iti diśyate [ed. ĀnSS, ed. LINDNER *ati dṛśyate*] | *eṣa āgneyaḥ kratuḥ / āgneyād eva krator na niś cyaveta / atha yady āgneyaḥ kratuḥ purā kālāt samatīyāt / āśvinam anu yat kiṃ dvidevatyam ṛkṣu tad anu vartayet / saurye kratau pāvamānīr yathāchandasam [...]* *etad vai kiṃcid iva rcām na pra diśyate* [ed. ĀnSS, ed. LINDNER *pra dṛśyate*]

‘However, the extensive use of the [verses addressed to] Aśvins, verily, is prescribed. This is a service for Agni; verily he should not fall away from the service for Agni. If he should pass over the service for Agni before the due time, he should apply there whatever in service for Aśvins is addressed to two gods in the stanzas (ṛc): in the service for Sūrya [he should use the verses] for [Soma-]Pavamāna. [...] Thus, verily, none of the verses is prescribed.’

Although the two early eds. (ed. ĀnSS, ed. LINDNER) read *dṛśyate* instead of *diśyate* in both cases, the passive of *dṛś* ‘see’ badly suits the context; cf. the hesitant and inconsistent translation by KEITH: ‘the expansion of the Āśvina **is** however **conspicuous**. This is a service for Agni [...] That is whatever of the Ṛcs **is not set forth**’ (?). Note also that the passive -*dṛśyate* is unattested with *āti* elsewhere in Vedic. By contrast, the meaning of (pra-)diś is perfectly appropriate; see GONDA 1929: 177f., 185 and cf. another Vedic (JUB) attestation of *diśya*-^{te}:

(JUB 1.13.1.3 [ed. OERTEL 1.40.3])

tad yat kiṃ cārvācīnam brahmaṇas, tad vāg eva sarvam; atha yad anyatra, brahmopadiśyate

‘Whatsoever is on that side of the Brahman, all that is speech; and what [is] elsewhere is taught as Brahman’ (i.e. Brahman is “the transcendental counterpart of that which is expressed by human speech”; see BODEWITZ 1983a: 51, note 3).

dih ‘smear’: *dihya*-^{te}TĀ^m 1.2.4 (+)

- pass.

(abhi-dihyet BhārŚS 11.17.10 (≈ ĀpŚS 15.17.8 abhi-dīhyāi) – -yet-optative)

The only Vedic attestation of the passive *dihya*-^{te} occurs in a TĀ mantra:

(TĀ 1.2.3-4)

*ekam̐ hi śiro nānā mukhe ' kṛtsna tad ṛtulakṣaṇam ||3||**ubhayataḥ sap্তendriyāṇi ' jalpitaṁ tv eva dihyate*

‘For [the year has] one head [but] two different faces. This, on the whole, is the feature of the seasons. On the both [sides] there are seven organs of perceptions. But [whatever period of time] is murmured [i.e. when something is expressed unclearly], it is [as if] being smeared [i.e. as if not having clear-cut borders from the adjacent periods of time].’

du (**dū**)¹⁵⁸⁹ ‘burn’: *dūya*-^{te}Simplex RVKh. 7.7.2 (*dūyate*, v.ll. *dhūyate*, *hūyate*);+ *pra* ChU 5.24.3^{2x};+ *vi* GobhGS 4.9.7¹⁵⁹⁰

- anticaus. / (pass.)

The rare -ya-present *dūya*-^{te} first appears in the additional stanzas of the RVKh. (“die nachträglich in die Khilasammlung aufgenommenen Verse”; ed. SCHEFTELOWITZ, p. 172). As in the case of the synonymous *dāhyā*-^{te} (see Chapter III, s.v.), a non-passive (anticausative) interpretation (i.e. ‘burn’, rather than ‘be burned’) is preferable for most or all of its occurrences:

(RVKh. 7.7.2cd)

ajātaputrapakṣāyā ' hṛdayam mama dūyate

¹⁵⁸⁹ Most derivatives point to an anīṭ-root (pr. *dunōti*, -ta-part. *duta-*), but cf. also -na-participle *dūná-* (AV+); see MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 707f.

¹⁵⁹⁰ For Epic forms (also with active inflection), see OBERLIES 2003: 241, 265, 447.

‘My heart burns, because no children have been born.’¹⁵⁹¹

(ChU 5.24.3)

*tad yatheṣṭkātūlam agnau protaṃ pradūyetaivaṃ hāsya sarve pāpmāṇaḥ
pra dūyante, ya etad evaṃ vidvān agnihotraṃ juhōti*

‘As the tuft of a reed, woven (like a filling thread) into the fire, burns up,
so burn up all the evils of the one who, knowing this thus, performs the
Agnihotra.’¹⁵⁹²

dhāv ‘rub’: *-dhāvya-*^{te}

+ *sām* KS^p 13.12^{2x}:193.16

• anticaus. or recipr.

The two occurrences of the present *-dhāvya-*^{te} (the intransitive counterpart of *dhāva-*^{ti};¹⁵⁹³ see GOTŌ 185f.), attested in one Kāṭhaka passage, display a non-passive (reciprocal) meaning:

(KS 13.12:193.15-16)

ime vai sahāstām. te yathā veṇū saṃdhāvyete, evaṃ sam adhāvyetām

‘Once these two (sc. Heaven and Earth) were [close] together. As two
bamboos **rub one another** [in the wind], so they **rubbed together**.’¹⁵⁹⁴

¹⁵⁹¹ Ed. SCHEFTELOWITZ, p. 173: ‘weil mir keine Söhne geboren sind, vergeht mir das Herz vor Kummer’.

¹⁵⁹² MÜLLER (1879: 91), HUME and SENART render the forms in question as passives (‘are burnt’; ‘would be burned up’, ‘are burned up’; ‘est brûlée’, ‘sont brûlés’); likewise OLIVELLE 1998: 245 (‘are burnt up’). Non-passive (anticausative) translations are proposed by BÖHTLINGK, MORGENROTH, THIEME (1966: 5) (‘verbrennten ... verbrennen’), DEUSSEN (1897: 153) (‘verflammt ... verflammen’, a particularly felicitous translation), GONDA (1951: 33) (‘burn’) and HAYOT (‘brûlerait’, ‘brûlent’).

¹⁵⁹³ Historically connected with the root *dhū* ‘shake’, see Chapter I, s.v.

¹⁵⁹⁴ The non-passive translation seems more appropriate than GOTŌ’s (ibid.) passive interpretation (‘zusammengerieben werden’).

nam ‘bend, bow’: *namyá-^{te}*

Simplex TĀ 9.10.4 (= TaiU 3.10.4);

+ *vī* RVKh. 5.22.3 (*vī namyate*, v.l. *vī tanvate*);

+ *sam* BhārŚS 8.16.7 [ed. RAGHU VIRA 8.15.7]

• pass. / anticaus.

The rare -ya-present *namyá-^{te}* co-exists within the IVS with the transitive active class I present *nāma-^{ti}* and its intransitive (anticausative) counterpart *nāma-^{te}* (see GOTÖ 193ff.). GOTÖ 195 takes *namyá-^{te}* as a passive, explaining its rarity and late age by the fact that the verb *nam* has originally been fundamentally intransitive. In fact, however, for two of the three above-listed attestations, an anticausative interpretation is either preferable or at least possible.

The only mantra occurrence of this present (in the RVKh., with the preverb *vī*), has the meaning ‘[the woman] is bends (apart) [or: bends back and forth?]’ (anticausative) or ‘[the woman] is bent (apart) [by her sexual partner]’ (passive); for its discussion, see below, s.v. *yabh*. Next to this attestation, *namyá-^{te}* occurs in late Vedic in two Taittirīya texts: in the late book 9 of the TĀ (= TaiU 3) and in the BhārŚS:

(TĀ 9.10.3-4 (= TaiU 3.10.3-4))

tat pratiṣṭhety upāsīta / pratiṣṭhāvān bhavati / tan maha ity upāsīta / mahān bhavati / tan +māna¹⁵⁹⁵ ity upāsīta / mānavān bhavati. ||3|| tan nama ity upāsīta / namyante ’smai kāmāḥ / tad brahmety upāsīta / brahmavān bhavati / tad brahmaṇaḥ parimara ity upāsīta / pary eṇaṃ mriyante dviṣantaḥ sapatnāḥ /

‘That [Food] he should worship as firm foundation, and he shall become firmly founded. That [Food] he should worship as greatness, and he shall become great. That [Food] he should worship as respect,¹⁵⁹⁶ and he shall become respected. That [Food] he should worship as bowing, and his wishes shall bow to him [by fulfilling themselves]. That [Food] he should worship as Brahman, and he shall possess Brahman. That [Food] he should worship as vanishing of the Brahman,¹⁵⁹⁷ and the rivals who hate

¹⁵⁹⁵ Conjecture by DEUSSEN.

¹⁵⁹⁶ Thus in accordance with DEUSSEN’s (1897: 239) conjecture *+māna[s]*.

¹⁵⁹⁷ For the meaning of *parimara*, see Ch. I, s.v. *mṛ*.

[him] shall die around him.’¹⁵⁹⁸

The form *namyante* is translated by all interpreters as non-passive, i.e. as ‘bend, bow [by itself]’.¹⁵⁹⁹ It is likely to represent a nonce formation, based on lexical parallelisms (⁺*mānas* : *mānavān bhavati* = *namas* : *namyante*) and employed in the usage which is regular for the class I present *nāma-te*.¹⁶⁰⁰ Thus, both Vedic attestations of *namya-te* are functionally equivalent to the non-passive present *nāma-te*.

The Sūtra attestation of *-namya-te* clearly exemplifies the passive usage:

(BhārṢS 8.16.7 [ed. RAGHU VIRA 8.15.7])

tatra ye devaprayāṇā mantrā, ubhayavat te saṃnamyeran

‘There, the mantras which are addressed to the gods should be transformed in twofold way [so as to be addressed both to the gods and Fathers].’¹⁶⁰¹

nud ‘push’: *nudya-te*

TĀ^m 1.3.2,¹⁶⁰² BaudhṢS 23.7:258.7

¹⁵⁹⁸ I follow W. KNOBL’s (p.c.) translation. I am thankful to W. KNOBL for valuable comments and clarifications on this passage and the usage of *namyante*.

¹⁵⁹⁹ Cf. HUME (1931: 292): ‘desires make adoration to [him]’; LESIMPLE: ‘Tous les désirs lui rendent hommage’; DEUSSEN (1897: 239): ‘alle Wünsche werden sich einem neigen’; F.M. MÜLLER (1884: 68): ‘all desires fall down before him in adoration’; BOETZELAER (1971: 190): ‘the objects which cause enjoyments yield themselves to him according to his desire’; OLIVELLE (1998: 313): ‘his desires will bow to his will’; ed. ANGOT, p. 496: ‘... les désirs lui rendent hommage’.

¹⁶⁰⁰ Note that, for system-related reasons, this formation can hardly be taken as a class IV present: we do not find synonymous class IV and class I presents within one IVS (*jāna-te* ‘beget’ and *jāya-te* ‘be born’ are opposed in transitivity, as members of the causative opposition: causative/anticausative).

¹⁶⁰¹ The corresponding active construction in the ĀpṢS favours the passive analysis:

(ĀpṢS 8.13.6)

ye ke ca devasaṃyuktā mantrā, devebhyaḥ pitṛbhya iti tān saṃnamati

‘All mantras which contain addressing to gods, he transforms these [so as to make them addressed:] “To the gods (and) to the Fathers ...” ’ (see EINO 1988: 196f., with fn. 1062).

¹⁶⁰² Ed. ĀnSS, ed. MAHADEVA SASTRI *nudyamāna-*; ed. MITRA erroneously *nadyamāna-*.

- pass.

The rare -ya-passive *nudya*^{-te} occurs in a TĀ mantra and, later, in the ŚrSū. The relevant mantra runs:

(TĀ 1.3.2)

ṛtur ṛtunā nudyamānaḥ / vinanādābhidhāvaḥ

‘A season ousted by [another] season has produced [a particular] sound, running forwards.’

(Caus. pass.)

For JB 3.238:19 *nodyate*, taken by CALAND and WITZEL (1986: 195) as a passive of the causative *nodaya*^{-ti}, see above, s.v. *ud*.

pad ‘move, fall’

pass. of caus. -*pādyā*^{-te}

+ *pra* AB, KB +

➡ Chapter B.II

pīḍ ‘press, squeeze’: *pīḍyā*^{-te}

TS^P, DhSū.+

- pass.

The passive counterpart of the transitive -āya-present *pīḍāya*^{-ti} AV + (see JAMISON 85) occurs in the TS, cf.:

(TS 2.6.7.1)

sā yātra-yatra nyākrāmat, tāto ghṛtām apīḍyata

‘Wherever she (sc. the cow) stepped, from there ghee was squeezed out.’

Other passives

The isolated form *pipīḷé* attested in the passive usage (‘has been pressed’) in RV 4.22.8 (see JAMISON 85; KÜMMEL 2000: 310) may be a 3sg.

stative form derived from the perfect stem (see KULIKOV 2006a: 67f.).

prī ‘please’: *prīya*^{-te} (*priya*^{-te})

JB 3.232:5, KaṭhU 1.16, MānŚS^m 11.9.2.5^{3x}, VaikhŚS^m 1.4:5.14–GrSū.^m +
• pass.

The late -ya-present *prīya*^{-te} first appears in the JB:

(JB 3.232:5)

taṃ devā nāprīṇan / so ‘*prīyamāṇa uśanasam kāvyaṃ āgacchat*
‘The gods could not please¹⁶⁰³ him. Being displeased, he came to Uśanas
Kāvya.’

Semantically, both passive and non-passive (anticausative) interpretations seem appropriate for *prīya*^{-te}; cf. WHITNEY’s (1885b [Roots]: 102) record “[4. (or *pass.*)]”. Under the non-passive analysis, the pair *prīyate* – *prīṇāti* could be considered as instantiating the common paradigmatic pattern “intransitive class IV present :: transitive class IX present” (cf. *ṛīyate* ‘whirls’ ~ *ṛiṇāti* ‘makes whirl’, etc.). However, the chronological gap between *prīyate* (JB^{1x} +) and *prīṇāti* (RV +) favours a passive analysis. As far as the earliest (JB) occurrence is concerned, note, furthermore, that *apṛīyamāṇa*- is preceded by the transitive present *apṛīṇan*, which supports the passive interpretation (‘not being pleased [by the gods]’). Most likely, the verb *prī* was fundamentally transitive in early Vedic, and *prīyate* was built as the late passive counterpart of *prīṇāti*; in the post-Vedic period (Sūtras) it could be secondarily reinterpreted as non-passive.

From the Sūtras onwards, the stem *prīya*^{-te} occurs both with the long and short root vowel – as, for instance, in impv. *prīyantām* attested in a well-known mantra found in the VaikhŚS and, with minor modifications, in a number of GrSū.:

(ŚGS 4.4.12 = BaudhGS 1.1.24 = BhārGS 3.16:85.5 = ĀgnivGS 2.3.4:58.6 ≈
VaikhGS 6.2:90.21-91.1 ≈ VaikhŚS 1.4:5.13-14 ≈ JGS 1.6:6.18 ≈ ĀgnivGS
2.3.2:56.9)

*nāndīmukhāḥ pitarāḥ prīyantām*¹⁶⁰⁴

¹⁶⁰³ *āprīṇan* may instantiate here an *imperfectum de conatu*, i.e. refer to an attempted activity (W. KNOBL, p.c.).

¹⁶⁰⁴ The attested variants are: VaikhŚS *nāndīmukhāḥ sāgunāḥ pitarāḥ priyantām*;

‘Let the fathers, with joyful faces,¹⁶⁰⁵ be pleased.’

The regular stem variant (with the long vowel) appears in the ŚGS, JGS and ĀgnivGS; other Sūtras (VaikhŚS, VaikhGS, BaudhGS, BhārGS) attest the secondary short vowel variant.

The same imperative form occurs in a few other young mantras:

(MānŚS 11.9.2.5)

*priyantāṃ pitaraḥ priyantāṃ pitāmahāḥ priyantāṃ prapitāmahāḥ*¹⁶⁰⁶

‘Let the fathers be pleased; let the grandfathers be pleased; let the great-grandfathers be pleased.’

(MānŚS 11.9.3.25)

prīyantām

‘Let [the fathers] be pleased.’

(BaudhGPariś. 4.2:25.14-16)

kṛttikāputraḥ prīyatāṃ; viniyogaḥ prīyatāṃ; śāśaḥ prīyatāṃ; putrikāputraḥ prīyatāṃ; bhagavān mahādhūrtaḥ prīyatāṃ

‘Let Kṛttikāputra be pleased; let Viniyoga be pleased; let Śāśa be pleased; let Putrikāputra be pleased; let the Lord, the great Dhūrta be pleased.’

(YājñSmṛ. 1.244)

viśvedevāś ca prīyantām

‘And let the All-Gods be pleased ...’

For the length vacillation in the passives derived from the *Crī* roots, see Chapter B.I, s.v. *śri*, Chapter C.IV.1, and KULIKOV 2005a.

plī: *plīya-*^{te}

➡ s.v. *vlī*

JGS *sapraṇavaṃ nāndīmukhāḥ pitaraḥ prīyantām*, ĀgnivGS 2.3.2:56.9 *sapraṇavanāndī*^o.

¹⁶⁰⁵ *nāndīmukhāḥ* (lit. ‘with joyful faces’) is a particular class of ancestors.

¹⁶⁰⁶ The mss. have short vowels in all the three occurrences, which ed. VAN GELDER emends to ⁺*prīy*^o.

(*pluṣ* ‘burn’: *ploṣya*^{te})

The middle future participle of *plu* ‘swim’, *ploṣyamāṇā* (JB 2.441:4) is quoted in VWC-Br. II, 1049a s.v. *pluṣ* (i.e., as a supposed passive of the causative of *pluṣ* ‘burn’) by mistake.

(*psā* ‘chew’: *-psīya*^{te})

The passive *sam...apsīyata* recorded by OERTEL (1935: 126f. [= Kl.Schr. I, 335f.]) in JB 3.16:9 (cf. also WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]: 104) is an erroneous reading for *°plīyata*; see s.v. *vlī* (*plī*).

***bṛh*: *bṛhya*^{te}**

➡ s.v. *vr̥h*

(*blī*: *blīya*^{te})

➡ s.v. *vlī*

***bha(ñ)j*¹⁶⁰⁷ ‘defeat, break’: *bhajya*^{te}**

Simplex AV 8.8.3, 8.8.4, AB 3.22.7, Sū.;

+ *nī* RVKh. 5.15.10 (*nī bhajyate* ≈ AV 20.131.1, ed. ¹ROTH/WHITNEY

⁺*vī bhidyate*, mss. *°ti bhadyate*)

-bhajya^{-ñ}: MānGS 2.15.6 *prabhajyet* - *-yet*-optative? (see KULIKOV 2006d: 34f.)¹⁶⁰⁸

• anticaus. / (pass.)

¹⁶⁰⁷ The nasal consonant is extracted from the infixed present *bhanākti* (MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 242).

¹⁶⁰⁸ For post-Vedic (Epic) forms with active inflection, see OBERLIES 2003: 241, 265 and 472.

The -ya-present *bhajya-te* first appears in the post-RVic mantras (AV, RVKh.) and, once, in the Brāhmaṇas (AB). An example is:

(AV 8.8.3c)

tājád-bháṅga iva bhajyantām

‘Let them (sc. the enemies) be broken like castor-oil shrub.’¹⁶⁰⁹

The relevant AB passage is quoted s.v. *lī* (Chapter II).

The parallel RVKh. 5.15.10 *nī bhajyate*¹⁶¹⁰ ~ AV 20.131.1 ^{+vī} *bhidiate*¹⁶¹¹ points to the close relationship with the -ya-presents with fluctuating accentuation, such as *chidyá-te* ‘break’, *bhidyá-te* ‘split’ (see Chapter III). The semantic affinity with ‘-yá-presents of destruction is supported by the paradigmatic properties: *bhajya-te* is opposed to the nasal present *bhanákti*. Thus, there are good reasons for reconstruction of the fluctuating accentual patterning **bhájya-te*, i.e. **bhajyá-te* in the AV, **bhájya-te* in the RVKh. (see Chapter C.II.4).

bhāṣ* ‘speak’: *bhāṣya-te

ŚĀ 8.9 (+)

- intr. or absolute tr. (?) (ŚĀ); pass. (post-Vedic)

The only Vedic attestation of the -ya-present *bhāṣya-te*, met with in the ŚĀ, is a nonce formation:

(ŚĀ 8.9)

*śuśrūṣante*¹⁶¹² *hāṣya parṣatsu bhāṣyamāṇasyedam astu yad ayam īhate*

‘[They] hearken [to him] when he *speaks* (?) in the assemblies, [saying]:

“Let this be, what he desires”.’

Syntactically, *bhāṣyamāṇa-* can be taken either as intransitive or as

¹⁶⁰⁹ According to MEYER (1939: 61ff.), *tājád-bháṅgam* (which should be taken as a compound, not as two separate words, contra PW and WHITNEY: ‘let them be **suddenly** broken like **hemp**’) is a botanic term denoting the castor-oil plant (“Rizinusstaude”), lit. ‘die mit dem plötzlichen Brechen’.

¹⁶¹⁰ On the compound *nī-bhañj*, see also JOHANSSON 1927: 14.

¹⁶¹¹ Conjecture of ed. ¹ROTH/WHITNEY; mss. ^o*ti bhadyate*.

¹⁶¹² Thus ed. ĀnSS; ed. KEITH *śuśrūṣante* (v.l. *śuśruṣante*); ed. BHIM DEV *śuśūṣante*.

transitive in the absolute (objectless) usage, but, in any case, not as a passive. Most likely, the form in question substitutes for the regular class I present *bhāṣamāṇa-*, but it is unclear which reasons might have triggered such a replacement. There is no productive morphological pattern “class I pr. :: class IV pr.”, and the meaning ‘speak’ does not belong to the three main semantic subclasses of the non-passive middle -ya-presents (see Chapter C.II.2.2). The only class IV present of sound/speech is *vāśya-^{te}*.¹⁶¹³ A noteworthy parallel is the isolated -ya-present *ṛcyante*, attested in the ŚĀ (see Chapter I, s.v. *ṛc*), probably a secondary replacement of *ṛcante*.

Apart from this isolated occurrence in the ŚĀ, *bhāṣya-^{te}* is not attested until the late post-Vedic texts (AVPariś., Yā., late Up., Cl.Skt.), where it is employed in the passive usage.¹⁶¹⁴

bhrj(j) ‘roast, parch’: *bhrj(j)ya-^{te}*

GB 1.1.3^{2x}:3.5-6 (mss., ed. MITRA °*bhrjya*°; BÖHTLINGK, ed. GAASTRA °*bhrjjya*°), MānŚS 1.7.6.8 (*bhrjjyamānāsu*) = 2.3.2.6 (*bhrjya*°), Yā.¹⁶¹⁵
• pass.

The late Vedic passive *bhrj(j)ya-^{te}* first appears in the GB, where it is used for ‘etymologizing’ the name Bhṛgu:

(GB 1.1.3:3.5-6)

tābhyaḥ śrāntābhyas taptābhyaḥ saṁtaptābhyo yad reta asīt, tad abhrjjyata. yad abhrjjyata,¹⁶¹⁶ tasmād bhr̥guḥ sam abhavat
‘The semen which was in these [waters], which were toiled, heated,

¹⁶¹³ Note, incidentally, the similarity of the phonological root structure: *CāS* (where *S* stands for sibilant).

¹⁶¹⁴ On the usage of *bhāṣya-^{te}* in Yāska’s Nirukta in the sense ‘is used, said, employed in speech’ (e.g. at 2.2), see MEHENDALE 1955: 129, fn. 8. Cf. also Tejobindūpaniṣad 6.52 *yat kiṁcid dṛśyate loke 'yat kiṁcid bhāṣyate janaiḥ* ‘... whatever is seen in the world, whatever is said by people...’. For Epic attestations, see OBERLIES 2003: 474.

¹⁶¹⁵ See GOTŌ 2009: 108. The form *bhrj(j)yéyuḥ* (MS^p 1.10.11:151.6 = ^AKSP 36.6:73.1) is a plural form of -yet-optative (see KULIKOV 2006d: 35; GOTŌ 2009: 109ff.).

¹⁶¹⁶ The geminate *jj* is conjectured by BÖHTLINGK (1896d: 14) and adopted in ed. GAASTRA.

completely heated, was parched. When it was being parched, Bhṛgu arose from it.’

bhraṁś* ‘fall, miss’: *bhra(ṁ)śya-te

bhraśya-te

Simplex TĀ 1.6.3, ŚŚS 17.10.10 (+);¹⁶¹⁷

+ *sam* ‘loosen’ Sū.¹⁶¹⁸

bhraṁśya-te TĀ^m 1.3.4^{2x} (*bhraṁśyante* ≈ KS^p 19.9^{2x}:10.13 = KpS^p 30.7^{2x}:144.2-3 *bhraṁśante*), KātyŚS 20.5.16

• anticaus.

The present *bhra(ṁ)śya-te* first appears in the TĀ:

(TĀ 1.6.3)

yo druhyati bhraśyate svargāl lokāt

‘Who is hostile [towards the person knowing thus¹⁶¹⁹], misses (lit. falls down from) the heavenly world.’

The secondary stem variant *bhraṁśya-*, probably resulting from contamination of *bhraśya-te* with the more archaic class I present *bhrāṁśa-te* YV^p + (GOTÖ 231), is attested in the same usage:

¹⁶¹⁷ For the post-Vedic (Ep., Cl. Skt.) usages of the simplex, see, in particular, SUKTHANKAR 1921: 123; WERBA [VIA I] 214; OBERLIES 2003: 478. In particular, *bhraśyate* is to be read at NārSmṛ. 12.17 *śālīnasyāpi dhṛṣṭastrīsaṃyogād bhraśyate dhvajah* ‘and [if] the phallus of a shy [man] falls [= loses erection] before/because of intercourse with an audacious woman ...’, in accordance with the reading of sub-recension D (vulgata) and against the reading adopted in ed. LARIVIERE: ... *bhajyate dhvajah*; the meaning of *bhajyate* ‘breaks’ makes little sense in the context. Cf. the translation given by VIGASIN & SAMOZVANCEV (1998: 116) (‘А у «робкого» перед близостью со смелой женщиной «падает знамя» ...’), which is more exact than LARIVIERE’s rendering (‘If one who is shy loses his erection during intercourse with his wife and she is not bashful ...’).

¹⁶¹⁸ See GOTÖ 231.

¹⁶¹⁹ Thus Sāyaṇa.

(TĀ^m 1.3.4 (≈ KS^p 19.9:10.13 = KpS^p 30.7:144.2-3))

hlādayate jvalataś caiva 'śāmyataś cāsyā cakṣuṣī

yā vai prajā bhraṁśyante 'saṃvatsarāt tā bhraṁśyante

‘[The rainy season] refreshes [living beings], its eyes burn and calm down.¹⁶²⁰ Those beings who miss [this season], miss the year.’

bhra(ṁ)śya-te belongs with the non-passive intransitive -ya-presents and has probably been created under the influence of the -ya-presents of (spontaneous) motion, such as, above all, *pādyā-te* ‘fall’ (see WERBA [VIA I] 214) or *śīyā-te* ‘id.’

mīv ‘move, impel’: -*mīvyā-te*

+ *ud* KS^p 34.15:47.2 (*unmīvyamānaḥ*, ed. SCHROEDER +*unnīya*^o)

• pass.

The system of forms and the meaning of the verb *mīv* have been discussed at length by NARTEN (1965). The -ya-passive -*mīvyā-te* occurs at KS 34.15:47.2, for which ed. SCHROEDER conjectures, after CALAND, +*unnīyamāna*. As NARTEN (op.cit., 59 [= Kl.Schr. 1, 49]) convincingly demonstrates (see also MITTWEDE 1989 [Textkr. zur KS]: 143), this emendation is unnecessary, and the ms. reading is correct:

(KS 34.15:47.2)

unmīvyamāna āyuh

‘In die Höhe geschoben, ist er Āyu’ (vom Ziegel bei der Schichtung des Hochaltars).’ (NARTEN)

The existence of the passive -*mīvyā-te* in Vedic is supported by the Avestan cognate *amuiiamna-* ‘immovable’, albeit with a somewhat different reflex of the zero grade in the root (*u* may be due to the influence of the initial *m-*; M. DE VAAN, p.c.).

¹⁶²⁰ See Chapter V, s.v. *śam*.

muṣ ‘steal, rob’: *muṣya*-^{te}

[i_{pass.}] ‘Y^{property}_{NOM} is stolen’ ĀpDhS 2.26.8 = HirDhS 2.5.203;

[ii_{pass.}] ‘Z^{person}_{NOM} is robbed’ Lost-Br., p. 111 [Bhāllavi-Br., Fragg. (3)]

(quoted in DrāhyŚS 3.4.2)

- pass.

The fundamentally transitive verb *muṣ* is a ‘two pattern’ verb. Constructions with the accusative of the first object (= stolen property) clearly prevail in the RV, but it can also be constructed with the accusative of the robbed person. A construction with two accusatives occurs, for instance, in:

(RV 4.30.4)

yātr_aotā bādhitébhyaś ' cakrām kútsāya yúdhyate

muṣāyá indra súryam

‘And where you, O Indra, stole the wheel of the sun for the oppressed ones, for the fighting Kutsa ...’

The first attestation of the passive *muṣya*-^{te}, in the lost Bhāllavi-Br. (quoted in DrāhyŚS 3.4.2)¹⁶²¹ instantiates pattern [ii_{pass.}] ‘Z^{person}_{NOM} is robbed’:

tathā ca bhāllavibrāhmaṇaṃ bhavati: yo 'nupagītaṃ sāmādatte, muṣyate [...]

‘Thus, the Bhāllavi-Brāhmaṇa says as follows: “Who begins the unaccompanied sāman,¹⁶²² is robbed [...]”.’

The passive counterpart of the transitive pattern [i], ‘X^{thief}_{NOM} steals Y^{property}_{ACC}’, appears in the Dharma-Sūtras:

(ĀpDhS 2.26.8 = HirDhS 2.5.203)

... yan muṣyate tais tat pratidāpyam

‘... they should be forced to give back what is stolen’ (see OLIVELLE 2000: 111).

¹⁶²¹ On this quotation, see PARPOLA 1969: 157f.

¹⁶²² On ādi (= the beginning part of a sāman), see Appendix II.

mṛt ‘destroy’: -*mṛtya*-^{te}

GB 1.4.13:104.13-14, ed. GAASTRA ⁺*nir-mṛtyeran* (mss., ed. MITRA [°]*mṛjy*[°])

- pass.

For the isolated middle optative form ⁺*nirmṛtyeran* (GB), conjectured in ed. GAASTRA for *nirmṛjyeran* attested in mss. and adopted in ed. MITRA, see KULIKOV 2006d: 36ff., with fn. 27.

mṛṣ ‘forget’: *mṛṣya*-^{te}

Simplex RV 1.145.2, 6.67.7, MS^P 1.5.12:81.3, 5, KS^P 7.10:71.19 = KpS^P 5.9:57.7, ŚB (book 12) (+);

+ *āpi* RV 6.54.4, 7.22.5

- (absolute) tr.

The present *mṛṣya*-^{te} occurs either [i] constructed with the accusative or, more rarely, [ii] in the absolute usage. Examples are:

[i]:

(RV 7.22.5ab)

ná te gíro āpi mṛṣye turásya ' ná suṣtútīm asurṣyàsyā vidvān

‘I, the knowing one, do not forget praising songs for you, the strong one (sc. Indra), neither the beautiful praise for the divine one.’

(KS^P 7.10:71.19 = KpS^P 5.9:57.7)

sā yamī bhrātaraṃ mṛtaṃ nāmṛṣyata

‘This Yamī did not forget her dead brother (Yama).’

[ii]:

(RV 6.67.7cd)

ná mṛṣyante yuvatáyó ' aṽtā ' ví yāt páyo viśvajinvā bhārante

‘The young unsurpassable wives do not neglect [their work] when they distribute milk, O all-enlivening ones (sc. Mitra and Varuṇa).’

Although this -ya-present does not occur accented,¹⁶²³ the non-passive

¹⁶²³ WHITNEY (1885b [Roots]: 126) gives the accent (*mṛṣyate*), but I was unable to

syntax and meaning and, particularly, the semantic and syntactic affinity with the middle '-ya-presents of mental activities, also constructed with accusatives (*mánya-te*, *búdhya-te* (β) 'perceives'; see Chapter C.II.2.2) pleads for grouping *mṛṣya-te* with class IV presents.

yāt 'be/put in place'

pass. of caus.: -yātya-^{te}

+ *anv-ā* KB 21.6.1, 5 [ed. LINDNER 21.5^{2x}], ŚŚS

The meaning of the verb *yāt* has been repeatedly discussed in the literature and can be roughly determined as 'be in place, in appropriate position'. The meaning of the compound with *ā* is described as 'take position, line up', while its causative is translated as 'arrange in an orderly manner' (GONDA) or the like; see, in particular, GELDNER 1901 [VSt III]: 11ff. and 185; GONDA 1972: 93ff.; 1982c: 89 (on the causative passive in ŚŚS 14.3.1); JAMISON 131, with fn. 54; THIEME 1957: 39f. [= O.Mai. I, 233f.]; WERBA [VIA I] 366f. (with bibl.). The passive of the causative *yātāya-^{ti}* 'put in place' etc. first occurs in the KB:

(KB 21.6.1 [ed. LINDNER 21.5])

tad āhuḥ: kasmād vaiśvadevāny evānvāyātyante, naikadevatyāni, na dvidevatyānīti

'They say: "Why are [the litanies] for the All-Gods arranged, not those for one deity or for two deities?"'

yabh 'fuck, copulate': *yabhya-^{te}*

RVKh. 5.22.3 (*yábhyamānā*, read ⁺*yabhyaṁmānā*)

• pass. (?)

pass. of desid.: *yīyapsya-^{te}* 'be sought for copulation'

ĀśŚS 8.3.24 (*yīyapsyate*) ≈ ŚŚS 12.23.5 (*yīyapsyamānā*)

trace accented occurrences.

The -ya-present *yabhya-te* occurs only in the RVKh., in a stanza, discussed at length by HOFFMANN (1976: 570f.); see also KNOBL 2007a: 121, fn. 48. The passage runs (with HOFFMANN's emendations):

(RVKh. 5.22.3 (≈ AVŚ 20.136.3))¹⁶²⁴

yád alpikā s_uvālpikā ' +karkandhukéva +pácyate

+vāsantikam 'va téjanam ' yábhyamānā ví namyate

‘Wenn die Kleine, ganz Kleine wie eine Brustbeere reif wird, biegt sie sich wie ein Frühlingsschilfrohr beim Begatten hin und her.’

(HOFFMANN)¹⁶²⁵

Relying upon the non-passive root accentuation, HOFFMANN (followed by GOTÖ 255) suggested a non-passive translation for *yábhyamānā* (‘sie begattet sich’). HOFFMANN believed that the non-passive *yábhyate* with root accentuation might develop on the model *pacyáte* ‘is cooked’ ~ *pácyate* ‘ripens’.¹⁶²⁶ This argumentation falters for a number of reasons, however:

1) The pair *pacyáte* ‘is cooked’ ~ *pácyate* ‘ripens’ is the *only* clear example of the opposition between a suffix-accented -yá-passive and a non-passive intransitive -ya-present with root accentuation built on the same root (see Chapter C.II.4.3) and thus can hardly serve as a productive derivational model.

2) The semantic difference between *pacyáte* ‘is cooked’ and *pácyate* ‘ripens’ does not amount to the passive/non-passive distinction. In other words, ‘ripens’ does not mean ‘is cooked by itself’ (anticausative) or ‘cooks itself’, but results from some idiomatic semantic change, although ‘is cooked’ and ‘ripens’ certainly do have a common semantic denominator (which might be defined as ‘becomes ready’ or the like). I see no semantic development parallel to ‘is cooked’ → ‘ripens’, which might apply to the

¹⁶²⁴ The AVic variant of this stanza is quite different:

yád alpikā s_uvālpikā ' kárkadhūkéva śádyate [+pádyate ?]

vāsantikám 'va téjanam ' yánty avātāya vítpati

¹⁶²⁵ Likewise KNOBL (2007a: 121, fn. 48): ‘like a reed in springtime, she bends back and forth when making love.’

¹⁶²⁶ “Da z.B. neben dem Passiv *pacyáte* ‘wird gekocht’ (RV.) mit anderem Akzent und intransitiver Bedeutung *pácyate* ‘wird reif’ (RV.) steht, kann sich zu einem Passiv **yabhýate* ‘wird begattet’ ein intransitives **yábhyate* ‘begattet sich (von einer Frau)’ entwickelt haben, das in *yábhyamānā* vorliegt” (HOFFMANN 1976: 571).

original passive meaning of **yabhyáte* ‘is fucked’.

3) Even assuming that *yábhyate* may have been built as the non-passive counterpart of **yabhyáte* ‘is fucked’, we can hardly understand what this non-passive intransitive might mean; HOFFMANN’s translation ‘sie begattet sich’ barely clarifies its meaning. By virtue of their semantics (and leaving aside anatomical and biological curiosities), *fuck* and *begatten* (as well as the more vulgar quasi-synonym of the latter, *ficken*, which seems to be a more exact translation of *yabh*)¹⁶²⁷ are fundamentally transitive verbs, which can be passivized (*wird begattet* \approx *wird gefickt*), but not anticausativized or reflexivized. As for other intransitive derivations available in European languages, they cannot be merely expanded to the hypothetical *yábhyate* for several reasons:

(a) The reflexive pronoun *sich* would be appropriate in a causative reflexive construction (*sie läßt sich begatten*), which is nearly identical to simple passive. However, this meaning is usually expressed in Vedic by a causative with the suffix *-áya-* and middle inflection, so that we might rather expect the form **yābháyamānā* in this sense.

(b) Reciprocal constructions are possible, for instance, for the Russian cognate of *yábha-* (with the “reflexive” suffix *-ся*), i.e. *ебаться* (cf. *X u Y ebytся*, *X eбётся с Y(-ом)*),¹⁶²⁸ but we certainly cannot expand this syntactic model to the Vedic middle *yabhya-^{te}* (whatever its accentuation), since the present suffix *-ya-* never expresses the reciprocal meaning.

(c) One more intransitive derivation which, at first glance, might be relevant for our discussion is ‘object deletion’ of the type *John eats* or *She fucks*.¹⁶²⁹ This function can indeed be rendered by middle (‘reflexive’) forms in some European languages;¹⁶³⁰ in particular, it is most common for the

¹⁶²⁷ I am much indebted to Werner ABRAHAM, Martin HASPELMATH and Heinz VATER for valuable comments on the syntax and semantics of the relevant German verbs.

¹⁶²⁸ With *ficken* this meaning is expressed without *sich*: *sie ficken (einander)*. GRIMM’s *Deutsches Wörterbuch* (1854, Bd. I, 1278) adduces the reflexive verb *sich begatten*, explained as “*jungi, coire, von menschen und thieren*” and illustrated by such examples as *die tauben wollen sich nicht begatten; ungleiche thiere begatten sich nicht untereinander*. Both examples suggest a reciprocal interpretation. However, as a number of native speakers of German pointed out to me, such an interpretation is highly unusual, if possible at all, for *sich begatten*, at least in Modern German.

¹⁶²⁹ Other terms are ‘antipassive’ or ‘suppressif objectal’ (MEL’ČUK 1994: 139, 142).

¹⁶³⁰ Cf. Rus. *Собака кусает Ивана* ‘The dog bites Ivan’ ~ *Собака кусает-ся* ‘The dog bites’.

reflexive derivate of the Russian cognate verb *ебаться* (cf. *Она ебётся*), this meaning is also suggested by KNOBL's (2007a: 121, fn. 48) translation '...when making love'. The Vedic present suffix *-ya-* does not have this function, however.

(d) Moreover, the two last interpretations can perhaps be ruled out by the fact that, judging from the contexts where *yabh* occurs, this verb, like its Latin translation equivalent *futuo*,¹⁶³¹ could not be used "symmetrically": its subjects could only refer to a male, not to a female (its more exact rendering might be then '(sexually) penetrate' or the like.¹⁶³²

4) Finally, the text of the RVKh. is too corrupt (in particular, as far as the accents are concerned) to uncritically deduce the non-passive meaning (which even contradicts common sense) from the root accentuation of *yábhyamānā*. Note, incidentally, that HOFFMANN emended accentuation in another *-ya*-present found in the very same stanza, *+pácyate* (see s.v. *pac*).

To sum up, the hapax *yábhyamānā* cannot be anything but the passive counterpart of the transitive present *yábha^{-ti}*, and its accentuation should be emended correspondingly: *+yabhyámānā*.¹⁶³³

To conclude the analysis of the stanza, one should briefly discuss another *-ya*-present attested in the same *pāda*, for which a passive interpretation seems possible as well, *ví namyate*. The anticausative (or reflexive) translation suggested by HOFFMANN ('sie biegt sich hin und her') and KNOBL ('she bends back and forth') cannot be ruled out. Yet, the competition with the well-attested class I present *náma^{-te}*, typically employed in the anticausative usage (as noticed by HOFFMANN himself, *ibid.*, fn. 6), makes this interpretation somewhat questionable. HOFFMANN hesitantly conjectures the intensive *námnate*. In my view, a passive interpretation of *-namyate* is not impossible here. As in the case of *+yabhyámānā*, the semantic context of copulation implies an agent (which is not expressed in the text), i.e. the male partner of the woman. The preverb *ví*, translated by HOFFMANN as 'hin und her', may also mean 'asunder, apart', thus referring to the movements of the woman during the coitus, i.e. spreading legs (and/or

¹⁶³¹ Etymologically probably related to *-futo* (cp. *con-futo*, *re-futo*) 'strike'; see ADAMS 1982: 118; DE VAAN 2008: 253f.

¹⁶³² Cf.: "Except in the passive, *futuo* was not as a rule used of the female role" (ADAMS 1982: 121f.).

¹⁶³³ Thus hesitantly emended (with a question mark) by WERBA [VIA I] 221.

female genitals?).¹⁶³⁴ This verbal compound may also underlie the root noun **vi-nám-*, according to the very plausible analysis of the first member of the RVic nominal compound *vinam-gr̥sás-* (hapax at RV 9.72.3), proposed by PINAULT (2010: 142); PINAULT translates *vinam-gr̥sás-* as ‘penis of/in the vagina’. In my view, the context of RVKh. 5.22.3 strongly supports this morphological analysis of **vi-nám-*, which could then be taken as based either on transitive usages of *nam* (‘spreading (trans.) apart [female genitals]’ = ‘penis’), or on intransitive usages (‘spreading [intr.] apart’ = ‘female genitals’). Cf. also other compounds with *ví* employed in similar contexts, such as *vy àjyate* RV 10.85.28 ‘is impregnated (lit. anointed) [with semen]’ (see Chapter I, s.v. *añj*), VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 4.11 = *vy-asyate* VādhS [ed. CALAND] 4.27:13ff.;¹⁶³⁵ cf. also RV 1.101.10 *ví śyasva śípre* ‘open your lips’. Thus, ⁺*yabhyámānā ví namyate* may mean ‘being fucked, [she] bends/is bent (apart/spreading [her legs])’ (i.e. her legs are spread [by her sexual partner])’ or the like.

Concluding the analysis of this stanza, it is in place to note that, next to the hapax ⁺*yabhyámānā*, which clearly belongs to the vulgar stylistic register, we find here two other (quasi-)hapaxes – *álpika-* and *sválpika-*. Their general sense raises no questions (both are derived from *álpa-* ‘small, little’), but, most remarkably, they are virtually unattested elsewhere,¹⁶³⁶ which may point to the fact that they belong to the same vulgar-sexual stylistic register;¹⁶³⁷ their approximate English stylistic equivalents could be then *baby*, *babe* or the like. ⁺*karkandhukā-* ‘jujube berry’,¹⁶³⁸ also unattested

¹⁶³⁴ It seems that this latter sense underlies the interpretation of RVKh. 5.22.3 by EDGERTON (1911: 147), who believed that all verbal forms of this stanza should be understood as constructed with the subject of female genitals, not of the woman herself (“the adjectives *alpikā* and *svalpikā* go not with *karkandhukā* [...], but with the understood subject of the verbs (viz. the female organ)”). However, even though such interpretation is possible with the verb *ví namyate* ‘bends/is bent (apart)’, the designation of female genitals can hardly serve as the direct object of *yabh* ‘fuck’ and as the subject of *pac* ‘become ripe’.

¹⁶³⁵ CALAND (1928: 132 [= Kl.Schr., 432]) hesitantly translates ‘sich auseinander tun, die Beine auseinander tun’.

¹⁶³⁶ *alpika-* occurs only in AB 6.35.11.

¹⁶³⁷ This fact was noticed by EDGERTON (1911: 147), who called such derivatives with the suffix *-ka* “Diminutives of Obscenity”.

¹⁶³⁸ *karkándhu-* ‘*ziziphus jujube*’, also called ‘red date’, or ‘Chinese date’ – a small fruit tree with sweet juicy berries.

elsewhere, might belong to the same domain; cf. Rus. *ягодка* ‘(little) berry’ or American slang *tomato* used to refer to a sexually attractive woman.

Thus, one may tentatively render the stanza in question as follows:

‘When the baby, little baby, becomes ripe, like a jujube berry, she bends/is bent (apart/spreading [her legs]), like a reed in springtime, being fucked.’

Other passives

According to HOFFMANN, op.cit., 573f., the corrupt form *yákṣyamāṇā* attested in an Atharvavedic Kuntāpa hymn, at AV 20.135.5 (ed. VISHVA BANDHU, omitted in ed. ¹ROTH/WHITNEY), may represent a middle future participle in the passive usage. The relevant passage runs, with HOFFMANN’s emendations: *patnī⁺ yāpsyāmāṇā* ‘die Gattin (kommt) in der Absicht sich zu begatten (begattet zu werden)’.¹⁶³⁹ An alternative conjecture, also proposed by HOFFMANN, suggests a passive participle derived from the desiderative stem: *⁺yīyāpsyāmāṇā*. This conjecture seems less likely, since passives of desideratives first appear in Vedic prose, and *yīyāpsyā^{-te}* does not occur before the Śrauta-Sūtras (see below).

Desid. pass.

The two Sūtra attestations of the desiderative passive *yīyāpsyā^{-te}* (in the parallel passages of the ĀśŚS and ŚŚS) are unanimously translated by all interpreters as ‘wish to be fucked’:

(ĀśŚS 8.3.24 ≈ ŚŚS 12.23.5)

patnī yīyāpsyate [ŚŚS *yīyāpsyamāṇā*]; *jaritar othā modaiva! hotā viṣṭīmena* [ŚŚS *viṣṭīmī*]; *jaritar othā modaiva*

Cf. HOFFMANN (1976: 573): ‘Die Gattin möchte begattet werden; o Sänger, möchten wir beide uns sodann erfreuen! der Hotar (möchte es tun) mit dem steifen Glied; o Sänger, möchten wir beide uns sodann erfreuen!’; likewise, MYLIUS (1994a: 345) for the ĀśŚS (‘Die Ehefrau möchte beschlafen werden ...’); MONIER-WILLIAMS 845 for the ŚŚS (‘desiring to be carnally known’); CALAND (1953: 340) for the ŚŚS (‘The wife who wishes for coitus ...’).

Given this interpretation, *yīyāpsyā^{-te}* turns out to be the only desiderative passive, for which the experiencer of desire (= the one who desires the event denoted by the base verb to come about) is identical with the patient, not with the passive

¹⁶³⁹ The bracketed translation is more appropriate; see above on *yābhyamāṇā*.

agent – in contrast to other Vedic passives derived from desideratives: *aparurutsyāmāṇaḥ* KS ‘who is desired for expelling’ (not *‘who desires to be expelled’), *ālipsyāmāṇā* ŚB ‘[these animals], being desired for sacrifice’ (not *‘desiring to be sacrificed’), *āditsyamānam* JB ‘what is desired to be taken’; see Chapter C.II.1.2.3 for a general discussion of the Vedic desiderative passives. This very fact raises some doubts on the correctness of the above translations of *yīyapsya^{te}* and strongly pleads for an alternative interpretation, which suggests that the experiencer of desire is identical with the passive agent, i.e. (lit.) ‘the wife is sought for copulation’,¹⁶⁴⁰ that is ‘someone seeks to fuck the wife’.¹⁶⁴¹ Note, furthermore, that this analysis is supported by the context, cf.: *hotā viṣṭīmena/viṣṭīmī* ‘the hotar with the hard penis’.

The participle (gen.sg.m.) *yīyapsyataḥ* ŚŚS 16.4.6 (~ ĀśŚS 10.8.11 *yīya^o*¹⁶⁴²) ‘of the one who desires to fuck’ is derived from the stem homonymous to that of the desiderative passive (apart from the short reduplication vowel in the ŚŚS variant), but, of course, cannot belong with passives, in virtue of the active morphology. HOFFMANN (op.cit., 572 and fn. 22) saw here a contamination of the future (*yapsya-*) and desiderative (**yīyapsa-*) stems (see also JAMISON 1996: 275, note 129). The formation may probably be explained without recourse to contamination, i.e. as a mere reduction of the regular future from the desiderative stem, i.e. **yīyaps-sya-*; cf. *āripsyamāna-*, discussed s.v. *rabh/labh* (Chapter I).

²*yā* (ī) ‘implore, request’: *īya^{te}*

RV 1.145.1^{2x}, 6.21.1, 7.32.5, (9.65.16 [?])

• pass.

As SCHMID (1956: 224) has demonstrated (see also INSLEER 1972: 99), the passive *īya^{te}* belongs with the transitive *īmahe* etc. ‘implore, request’.¹⁶⁴³

¹⁶⁴⁰ This analysis is now adopted by HEENEN (2006: 206): ‘L’épouse est **desirée d’être pénétrée**.’

¹⁶⁴¹ This translation does not imply that the coitus comes about against the wife’s wish.

¹⁶⁴² Thus in mss. and ed. B.Ind.; ed. Hoshiarpur emends **yīya^o*.

¹⁶⁴³ The morphological structure of this formation is unclear. GRASSMANN (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 200) considered it as an intensive of the verb *i* ‘go’; SCHMID, op.cit., 222f. JOACHIM 138 takes it as a reduplicated present. Most often, however, *īmahe* is treated as a root present (see MACDONELL 337; INSLEER, *ibid.*, fn. 18; GARCÍA-RAMÓN 1993a: 76ff.); for a survey of interpretations and bibl., see SCHMID, op.cit., 219ff.

Out of almost 40 unaccented RVic occurrences of *īya-te*, which, in formal terms, may belong either to ¹*yā* ‘drive (fast), speed’ (pres. *īya-te*; see Chapter II, s.v.), or to ²*yā* (*ī*) ‘implore, request’, only four or five can be connected with the latter. The relevant passages are:

(RV 1.145.1b)

*sá cikítvāṁ īyate sá n_uv*¹⁶⁴⁴ *īyate*

‘He, the experienced one, is implored; only he is implored.’¹⁶⁴⁵

(RV 6.21.1d)

rayír víbhūtīr īyate vacasyā

‘Abundant wealth is requested through eloquence.’

(RV 7.32.5a)

śrávac chrútkarṇa īyate vásūnām

‘May he (sc. Indra) hear [us]; with hearing ears, he is requested for wealth.’

The meaning of the form *īyate* in the following passage is more problematic:

(RV 9.65.16)

rājā medhābhir īyate 'pávamāno manāv ádh_iv

antárikṣeṇa yāṭave

īyate in pāda a was reckoned to ²*yā* ‘implore’ by GRASSMANN (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 200f.),¹⁶⁴⁶ BERGAIGNE (1878: 190), LÜDERS (1951: 214f.), INSLER (1972: 99), GARCÍA-RAMÓN (1993a: 79, fn. 43), LUBOTSKY (1997a [RVWC]: 1151); cf. INSLER’s translation: ‘The king (= Soma) is implored by the wise to drive through space’. The alternative analysis of *īyate* as pr. of ¹*yā* ‘drive’ is adopted by GELDNER (‘Der König zieht ... unter Manu aus, um durch die Luft zu fahren’), RENOU (EVP VIII, 40: ‘Le roi (Soma) s’avance à l’aide des pensées-sages (des poètes) ...’), WERBA [VIA I] 408 and ELIZARENKOVA; see, in particular, RENOU’s argumentation (EVP VIII,

¹⁶⁴⁴ Or *sān_uv* [= *sá ān_uv*]; see OLDENBERG, *Noten*, da loc.; KUPFER 2002: 166, 174.

¹⁶⁴⁵ Thus GRASSMANN (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 201), GELDNER, RENOU (EVP XII, 36: ‘il (est le dieu) attentif (qu’) on aborde, oui, celui (qu’) on aborde’), ELIZARENKOVA, WERBA [VIA I] 408; differently LUBOTSKY (1997a [RVWC]: 270): *√i-2* ‘to impel, send’.

¹⁶⁴⁶ In GRASSMANN’s notation, *i* ‘laufen, eilen, schnell fahren’ etc.

98).¹⁶⁴⁷

The passive translation of *īyate* in RV 1.144.2d *ádha svadhá adhayad yábhīr īyate* as ‘[Agni] wird angegangen’, adopted by GRASSMANN (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 201), LUDWIG (1876 [RV übers.]: I, 313) and LÜDERS (1959: 591), is impossible – foremost, because of the non-passive root accentuation. Other interpreters (OLDENBERG (1897: 160), GELDNER, RENOU (EVP XII, 36), ELIZARENKOVA, LUBOTSKY (1997a [RVWC]: 270)) rightly connect this form with ¹yā ‘drive’: ‘Then [Agni] sucked (his) powers by which he drives.’¹⁶⁴⁸

Other passives

The passive usage is also well-attested for the participle *iyāná-* (participle of the passive aorist **ayāyi?* see KULIKOV 2006b), cf.:¹⁶⁴⁹

(RV 8.50.5ab (= Vāl. 2.5ab))

á naḥ sóme s_uvadhvará ' iyānó átyo ná tośate

‘[Indra], being implored, speeds like a horse, to our Soma, which is well-adapted to a sacrifice.’¹⁶⁵⁰

(RV 10.99.12c)

sá iyānáḥ karati svastīm asmai

‘He (sc. Indra), being implored, will bring luck to him (sc. Vamraka).’

¹⁶⁴⁷ LÜDERS’ argumentation (“Daß *īyate* hier „er wird gebeten“ bedeutet, wird schon dadurch nahegelegt, daß Soma hier *rājā* genannt wird; einen König bittet man”) does not seem convincing.

¹⁶⁴⁸ For the same reason, *īyase* in RV 5.3.8c *saṁsthé yád agna īyase rayīnām*, for which SCARLATA 658f. gives two possible interpretations (‘wenn du, o Agni, in Eile bist/erbeten wirst zum Zusammentreffen der Reichtümer ...’), can only belong with ¹yā ‘drive (fast), speed’. The second meaning (‘you are (being) implored’?) makes little sense in the context.

¹⁶⁴⁹ For the morphological analysis, see, in particular, GARCÍA-RAMÓN 1993a: 76f., with fn. 31.

¹⁶⁵⁰ Thus GOTÖ 167 (‘Zu unserem zur Opferhandlung geeignetem Soma eilt er (Indra) **angefleht** wie ein Roß herbei’), SCARLATA 217; less likely GELDNER: ‘... sprengt er **eilends** her’.

raj ‘colour, become red’: *rajya*^{te}, *lajja*^{te}*rajya*^{te} :

Simplex AV 15.8.1;

+ *vi* ‘become colourless’ ŚB 5.6.2, ViṣṇuSmṛ. 23.6 +*rajya*^{ti} (-*rajja*^{ti}) :ManB 2.4.10 (*upanirajjatu*, ed. JÖRGENSEN +*uparajyatu*) +*lajja*^{te/(ti)} ‘feel shy’ :

[[Med.]] AB 3.22.7 (+); [[Act.]] Smṛ. +

• anticaus.

The rare -ya-present *rajya*^{te} as well as the corresponding transitive-causative *rajaya*^{ti} ‘make colour, redden’¹⁶⁵¹ (AV 1.23.1, probably to be read +*rājaya*-, see JAMISON 151f.) first appear in the AV (prose, book 15):

(AV 15.8.1)

sò 'rajyata. táto rājanyò 'jāyata‘He became red (impassioned).’¹⁶⁵² Therefrom the noble was born.’

Another Vedic occurrence of this -ya-present is found in the late ŚB:

(ŚB 5.6.2)

[...] *yadā* [...] *mitrāṇi vā virajyante*

BOLLÉE apparently follows the indigenous commentator’s glosses *viyojyante vidviṣanti* ‘are disjoined, hate each other’ in his translation (‘if ... friendships are broken’). One might probably stick closer to the basic meaning: ‘... or if friendships become colourless / grow cold’.¹⁶⁵³

The present *lajja*^{te} ‘feel shy’ (← ‘turn red’), derived from the *l*-variant of the root *raj* (with a Prakrit-like change *jy* → *jj*), is attested only once in Vedic (AB 3.22.7; the relevant passage is quoted in Chapter II s.v. *lī*), but becomes very common in post-Vedic Sanskrit. The traditional connection

¹⁶⁵¹ See, in particular, TUCKER 2002: 279.

¹⁶⁵² Thus WHITNEY; AUFRECHT (1850: 134): ‘Er gerieth in Leidenschaft’; CHARPENTIER (1911: 381): ‘Er erglühte’.

¹⁶⁵³ Cf. WERBA [VIA I] 224: ‘seine Farbe wechseln/verlieren, kalt/gleichgültig werden’. Cf. also KA 1.20.8 *cakorasyākṣiṇī virajyete* ‘the eyes of the Cakora-partridge become colourless’; KA 8.5.28 *siddham virajyati* ‘the [newly] acquired [friendship] grows cold’.

with *rajya-te* is accepted by most Sanskritists (cf. WACKERNAGEL 1896 [AiG I]: 163; 1897: 90 [= Kl.Schr. III, 1487]; 1926: 13 [= Kl.Schr. I, 429]; SCHEFTELOWITZ 1913/14: 152; LIEBICH 1920: 34, fn. 1; MAYRHOFER, KEWA III, 86f. (with bibl.); EWAia II, 473); BURROW's (1970: 53) objections do not seem convincing.

Active forms

Active forms do not occur before the post-Vedic period. The Vedic form *rajyati*, repeatedly quoted in Indo-European studies (particularly, as the alleged cognate of Gr. ῥέζω; cf., for instance, DEBRUNNER 1907: 256), must be a hoax. It seems to be based, above all, on PW VI, 230ff. (“*rájyati*, *rájyate*”) and WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]: 134 (“*Pres.* [4.] **rajyati -te** etc. AV¹.E.+”), which, in turn, refer to Pāṇ. 3.1.90 *kuṣi-rajoḥ prācāṃ śyan parasmaipadaṃ ca* ‘[the roots] *kuṣ* [‘tear’] and *raj* [take the class IV present suffix] -ya- and the active ending according to Eastern [grammarians]’. One of the earliest attestations of an active form (with the geminate *jj* ← *jy*) is found in ManB 2.4.10 *ākāśa upanirajjatu* (for which ed. JÖRGENSEN, p. 66 conjectures ⁺*upa rajyatu*) ‘let the heaven become dark’ (JÖRGENSEN: ‘Mag auch der Luftraum sich verfinstern (?)’); see SHARMA 1959/60: 78f. on this form. See also OBERLIES 2003: 492 on Epic forms; and cf. also KA 7.18.42, 8.5.28 *virajyati* ‘grows cold, becomes disaffected’.

Active forms made from the stem *lajja-* are attested from the Smṛtis onwards; cf. e.g. ManuSmṛ. 12.35 *lajjati* (with v.l. *lajjate*, adopted in some eds.); see ed. JOLLY, p. 333, notes ad loc.; PW VI, 489; BÖHTLINGK 1896a: 249; and OBERLIES 2003: 500 for Epic evidence.

ribh ‘creak, rasp (?); sing’: *ribhya-te*

RV 7.76.7

• pass.

The original meaning of the root *ribh* has been determined by JAMISON (2000a: 11f.) as ‘creak, rasp’. Both the class I present *rébha-^{ti}* (RV) and pf. *rirébha* (RV 1.120.6) are employed intransitively (‘sing, raise the voice’).¹⁶⁵⁴

¹⁶⁵⁴ For the intransitive interpretation of the perfect, i.e. ‘ich habe für euch gesungen’, not ‘ich habe euch besungen’ (GELDNER; cf. also GOTÖ 273, fn. 626), see KÜMMEL

A transitive usage can only be reconstructed on the basis of the RVic hapax pass. *ribhyate* (see GOTÖ 273; KÜMMEL 2000: 428, fn. 782):

(RV 7.76.7b)

uṣā uchántī ribhyate vásiṣṭhaiḥ

‘The shining Uṣas is being rasped to by the Vasiṣṭhas.’

ruc ‘shine, glow’

pass. of caus.: *rocya-*^{te}

KaṭhĀ 3.233:94.24 (+)

• pass.

This causative passive appears in Vedic only once, in the KaṭhĀ:

(KaṭhĀ 3.233:94.24)

āgnīdhre rocyeta

‘In the Āgnīdhra-place [the vessel] should be made glow.’¹⁶⁵⁵

²*vas* ‘scorch, burn’: *-uṣya-*^{te}

➡ S.V. *uṣ*

(*vīp* ‘tremble’)

pass. of caus.: *vepya-*^{te}

(AV 19.9.8, mss. *vepyamānā-*; ed. VIŚVA BANDHU ⁺*vepyámāna-*, read with ed. ROTH/WHITNEY ⁺*vépamāna-* ?)

The obscure form *vepyamānā* occurs in the verse AV 19.9.8a, which the

2000: 428, with fn. 781.

¹⁶⁵⁵ WITZEL translates: ‘[i]m Āgnīdhra(zelt) soll er (den Kessel) für sich (ans Feuer) setzen’.

mss. read as *śám no bhúmīr vepyamāñā*¹⁶⁵⁶ ‘weal for us be the quaking earth!’ (WHITNEY); the whole verse is quoted in Chapter III, s.v. *dṛ̥*. *vepyamāñā* might be a participle of the passive of the causative *vepáya-ti* ‘make tremble’ with the abnormal final accent; ed. VIŚVA BANDHU mentions ⁺*vepyámāñā* as a possible emendation. Note, however, that passives of causatives first appear in the YV, and, furthermore, the passive of *vepáya-ti* is unattested elsewhere in Vedic. Ed. ROTH/WHITNEY conjectures a class I present participle ⁺*vépamāna-*.

viṣ ‘be active’: *viṣya-te*

Simplex (β) AVPariś. 64.7.4;¹⁶⁵⁷

+ *pári* (α) ‘serve’ PB 15.7.3, ChU 4.3.5 [ed. MORGENROTH 4.3.4]; (β) ‘surround (with a halo)’ ŚB 5.10.2
• pass.

The fundamentally intransitive verb *viṣ* ‘be active’ can be passivized in compounds with *pári*, with two idiomatic meanings, obviously based on ‘be active around smth.’: (α) ‘serve’, (β) ‘surround’. The passive *-viṣya-te* occurs in three texts of the Sāmavedic tradition:

(α) :

(PB 15.7.3)

yad vai śreṣṭhe ⁺*pariviṣyamāñe* ⁺(*ava*)*vadanty*¹⁶⁵⁸, *annād yasya so*
[']*vagrahaḥ*

‘The blame they utter, whilst a person of high rank is being served with food, is an impediment.’ (CALAND)

(ChU 4.3.5 [ed. MORGENROTH 4.3.4])

atha ha śaunakaṇi ca kāpeyam abhipratāriṇaṇ ca kākṣasenim
pariviṣyamāñau brahmacārī bibhikṣe

‘Now a Brahman-disciple was begging unto Śaunaka Kāpeya and

¹⁶⁵⁶ V.II. *vepyamāñāḥ*, *vepyamāñāḥ*.

¹⁶⁵⁷ The form *viṣyamāñā* (JB 3.279:3), quoted in VWC-Br. II, 1370b s.v. *viṣ* (with fn. f: *arthaḥ?* ‘meaning?’), is derived from the compound *vi-ṣā* (root *sā* ‘bind’; see Chapter VI, s.v.).

¹⁶⁵⁸ CALAND’s conjectures; ed. ^o*viṣyamāño* ‘vadaty’.

Abhipratārin Kākṣaseni, while they were being served (with food).’

Note that the parallel JUB passage has the -ya-intensive instead of the -ya-passive in the ChU:

(JUB 3.1.1.21 [ed. OERTEL 3.1.21])

*tad dha śaunakaṃ ca kāpeyam abhipratāriṇaṃ ca [kākṣasenim]
brāhmaṇaḥ pariveviṣyamāṇā upāvavrāja*

OERTEL translated *pariveviṣyamāṇā* as passive (‘Now unto Çāunaka Kāpeya and Abhipratārin [Kākṣaseni], while they were being waited upon, a Brāhman came’); the passive analysis is also adopted by JAMISON (1983b: 66). GOTŌ (1996b: 108, with fn. 77) rightly points out that -ya-intensives do not change the syntactic properties of the base verb, and thus the form in question can only be employed transitively (absolute construction): ‘indem sie [um jmdn. immer wieder] herum [mit Speisen] geschäftig sind, während sie [jmdn.] bedienen.’ Yet, the context and the parallel ChU passage favour OERTEL’s passive interpretation; see also BODEWITZ 2001: 60, fn. 19 for a convincing argumentation against a transitive analysis. One might assume that the variant attested in the JUB is secondary as against the passive form in the ChU.

(β) :

(ŚB 5.10.2)

athā yadā [...] vijale ca pariviṣyate

‘Then ... if [the moon or sun] is surrounded [with a halo] during a non-rainy weather ...’ (a list of portents)

Other passives

For the passive usage of the -ya-intensive *pariveviṣya-te* attested in the JUB, see above.

vr̥h (br̥h) ‘tear (off)’: -*vr̥hya-te* (-*br̥hya-te*)

-*vr̥hya-te*:

+ *prá* MS^p 2.5.6:54.19 ≈ KS^p 13.2:180.18;

+ *ví* ‘tear (in pieces), destroy’ ŚB 1.3.5.14 (*vívṛhyeta* ≈ ŚBK 2.3.3.9,

v.ll. *vivṛjyate*, *mimṛhyate*, ed. CALAND ⁺*vívṛhyate*), JB

-*br̥hya-te*:
 + *úd* KS^p 34.15:46.16
 • pass. / (anticaus.)

vr̥h and *br̥h* are distinct roots in early Vedic, but by the time of Vedic prose, when the -ya-passives of the former verb appear, they become confused (for details, see NARTEN 1959: 44f., 51f., notes 33-34 [= Kl.Schr. 1, 7f.], MAYRHOFER, EWAia II, 524), so that -*vr̥hya-* and -*br̥hya-* function as variants of one single passive stem. In the YV^p, the main passive stem variant -*vr̥hya-te* is attested with *prá* and -*br̥hya-te* with *úd*. The relevant passages are:

(MS 2.5.6:54.18-19 ≈ KS 13.2:180.18)

*tásyānuháya pádam agr̥hñāt. tásya śapháḥ právr̥hyata. sá ékaśitipād
 abhavat*¹⁶⁵⁹

‘Having caught up with [the black ram], [Prajāpati] seized a foot of his.
 His hoof was torn off. He became one with a single white foot.’

(KS 34.15:46.16)

rakṣasām bhāgadheyam vapāyām udbṛhyamānāyām

‘A share for the Rakṣases lies in the omentum when it is being torn out.’

In the Brāhmaṇas (ŚB, JB), -*vr̥hya-te* occurs only with the preverb *ví*, and, like many other verbs of destruction, can be employed as a non-passive intransitive (anticausative) in some contexts. Examples are:

(JB 1.188:8-9)

*yo ha vā etasmāt sāmno ’tirātra iyād, ahorātrayor ha vai sa rūpeṇa
 vivṛhyeta*

‘Who would miss this sāman [and use another] in the Atirātra, he would
 be torn away¹⁶⁶⁰ from the representation of night and day.’

(JB 1.155:8-10 [ed. CALAND §47])

*ta ime lokā vyavṛhyanta, vi yajño ’vr̥hyata. te devā akāmayanta: sam
 imān lokān dadhyāma, saṃ yajñam dadhyāmeti*

‘These worlds broke apart, the sacrifice broke apart. The gods wished:

¹⁶⁵⁹ The Kāthaka variant of the legend runs: *pādam agr̥hñāt. sa právr̥hyata. sa ékaśitipād abhavat.*

¹⁶⁶⁰ BODEWITZ’s (1990: 106) reflexive translation (‘one would tear away oneself’) seems less probable and cannot be supported by other occurrences of -*vr̥hya-te*, which is only employed in passive or, more rarely, anticausative usages.

“Let us put together these worlds, let us put together the sacrifice”.’

-i-aorist

The non-passive usage of the *-i*-aorist (inj.) *vī varhi* (RV 3.53.17b *méṣā vī varhi mā yugām vī sārī* ‘may the pole not break apart, may the yoke not split’; see KÜMMEL 1996: 108) may be due to the adjacent *-sārī*, which belongs with the non-passive *‘-yá*-present *śīryá-te* (see Chapter III, s.v.).

***vlī* (*plī*, *blī*) ‘oppress; collapse’: *vlīya-te* (JB, SVB *-plīya-te*)**

Simplex ‘be crushed’ (of *Vṛtra*) MS^p 3.9.4:119.6; ‘collapse’ (of the sacrifice) KS^p 21.2:38.22 = KpS^p 31.17:165.14;¹⁶⁶¹ (of the quarters) MS^p 3.2.3:19.2, 3.2.9:29.18, PB 8.8.13; (of the day) PB 12.3.13; (‘dissolve’ MaitrU 6.35, ed. COWELL, ed. VAN BUITENEN *vlīyante*, ed. “32 Up.” [ĀnSS 29] *vlīy°*, v.l. *līy°*, read with ed. “18 Up.” *vi līy°*);¹⁶⁶²

+ *abhi* ‘collapse’ PB 25.10.11;

+ *prā* ‘faint, perish’ ŚB 3.7.3.2, JB 3.267:4¹⁶⁶³ [ed. CALAND §208] (ed. RAGHU VIRA/LOKESH CHANDRA *+prāvlīyata*, mss. *prāūpīyata*, *prāplīyata*), AB 4.19.2 (*pravliyeran*);

+ *vi* ‘open’ SVB 3.9.1 (ed. BURNELL *viplīyante*, ed. SHARMA *+°vlīy°*);

+ *sām* ‘collapse’ (of the quarters) TS^p 5.2.3.4 ≈ KS^p 20.1:19.4 = KpS^p 31.3:150.13, TS^p 5.3.2.2 = KS^p 20.11:31.3 = KpS^p 31.13:161.5, JB 3.16:9 (ed. RAGHU VIRA/LOKESH CHANDRA *sam ... +aplīyata*, mss. *°pluyata*, *°psīyata*¹⁶⁶⁴), 3.40:9 (*aplīyanta*); (of the sacrifice) TB 1.5.4.2

• pass., anticaus.

The *-ya*-present *vlīya-te* is usually considered a passive (cf. WHITNEY

¹⁶⁶¹ KS, ms. *vlīyate*; ed. SCHROEDER, KpS *avliyata*. Ed. SCHROEDER mentions in the crit. app. the reading *ablīyata* attested in the KpS, but ed. RAGHU VIRA reads *avliyata*, with no mention of v.l.

¹⁶⁶² For details, see Chapter II, s.v. *lī*.

¹⁶⁶³ On this passage, see FALK 2001: 138f.

¹⁶⁶⁴ Erroneously interpreted by OERTEL (1935: 126f. [= Kl.Schr. I, 335f.]) as a passive of the verb *psā* ‘chew, devour’. “Pass. **apsīyata** JB.” in WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]: 104 seems to refer to the same occurrence.

1885b [Roots]: 168; MAYRHOFER, EWAia II, 598), referring to the quarters being oppressed by the gods stepping on them.¹⁶⁶⁵ *vlīya-te* may also refer to spontaneous processes, such as the collapse (confusion) of quarters or sacrificial work, and therefore can be qualified as anticausative, rather than passive, in some contexts. Examples are:

(MS 3.2.3:19.1-2)

chándobhir vái devāḥ svargāṃ lokāṃ āyaṃs. té díśā ākramanta. tā avlīyanta

‘With hymns the gods went to the heavenly world. They stepped on the quarters. They (sc. the quarters) were oppressed (/ collapsed).’

(TS 5.2.3.4 ≈ ^UKS 20.1:19.3-4 = KpS 31.3:150.12-13)

téṣāṃ suvargāṃ lokāṃ yatāṃ díśaḥ sám avlīyanta [ed. B.Ind. *ablīy°*]

‘When they (sc. the gods) went to the heavenly world, the quarters were oppressed (/ collapsed).’

Cf. also examples from the AB and JB quoted below.

For some occurrences of *vlīya-te*, the passive interpretation (‘be crushed’) is the only possible analysis, as in:

(MS 3.9.4:119.6)

índro vái vṛtrāya vājram úd ayachat. sò ’vlīyata

‘Indra raised his vajra against Vṛtra. He (sc. Vṛtra) was crushed.’

(PB 25.10.11)

sarasvatyā vai devā ādityam astabhnuvan. sā nāyacchat. sābhy avlīyata. tasmāt sā kubjimatīva

‘By means of Sarasvatī the gods propped the sun. She (sc. Sarasvatī) did not sustain it. She was pressed at. Therefore she is rather sinuous.’¹⁶⁶⁶

In spite of its predominantly passive semantics, *vlīya-te* may be (secondarily) associated with some -ya-presents with fluctuating accentuation denoting spontaneous destruction, such as *kṣīyá-te* ‘perish, disappear’, *chidyá-te* ‘break’, *dīryá-te* ‘crack, split, burst’, *mīyá-te* ‘diminish, perish’, etc.; see Chapters B.III and C.II.3.3. Besides its semantics of collapse, *vlīya-te* shares several other features with some -yá-presents, notably the

¹⁶⁶⁵ For this meaning, see OERTEL 1935: 167f. [= Kl.Schr. I, 376f.]); 1939: 651 [= Kl.Schr. I, 495]; and, especially, HOFFMANN (1960: 23f. [= Aufs. 1, 99f.]).

¹⁶⁶⁶ For this passage, see WITZEL 1984: 231 and 263, note 116; GONDA 1985a: 9. WITZEL erroneously translates: ‘elle (sc. la Sarasvatī) glissait’.

phonological structure (*C(C)īya-*) and the opposition to a transitive-causative nasal (class IX) present (*vlīnāti* YV^p +) ‘make collapse, destroy’. Note also the affinity with the -ya-present *līya-^{te}* ‘dissolve’, for which only root accentuation is attested; see Chapter II, s.v. The historical analysis of *vlī* as going back to *lī* with the preverb *vi* (i.e. ‘dissolve’; thus WEBER 1862: 232), is not accepted nowadays in etymological dictionaries (no mention e.g. in MAYRHOFER, EWAia, s.v.), but at least the secondary relationship of these two roots should not be neglected; cf. especially MaitrU 6.35 *vilīyante*, with v.l. *vlīyante* (see TSUJI 1955: 95), discussed s.v. *lī*.¹⁶⁶⁷

The secondary root variant *plī*, often regarded as mere ms. error,¹⁶⁶⁸ is attested in two texts of the Sāmaveda tradition – in the JB (in particular, in all three JB occurrences of *v/plīya-^{te}*) and in the post-Vedic SVB, where it was discovered (see WEBER 1874 [= Ind.Str. 3, 274]), cf.:

(JB 3.40:8-9)

tato diśo 'paśyan / tāsv ākramanta / tās sam ivāplīyanta

‘Then they saw the quarters. They stepped on them. They (sc. the quarters) were oppressed.’

(SVB 3.9.1)

*dvārāṇi cāsya viplīyante*¹⁶⁶⁹

‘And his doors open.’

The two other JB attestations are 3.267:4 [ed. CALAND §208] (mss. *prāūpīyata*, *prāplīyata*, ed. RAGHU VIRA/LOKESH CHANDRA *prāvlīyata*) and 3.16:9 (mss. *sam ivāpluyata*, *°psīyata*, ed. RAGHU VIRA/LOKESH CHANDRA *°oplīyata*); besides, we find the *p*-variant in *vy-ava-plīnāti* at JB 3.72:1 = 3.82:9. Ed. RAGHU VIRA/LOKESH CHANDRA mostly retains the mss. reading (*p*), but conjectures *prāvlīyata* in 3.267:4. Although in four of the five attestations listed above *p* appears after *v* in the preceding syllable and thus may result from dissimilation *v...v* → *v...p* (LUBOTSKY, p.c.), it also occurs after *pra* (in 3.267:4) and thus may represent a general feature of the

¹⁶⁶⁷ See also GONDA (1936: 196 [= Sel.St. III, 36]): “ $\sqrt{v}lī$ - ... Analogische Bildung (*lī*?)?”.

¹⁶⁶⁸ Cf. BÖHTLINGK’s (1885b: 535) remark on WHITNEY’s record “ $\sqrt{p}lī$ (?)” in his review of WHITNEY 1885b [Roots], ad p. 103 (“**plī** ist einfach zu streichen, da *vi plīyante* ein Fehler für *vi vlīyante* ist”) and HOFFMANN’s (1960: 23f. [= Aufs. 1, 99f.]) emendation for JB 3.72.

¹⁶⁶⁹ Thus ed. BURNELL; ed. SHARMA *°vplīy°*.

Jaiminīya (together with SVB) tradition. SHARMA's emendation for SVB and HOFFMANN's (1960: 23f. [= Aufs. 1, 99f.]) conjecture for JB 3.72 ([°]*vlr*[°] for [°]*plr*[°]) may be then unnecessary.

The third root variant, viz. *blī*, occurs in some mss. of the Kāṭhaka and Kapiṣṭhala traditions. WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]: 168 adduces "*blīya*-[^{te}]" (as a stem variant of *vlīya*-) with the mark "K[āṭhaka]", but I was unable to trace these attestations. In fact, the *b*-variant of the root appears in ed. SCHROEDER only twice, in crit. app. ad KS^p 36.5:72.10 (int. *avevlīyanta*, ms. *aveblī*[°]) and ^ΔKS^p 23.2:75.13-14 (pres. *prā* ... *ávlīnāt*, v.l. ... *ablināt*). Both *b*-readings are attested in Chambers ms. (Ch.). In addition, the *b*-variant is mentioned in SCHROEDER's crit. app. ad KS 21.2:38.22 ([*a*]*vlīyata*) as the reading attested in the parallell passage of the KpS; however, ed. RAGHU VIRA has [*a*]*vlīyata* in the corresponding passage (31.17:165.14). Besides, the stem variant *blīya*- is found at TS 5.2.3.4, in ed. B.Ind.; other eds. (ed. WEBER, ed. ĀnSS) read [°]*vlīya*[°] for the same passage (see above).

The stem variant with the short root vowel (*-vliya*[-]) is attested in the optative form *-vliyeran* met with in the AB:

(AB 4.19.2)

samā iva vai stomā avigūlhā iveme ha na pra vliyeran

'Verily, the stomas are as if alike and as if unprotected; they should not perish.'¹⁶⁷⁰

As I argued elsewhere (KULIKOV 2005a), the shortening of *ī* in *-ya*-passives built on *CRi* roots (cf. also *śriya*-^{te} for *śrīya*-^{te}, discussed in Chapter I, s.v. *śri*) is particularly frequent before the suffix vowel *e* (in particular, in optatives in *-yeta*, *-yeran*). In my view, the variation in *vlīya*- could even support the parallel variation in the class IX present *vlīnāti*,¹⁶⁷¹ which thus

¹⁶⁷⁰ KEITH: 'sink down'.

¹⁶⁷¹ Cf. OERTEL 1935: 167 [= Kl.Schr. I, 376]; HOFFMANN 1968: 42 [= Aufs. 2, 508], note 5. HOFFMANN did not draw any conclusion, but, judging from his list of attested forms, the distribution of the *i*- and *ī*-variants in texts is as follows: the MS, KS, KpS and ŚB have the original short vowel (e.g. (-)*vlīnāti* MS 4.5.5:71.5, 4.8.3.110.9, ŚB 1.6.3.31), while the TS, TB, JB and GB have introduced the long vowel (e.g. (-)*vlīnāti* TB 2.2.5.1, 3.11.8.8, JB 3.72:1 = 3.82:9, GB 2.3.18:205.2). The only exception to this regularity is ŚB *-ávlīnāt*, attested in the late book 13 (13.1.8.1) as against two short vowel forms in ŚB 1.6.3.31 and 5.4.1.17. It seems that we are deling with yet another isogloss shared by the MS, KS (with KpS) and ŚB, as opposed to the TS and TB (with JB and GB); cf. the accentual patterning in *-ya*-presents with fluctuating accentuation

accounts for the rise of the secondary long \bar{i} (for i) in the nasal present.

śam ‘be/become extinguished; be/become appeased’

pass. of caus.: *śāmya*^{-te}

GB

➡ Chapter B.V

ślāgh ‘laud, brag’: *ślāghya*^{-te}

GB 1.2.2:34.4 (+)

• pass.

The class I present *ślāgha*^{-te} (ŚB, GB +) is built on the late Vedic secondary root *ślāgh*, extracted from the noun *ślāghā*- ‘praise, glory’ (GOTÖ 317); its passive counterpart *ślāghya*^{-te} first appears in the GB:

(GB 1.2.2:34.3-4)

athādbiḥ ślāghamāno na snāyāt. tena tām ślāghām avarunddhe yāsyāpsu bhavati. sa ha snātaḥ ślāghīyo ’nyebhyaḥ ślāghyate

‘And he should not bathe when bragging with the waters. Thereby he obtains the bragging which is in his waters. This snāta (initiated householder) is lauded more laudably than the others.’¹⁶⁷²

²***śidh*** ‘repel’: *-śidhya*^{-te}

+ *prati* ‘prohibit’ JB 2.271:4 [ed. CALAND §151] (+)

• pass.

discussed in Chapter C.II.3.2.

¹⁶⁷² On this passage (duties and seven passions of a brahmācārin), see BLOOMFIELD 1899: 110f.

The late -ya-passive -*sidhya*-^{te} 1673 first occurs in the JB (cf. FRENZ 41):

(JB 2.271:4 [ed. CALAND §151])

tad dha badhiro grāme takṣā pratiṣidhyamānaṃ na śuśrāva

‘Now a deaf carpenter in the village did not hear the prohibition [of the father].’¹⁶⁷⁴

²*sū* ‘generate, bear, beget’: *sūya*-^{te}

[**pass.**] ‘be produced’:

Simplex ManB 1.5.1 *sūyatām* (≈ TB^m 3.7.14.4-5^{2x} = TĀ-Āndhra^m 45 [= MNU ed. VARENNE 388] *śīyatām*), MaitrU 6.16, (6.7 *sūyamānāt* ≈ MaitrāyaṇyU 5.7 *sūyamānatvāt*; or from √¹*sū* ‘impel; consecrate’?);

+ *pra* ŚB 5.11.2, MānŚS^v 9.2.5.16 (= MānŚulbS^v 2.5.16) +

[**tr.**] ‘produce’:

Simplex AVPariś.; + *pra* ĀgnivGS^v 2.7.6:112.4, Smṛ., Ep. +

The passive of ²*sū* ‘generate, beget’ first appears at the very end of the Vedic period, in the late ŚB (cf. GOTÖ 1991: 699).¹⁶⁷⁵

(ŚB 5.11.2)

atha yadāśya gavāṃ mānuṣamahīṣvyajāśvoṣṭrāḥ prasūyante ...

‘And if from his cows human beings, buffalos, goats, horses or camels are born...’ (from the list of portents connected with Rudra)

To the same root probably belongs another (late Vedic or early post-Vedic) attestation of this compound in the MānŚS^v:

(MānŚS^v 9.2.5.16 (= MānŚulbS^v 2.5.16))

etāḥ sarvāḥ yajuṣmatyo ’yābhir agnir prasūyate ¹⁶⁷⁶

¹⁶⁷³ Not to be confused with the active -ya-present of the homonymous root ¹*sidh* ‘succeed’ (cf. GONDA 1936: 173 [= Sel.St. III, 13]); see Chapter V, s.v.

¹⁶⁷⁴ For the construction *śru* ‘hear’ + present participle, see OERTEL 1941: 104 [= Kl.Schr. II, 1473].

¹⁶⁷⁵ Not to be confused with the occurrences of the well-attested pass. *sūya*-^{te} ‘be consecrated’, which belongs primarily with the verb ¹*sū* ‘impel’, but could have been secondarily associated with ²*sū* ‘beget, generate’ (see Chapter I, s.v.).

¹⁶⁷⁶ Mss. °*sūryate*, °*suryate*.

‘These are all [bricks] with sacrificial formulas with which the fire [altar] is being constructed.’

The majority of other rare occurrences of this passive in more recent (early post-Vedic) texts (ManB, MaitrU) are uncertain and/or ambiguous. The imperative *sūyatām* in ManB 1.5.1 is the secondary substitute for *śīyatām* ‘let [the weal] fall’ in the original mantra TB^m 3.7.14.4-5 = TĀ-Āndhra^m 45 [= MNU ed. VARENNE 388] (see Chapter III, s.v. *śī*): ... *sūyatām rayiḥ* ‘let the wealth be produced’.¹⁶⁷⁷

Both morphologically and semantically unclear is also an occurrence in the MaitrU, in a scholarly discussion of the origin of the names of gods:

(MaitrU 6.7 ≈ MaitrāyaṇyU 5.7)

*śaśvat sūyamānāt*¹⁶⁷⁸ *sūryaḥ. savanāt savitā*

Among possible interpretations of the polysemous *sūyamāna-* (‘being pressed’, ‘being impelled, consecrated’, ‘being generated’), the one given by the indigenous commentator Rāmātīrtha (*sūyamānāt savakaraṇāt sūryaḥ sūryo hi prātarādisavanakartā prasiddha ity arthaḥ*) and adopted by COWELL (‘from the Soma being continually expressed (*su*) he is called *sūrya*’)¹⁶⁷⁹ seems most forceful. VAN BUITENEN (1962: 136, with fn. 57) reckons this occurrence to ²*sū* ‘generate, produce’ (albeit not ruling out the meaning ‘press’): ‘Sūrya is called thus, because it is perpetually produced. Savitā is thus called, because of the impelling’. It seems that the meaning ‘consecrate’ (√¹*sū*) is also possible in this context: ‘Sūrya [is called thus], because it is perpetually consecrated.’

For Epic attestations of this passive (not infrequently with active inflection), see OBERLIES 2003: 533.

***sūya-^{te}* (tr.).** The post-Vedic transitive *-ya*-present *sūya-^{te}* ‘produce’ (mostly with *pra*) is in competition with the old root present *sūte* (RV +) and occurs from the late Sūtras onwards (ĀgnivGS^v, Smṛ.¹⁶⁸⁰); see GOTÖ 1991: 698; OBERLIES 2003: 533. The origin of this formation is unclear; it does not conform to any productive morphological model and does not fit any of the main semantic subclasses of the middle non-passive *-ya*-presents. The only possible parallel is *hūya-^{te}* for *hvaya-^{te}*

¹⁶⁷⁷ Or: ‘impelled’ (?); cf. GOTÖ 1991: 699, fn. 149.

¹⁶⁷⁸ MaitrāyaṇyU reads *sūyamānatvāt*, which is also recommended by VAN BUITENEN (1962: 136, fn. 57); note, however, that *sūyamānatvāt* can hardly be syntactically connected with the adverb *śaśvat*. In any case, the syntax of the sentence is quite infelicitous.

¹⁶⁷⁹ As COWELL explains, “the sun by his rising, culmination, and setting, determines the three times for the soma libations”. Likewise DEUSSEN (1897: 334): ‘*Sūrya* heißt so, weil fort und fort [Soma] gekeltert wird.’

¹⁶⁸⁰ For instance, at ViṣṇuSmṛ. 88.1, ManuSmṛ. 10.27-36.

‘call’ (see Chapter I, s.v.).

²*sr̥* ‘stretch’: *-sriya-te*

+ *prá* ‘stretch’ KS^p 11.4:148.9

- anticaus.

pass. of caus.: *-sārya-te*

+ *prá* ‘be extended’ JB, GobhGS 3.6.7

¹*sr̥* ‘run, speed’ and ²*sr̥* ‘stretch’ are two synchronically distinct (albeit probably genetically related) roots (NARTEN 1969a [= Kl.Schr. 1, 125ff.]; see also WERBA [VIA I] 256f.); their IVSs are summarized by NARTEN, op.cit., 98 [= Kl.Schr. 1, 142]. The hapax *-ya*-present *-sriyate*, attested in the KS, belongs with the latter verbal root and, according to NARTEN, op.cit., 91f. [= Kl.Schr. 1, 137], replaces the older reduplicated middle present (*śísratām* AV 1.11.1):

(KS 11.4:148.9)

so ’napobdho vīryāya pra sriyate

‘He, unbound, stretches to the heroic power.’

Although the only attested form is unaccented, by virtue of the phonological structure of the root (*Cṛ*), this *-ya*-present can only have the accent on the suffix: **sriyáte*. However, semantically *-sriya-te* undoubtedly belongs with the non-passive middle *-ya*-presents (class IV), together with other pseudo-passives of the type *mriyáte* (see KULIKOV 1997 and Chapter C.II.3.2). Specifically, it perfectly fits in the class of verbs of motion and body posture (see Chapter C.II.2), cf. esp. the synonymous *r̥jya-te* ‘stretches’.

***-i*-aorist**

For the *-i*-aorist *prāsāri* ŚB 1.1.4.8, which belongs with *pra-sriyate*, see NARTEN 1969a; KÜMMEL 1996: 128f.

Caus. pass.

To the IVS of the verb ²*sr̥* also belong the causative *-sāraya-ti/te* RV 10.56.5, YV + ‘stretch, extend’ (tr.) and its passive counterpart (also attested

only with *pra*), which first occurs in the Brāhmaṇas (JB),¹⁶⁸¹ cf.:

(JB 1.318:5-6)

yato vai garbhāḥ prasāryante, 'tha jāyante

‘When the embryos are extended, then they are born.’

styā ‘become coagulated, stiff’: *-styāya-^{te}*

+ *nī(h)*¹⁶⁸² ‘become coagulated’ AVP 2.39.1 ≈ VS 6.15 ≈ 38.18

• anticaus.

The intransitive *-ya*-present *-styāya-^{te}* derived from the root *styā*¹⁶⁸³ occurs only in a few related mantras in the AVP and VS:

(AVP 2.39.1 (≈ VaitS 24.1))

*yat te grāvā bāhucyuto⁺ acucyon¹⁶⁸⁴ ' naro yad vā te hastayor adhukṣan
tat ta ā pyāyatām tat te nī ṣtyāyatām soma rājan*

‘Was von dir der armgeschüttelte Pressstein erschüttert hat oder was von dir die Männer in ihren Hände gemolken haben, das soll dir (wieder) anschwellen, das soll dir (wieder) fest werden, König Soma.’ (ZEHNDER)

(VS 6.15.f)

*yāt te krūrām yād āsthītām, tát ta ā pyāyatām nī ṣtyāyatām, tát te
śudhyatu*

‘Whatever is wounded in you, whatever [sore] is arisen in you, let it swell up and become coagulated for you, let it be cleansed for you.’

Since *-styāya-^{te}* occurs only in one fixed collocation, adjacent to the phonologically and semantically similar *-pyāya-^{te}*, it may be a nonce formation, emerged under the influence of the latter present (see INSLEER 1987: 61f.; LUBOTSKY 1997d: 57f.) and grouped with the class IV middle

¹⁶⁸¹ See OERTEL 1935: 178 [= Kl.Schr. I, 387].

¹⁶⁸² *nī* in *nī-ṣtyāyatām* may represent *nīh-* in sandhi, according to Vājasaneyi-Prātiś. (see ed. WEBER, p. 192 and cf. WERBA [VIA I] 413).

¹⁶⁸³ On possible etymological connections of this root, see, in particular, RASMUSSEN 1987 [= RASMUSSEN 1999: 302ff.]. On possible morphological analyses of *-styāya-^{te}*, see LIV 603, note 2 s.v. *?*stjēH-*.

¹⁶⁸⁴ Thus in the VaitS; the AVP mss. have *acakron*.

presents, denoting spontaneous change of state.¹⁶⁸⁵

***sthā* ‘stand’: *sthāya*-^{te}**

Simplex [caus. pass. or non-pass. intr.] ‘be established’, ‘stand’ AVPariś., late Up. +;

+ *ādhi* [pass.] ‘be stood upon’ KSP 13.3:182.1;

+ *ūpa* [pass.] ‘be attended, served’ KSP 7.5:66.18-19 = KpSP 5.4:53.14;

+ *ni*[s] [caus. pass.] ‘be placed’ BaudhŚS

• pass.

pass. of caus.: *sthāpya*-^{te}

Simplex VaitS 16.2;¹⁶⁸⁶

+ *ut* ‘remove’ AB 7.27.2

+ *prati* ‘put down’ JB 1.21:2 (*prati-ṣṭhāpyamānam* ≈ ŚB etc. *ud-vāsyā*-^{te});¹⁶⁸⁷

+ *sam* ‘accomplish’ GB 1.2.9:42.9¹⁶⁸⁸

The fundamentally intransitive verb *sthā* can be passivized in secondary transitives with preverbs as well as in causatives. Examples are:

- with *ādhi*:

(KS 13.3:181.22-182.1)

*yadā sahasraṃ paśūn prāpnuyād, atha vaiṣṇavaṃ vāmanaṃ ā labheta
pratiṣṭhityā. etasmin vai tat sahasraṃ adhy atiṣṭhat. sa vy aiṣad
adhiṣṭhīyamānaḥ*

‘If he obtains a thousand head of cattle, then he should sacrifice a
dwarfish [bull] dedicated to Viṣṇu, [for the cattle] to have a firm stand.
For then a thousand [head of cattle] were standing upon this [dwarf =
Viṣṇu]. He went asunder as [he was] being stood upon [by the cattle].’¹⁶⁸⁹

¹⁶⁸⁵ For the meaning, see, in particular, CHARPENTIER 1919: 9ff.

¹⁶⁸⁶ For this passage, see CALAND & HENRY 120ff.

¹⁶⁸⁷ For the meaning, see BODEWITZ 1973: 69f., note 2.

¹⁶⁸⁸ For KSP 26.10:135.6 *yajñas saṁsthāpyate na* (thus ed. SCHROEDER against mss.) read with KpS 41.8:245.4-5 (cf. RAGHU VIRA, Introduction to ed. KpS, p. 29) *yajñam saṁsthāpya tena*; see MITTWEDE 1989 [Textkr. zur KS]: 127.

¹⁶⁸⁹ I have greatly benefited from discussing the interpretation of this passage with Ch. H. WERBA (letter of 7.5.1998) and W. KNOBL, to whom my sincerest thanks go.

- with *úpa*:

(KS 7.5:66.18-19 = KpS 5.4:53.14)

kasmai kam agnir upasthīyata iti

‘For what [purpose], well, is Agni worshipped on [with prayers]?’¹⁶⁹⁰

The passivizability of the compounds like *ádhi-ṣṭhā* points to the fact that, at least in the Saṃhitā prose, they could be considered as true transitives rather than intransitives with goal accusatives, as was the case in early Vedic; for the problem in general and the syntax of *ádhi-ṣṭhā* in particular, see HETRICH 1991: 39ff., 46 et passim and Chapter C.II.1.3.2 below.

Passives of the simplex first appear in late post-Vedic texts (AVPariś., late Up.) and behave as causative passives (see below), meaning ‘is established, put, placed’, or as non-passive intransitives (cf. PW VII, 1287: “pass. = simpl.”), e.g. in Yogaśikhopaniṣad 1.127b *vāyunā sthīyate sthiram* ‘by breath the steadfastness is established’. To the same type belongs the passive of the compound with *ni[s]* attested in the BaudhŚS:

(BaudhŚS 10.21:19.15-17)

iti nvā iyaṃ prathamā citir niṣṭhīyata; evam eva dvitīyā niṣṭhīyata, evaṃ tṛtīyaivaṃ caturthaivaṃ pañcamī

‘Thus, indeed, this first layer is being placed; thus, verily, the second is being placed, thus the third, thus the fourth, thus the fifth.’

This “causative” usage may originate in the quasi-synonymy of the non-causative and causative -*tá*-participles, viz. *sthitá-* ‘standing’ (RV +) and (more recent) *sthāpita-* (GB +) ‘established, placed’ (lit. ‘made stand’), almost indistinguishable in some contexts: *sthāpita-* ≈ *sthitá-* :: *sthāpyate* ≈ *sthīyate*.

Caus. pass.

Passives built to the causative *sthāpáya-*^{ti/te} (RV_{I,X}+) first appear in the Brāhmaṇas. Examples are:

- with *ut*:

(AB 7.27.1-2)

[1] *pāpasya vā ime karmaṇaḥ kartāra āsate, ’pūtāyai vāco vaditāro yac chyāparṇā. imān utthāpayata. [...] tān utthāpayāṃ cakrus. [2] te hotthāpyamānā ruruvire*

‘[1] “Here are sitting the Śyāparṇas, these doers of an evil deed, [these] speakers of impure speech. Make these here stand up [from the sacrificial

¹⁶⁹⁰ For this ceremony (agniyupasthāna), see GONDA 1980a: 8ff.; 1980b: 458ff.; 1989b: 29, 48f.

ground]! [...]” They made them stand up. [2] Being made to stand up, they called out loud ...’

- with *sam*:

(GB 1.2.9:42.8-9)

yajño 'dbhir pravartate, 'psu samsthāpyate

‘The sacrifice starts with waters, [and] in waters it is being accomplished.’

(*-i/-ran-aorist*)

The form *-asthiran* (RV, AV) can be grouped with the medio-passive *-i*-aorist only from the formal point of view. It does not belong with the (more recent) *-yá*-passives, being incorporated into the root aorist paradigm (as in the case of some other *ā* roots) as the replacement of the morphologically opaque form with the regular 3pl. ending (**asthata?*) (see KÜMMEL 1996: 137f.).

sphā ‘fatten, swell; prosper’: *-sphāya-^{te}* (*sphīya-^{te}*)

(-)*sphāya-^{te}*:

+ *ud* AVP 8.11.11

sphīya-^{te}:

SVB 3.3.1

• anticaus.

The only Vedic attestation of the present *sphāya-^{te}*, which used to be known from Indian lexicographers only (DhP I 516; see ed. BÖHTLINGK, p. 65*),¹⁶⁹¹ is encountered in the AVP:

(AVP 8.11.10a, 11)

sphātir me astu hastayoḥ [...]

iha me bhūya ā bhara 'yathāhaṃ kāmāye tathā

yathedam ud ⁱva *sphāyātai* 'traya ⁱva *hastinaḥ saha*

‘Let there be prosperity in my hands... [...] Bring me more here, so [much] as I wish, so that this [world of mine] may grow up rather fat, like

¹⁶⁹¹ Thus quoted in PW VII, 1371; WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]: 197.

three elephants together.’

Like most *CCā* roots, *sphā* does not show ablaut in the *-ya*-stem. The zero grade stem variant appears in the post-Vedic SVB:

(SVB 3.3.1)

gāḥ prakālyamānāś copakālyamānāś ca sadopatiṣṭheta. gavyo ṣu ṇa ity etābhyāṃ sphīyante

‘One should always worship cows when they are being driven out [to a pasture] and when they are being driven back home. “In our desire for cows, [horses, chariots, create] rightly for us ...” [= SV 1.186-187 (= ed. BENFEY 1.2.2.5.2-3) = RV 8.46.10 and RV 8.6.19]; through these two [verses] they grow fat.’¹⁶⁹²

sphā is one of the parade examples of the so-called long diphthong roots (**sphēi* in earlier notation), and *sphāya-te* was usually analysed as a class I present (*sphāy-a-te*),¹⁶⁹³ but, synchronically, it can readily be grouped with the non-passive middle *-ya*-presents. Like the phonologically and semantically similar *pyāya-te* and *-ṣṭyāya-te*, *sphāya-te* (together with its late variant *sphīya-te*) denotes spontaneous, non-controllable processes and belongs with the verbs of change of state.

smṛ ‘remember’: *smāya-te*

TĀ^m 1.12.1, Sū., late Up. +
• agentless pass.

The passive *smāya-te* first appears in a late Vedic mantra:

(TĀ^m 1.12.1)

asaṃkhyātāḥ sahasrāṇi smaryate na ca dṛśyate

‘[The manifestations of Rudra are] innumerable, [there are] thousands; [he] can be remembered but cannot be seen.’

¹⁶⁹² For a discussion of this passage, see also EINO 2004: 40. I am thankful to W. KNOBL for valuable comments on this passage.

¹⁶⁹³ Cf. e.g. WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1896 [AiG I]: 88; OSTHOFF 1910: 97; PERSSON 705f., 717; CHARPENTIER 1912b: 127f.; and, most recently, RASMUSSEN 1989: 28, 62; see also MAYRHOFER, EWAia II, 776f.

smarya^{te} becomes frequent in the Sūtras, where it is typically employed in the terminological sense ‘be stated/taught in the Smṛtis’, as in:

(ĀpDhS 2.4.24 = HirDhS 2.1.77)

brāhmaṇa ācāryaḥ smaryate tu

‘It is stated in the Smṛtis [that] a Brahman [alone may be] a teacher.’

hi(m)s ‘injure, harm’: *-hiṃsyamāna-*

Simplex RV 1.141.5

• pass.

The passive of the secondary root *hiṃs* is attested in the RVic hapax *āhiṃsyamānaḥ*:

(RV 1.141.5ab)

ād īn māṭṭr āviśad yās_uv ā śúcir ‘*āhiṃsyamāna* urviyā ví vāvṛdhe

‘Then he (sc. Agni) entered the mothers, in whom he, bright, suffering no harm, has widely grown in different directions.’

The old theory about the desiderative origin of the quasi-root *hiṃs* (supposedly extracted from the desiderative of *han* ‘kill’) is nowadays abandoned (cf. MAYRHOFER, EWAia II, 821; for a discussion, see especially LÜDERS 1935: 114ff. [= Phil.Ind., 774ff.]). Most likely, *hiṃs* is extracted from the nasal present stem *hinás-/hiṃs-* by reinterpretation of 3pl. *hiṃsanti* as a thematic formation; for details, see LÜDERS, op.cit., 118f. [= Phil.Ind., 778f.].

V. Active -ya-presents

as ‘throw, shoot’: *ás_(i)ya^{-ti/te}*

ásya^{-ti} :

RV + (also with preverbs)¹⁶⁹⁴

accented: RV +¹⁶⁹⁵

• tr.

ásya^{-te}

Simplex [pass.] AĀ 2.3.5 +

with preverbs: [tr.-aff.] RV +;

[pass.] Sū. +

The transitive present *ásya^{-ti/(te)}*¹⁶⁹⁶ is typically constructed with the

¹⁶⁹⁴ See, in particular, JAMISON 1991a: 115f. on *nír-as* ‘cast out, expel’; HOFFMANN 1957a: 95 [= Aufs. 2, 429f.], with fn. 29, on *páry-as* ‘abort’.

¹⁶⁹⁵ The abnormal suffix accentuation is attested in MS 3.9.4:119.14 *prāsyāti* ‘he throws [the sacrificial post]’. CALAND (1918: 10 [= Kl.Schr., 246]) emends the number, but leaves the accent as it is (**prāsyānti*); read with DELBRÜCK (1888 [AiS]: 502) and MINARD (1956: 173, [§]422, with fn. a) **prāsyati* (see MITTWEDE 1986 [Textkr. zur MS]: 138 for discussion and bibl.).

¹⁶⁹⁶ The secondary stem variant without *y* – in particular, before the optative *e* – sporadically occurs in post-Vedic texts, for instance, in MānŚS 10.3.5.22, 11.7.1.6^{2x} *ny-aset*, MānŚS 11.7.1.6 *vi-ny-aset*, ĀpDhS 1.27.8 *abhy-aset* (~ HirDhS 1.7.33 *abhy-asyet*; cf. RENOU 1947b: 193), in the Smṛtis (ManuSmṛ. 3.226 *vi-ny-aset*, ManuSmṛ. 6.46 *ny-aset*, ManuSmṛ. 6.94 *saṃ-ny-aset*; see BÖHTLINGK 1896a: 249f.; M. LEUMANN 1968b: 58; YājñSmṛ. 2.103, 3.35 *ny-aset*); in BhāgP 7.12.24 *ny-aset*; for Epic forms, see OBERLIES 2003: 197, 390. Although we find a few instances of non-optative forms without *y* (e.g. ManuSmṛ. 3sg.med. *°abhyasate*; see BÖHTLINGK, *ibid.*; M. LEUMANN, *ibid.*; for Epic forms, see OBERLIES 2003: 390), the obvious preponderance of optative forms among attestations of this secondary class I present

accusative of weapon and with the dative or locative of goal, or, more rarely, with the goal accusative (see DELBRÜCK 1869: 84; 1888 [AiS]: 144; 1897: 27; OERTEL 1937: 28 [= Kl.Schr. II, 889]; HAUDRY 252f.; KRISCH (2006 [RIVELEX 1]: 645ff.; HETTRICH 2007: 16ff.), cf.:

(RV 1.103.3c)

vidvān vajrin dāsyave hetīm asya

‘Throw, O vajra-holder, skilfully the weapon at the Dasyu.’

Another syntactic pattern, with the instrumental of the weapon being thrown, is attested in:

(RV 2.24.8c)

tāsya sādhvīr īṣavo yābhir āsyati

‘Unerring are his (sc. Brahmanaspati’s) arrows, with which he shoots.’

This rare construction (see, in particular, HETTRICH 2007: 17) must be secondary; HAUDRY’s (ibid.) speculations on the original character of this usage (in his terms, “modèle 1”) do not seem convincing.

āsyā^{ti} is the only *-ya*-present which occurs with the trisyllabic (i.e. distracted) stem: *-as_iya-* (RV 4.30.20, 10.72.8, 10.138.4).¹⁶⁹⁷ All the three occurrences of the trisyllabic stem are 3sg. imperfects (vy *ās_iyat*) attested at the pāda end (see NEISSER 1902: 9 [= Kl.Schr., 177]; ARNOLD 1905: 95; SOMMER 1977a: 39; SEEBOLD 1972: 288; HOFFMANN 1982: 69 [= Aufs. 3, 775]). The trisyllabic stem is also attested in RVKh. 5.15.2 (*pārās_iyaḥ*; see HOFFMANN, ibid.) and in the AV – again in an imperfect form:

(AV 20.128.13cd)

tvām rauhiṇām v_iy ās_iyo ' ví vṛtrāsyābhinac chīraḥ

‘Du schleudertest den *rauhiṇā* [ein Epithet des Ahi] auseinander (d.h. zerstückeltest ihn), zerspaltetest den Schädel des Vṛtra.’ (H.-P. SCHMIDT 1963b: 301)

SOMMER accounts for this peculiarity through the length of the root vowel, which has triggered the Sievers’ law – in contrast with the *-ya*-stems with the supposedly recent vowel length, such as *śrāmya-*, *jūrya-*, *śīrya-*. It

clearly shows that the starting point for the rise of the present *asa*^{ti/te} was the 3sg./pl.opt. form. The loss of *y* in compounds has probably been supported by dissimilation processes after preverbs in *-i* (M. LEUMANN, ibid.; GOTŌ 85). For details, see KULIKOV 2005a: 307f.

¹⁶⁹⁷ Probably also in RV 3.24.1 *āpās_iya* (A. LUBOTSKY, p.c.).

seems that most -ya-presents have generalized the non-distracted stem variant regardless of the quantity of the root syllable, while the trisyllabic stem -āsiya- (in accordance with SCHINDLER's rule; see Chapter A.I.3) could be preserved under the influence of the type *Cyāti* (cf., especially, the phonologically similar -siyāti), which commonly displays the distracted stem (*Ciyā-*; see below, Chapter VI).

Middle forms

Middle forms occur in Vedic only in compounds,¹⁶⁹⁸ except for one attestation in the AĀ, for which see below. The middle diathesis typically expresses the self-beneficent meaning: 'throw, put for oneself' etc. Examples are:

- with *ādhi*:

(JB 3.359:13-14)

sa yathā hastī hastenādāya prṣṭhye 'dhyasyetaivam evaiṣā devataitad vidvāṃsam urubhī raśmibhir ādāya varīyasv adhy asyate

'Wie etwa ein Elefant mit dem Rüssel nehmend sich (etwas) auf das Rückenteil setzt, so setzt diese Gottheit einen, der dies weiß, mit den breiten Strahlen nehmend auf die breiteren (Strahlen).' (Hoffmann 1960: 34f. [= Aufs. 1, 110f.])

- with *āpi*:

(AB 6.30.14)

atha tvam etaṃ hotar upariṣṭād raudryai dhāyāyāi purastān mārutasyāpy asyāthāḥ

'Then you, O hotar, after the dhāyā[-stanza]1699 to Rudra (= RV 1.43.6) [and] before [the hymn] to the Maruts insert this [Evayāmarut-hymn] (= RV 5.87).'

- with *ūpa*:

(TS 1.6.10.1)

yā evāinaṃ pratyutpīṣṭe, tām ūpāsyate

'Whoever rises against him in revolt, that one he subdues to himself.'¹⁷⁰⁰

The middle diathesis can also express the indirect reflexive meaning, as

¹⁶⁹⁸ Cf. Kāty., Vārtt. 3 on Pāṇ. 1.3.29; see LIEBICH 1891: 84.

¹⁶⁹⁹ An additional stanza inserted here between two hymns.

¹⁷⁰⁰ For *ūpa+asya-*^{te}, see, in particular, BRADKE 1883-84: 175.

in:

(AB 2.11.1)

te devāḥ pratibudhyāgnimayīḥ puras tripuram pary āsyanta

‘The gods, having noticed [that attack of the demons], placed around themselves a triple fortification consisting of citadels made of fire.’

The compound *ā+as* displays the idiomatic semantic development, parallel to the middle forms of *ā-dā* ‘take’ (~ ¹*dā* ‘give’) and some other compounds with *ā*:

(TS 2.5.9.6)

ghṛtāvātīm adhvaryo srúcam āsyasva

‘O adhvaryu, take the spoon full of ghee.’

For the middle *vi-pary-asyate* with the reflexive object *ātmānam* (‘[die Sonne] dreht sich um’ or ‘wirft sich auf die andere Seite’) in AB 3.44.7, see SIEG 1923: 2 [= Kl.Schr., 325].

Another occurrence of the compound with *pāri*, taken by some interpreters as intransitive, occurs in a difficult AVic passage, dedicated to the sun:

(AV 13.2.43ab)

abhy ānyād eti páry anyád asyate ‘¹horātrābhyāṃ mahiṣāḥ kálpamānaḥ

LUDWIG (1878: 543) renders *páry asyate* as passive (‘eines kommt heran, das andere **wird umgestürzt**; mit [dem wechsel von] tag und nacht gestaltet der fürst sich’), HENRY (1891: 13) – as non-passive intransitive (anticausative) (‘L’un [de ses deux aspects] vient vers [nous], l’autre **se retourne**, | [tel est] le buffle adaptant [successivement] au jour et à la nuit’), with *anyát* ‘one [of the two aspects (*rūpām*)¹⁷⁰¹ of Rohita]’. However, the intransitive usage of *asyate* has no parallels in the mantra language, and the passive usage is not attested until very late texts (AĀ, Sūtras; see below).

More likely is WHITNEY’s transitive analysis (cf. also *paryāsyanta* in AB 2.11.1 quoted above): ‘The one he falls upon (*ābhi-i*), the other he **casts** about, the bull ...’; cf. also ELIZARENKOVA (2010: 31): ‘К одной (форме) он приближается, другую **отбрасывает**’. *anyád* may refer to one of the two forms of Sūrya, as SIEG (1923: 3f. [= Kl.Schr., 326f.]) explains (‘in die eine (Erscheinungsform) geht über, die andere wirft herum der Büffel, sich anpassend an Tag und Nacht’); likewise HILLEBRANDT 1924/25: 114

¹⁷⁰¹ See HENRY, op.cit., 44.

[= Kl.Schr., 250] ('die andere (Form) legt er (als Gewand) herum').

A non-passive intransitive (anticausative) construction with the reciprocal meaning is attested for the compound *sam-asya-^{te}*:

(JB 3.360:11)

ta ūrayas samāsyanta phā3l phā2l iti

'These waves collided with [the sound] *phāl-phāl*.' (see HOFFMANN 1970: 63ff. [= Aufs. 2, 519ff.]; STRUNK 1983: 27, fn. 37)

Finally, middle forms appear as (secondary and more recent) variants of the corresponding active forms in parallel passages, cf. KB 30.1.18 *aupāsanāṁs tṛtīyasavana upāsyanti* 'they offer the sacrificial cakes [for the fathers] at the third pressing' ≈ GB 2.4.5:213.10 *atha yad aupāsanaṁ tṛtīyasavana upāsyante*. The opposite chronological relation is attested for the mantra *ayāṁ yājamāno mṛdho vy āsyatām / °tu* (TB 2.5.3.3 = ĀpŚS 7.16.7 ≈ ĀśŚS 2.10.18) 'let this sacrificer expel away (his) enemies', where the TB and ĀpŚS attest the middle imperative, while the ĀśŚS has the corresponding active form (see BLOOMFIELD & EDGERTON 1930 [Ved. Var. I]: 45; AITHAL 1986: 59).

Passives

The earliest attestation of a simplex middle form appears in the AĀ and occurs in the passive usage:¹⁷⁰²

(AĀ 2.3.5)

akṛtsno hy eṣa ātmā yad vāg; abhi hi prāṇena manase 'syamāno, vācā nānubhavati

'For the self which is speech is incomplete; since [a person] understands when being driven to thought by breath, not by speech.'¹⁷⁰³

For compounds of *as*, the passive usage is attested from the Sūtras onwards. Examples are:

(ĀpŚS 24.2.18)

atha yāni na samasyante, pradakṣiṇaṁ tāni

'And those [cords] which are not composed [from different smaller cords he should wind] rightwards.'

¹⁷⁰² Cf. GONDA 1951: 30.

¹⁷⁰³ For this difficult passage, see KEITH, ad loc.

(MānŚS 5.2.9.5)

yāny avyayāny anekāni, tāni dvir abhyasyante

‘The indeclinable words which are related to many things are repeated twice.’

Cf. also VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 4.11 = VādhS [ed. CALAND] 4.27:13ff. *vy-asyate* ‘[the womb] (?) is opened [for impregnation],’¹⁷⁰⁴ (cf. Gr̥Sū.^m [v]*yasya yonim* ‘open the womb’ discussed below, s.v. *yas*).

It is interesting to note that the Young Avestan cognate *aṃha*-¹⁷⁰⁵ (with middle morphology) is also attested in the passive usage as a simplex, while its compound (with *ni*-) appears in a transitive construction:

(Y 57.28)

*āsiiaṃha huuastaiiā aṃhəmnaiiā*¹⁷⁰⁶

‘[They are] faster than two well-launched [arrows] when being launched.’

(Yt 19.67)

^x*niiaṃhəmnō*¹⁷⁰⁷ *paoirīš vōiṃnā*

‘[The river Haētumant], ... sending down many floodings.’

ār ‘recognize, treat as an ārya’: (-)*ārya*-^{ti}

+ *ā* (?) RV 8.16.6, 10.48.3

accented: RV +

• tr.

The present *āryanti* is attested twice in the RV. WHITNEY (1885b [Roots]: 6) takes this formation as a compound *ā* + *aryanti*, supposedly derived from the root *ṛ/ar* ‘move’, which suggests an improbable semantic shift. By contrast, NEISSER (1924 [Zum Wb. des RV I]: 38), and, subsequently, WERBA [VIA I] 449 posit a separate root (WERBA: IIr. **Hār* (?)), meaning ‘rühmen’ (NEISSER) or ‘anerkennen’ (MAYRHOFER, WERBA,

¹⁷⁰⁴ CALAND (1928: 132 [= Kl.Schr., 432]) hesitantly translates: ‘sich auseinander tun, die Beine auseinander tun’; for the erotic connotations of the preverb *vi* in this context, see Chapter IV, s.v. *yabh*.

¹⁷⁰⁵ See, in particular, LIV 242f., with note 5.

¹⁷⁰⁶ For this reading see HOFFMANN & NARTEN 1989: 57.

¹⁷⁰⁷ On this form, see HINTZE 1994: 314, with bibl.

LIV 271¹⁷⁰⁸). More likely is OLDENBERG's (Noten ad 1.101.4) analysis of *āryanti* as a denominative derived from *ārya-*, thus meaning 'treat as an *ārya*-'; see also GELDNER 1901 [VSt III]: 94; MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 172; LIV 270, note 3. Both occurrences are employed transitively. Although most scholars believe that the stem is trisyllabic (*ār̥ya-*) in RV 8.16.6ab (ARNOLD 1905: 95; SEEBOLD 1972: 288; VAN Nooten & Holland) – which is unusual for the non-secondary -ya-presents¹⁷⁰⁹ – this analysis is in fact not required by the metre of the corresponding pāda:

(RV 8.16.6ab)

tām ic cyaut_anāir āryanti ' tām kṛtébhiś carṣaṇáyah

'Him alone (sc. Indra) the races treat as an *ārya* through his activities, him through his deeds.'

(RV 10.48.3d)

mām āryanti kṛténa kárt_avena ca

'They treat me (sc. Indra) as an *ārya* for what is done and what is to be done.'

On the basis of the accentuation of *āryanti*, OLDENBERG, *ibid.*, and GELDNER, ad RV 10.48.3, considered *āryanti* as a compound (*ā-āryanti*); the same analysis seems preferable for another occurrence as well (see KLEIN 1992: 97, note 2).

²*iṣ* 'send, dispatch, impel': *iṣya-*^{ti/(te)}

iṣya-^{ti}:

Simplex RV, MS^m 4.5.2:64.14 = TS^m 6.4.3.3 = ŚB^m 3.9.3.15, JUB^m 3.4.4.3 [ed. OERTEL 3.18.3], ŚSS^m-LātyŚS^m,¹⁷¹⁰

+ *prā*¹⁷¹¹ RV +;

+ *ati-pra* ŚtSū.;

+ *abhi-prā* AVŚ 16.7.2 (*abhi-préṣyāmi* ≈ AVP 17.24.3 *abhi-preṣyāmaḥ*)

¹⁷⁰⁸ According to LIV, this root must go back to PIE **h₂er-* 'gewichtig/laut sprechen'.

¹⁷⁰⁹ For the only clear exception, *-ās_iya-*, see above, s.v. *as*.

¹⁷¹⁰ *iṣyat* in AVP-Kashm. (ms.) 5.26.2c *rātyāt sarvam iṣyat* (with BARRET's hesitant conjecture ⁺*iṣam yat*) is a ms. mistake; recte Or. *arātyāḥ sarvam ic chiraḥ*.

¹⁷¹¹ In Vedic prose mostly as quasi-denominative 'perform praise'.

[Kashm. ms. *api-peṣyā*^o]);

+ *upa-prá* RVKh. 5.7.2.a (ed. SCHEFTELOWITZ *upa-preṣa*, ed. MINKOWSKI, p.204 [Praiśādhyāya 12] *úpa préṣya*), YV^m, Br.^m, ŚrSū.^m, MS^p+

+ *sam-prá* AB 6.2.10, KB 10.3.14 [ed. LINDNER 10.2], ŚB, KaṭhĀ^p 3.177:66.15 +

accented: RV +

• tr.

iṣya^{-te} :

[tr.-aff.] *iṣye* RV 4.33.1;¹⁷¹²

[pass.] *preṣyate* AVP-Or. 16.54.2 = AVP-Kashm. 16.54.8¹⁷¹³

The transitive *iṣya*^{-ti} is well-attested from the early Vedic period onwards, commonly constructed with the accusative *vācam* ‘speech, voice’ (6 of the 12 RVic occurrences). Examples are:

(RV 9.64.25ab)

t_uvām soma vipaścítam ‘punānó vācam iṣyasi

‘You, O Soma, purifying yourself, send the inspired speech.’

(RV 9.12.6a)

prá vācam índur iṣyati

‘The sap sends his voice.’

(RV 9.64.9a ≈ SV 2.310a [= 2.3.2.2.3a] = JB^m 3.85^{2x}:8, 9)

hinvānó [SV, JB jajñānó] vācam iṣyasi

‘Being impelled [SV, JB ‘being born’], you send the voice, [O Pavamāna].’

(RV 1.61.12d)

iṣyann árṇāṁs_iy apāṁ carádhyai

‘[You, O Indra], impelling the streams of waters to run...’

In the RV, *iṣya*^{-ti} mostly occurs as a simplex (9×) and only three times with *prá*; in the post-RVic period the simplex appears only in a few mantras (cf. GOTÖ 1993: 128), in particular in:

¹⁷¹² BARRET’s conjecture ⁺*bhūnn iṣyate* for AVP-Kashm. 19.37.10b (ms. *iṣam iva bhūn niṣyate*) is not supported by the Orissa mss. [Pa., Gu_c]; read *iṣum iva tunyaḥ khide* (GRIFFITHS, p.c.).

¹⁷¹³ RV 9.69.1 *āpi sóma iṣyate* probably belongs with ¹*iṣ* ‘seek, wish, desire’; see Chapter IV, s.v.

(MS^m 4.5.2:64.14 = TS^m 6.4.3.3 = ŚB^m 3.9.3.15 (≈ ŚrSū.^m))

apá iṣya hotaḥ

‘O hotar, impel the waters.’¹⁷¹⁴

(JUB 3.4.4.3 [ed. OERTEL 3.18.3])

*devena savitrā prasūtaḥ prastotar devebhyo vācam iṣyety u haikē
'numantrayante*

‘“Impelled by god Savitar, O prastotar, send the speech to the gods”, thus some recite the after-verses.’

By contrast, the compounds with *prá* have become very common (see GOTŌ, *ibid.*, for references).¹⁷¹⁵ On the basis of the collocation *prá vācam iṣya*-^{ti} ‘send speech’ (as in RV 9.12.6 quoted above), Vedic prose has developed a technical usage for this compound. The noun *praiṣá-* has become a ritual term denoting an invitation to the recitation addressed to the hotar; see SCHEFTELOWITZ 1919: 42ff.; RENOU 1954b: 117; GONDA 1974a: 199f.; MINKOWSKI 1991: 26ff., 160ff. et passim; SPROCKHOFF 1994: 72ff. (where *praiṣá-* is rendered as ‘Aussendung, Entsendung’); MYLIUS 1995: 100. The corresponding verbal compound should be qualified as a quasi-denominative,¹⁷¹⁶ meaning ‘perform *praiṣa*’. This analysis of *préṣya*-^{ti} accounts for several peculiarities of its syntax, in particular, for the lack of the direct object, as in:

(KB 28.2.5-7 [ed. LINDNER 28.1])

*etā ha vai devatāḥ praiṣāṇām ājim īyuh | tān¹⁷¹⁷ mitrāvaruṇā uj jigyatuḥ |
tasmān maitrāvaruṇa eva sarvebhyaḥ preṣyati*

‘Verily, these deities ran a race for the *praiṣas*. Mitra and Varuṇa won them (i. e. the *praiṣas*). Therefore only the Maitrāvaruṇa-priest performs

¹⁷¹⁴ In the ŚB *iṣya* is glossed with *iccha* and accordingly translated by EGGELING as ‘desire the waters, O Hotar!’ The same mistake occurs in HAUG’s translation of the AB: ‘ask for the waters’ (p. 114, fn. 4; cf. WEBER 1865b: 224); correctly evaluated in JAYASURIYA 1957: 154; see also GOTŌ 1993: 128, fn. 58.

¹⁷¹⁵ On the syntax of the compound *préṣ* (typically constructed with the accusative; constructions with the genitive are prescribed by Pāṇ. 2.3.61), see BRONKHORST 1991: 92 and 108f., note 22.

¹⁷¹⁶ On this notion, see Appendix II.

¹⁷¹⁷ Read thus with ed. Poona (W. KNOBL, p.c.); ed. SARMA has *tan* [*tad*], ed. LINDNER *tām*.

the praiṣas¹⁷¹⁸ [addressed] to all.’

To the same quasi-denominative type belong compounds with a second preverb based on *préṣ* attested in Vedic prose, such as *ati-préṣ* ‘perform an additional praiṣa’ (see MYLIUS 1995: 27 and EDS II, 1051 for derivatives attested), *upa-préṣ* ‘perform an upapraiṣa’ (see MINKOWSKI, op.cit., 161), *sam-préṣ* ‘perform a sampraiṣa’ (a subsidiary command; see GONDA 1974a: 306, fn. 134; MINKOWSKI, op.cit., 50ff.). One of the earliest occurrences of such a double compound (*upa-préṣ*), which must underlie the quasi-denominative usage (i.e. ‘impel [the oblations] to [the gods]’ → ‘perform an upapraiṣa’), appears in a Khilāni mantra, repeated in the AB and in a number of YVic texts:

(RVKh. 5.7.2.a [ed. MINKOWSKI, p. 204, Praiṣādhyāya 12]) = TS^m 6.3.8.2 = MS^m 4.13.4:203.6-7 = ^AKS^m 16.21:244.8 = AB^m 2.5.6 = TB^m 3.6.5.1 = ŚB^m 3.8.1.11 (= ĀpŚS^m 7.15.7 etc.))

*úpa*¹⁷¹⁹ *préṣya*¹⁷²⁰ *hotar*¹⁷²¹ *havyā devébhyaḥ*
 ‘Hotar, impel the oblations to the gods.’

The nasal (class IX) present *iṣṇāti*¹⁷²² is also employed transitively, thus being in competition with the *-ya*-present *iṣya-ti* (cf. OETTINGER 1992: 137). There seems to be no essential semantic difference between these two formations,¹⁷²³ but the former, in contrast to *iṣya-ti*, is attested only as a

¹⁷¹⁸ KEITH, GONDA (1974a: 199): ‘gives directions to all’; cf. also MINKOWSKI 1991: 160.

¹⁷¹⁹ Unaccented in the MS (see MINKOWSKI 204, fn. 29).

¹⁷²⁰ RVKh., ed. SCHEFTELOWITZ *upa preṣa*; recte ed. MINKOWSKI; see also GOTŌ 1993: 129, fn. 61; MS, v.l. *práṣya*.

¹⁷²¹ Accented (*hótar*) in the RVKh.

¹⁷²² According to JOACHIM 43, a more recent formation (but cf. also LIV 234, note 4).

¹⁷²³ DELBRÜCK (1897: 30) saw a subtle semantic distinction, which he describes as *iṣyati* ‘bewegen’ ~ *iṣṇāti* ‘in Bewegung setzen’; i.e. in terms of the durative/inchoative opposition – most likely, in the vein of the general assumption on the terminative meaning of the nasal presents (cf. *ibid.*, 48). In my view, the RVic evidence can neither support nor disprove DELBRÜCK’s interpretation, since for most or all contexts both meanings are perfectly appropriate; cf. e.g. the above-quoted passage RV 1.61.12 *iṣyann árṇāṃsya apām* ‘impelling the streams of waters’ = ‘committing the initial push’ (inchoative) / ‘keeping moving after having set in motion’ (durative).

simplex (GOTÖ, op.cit., 129) and does not occur with the accusative of speech. *iṣṇāti* practically disappears in Vedic prose (2× in the ŚB, book 7; 2× in GB 1.2.1).

Middle forms

Middle forms occur only twice. The only RVic attestation is transitive:

(RV 4.33.1ab)

prá ṛbhúbhyo dūtám iva vácām iṣya 'upastíre śvāitarīm dhenúm īle

‘To the Ṛbhus I send the speech, like a messenger; I invoke the milch cow Śvaitarī to spread [its milk] (?)’¹⁷²⁴

According to JOACHIM 43, the middle form *iṣye* has emerged under the influence of *īle* in the next pada.¹⁷²⁵

In the AVP, the middle form (*preṣyate*) is attested in the passive usage:

(AVP-Or. 16.54.2cde = AVP-Kashm. 16.54.8 ≈ AVŚ 11.3.14-15¹⁷²⁶)

ṛcā kumbhy adhi + dhīyate¹⁷²⁷ 'ārtvijiyena¹⁷²⁸ preṣyate

brāhmaṇā prati gṛhyate

‘With the stanza (ṛc) the kumbhī-pot is being put on [the fire], with the performance of the priest it is being impelled, with the ritual formula it is being seized.’

īṛṣ ‘be/become angry’: *īṛṣya-*^{ti}

TS^p 2.3.5.1, DhSū.

accented: TS

• intr. state

¹⁷²⁴ Cf. RENOU (EVP XV, 87): ‘(dont le lait est) à étendre.’

¹⁷²⁵ Untenable is NEISSER’s (1894: 63 [= Kl.Schr., 153]) analysis: “*iṣye* ist ... nur als coll[ectivum] (i.e. ≈ pl.impv. *iṣyata* ‘send’ – LK) zu verstehen.”

¹⁷²⁶ The Śaunakīya recension has passive -ta-participles instead of -ya-passives:

ṛcā kumbhy ādhihitārtvijiyena préṣitā ||14|| *brāhmaṇā párigṛhītā sāmñā páryūḍhā*

¹⁷²⁷ BHATTACHARYA’s hesitant conjecture for mss. *dhīhitā* (Or.), *nīyate* (Kashm.); cf. AVŚ 11.3.14a = AVP 5.13.4a *ṛcā kumbhy ādhihitā*.

¹⁷²⁸ Kashm. ms. *sārtvijiyena*.

also in nom. deriv.:

-ú-: *īrṣyú-* ‘jealous’ AV 6.18.2, JB (+)

The present *īrṣya-*¹⁷²⁹ originates in a denominative verb (see KLINGENSCHMITT 1982: 149, fn. 9; GOTÖ 83).¹⁷²⁹ The root accentuation is secondary, probably due to the influence of the active -ya-presents of emotional and physiological states. In Vedic, it is only once attested in the TS and does not reappear before the Dharma-Sūtra period:

(TS 2.3.5.1)

prajāpates trāyastriṃśad duhitāra āsan. tāḥ sómāya rājñe ’dadāt. tāsāṃ rohiṇīm upait. tā īrṣyantīḥ púnar agacchan

‘Prajāpati had 33 daughters. He gave them to Soma the king. Of them, Soma sexually united with Rohiṇī. They (sc. the other daughters), being angry, went back.’

Although this -ya-present is not attested in early Vedic, the noun *īrṣyú-* ‘jealous’ (AV 6.18.2, JB), based on the same -ya-stem, as well as its Iranian cognates (YAv. *arəšiiant-* etc.; see BARTHOLOMAE 1897: 13; MAYRHOFER 1965a: 246; EWAia I, 206f., with (possible) cognates outside Indo-Iranian), point to its antiquity (probably Indo-Iranian inheritance).

uc ‘be/become accustomed to, take pleasure’: -*ucya-*¹⁷³⁰

+ *abhi* MS^p 1.8.9:129.19, TS^p 2.2.2.5^{2x};

+ *ní* AVŚ 2.14.3 (*ny-ucyatu* ≈ AVP-Or. 2.4.5 *ny-acyatu*, AVP-Kashm. *niyaśchatu*, read with AVŚ and ed. ZEHNDER ^{ny-ucyatu}), 6.26.3;¹⁷³⁰

+ *sám* ‘be wont to live together’ RV 5.81.4¹⁷³¹

¹⁷²⁹ Untenable is MANESSY’s (1961: 45) analysis of *īrṣya-*^{ti} as a reduplicated present with the suffix -ya- (**ai-ərs-ye-ti*). Improbable is also RASMUSSEN’s (apud OLSEN 1993: 368, fn. 10) explanation of this formation as “a denominative aorist *(h)*ṛh-és-t* > *iras-*, later analogically extended by the *ī-* suffix of the corresponding present *(h)*ṛhs-ī-é/ó-* (originally with accented *-ī-é/ó-* triggering zero grade of the preceding stem) > *īrṣya-*”.

¹⁷³⁰ See also Chapter IV, s.v. ¹*añc* on AVP-Kashm. ms. *°ucyatām* ≈ AVP-Or. 2.5.3 *ny-acyatām* [thus ed. DIPAK BHATTACHARYA], v.l. *nvacyatām* (≈ AVŚ 2.12.2 *ní yujyatām*).

¹⁷³¹ OERTEL (1907: 82 [= Kl.Schr. I, 162], fn. 12; 84 [= Kl.Schr. I, 164], fn. 5)

unaccented
• intr. state

The scarcely attested active present *-ucya-*^{ti} ‘take pleasure, be accustomed to’¹⁷³² only occurs in compounds. The sole RVic attestation (with the preverb *sám*) appears constructed with the comitative instrumental (see, in particular, HETTRICH 2007: 25):

(RV 5.81.4ab)

utá yāsi savitas trīṇi rocanó_utá súryasya raśmībhiḥ sám ucyasi

‘And you, O Savitar, drive through the three luminous spaces; and you are wont to live with the rays of Sūrya.’¹⁷³³

The compound *ny-ūcyā-*^{ti} occurs twice in the AV:

(AVŚ 2.14.3 ≈ AVP 2.4.5)

asáu yó adharād grhás ' tátra sant_uv arāy_iyāḥ

tátra sedír n_iy ūcyatu ' sárvas ca yātudhān_iyāḥ

‘The house which is there below, there let the hags be; there let debility be home, and all the sorceresses.’

conjectures impf. ⁺*upaucyat* (i.e., presumably, impf. of *upa+uc*) for a corrupt JB form (mss. *pauccad*, *apauchcad*, *upauchcad*) and reads the relevant sentence (JB 1.125:5) as *tasya jāyām* ⁺*upaucyat*. OERTEL’s interpretation (‘He [i.e. Indra] liked to consort with his (the Gandharvan’s) wife’) thus suggests the elsewhere unattested compound **upa + uc* in the sense of *abhi + uc* (‘einen Zug haben zu, gern aufsuchen’). Ed. RAGHU VIRALOKESH CHANDRA (1.125:5), based on different (albeit similar) mss. readings, gives a different conjecture:

tasya jāyām ārcchad [v.ll. *pauccad*, *ap̄rcchad*, *pācchad*] *etasyaiva vijayasya kāmāya*

More likely is the reading *upārcchat* (i.e. *upa+ṛ* (*ṛch*) ‘importune’), suggested by BODEWITZ (1990: 71, 244, note 6) on the basis of TS 1.5.9.6: ‘he importuned his wife, since he was desirous of this victory.’

¹⁷³² On the meaning and IE cognates, see especially NEISSER 1924 [Zum Wb. des RV]: 170f.; BAILEY 1936: 98; INSLER 1975a [Gāthās]: 207 (with Iranian parallels); LIV 244.

¹⁷³³ Cf. RENOU (EVP XV, 24): ‘Et tu marches, ô Savitar, (dans) les trois espaces-lumineux, es tu cohabites avec les rayons du soleil’, explaining: “*sám-uc-*, rendu d’après *sámokas* (« ayant même résidence que »), mais en fait, marquant simplement l’affinité”; see also GONDA 1972: 58.

(AVŚ 6.26.3ab ≈ AVP 19.19.2cd)

anyátrāsmán n₂y ūcyatu 'sahasrākṣó ámart₂yaḥ

'Let the thousand-eyed immortal (sc. evil) be home elsewhere than [with] us.'

The form *niyaśchatu* (read probably *nī-yachatu*) attested in the parallel Paippalāda (Kashm.) passage (2.4.5c) seems to be secondary: although *nī-yam* can be employed in (nearly) the same sense as *ny-uc* ('be home, stay'), it does not occur with the active inflection. The Orissa reading *ny-acyatu* results from a scribal error (loss of a stroke denoting *u*; Th. ZEHNDER, p.c.).

In the YV, *ucyati* is attested with *abhí*, in constructions with the accusative:

(TS 2.2.2.5)

abhí vā eṣá etásya grhān ucyati yásya grhān dáhati

'This (Agni) likes to frequent the houses of this [sacrificer], when he burns his houses.'

(Middle forms)

For AVP-Kashm. 2.5.3 -*ucyatām*, see Chapter IV, s.v. ²*añc*.

kup 'be/become angry, quake': *kupya*^{-ti}

AV 20.130.8 (*ákupyant-* ≈ RVKh. 5.15.7 (v.l.) *akubhyant-*, ed. SCHEFTELOWITZ *ābjant-*) (+)

unaccented

• intr. state (?)

The only Vedic occurrence of the -ya-present *kupya*^{-ti}, in the corrupt AVic passage AV 20.130.8 *ákupyantaḥ* ^{+kupāyávaḥ},¹⁷³⁴ is uncertain; JAMISON 140 renders this form as 'unquaking', without translating the whole passage. The parallel RVKh. passage (5.15.7) is also corrupt and does not help much (ed. SCHEFTELOWITZ *ābjantaḥ kubhāyávaḥ*; more likely is the reading *akubhyantaḥ* attested in two mss. [M₁ and R.], which is at least closer to that of the AV).¹⁷³⁵ Although *kupya*^{-ti} does not appear until late post-Vedic

¹⁷³⁴ Conjecture of ed. ¹ROTH/WHITNEY; mss. and ed. VISHVA BANDHU *kúpāyakuh*.

¹⁷³⁵ *kubh* may be a root variant of *kup*; improbable is SCHEFTELOWITZ's assumption

texts,¹⁷³⁶ its antiquity is indirectly corroborated by some other derivatives of *kup* attested in the RV, such as caus. *kopáya*-^{ti} ‘make quake’, -*tá*-participle *prá-kupita*- ‘quaking’ (cf. esp. the very similar IVS of the synonymous verb *krudh* ‘be/become angry’: -*ya*-present *krúdhya*-^{ti}, caus. *krodháya*-^{ti}, -*tá*-participle *kruddhá*-) as well as by the parallels outside Indo-Iranian, such as, above all, Lat. *cupiō* ‘desire’ (see MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 402f.; LIV 359). For the meaning of the root *kup* and its development in the post-Vedic period, see RENOU 1939b: 395f. [= Choix I, 231f.].

***kṛś* ‘be/become lean’: *kṛśya*-^{ti}**

ŚB, TB, PB, JB

accented: +

• intr. state

The intransitive present *kṛśya*-^{ti} occurs in Brāhmaṇas. An example is:

(ŚB 11.1.6.34)

tāsmād u māṁśāny evā médyato médyanti, māṁśāni kṛśyataḥ kṛśyanti

‘Therefore the flesh of a fat [person] is fat, and the flesh of a lean [person] is lean.’

The corresponding transitive-causative present -*karśáya*-^{ti} occurs only in RV 6.24.7 and does not reappear until late Sanskrit, thus probably being a nonce formation in Vedic, built in analogy with *medáyati* ‘makes fat’ (JAMISON 81).

***krudh* ‘be/become angry’: *krúdhya*-^{ti/(te)}**

RVKh. [ed. SĀTAVALEKAR] 29.47 (*krudhyásva*), AV 4.36.10, ŚB, JB, VaikhŚS 12.11:141.4 +

accented: AV, ŚB²

(comm. ad loc.) on the elsewhere unattested root *kubh* (with reference to DhP X 113: *kubhi āchādane kubh*) ‘sich verhüllen’ ~ Gr. κρυφόζ.

¹⁷³⁶ For instance, in AVPariś., Ep. (see WERBA [VIA I] 340; OBERLIES 2003: 402), KA (e.g. 7.18.22).

- intr. state

The intransitive *krúdhya-^{ti}* is typically constructed with the dative, as in:

(AV 4.36.10cd)

malvó yó máhyaṃ krúdhyaṭi ' sá u páśān ná mucyate

‘The fool which is angry at me, he is not released from the fetter.’

The rare construction with the accusative in VaikhŚS 12.11:141.4 *anyaṃ na krudhyet* (noticed in ed. CALAND, Introd. p. xix) may instantiate a -yet-optative (see KULIKOV 2006d: 44, fn. 42).

For the transitive-causative formations of the IVS of *krudh* (caus. *krodháyaṭi* AV^{1x} +, reduplicated aor. *ácukrudhat* RV), see JAMISON 140.

Middle forms

The only Vedic attestation of a middle form (2 sg.impv.), irregular both in accentuation (on the suffix) and diathesis, appears in the RVKh. (ed. SĀTAVALEKAR):

(RVKh. [ed. SĀTAVALEKAR] 29.47cd)

jahí śatrúṃs triśūlená ' krudhyásva piba śónitam

‘Smite the enemies with a trident! Get angry! Drink the blood!’

kṣā ‘burn’: *kṣāya-^{ti}*

Simplex MS^p 1.4.13:62.15 ≈ ĀpŚS 9.15.6, 7;

+ *āpa* ‘fall down’ (of fire) MS^p–KS^p–KpS^p–TB, ŚrSū.;

+ *prá* AVP–Kashm. 13.3.14 (*prakṣāyatas* ~ AVP–Or. 12.6.4 *prakṣāyakas*) ≈ TB^m 2.4.1.2 etc. ≈ TĀ^m 2.5.3¹⁷³⁷ [ed. MALAMOUD 2.5.12] ≈ ĀpŚS^m (~ ŚŚS^m 4.12.10 *prakhyāyatas*)

accented: +

- intr. process

¹⁷³⁷ Ed. MITRA [B.Ind.] does not mark the end of 2.5.2, whence the erroneous reference “TA. 2.5.2” in BLOOMFIELD’s VC 204, sub *idhmasyeva* ... (reproduced in FRANCESCHINI I, 394).

The intransitive present *kṣā́ya-ti*¹⁷³⁸ first occurs in an AVic (Paippalāda) mantra, attested also in the TB and TĀ:

(AVP-Kashm. 13.3.14cd ≈ AVP-Or. 12.6.4cd)

*idhmasyeva*¹⁷³⁹ *prakṣā́yatas* ' *tasya moc cheṣi*¹⁷⁴⁰ *kīm cana*

'As of the burning fuel [nothing remains], may nothing remain of him.'

Instead of the participle *prakṣā́yatas* (Kashm.), the Orissa mss. attest another form, differing in just one akṣara: *prakṣā́yakas*. This form seems to result from a ms. error; the repetitions of this mantra in the Taittirīya texts (TB 2.4.1.2, 3.7.6.17, 3.7.6.23, TĀ 2.5.3 [ed. MALAMOU 2.5.12], ĀpŚS 4.11.5, 4.16.1; see FRANCESCHINI I, 394) read *prakṣā́yatas*,¹⁷⁴¹ which supports the reading of the Kashmir ms.¹⁷⁴²

In Vedic prose (Black YV), *kṣā́ya-ti* typically occurs with preverbs, meaning 'fall down' (said of fire),¹⁷⁴³ cf.:

(KS 35.17:63.2-3 ≈ KpS 48.15:306.5-6 ≈ TB 3.7.1.3)

āyuṣā vā eṣā vīryeṇa vy ṛdhyate, yasyā́hitāgner agnir apakṣā́yati

'[A man] who has established the [sacrificial] fire is deprived of his life power and manliness, if his fire falls down.'

The simplex is attested only once, in the MS (with variants in the ĀpŚS):

(MS 1.4.13:62.14-15 ≈ ĀpŚS 9.15.6, 7)

átha yasya puroḍā́sau kṣā́yatas, táñ yajñám váruṇo gr̥hṇāti

'And Varuṇa seizes the sacrifice of the one whose puroḍā́sa-cakes burn.'

For the corresponding causative *kṣā́pāya-ti* (AV +), see JAMISON 140.

¹⁷³⁸ On its secondary (probably aoristic) origin and Indo-European cognates, see LIV 133f., with note 6.

¹⁷³⁹ Thus Or.; Kashm. ms. *yugma*°.

¹⁷⁴⁰ Kashm. ms. *muś cheṣa*.

¹⁷⁴¹ *idhmāsyeva prakṣā́yataḥ | mā́ tásyóc cheṣi kīm caná*.

¹⁷⁴² ŚS 4.12.10 *prakhyā́yatas* is a corrupt form.

¹⁷⁴³ Not 'extinguish', as pw II, 123 translated this compound ('verlöschen'); I follow CALAND's (1924a: 67f., ad ĀpŚS 9.1.17) interpretation ('hinabfallen').

kṣudh ‘be/become hungry’: *kṣúdhya*-^{ti}

Simplex RV 1.104.7, YV^p, TĀ 1.31.5, VārŚS 2.1.5.14 +;
 + *ví* TB 2.2.7.3 = 2.2.11.5 (*vy àkṣudhyan* ≈ TS^p 1.5.4.4 *vy àtṛṣyan* [ed.
 WEBER, v.l. *vy àkṣudhyan*] ≈ MS 1.7.5:114.2 ≈ ^UKS 9.3:106.12 ≈ KpS
 8.6:85.1)

accented: RV +

• intr. state

(also in nom. deriv. (?):

-á-: *a-kṣudhyá*- ‘non-hungry’ AV 7.60.4, 6¹⁷⁴⁴)

The intransitive *kṣúdhya*-^{ti} is commonly attested in participles, employed in the adjective usage (‘hungry’), cf. the only attestation of this -ya-present in early Vedic:

(RV 1.104.7d)

índra kṣúdhyaadbhyo váya āsutīm dāḥ

‘O Indra, give enlivening force and food to the hungry ones.’

It is interesting to note that a finite form of *kṣudh* (thematic aor. inj.) occurs in early Vedic only once, in AV 2.29.4d *mā́ kṣudhan mā́ tṛṣat* ‘may [this man] not be hungry, not thirsty’, i.e. adjacent to another thematic aorist inj. (which also is the counterpart of an active -ya-present, *tṛṣya*-^{ti}; see below, s.v.).

kṣúdhya-^{ti} occurs with preverbs only in Taittirīya texts, in the TB and TS (as v.l.):

(TS 1.5.4.4 ≈ TB 2.2.7.3 = 2.2.11.5)

ādityā vá asmāl lokād amúṁ lokám āyan. tè ’múṣmiṁ loké vy àkṣudhyan
 [TB,¹⁷⁴⁵ TS v.l.] / *àtṛṣyan* [TS]

‘Verily, the Ādityas went from this world to yonder world. They were thirsty / starving in that world.’¹⁷⁴⁶

¹⁷⁴⁴ Or, more likely, a nonce formation built in analogy with the adjacent *atrṣyá*- ‘non-thirsty’; see WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 81f., §24ba.

¹⁷⁴⁵ Ed. MITRA [B.Ind.] erroneously reads -*àkṣubhyan* for TB 2.2.7.3; see OERTEL 1926: 280.

¹⁷⁴⁶ See GONDA 1966b: 53.

The original character of the reading *vy àtṛṣyan* is supported by the parallel passages in other YVic Saṃhitās (MS 1.7.5:114.1-2, KS 9.3:106.11-12, KpS 8.6:85.1); *vy àkṣudhyan* appears to be a Taittirīya innovation.

(*gā* ‘sing’: *gāya*^{ti/te})

gāya^{ti/te} is taken in the present study as a class I present (i.e. *gāy-a-*); for discussion, see Chapter I, s.v.

gṛdh ‘be/become greedy, eager, hanker’: *gṛdhya*^{ti}

RV 4.38.3, ŚBM 3.9.3.22 ≈ ŚBK 4.9.3.16^{2x} (+)

accented: RV +

• intr. state

The rare intransitive *gṛdhya*^{ti} first appears in the syntactically difficult RVic passage 4.38.2-3 *vājīnam* [...] *dadhikrām u dadathuḥ* [...] *paḍbhīr gṛdhyantam* ‘you two gave the courser Dadhikrā, [...] eager [to win (?)] with [his] feet.’¹⁷⁴⁷

Another occurrence of this -ya-present is met with in the ŚB, constructed with the locative:

(ŚBM 3.9.3.22 ≈ ŚBK 4.9.3.16)

té pātīṣv evā gandharvā gṛdhyanti [ŚBK *agrḍhyan*]

‘The gandharvas hanker after the wives.’

Like many other active -ya-presents of emotional and physiological

¹⁷⁴⁷ For this repeatedly discussed passage, cf., in particular, BLOOMFIELD’s (1890: 353) comments and interpretation: ‘(the horse) impatient with his feet’; RENOU (EVP XV, 162): ‘... avec ses pieds, lui l’avide (de butin) ...’; cf. also PISCHEL (1889 [VSt I]: 231ff.): ‘(be)gierig’ (but with the improbable and long abandoned interpretation of *paḍbhīr* as a form of the hypothetical root noun **pás-* ‘Fessel, Strick’); NEISSER (1930 [Zum Wb. des RV II]: 88): ‘mit den Füßen ausgreifend’. GELDNER (1907: 107) connected this word with the root *paś* ‘see’, interpreting it as a root noun with the meaning ‘seeing, look’ (this interpretation is adopted by SCARLATA 188: ‘mit Blicken gierig’), but later GELDNER abandoned this analysis.

states, *gṛdhya*-^{ti} co-exists in the IVS with the thematic aorist *ágr̥dhat* (RV 10.34.4 +).

glā ‘be/become weary, relax’: *glāya*-^{ti}

Simplex ŚB, KB 4.10.3 [ed. LINDNER 4.14], JUB 3.2.5.3 +;
 + *áva* AVŚ 4.4.7 = 6.101.3, AVP 4.5.10;
 + *pari* VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 4.16 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 4.30:22 (= CALAND 1928: 140f. [= Kl.Schr., 440f.]));
 + *vi* JB 2.23^{2x}:10 (*vi...glāyati*, v.ll. *śyāyanti*, *ślāyanti*), 11 (*vi...glāyanti*, v.l. *śyāyanti*)
 accented: ŚB
glāya-^{te}: ŚGS 6.3.8 (*glāyeran*) +
 • intr. state

The intransitive present *glāya*-^{ti}, opposed to the causative *glāpāya*-^{ti} (RV 1.164.10¹⁷⁴⁸ +), occurs in the mantra language (AV) only with the preverb *áva*:

(AVŚ 4.4.7 = 6.101.3 = AVP 19.13.12)
āhāṃ tanomi te páso 'ádhi jyām iva dhānvani
krāmasvá rśa 'va rohítam 'ánavaglāyatā sádā
 ‘I stretch your penis taut, like a string on a bow; mount, as a stag a doe, with the never relaxing one.’

The simplex first appears in the Brāhmaṇas.

jas ‘disappear, get lost’: *-jasya*-^{ti}

+ *ní* RV 1.191.7 (= AVP 5.3.3 = AVP 9.6.7), AVP 4.16.6,¹⁷⁴⁹ HirGS^m 1.15.6

¹⁷⁴⁸ *áva glāpayanti*; read with the long *ā* contra Pp.; see JAMISON 140.

¹⁷⁴⁹ *jassyām* in AVP-Kashm. 4.16.2, which BARRET emends to ⁺*jasyān* (i.e., presumably, 3pl.subj. of *jasya*-^{ti}) is a ms. error. The Orissa version (ed. DIPAK BHATTACHARYA) has *jambhyā[n]*, i.e. acc.pl. of *jāmbhyā*-, which is likely to be a variant of *jabhya*- ‘grinder’, attested in AVŚ 6.50.2.

unaccented
• intr. process

The rare present *-jasya-^{ti}* (attested only with the preverb *ní*) occurs in the mantras (in the late RV, AVP as well as in an unidentified mantra quoted in the HirGS). All occurrences appear in similar contexts, in spells against enemies or harmful creatures:

(RV 1.191.7d = AVP 5.3.3d = AVP 9.6.7d)

sárve sākám ní jasyata

‘Let all of you disappear at once.’ (against poisonous animals)

(AVP 4.16.6)

yathā phena udakena ' dadṛśāno nijasyati

evā vyaṃ ghuṇān¹⁷⁵⁰ sarvān ' sākam vācā ni jāsayāmasi

‘Just as the foam, which has appeared, disappears by means of water, so we make disappear all the ghuṇas¹⁷⁵¹ together by means of a spell.’

(HirGS^m 1.15.6)

ní jasya¹⁷⁵² nihito mayā

‘Disappear, struck by me.’

Unlike the quasi-synonymous present *dāsya-^{ti}* (derived from the root variant *das*; see INSLEY 1999: 163, fn. 1 and below, s.v.), *-jasya-^{ti}* disappears in younger texts.¹⁷⁵³ Synchronically, *jas* and *das* are distinct verbs, although their semantic differentiation was probably not finished by the period of RV–AV. In contrast to *jas*, *das* does not occur with *ní*. Besides, they clearly differ in meaning: *jas* refers to serious damage and/or total destruction (emphasized by the preverb *ní*, common with the verbs of destruction). By contrast, *das* refers to less fatal processes, specifically, to exhaustion or loss of some property, and occurs with subjects of positive character (see examples s.v.).

Together with the thematic aorist (attested in the middle part. *jāsamāna-*, see GOTÖ 84) and perfects (RV, AV), *-jasya-^{ti}* is opposed to the *-āya-*causative (cf. AVP 4.16.6 quoted above) and reduplicated aorist (also in

¹⁷⁵⁰ AVP-Kashm. *ghṛṇān*.

¹⁷⁵¹ Invisible demonic creatures.

¹⁷⁵² With the improbable emendation *jesi* in ed. KIRSTE (crit. app., hesitantly).

¹⁷⁵³ Note also that the derivatives of *jas* occur in the AV-Paippalāda, while the Śaunakīya recension mostly attests forms derived from *das*.

the Paippalāda: *ajījasas* AVP 4.16.7).

jī ‘grow old, decay, age, wear (out)’: *jūrya*^{ti}, *jīrya*^{ti/(te)}

jūrya^{ti}: RV

accented: +

jīrya^{ti}: AV +

Simplex AV 10.8.32, YV^p, ŚB 11.7.1.1^{2x}, PB, JB, ChU, KaṭhU 1.28 +;

+ *nir* JUB 3.6.5.3^{2x};

+ *sám* MS^p, KS^p–KpS^p

accented:

jūrya–: TS 1.5.4.1, 1.5.7.3 ≈ MS 1.5.6:74.12 ≈ ^AKS 7.4:66.8, ŚB 11.7.1.1;

-jīryá–: MS^p 3.7.3:78.6 (*sám...jīryátaḥ*, v.l. *sa jīryataḥ*, MITTWEDE
+ *sám...jīrya*^o)

jīrya^{te}: AĀ (all in 2.1.7), Smṛ., Ep. +¹⁷⁵⁴

• anticaus.

The stem variants *jūrya*– and *jīrya*– are distributed in texts as follows: *jūrya*– in the RV; *jīrya*– in the later texts.¹⁷⁵⁵ *jūrya*^{ti} and *jīrya*^{ti} show no difference in meaning and usage and probably belong to different Vedic dialects (thus already WACKERNAGEL 1896 [AiG I]: 28; see also PINAULT 1987–88: 329f.); the *-u*-vocalism may be due to the influence of the *-va*-present *jūrvati* (BURROW 1957: 141f.). Examples are:

(RV 1.117.4d)

ná vām jūryanti pūrvyá kṛtāni

‘Your ancient works do not decay.’

¹⁷⁵⁴ AVP–Kashm. 11.7.10 *āpo jīryante* (GOTŌ 152, fn.235: “ganz fraglich”) is a corrupt reading for *nāpo jīryanti* ‘the waters do not become old’ (thus AVP–Or. 13.4.5). For Epic attestations, see OBERLIES 2003: 433.

¹⁷⁵⁵ After the RV, the stem *jūrya*– only occurs in MS^m 4.14.14:238.8, in the repetition of RV 3.46.1c (*ājūryato vajrīṇo vīryāṇi* ‘the heroic deeds of the unaging one with vajra’). Although the Pp. has *ū*, and this reading is adopted in ed. SCHROEDER, all mss. read *ājūryato* (see crit.app. ad loc.), which conforms to the general distribution (*ū* in RV; *ī* in other texts), and, most likely, should be considered the authentic MS reading.

(RV 1.128.2de)

sá na ūrjám upábhṛty ' ayá kṛpá ná jūryati

'He (sc. Agni) does not grow old in this appearance through our presentation of reinforcements [to him].'

(RV 3.23.1c)

jūryats_{uv} agnīr ajāro váneṣu

'Unaging Agni, among the woods growing old ...'¹⁷⁵⁶

(TS 1.5.7.3 ≈ MS 1.5.6:74.12 ≈ ^AKS 7.4:66.7-8 ≈ KpS 5.3:53.4)*yáthā vái pūruṣó 'śvo gáur jūryaty, evám agnīr áhito jūryati*

'Just as a man, a horse, a cow grows old, so a fire, [when it has been] established, grows old.'

(ŚB 11.7.1.1)

jūryanti ha vái júhvato yájamānasyāgnáyo, 'gnñ jūryató 'nu yájamāno, yájamānam ánu gṛhás ca paśávaś ca

'For, while he is offering, the sacrificer's fires grow old, and so does the sacrificer along with the fires wearing out, and along with the sacrificer his house and cattle.'

The abnormal suffix accentuation is attested once in the MS:

(MS 3.7.3:78.6)

sám hí jūryátaḥ, sárvam āyur itaḥ

'For they both grow old together, they both live the whole lifetime.'

The suffix accentuation is impossible for active -ya-presents, -jūryátaḥ being the only exception. MITTWEDE (1986 [Textkr. zur MS]: 126; see also GOTÖ 152, fn. 234) conjectures ⁺jūryataḥ. The suffix accentuation could have emerged under the influence of the phonologically similar -yá-presents of decay and destruction (which have the accent on the suffix in the MS), such as *dīryá^{te}* 'crack, split', *śīryá^{te}* 'break (off), split, collapse'; see Chapter C.II.3.6.

A comprehensive description of the syntactic patterns of the derivatives of *jṛ* is given in GOTÖ 151ff., with fn. 233. The intransitive *jūrya^{ti}*, *jūrya^{ti/(te)}*, together with *jara^{te}* (RV^{1x}; cf. GOTÖ 152), active sigmatic aorist *jāriṣuḥ* (RV^{2x}, see NARTEN 121) and perfect (RV, AV), are opposed to the transitive class I present *jāra^{ti/(te)}* 'make old'¹⁷⁵⁷, -āya-causative *jarayati*¹⁷⁵⁸ (RV,

¹⁷⁵⁶ See SCARLATA 163.

¹⁷⁵⁷ The only middle occurrence of this present (RV 10.31.7 *jaranta*) is syntactically

YV^m +) ‘id.’ (cf. JAMISON 154ff.) and class VI present (them. aor.?)¹⁷⁵⁹ (RV) ‘id’ (GOTÖ: ‘hinfällig machen’).

Middle forms

Middle forms of the present *jīrya-* first occur in the AĀ (repeated several times in one passage, 2.1.7), cf.:

(AĀ 2.1.7)

nāsyā tāval loko jīryate, yāvad etayor na jīryate pṛthivyāś cāgneś ca, ya evam etām vāco vibhūtiṃ veda

‘As long as [the world] of earth and fire does not decay, so long the world of him, who knows thus the power of speech, does not decay.’

The middle present *jīrya-te* becomes more common in post-Vedic texts (Smṛ.,¹⁷⁶⁰ Ep.).

Although the middle forms of *jūrya-ti/jīrya-ti* are first attested at the very end of the Vedic period, there are several independent features which point to its particular position among other active -ya-presents and its close affinity with the middle -ya-presents, particularly, with those which show fluctuating accentuation:

1) Apart from the rare *tanyati* (√(s)tanⁱ; see below), *jūrya-ti/jīrya-ti* is the only active -ya-present derived from a long sonant root (in -r̥) (see Chapter C.I.2).

2) *jūrya-ti/jīrya-ti* is the only active -ya-present attested with suffix accentuation;¹⁷⁶¹ and

3) *jūrya-ti/jīrya-ti* is the only active -ya-present opposed to a transitive class I present (*jāra-ti/(te)* ‘make old’).

4) From the semantic point of view, *jūrya-ti/jīrya-ti* ‘grow old, decay, age, wear (out)’ is akin to the middle -ya-presents of spontaneous destruction

unclear (intransitive or transitive); see GOTÖ 152, with bibl.

¹⁷⁵⁸ In the RV probably also with the long root vowel (**jāraya-ti*), see JAMISON 126f., 154f.; GOTÖ 151f., fn. 231.

¹⁷⁵⁹ The only attested finite form (*jurátam* RV 1.182.3 ‘make weak, infirm’) is treated as a class VI present in WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]: 55, NARTEN 121, JOACHIM 83; as a thematic aorist in GOTÖ 152.

¹⁷⁶⁰ E.g. in ViṣṇuSmṛ. 13.5 *viṣaṃ* [...] *yadi jīryeta* ‘if the poison is digested ...’.

¹⁷⁶¹ Not counting some clearly erroneous forms in texts with corrupt accentuation, such as (some parts of) the RVKh. and TĀ.

and decay, such as *kṣīyá-te* ‘perish’, *śīryá-te* ‘break (off), collapse’, *mriyá-te* ‘die’ (see Chapter C.II.3.3).

5) Finally, one should mention an Iranian parallel formation, derived from the cognate root, Late Khot. *ysīrāre* (3pl.pres.med.), which seems to point to Old Iranian **zar-ja-*¹⁷⁶² ‘become old’ with the middle inflection.

To sum up. The lack of the productive model which might have attracted *jūrya-/jīrya-* to the class of active *-ya*-presents seems to point to the archaic character of the active inflection. On the other hand, the phonological and semantic affinity of this formation with some middle *-ya*-presents (particularly, with some *-yá*-presents of destruction/decay, such as *dīryá-te*, *śīryá-te*)¹⁷⁶³ as well as the abnormal suffix accentuation of MS *-jīryátaḥ* and late Vedic and post-Vedic middle *jīrya-te* may altogether betray a tendency to group *jīrya-ti* with the middle *-ya*-presents with fluctuating accentuation of the type *śīryá-te* (for which see Chapter C.II.3).

²*tan*⁽ⁱ⁾ (*stan*⁽ⁱ⁾) ‘thunder’: *tanya-ti*

RV 6.38.2, 1.80.12 (*tanyatā*: part.? *-tā*-deriv.?), AVParīś. 48.116 (*tanyantas*) unaccented (?)

• intr. activity

also in nom. deriv.:

(*-atā* (?): *tanyatā*, see above)

-ú:- *tanyú*- ‘thundering’ RV 5.63.2, 5

-tú:- *tanyatú*- ‘thunder’ RV, AV 5.13.3

The derivatives of the root (*s*)*tan* have been discussed at length by HOFFMANN (1976c) and NARTEN (1993). The only Vedic attestation of the present *tanyati* appears in the RV:

¹⁷⁶² Not **zr-ja-* (which would yield ***ysīrāre*), contra EMMERICK (1968: 113) and SKJERVØ (apud MAYRHOFER, EWAia II, 830); see SCHMITT 1971: 58f., with convincing argumentation.

¹⁷⁶³ This dual nature of the present *jūrya-ti/jīrya-ti* could perhaps be due to the origin of the root *jī* from two different sources, as KÜMMEL hesitantly suggests: “sind vielleicht zwei Wurzeln anzusetzen: **ġerh₂*- ‘alt werden’ und **ġerH-* ‘zerreiben, aufreiben’, die im Iir. zusammengefallen wären?” (LIV 165, note 1).

(RV 6.38.2ab)

dūrāc cid ā vasato asya kārṇā ' ghōṣād índrasya tanyati bruvāṇāḥ

‘Selbst von ferne sind seine Ohren nahe.

Vor Lärm donnert, wer von Indra spricht.’ (NARTEN, op.cit., 321
[= Kl.Schr. 1, 403])

Another occurrence of this -ya-present is the participle *tanyantas* attested in the late AVPariś. (48.116); see WERBA [VIA I] 442.

In spite of the scarcity of attestations, the authenticity of the present *tanya-*¹⁷⁶⁴ can be proved by a remarkably large amount of nominal derivatives based on this stem. These include the following formations:

1) *tanyú-* ‘thundering’, twice attested in the RVic hymn 5.63 (see NARTEN, op.cit., 322f. [= Kl.Schr. 1, 404f.]),¹⁷⁶⁴ belongs with the -ú-derivatives based on present -ya-stems, such as *druhyú-* (see below, s.v. *druh*) etc., for which see WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 845, §681d; LUBOTSKY 1988: 48.

2) *tanyatú-* ‘thunder’ RV, AV 5.13.3 (NARTEN, op.cit., 321f. [= Kl.Schr. 1, 403f.]) is a rare example of a -tú-derivative based on a -ya-present, the only parallel formation being *tapyatú-* ‘shining’ RV (cf. Chapter III, s.v. *tap*); see WACKERNAGEL 1903: 152 [= Kl.Schr. I, 404]; RENOUE 1937b: 7; WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 168, §71.

3) the form *tanyatā* is a hapax and a nonce formation (see KNOBL 2004: 264):

(RV 1.80.12ab)

ná vépasā ná tanyatāéndraṃ vṛtró ví bībhayat

‘Not with [his] trembling and not with [his] thundering did Vṛtra frighten off Indra.’ (KNOBL 2004: 264)

tanyatā can be analysed as a verbal substantive (fem. *tanyatā-*, thus GRASSMANN 1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 521; GELDNER; LÜDERS 1951: 182f.),¹⁷⁶⁵ as a verbal adjective (*tanyatā-*, thus WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 168, §71), as an adverb in -tā- (based on the adjective *tanyatā-*, thus

¹⁷⁶⁴ For this hymn, see also BRERETON 1981: 104ff.

¹⁷⁶⁵ OLDENBERG, *Noten ad loc.*, even considers this form as “Augenblicksbildung eines Instrum[entals], basierend auf Stamm *tanyatú*, aber abgelenkt durch das metrische Bedürfnis und das daneben stehende *vépasā*.” This interpretation is discarded by RENOUE (1936: 33) as “hypothèse inutile”.

WACKERNAGEL 1902: 742 [= Kl.Schr. I, 132]), or as a present participle (thus RENOUE (1936: 33): ‘tonnerre’); for a detailed discussion of this formation, see NARTEN, op.cit., 322 [= Kl.Schr. 1, 404] and, especially, KNOBL 2004: 264.

*tam*ⁱ ‘be/become exhausted, out of breath’: *tāmya*^{ti/(te)}

tāmya^{ti}:

MS^p 4.2.1:21.1, MS^p 4.6.1:78.12-13 ≈ KS^p 27.5:144.7 = KpS^p 42.5:252.9, ŚB, TB, PB 10.2.1, JB;

+ *ava* ŚrSū.;

+ *pra* AB^m 8.22.8

unaccented

tāmya^{te}:

MānŚS 1.7.6.49 ≈ VārŚS 1.7.4.51 (*tāmyante*)

• intr. state

One of the earliest attestations of the intransitive present *tāmya*^{ti} occurs in a late (AB) mantra:

(AB 8.22.8)

śataṃ tubhyaṃ śataṃ tubhyam ' iti smaiva pra tāmyati

sahasraṃ tubhyam ity uktvā ' prāṇān sma prati padyate

‘ “A hundred to you, a hundred to you” – verily, [by saying] thus he became out of breath. By saying “a thousand to you” he got back his breath.’

The simplex is attested from Vedic prose onwards. An example is:

(MS 4.6.1:78.12-13)

prajāpatiṛ vāi svayāṃ hótāsīt. sò 'tāmyat

‘Prajāpati himself was a hotar. He became exhausted.’

Cf. also the parallel passage in the KS–KpS:

(KS 27.5:144.6-7 = KpS 42.5:252.8-9)

agnir hotāsīt. sa vaṣaṭkṛtyātāmyat

‘Agni was hotar. Having uttered [the exclamation] *vaṣaṭ*, he was exhausted.’

The corresponding *-áya*-causative *tamáya*-^{ti} ‘make exhausted’ first appears in the Brāhmaṇas. On the syntax of the form *tamat*,¹⁷⁶⁶ attested both in transitive (RV) and intransitive (TB) constructions, see KULIKOV 1999: 232, with fn. 13.

Middle forms

Middle forms occur in the Śrauta-Sūtras (in the parallel passages of the MānŚS and VārŚS, for which see EINO 1988: 256, with fn. 1361).

tuṣ ‘be satisfied, be pleased’: *tuṣya*-^{ti}

tuṣya-^{ti}:

(AVP-Or. 2.79.3, mss. *tuṣyant*-, Kashm. *trpyant*-, ed. BHATTACHARYA, ed. ZEHNDER ⁺*trṣyant*-), ŚŚS 1.17.5 +¹⁷⁶⁷

tuṣya-^{te}:

AVPariś 13.4.8 (*tuṣyeran*), late Up.

unaccented

• intr. state

The present *tuṣya*-^{ti} is usually considered a post-Vedic formation; WHITNEY’s (1885b [Roots]: 64) record “S.[ūtras] +” (cf. also RENO 1965: 35) apparently refers to the only attestation in the Śrauta-Sūtras, in ŚŚS 1.17.5 *daivatena tuṣyet* ‘he should be satisfied with [the indication provided by] the deity [to whom the mantra is addressed]’. The construction with the instrumental could copy the syntactic pattern of the synonymous *-ya*-present *tṛpya*-^{ti/(te)} id., which, in contrast to *tuṣya*-^{ti}, is well-attested from the RV onwards (see below, s.v.).

It is unclear whether *tuṣya*-^{ti} existed in the Vedic period properly

¹⁷⁶⁶ *tamat* is registered as a thematic aorist (inj.) in WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]: 61; MACDONELL 372, §510, but the contexts plead for the analysis of this form as a root aorist subjunctive (HOFFMANN 1967a [Inj]: 240; thus also LUBOTSKY 1997a [RVWC]: 588).

¹⁷⁶⁷ AVP-Kashm. 19.26.6 *tusyāṃ* (ed. BARRET ⁺*tuṣyān*), taken by RENO (1965: 35) and WERBA [VIA I] 192 as belonging with *tuṣya*-^{ti} (hesitantly), is a ms. error for *tubhyam* (thus Orissa mss.); cf. *jassyā*^o for ⁺*jabhya*^o at AVP-Kashm. 4.16.2 (mentioned above, s.v. *jas*), which is a similar error.

speaking.¹⁷⁶⁸ The only possible occurrence is an uncertain form attested in the Paippalāda (only in the Orissa mss.). The relevant passage runs:

(AVP-Or. 2.79.3)

yathā kūpam⁺ udahṛtas¹⁷⁶⁹ , tuṣyanto yanti kāmīnaḥ
evā tvā sarve devarāḥ⁺ patayo yantu kāmīnaḥ

Instead of *tuṣyanto*, the Kashmir version reads *trpyanto*. Ed. BHATTACHARYA and ed. ZEHNDER reject both readings and conjecture ⁺*trṣyant-* ‘thirsty’ (*u* and *r* are often confused in the Orissa mss.); cf. ZEHNDER’s translation:

‘Wie Wasserträger zum Brunnen gehen, **durstig**, begierig: so sollen alle (deine) Schwager als Gatten begierig zu dir kommen.’¹⁷⁷⁰

Although the Orissa reading *tuṣyanto* finds semantic support in Kashm. *trpyanto*, the meaning of these two verbs badly fits in the context (‘the desirous ones go to the well, being satisfied [thereby]’?), and DURGAMOHAN BHATTACHARYA’s conjecture (accepted by DIPAK BHATTACHARYA and ZEHNDER) seems quite plausible.

trp ‘be/become satisfied, pleased, satiated’: *tr̥pya-*^{ti/(te)}

tr̥pya-^{ti}:

Simplex RVKh. 3.15.20^{2x}, AV(P) +;¹⁷⁷¹

+ *abhi* GB 2.3.1:189.3 *abhi-tr̥ṣyantīḥ*, v.l. ^o*tr̥p*^o;¹⁷⁷²

¹⁷⁶⁸ Note that the assumption that *tuṣya-*^{ti} did not exist before the Sūtra period is not very likely for system-related reasons: *tuṣya-*^{ti} would be the only well-attested active -ya-present first attested in the Sūtras (cf. WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]: 219), when this morphological type was no longer productive.

¹⁷⁶⁹ Conjecture by GONDA (1991: 36); Or. mss. *udahṛdas*, Kashm. *udhṛtas*.

¹⁷⁷⁰ Likewise GONDA (1991: 36): ‘Just as those who fetch (carry) water go thirsty and longing to a well ...’

¹⁷⁷¹ For AVŚ 19.2.5 (mss.) *tr̥pyate* read ⁺*tr̥ṣyate* (dat.sg.m. of the pres.part., see below s.v. *tr̥ṣ*).

¹⁷⁷² The passage is unclear: *atho yadābhitṣyantīr abhisamsthāṃ tarpayaty evam eva*. The variant reading ^o*tr̥p*^o seems preferable, since *tr̥ṣ* does not occur elsewhere with the preverb *abhi*, while the compound *abhi-tr̥p*^o is attested in the AV (AV 18.4.39 *abhi-tarpāyant-*), to which the GB belongs as its Brāhmaṇa.

+ *sam* JB, AĀ 2.3.8^{2x}, JUB 1.3.4.4 [ed. OERTEL 1.14.4]

accented: YV^p +

tṛpya^{-te}:

Simplex AVP 17.33.6 (?), (MaitrāyaṇyU 3.2, MaitrU [ed. VAN BUITENEN]

3.2/2 *tṛpyamāṇa*- ≈ [other eds.] 3.2 *uhyamāṇa*-), GṛSū.+;

+ *sam* KB [ed. LINDNER] 12.5 *saṃtṛpyante* (ed. SARMA 12.6.16 °*nti*)

• intr. state

The intransitive *tṛpya*^{-ti/(te)} appears after the RV alongside the nasal presents *tṛpṇóti*, *tṛpṇáti*, probably built in analogy with other -ya-presents of enjoyment, such as *rāṇyati*, *hāryati* (JAMISON 140f.). This -ya-present occurs in a variety of constructions, notably: [i] with the instrumental; [ii] with the genitive; [iii] with the content accusative; and [iv] in objectless (absolute) constructions:

[i] ‘X_{NOM} is satiated with Y_{INS}’:

(TS 2.5.11.3)

tṛpyati prajāyā paśúbhir, ||3|| *yá evám véda*

‘He is satiated with offspring and cattle, who knows thus.’

(ŚB^m 13.5.4.18)

ámādyad índraḥ sómenātṛpyan brāhmaṇā dhánaiḥ

‘Indra was inebriate with Soma, and the Brāhmans became satiated with wealth.’

The instrumental pattern is also attested in RVKh. 3.15.20 (2x), quoted and discussed in Chapter III, s.v. *dah*.

[ii] ‘X_{NOM} is satiated by consuming Y_{GEN}’, where the genitive expresses the partitive meaning, typically with the object of food or drink (esp. soma) being consumed, cf.:

(ŚB 10.3.5.13)

tásmād yadānnasya tṛpyaty átha sá gatá iva manyate

‘Therefore, when one is satiated with food, he feels like the one who has succeeded.’

[iii] For the content accusative construction (with the etymological accusative), attested, for instance, in PB 16.3.8 *indraḥ sarvām tṛptim atṛpyat* ‘Indra was satisfied with total satisfaction’, see S. SEN 1927: 360.

[iv] The objectless pattern ‘X_{NOM} is satisfied’ is attested from the

Brāhmaṇas onwards, as, for instance, in the following young mantra:

(ŚB^m 1.7.3.28 (≈ GobhGS^m 1.9.3))

brāhmaṇasyaivā tṛptim ānu tṛpyeyam [GobhGS *tṛpyāmi*]

‘After the satiation of the Brahman [with sacrificial food], may I become satisfied.’¹⁷⁷³

The alleged locative pattern in the AV, recorded by JAMISON 141, fn. 74 as emerging under the influence of *rāṇyati*, occurs only in two adjacent stanzas, 11.9.9 and 10, where the locative complement is in fact governed by the postposition *ādhi* ‘on’, cf.:

(AV 11.9.10)

átho sárvaṃ śuvāpadam 'mákṣikā tṛpyatu krímiḥ

páuruṣeyé 'dhi kúnape 'radité arbude táva

‘Then let all wild beasts, let the fly, let the worm satisfy itself¹⁷⁷⁴ upon the carrion of men, bitten, O Arbudi, of thee.’ (WHITNEY)

The same pattern is attested for the only Vedic middle occurrence (in the KB); see below and cf. S. SEN 1929: 73.

For the transitive counterparts of this -ya-present (-āya-caus. RV +, reduplicated aor. AV +), see JAMISON 140f.

Middle forms

Next to the imperative form *tṛpyatām* (probably triggered by impv. *kṛṇutām* in the preceding pāda) attested in an unclear Paippalāda passage (17.13.6), we only find a middle form in the KB:

(KB [ed. LINDNER] 12.5 ≈ [ed. SARMA] 12.6.16)

atha pavamāne ha vā u prātaḥ sarvā devatāḥ saṃ tṛpyante / -nti

‘And all the deities rejoice together in the morning in the Pavamāna.’

Ed. LINDNER and ed. ĀnSS read *saṃ tṛpyante*, ed. SARMA has the active form *saṃ tṛpyanti*. The former reading is supported by the sociative meaning, which is typical of middle compounds with *sám*.

Less certain is a more recent (post-Vedic) attestation of a middle form (*tṛpyamānaḥ*) in MaitrāyaṇyU 3.2 (≈ MaitrU 3.2 [ed. VAN BUITENEN 3.2/2] = 6.30), quoted and discussed in Chapter B.I, s.v. *vah*.

¹⁷⁷³ For the Gr̥Sū. variant of this mantra, see GONDA 1977: 643.

¹⁷⁷⁴ BLOOMFIELD (1897: 124): ‘obtain his fill’.

tṛṣ ‘be/become thirsty, thirst’: *tṛṣya*-^{ti}

Simplex RV, ⁺AVŚ 19.2.5 (mss., ed. VISHVA BANDHU *tṛpyate*, ed. ROTH/WHITNEY ⁺*tṛṣyate*) = AVP-Or. 8.8.11, AVP-Or. 11.10.10 = AVP-Kashm. 12.3.10, (AVP 2.79.3, Or. mss. *tuṣyant-*, ed. BHATTACHARYA, ed. ZEHNDER ⁺*tṛṣyant-* ≈ Kashm. *tṛpyant-*),¹⁷⁷⁵ TĀ^m 1.11.6;¹⁷⁷⁶

+ *ví* YV^p;

(+ *abhi* GB 2.3.1:189.3 *abhi-tṛṣyantīḥ*, v.l. ^o*tṛp*)¹⁷⁷⁷

accented: RV, (TĀ)

• intr. state

Apart from two occurrences in the TĀ and one uncertain form in the GB, the present *tṛṣya*-^{ti} does not occur outside the Saṃhitās. In early Vedic (RV, AV), it is only attested in participles (only as a simplex), meaning ‘thirsty’, cf.:

(RV 8.4.10a)

tṛṣyo ná tṛṣyann avapānam ā gahi

‘Like a thirsty antelope male, come here to drink, [o Indra].’

The only occurrence of this present in the AVŚ is based on WHITNEY’s conjecture ⁺*tṛṣyate* for *tṛpyate* (thus in ed. VISHVA BANDHU):

(AVŚ 19.2.5cd ≈ AVP 8.8.11cd)

yáthaivá ⁺tṛṣyate¹⁷⁷⁸ máyas ' tās ta āhrutabheṣajīḥ¹⁷⁷⁹

‘Just as refreshment to one who thirsts, [let] them [be] for you healers of dislocation.’

By contrast, in the Saṃhitā prose (YV) this present only occurs with the preverb *ví*, cf. the passage TS 1.5.4.4 ≈ MS 1.7.5:114.1-2 etc., quoted and discussed s.v. *kṣudh*.

For the thematic aorist *tṛṣat*, attested in AV 2.29.4, see above, s.v. *kṣudh*.

¹⁷⁷⁵ For a discussion of this occurrence, see above, s.v. *tuṣ*.

¹⁷⁷⁶ For JB 1.245:10 *tṛṣyantīḥ*, read ⁺*tṛp*° (BODEWITZ 1990: 289, note 8).

¹⁷⁷⁷ See above, s.v. *tṛp*.

¹⁷⁷⁸ AVP-Kashm. *drṣyate*.

¹⁷⁷⁹ AVP-Or. *ādyutta*°.

***tṛ* (*tūr*) ‘surpass, overcome’: *tūrya*-^{ti}**

Simplex RV 8.99.5 *tūrya* (nonce); GṛSū. *tūryantī* (a plant name)¹⁷⁸⁰

unaccented

• tr. (?)

The present stem *tūrya*- is attested in the RVic hapax *tūrya*:

(RV 8.99.5)

t_uvām indra prātūr_{ti}ṣ_uv ' abhī viśvā asi spṛdhaḥ

aśastihā janitā viśvatūr asi ' t_uvām tūrya taruṣyatāḥ

‘You, O Indra, are above all rivals in battles, you are destroyer of curses [and] all-surpassing progenitor; surpass you those who try to surpass [you] (i.e. the competitors).’¹⁷⁸¹

The imperative *tūrya* is a nonce formation, triggered by the word play and created under the influence of the derivatives of the root variant *tūr(v)*, cf. *prātūr_{ti}*-, *viśvatūr* and *taruṣyat*- encountered in the same stanza (see

¹⁷⁸⁰ The corrupt form *aturyathuḥ* / *aturyathāḥ* is attested in a TĀ mantra describing the intercourse of heaven and earth:

(TĀ^m 1.10.1)

jāyā bhūmi patir vyoma ' mithunaṃ tā aturyathuḥ / aturyathāḥ

putro br̥haspatī rudraḥ

‘The earth is the wife, the sky is the husband. They (you?) have performed (?) intercourse. Br̥haspati is [their (your?)] son, a Rudra.’

Ed. MITRA reads *aturyathāḥ*, ed. ĀnSS and ed. SASTRI/RANGACARYA have *aturyathuḥ*. The original morphological structure of the form is obscure, but, in any case, it hardly belongs to the present system. The ending *-thuḥ* (2du.) is impossible with present forms and may point to a perfect (SEN 1975: 150). On the other hand, *aturya*- cannot be a correct perfect stem, and the pronoun *tā* cannot be constructed with a 2nd person verbal form. The suffix *-ya*- might betray an intensive (A. LUBOTSKY, p.c.), cf. RV 8.1.4 *vī tartūryante*. The initial *tar*- could be haplogically dropped after *tā[v]*. However, the verb *tūr(v)* ‘overcome’ makes no sense in the context; one may assume that it secondarily substitutes for *car* in the collocation *mithunaṃ car*- ‘perform copulation, intercourse’ (A. LUBOTSKY, p.c.); note that both intensive stems (*carcūryá*-, *tartūrya*-) are attested in the RV.

¹⁷⁸¹ Cf. GELDNER: ‘Du, Indra, bist bei den Vorstößen allen Gegnern überlegen. Du bist es, der die Hohnreden niederschlägt und hervorruft, der Allüberholende. Überhole du die Wettstreiter!’

JOACHIM 88; GOTÔ 165). *tūr(v)* is genetically related to *tī* (*tīr*) ‘pass’ (discussed in Chapter IV), but, synchronically, these are distinct roots. The *u*-variant has undergone an idiomatic semantic change (‘overcome’); cf., above all, the -*va*-present *tūrva-ti*,¹⁷⁸² to which the hapax *tūrya* is likely to owe the root vowel quality (LUBOTSKY 1997b: 139f., with fn. 2).

Apart from this RVic hapax, the present stem *tūrya-* does not occur in Vedic, but it may underlie the plant name *tūryantī* (cf. WINTERNITZ 1892: 17), attested in one passage (with minor modifications) in a number of Gṛhya-Sūtras.¹⁷⁸³ Morphologically, *tūryantī* should be a feminine form of the present participle, but its original (etymological) meaning can only be guess work (‘surpassing [other plants]’? ‘overcoming [diseases]’?).

damⁱ ‘control, restrain (oneself)’: *dāmya-ti*

ŚB 14.8.2.2 (= BĀUM 5.2.2 = BĀUK 5.2.1), 14.8.2.4 (= BĀUM 5.2.4 = BĀUK 5.2.3)

accented: ŚB

• intr. state

The rare present *dāmya-ti* occurs in the late ŚB (BĀU):

(ŚB 14.8.2.2 (= BĀUM 5.2.2 = BĀUK 5.2.1))

uṣitvā brahmacāryaṃ devā ūcuḥ | brāvītu no bhāvān iti. tébhyo haitād akṣāram uvāca dā iti. | vyājñāsiṣṭēti | vyājñāsiṣmēti hocur. | dāmyatēti na āthēti

‘Having finished their period of learning, the gods said [to Prajāpati]: “Tell us, O Lord, [our duty]”. He proclaimed to them this syllable DA. “Did you comprehend?” – “We did comprehend” – they said. “Restrain yourselves” – you told us.’¹⁷⁸⁴

JAMISON 101f. believes that the transitive -*āya*-present *damāyati* (RV +)

¹⁷⁸² On this formation, see GOTÔ 163.

¹⁷⁸³ ... *pattas tūryantīm nidhāya* ... (ĀpGS 6.14.14 = HirGS 2.2.8 = BhārGS 1.22:22.14 ≈ ĀgnivGS 2.1.3:46.16 ≈ VaikhGS 3.14:45.15-16) ‘... having laid a Tūryantī-herb at the feet [of the wife who is going to deliver a baby] ...’

¹⁷⁸⁴ On this passage and its philosophical content, see WINTERNITZ 1936: 167f. [= Kl.Schr. I, 222f.]; ESSERS 1952: 115.

goes back to the deverbative **damāyāti*. However, at least in Vedic prose, *dāmyati* and *damāyati* could become (secondarily) associated as a causative pair.

***das* ‘waste, become exhausted’: *dāsya-*^{ti}**

dāsya-^{ti}:

Simplex JB 1.314:7^{2x} (+);

+ *āpa* RV 1.135.8;

+ *ūpa* RV +;

+ *vī* RV 1.11.3, 6.37.3,¹⁷⁸⁵ KSP

dasya-^{te}:

+ *upa* JB 1.224:2 (*upādasyata*, CALAND etc. ⁺*upadasyat* (?)), APṛāyaśc. 6.5;

+ *pra* (?) ⁺JB 1.360:2 (ed. RAGHU VIR/LOKESH CHANDRA *pra* ...

darghyaṃ ta^o; BODEWITZ ⁺*-dabhyate*; read probably ⁺*-dasya*^o);

accented: RV +

• intr. process

also in nom. deriv.:

-á-: *avidasyá-* ‘inexhaustible’ RV 7.39.6¹⁷⁸⁶

das is a variant of the root *jas*, probably emerged by dissimilation (see HOFFMANN apud MAYRHOFER, KEWA III, 732 and apud GOTÖ 177, fn. 299; see also INSLE 1999: 163, with fn. 1¹⁷⁸⁷; KÜMMEL 2000: 236); for the semantic difference between *jas* and *das* and distribution in texts, see above, s.v. *jas*.

The present *dāsya-*^{ti} mostly occurs in compounds, particularly often with *ūpa*. The intransitive patterns attested with *dāsya-*^{ti} are: [i] ‘X_{NOM} wastes away’; [ii] ‘Y^{possessor of} X_{NOM} becomes exhausted (of X_{INS})’. The former construction is much more frequent. Examples are:

(RV 1.135.8e)

ná te vāya ūpa dasyanti dhenávaḥ

¹⁷⁸⁵ Also in the adjective *avidasyá-* (see below).

¹⁷⁸⁶ See WACKERNAGEL 1905 [AiG II/1]: 179, §76ba.

¹⁷⁸⁷ *dāsya* is “a dissimilated form of underlying **jāsya* (= **dyāsya*)”.

‘Your milch cows, O Vāyu, do not waste away.’

(RV 1.62.12ab)

sanād evá táva ráyo gábhastau ' ná kṣīyante nópa dasyanti dasma

‘From of old the riches in your hand do not disappear, nor become exhausted, O wondrous one.’

The latter example clearly shows the semantic affinity with *kṣīyá-te* as well as, in general, with the middle -yá-presents of spontaneous destruction and decay (see Chapter C.II.3).

The rarer pattern [ii], first attested after the RV (AV +), may have been introduced under the influence of another -yá-present, *vy-ṛdhya-te* ‘be bereft, deprived [of property]’ (see Chapter III, s.v.). An example is:

(AV 12.4.2ab)

prajāyā sá ví krīṇīte ' paśúbhiś cópa dasyati

‘He bargains away his progeny and becomes exhausted of cattle.’

(WHITNEY)

It is interesting to note that the KS and KpS differ in the syntax of *úpa-dasya-te*: the KS attests the older pattern [i], while the KpS has replaced it with the secondary construction [ii], cf.:

(KS^p 35.16:61.11-12 ≈ KpS^p 48.14.305.1-2)

yásya droṇakalášá upadásyati, kalášam evá tásyopaváyantam [KS]

prāṇó 'núpa dasyati / [KpS] *prāṇenopa dasyati*

‘Whose wooden pot wastes, – his breath wastes after the pot becoming empty / he becomes exhausted in breath.’

The parallel passages KS^p 35.16:61.16-17 ≈ KpS^p 48.14.305.6-7 display the same syntactic difference.

Pattern [ii] is also attested for the only Vedic attestation of the simplex (without an instrumental argument):

(JB 1.314:6-7)

saṁvatsaro bhūtvā nādasyat / na ha dasyati ya evaṁ veda

‘Having become the year, [Prajāpati] did not become exhausted. He who knows thus does not become exhausted.’

Besides the very common *úpa-dasya-te* and rarer compounds with *ápa* and *ví*, a compound with *pra* can probably be conjectured for the following JB passage:

(JB 1.360:1-3)

*imaṃ ha vai lokaṃ devā aparapakṣe vardhayantīmam āpyāyayantīmam
prajanayanti. tasmāt pra pūrvāḥ prajāḥ paśava oṣadhayo vanaspatayo
darghyam tathāparāḥ kalyāṇītarāḥ ⁺pratidhīyanta¹⁷⁸⁸ iti*

All interpreters of the passage are unanimous in conjecturing ⁺ante 'thā for °am tathā°. CALAND's transcript (quoted in BODEWITZ 1990: 321, note 3) reads ⁺darpyante, which makes little sense, however. FRENZ 22 conjectures ⁺vardhyante, which furnishes a forced translation ('Deswegen werden die Geschöpfe ... erst zum Aufwachsen gebracht und später schöner angesetzt [d.h. weitergebildet]'). Neither *darpyante* nor *vardhyante* (presumably, causative passives) are attested elsewhere, which makes both interpretations highly suspect. BODEWITZ, *ibid.*, conjectures pass. ⁺dabhyate, which does occur in Vedic, and translates (*op.cit.*, 206):

'The gods cause to thrive this world, cause to increase this world and produce this world in the second half of the month. Therefore the creatures, animals, plants and trees **become deficient** during the first half and during the second half they are restored in a more prosperous condition.'¹⁷⁸⁹

This conjecture falters for a number of reasons, however: 1) the passive *dabhyate* is a hapax and does not occur after the RV (see Chapter IV, s.v.); 2) the meaning attested for RV 1.41.1 *dabhyate* ('is deceived') does not suit the context, and the hypothetical passive of another root, *dambh* 'hurt' (the meaning, which probably underlies BODEWITZ's translation of the passage), is not attested.

However, the meaning 'become deficient' is perfectly appropriate for the present -*dasya*-^{ti} (LUBOTSKY, p.c.); a possible conjecture might be then ⁺dasyante 'thā 'they become deficient; then ...' (Th. ZEHNDER, p.c.).

On the transitive counterpart of *dasya*-^{ti}, the -*āya*-causative *dāsayati* (AV +), see JAMISON 141.

Middle forms

Alongside the hypothetical form *pra* ... ⁺dasyante, discussed above, one more middle occurrence is also attested in the JB:

¹⁷⁸⁸ For this form, see Chapter I, s.v. *dhā*.

¹⁷⁸⁹ As BODEWITZ explains, "there is a complementarity between the waxing of the moon in heaven and the decline on earth, and between the waning of the moon and the growth on earth, in view of the Brāhmaṇas".

(JB 1.224:1-2 [ed. CALAND §84])

*ghṛtaścutā ca vai madhuścutā ca devā yatra-yatraiṣāṃ
yajñasyopādasyata, tad āpyāyanta*

‘By means of [the words] *ghṛtaścut* and *madhuścut* [= “ghee-dripping” and “honey-dripping”] the gods made their sacrifice swell, whenever it wasted.’¹⁷⁹⁰

Both CALAND and RAGHU VIRA & LOKESH CHANDRA (1955: 267 [= AO 22, 66]) conjecture the active form ⁺*upādasyat* (cf. also FRENZ 18). The middle inflection may express the possessive-reflexive sense and could have been triggered by the adjacent *āpyāyanta* ‘[the gods] made [**their** sacrifice] swell for **themselves**’ – i.e. ‘[whenever] **their** (*eṣāṃ*) [sacrifice] wasted...’

¹*dī* ‘fly’: *dīya*-^{ti/(te)}

dīya-^{ti}:

Simplex RV;

+ *nīḥ* RV 4.27.1 (*nīr adīyam*, ROTH, HILLEBRANDT ⁺*-adīyat*,

SCHNEIDER ⁺*-adīyāva*);

+ *pāri* RV;

dīya-^{te}:

Simplex SV 2.606 [= 2.5.2.2.1] (*dīyate* ≈ RV 9.3.1 *dīyati*);

+ *pāri* SV 2.314 [= 2.3.2.3.4] (*pāri-dīyase* ≈ RV 9.24.5 *pāri-dhāvasi*)

accented: RV, SV

• intr. activity

The intransitive -ya-present *dīya*-^{ti/(te)}¹⁷⁹¹ occurs only in the RV and RVic repetitions. Examples are:

(RV 9.3.1ab)

eṣā devó ámart,yaḥ ' parṇavīr iva dīyati

‘This immortal god (sc. Soma) flies like a winged bird (?)’¹⁷⁹².

¹⁷⁹⁰ BODEWITZ: ‘became dried up’.

¹⁷⁹¹ A remodelled root present? (see LIV 107, note 6).

¹⁷⁹² On the semantics and etymology of *parṇavī-*, see SCARLATA 499f.

(RV 8.26.6ab)

dasrá hí víśvam ānuśān ' makṣúbhiḥ paridīyathaḥ

‘For you, the wonderful ones, fly round everything one by one, with the speedy [horses].’

Worthy of special mention is the compound with *nīḥ*, which is one of the most discussed RVic verbal forms. The form in question occurs in the well-known legend of Soma’s abduction:

(RV 4.27.1)

*gárbhe nú sánn án_uv eṣām avedam ' ahám devánām jánimāni víśvā
śatām mā púra áyasīr arakṣann ' ádha śyenó javāsā nír adīyam*

The first three pādas pose no syntactic problems:

‘Still being in the womb, I learned all kinds of these gods; hundred iron strongholds were guarding me ...’

Most difficult is pāda d: the 1sg. form *adīyam* and the nominative *śyenó* ‘eagle’ in the same clause raise the question of the referential identification of the subject (= 1st person); for a survey of interpretations, see OLDENBERG, *Noten ad loc.*; SCHNEIDER 1971: 12f.

LUDWIG (1876 [RV übers.]: II, 592; cf. also 1883 [RV übers., Comm. II]: 467f.) rendered the stanza as pronounced by Soma himself, treating *śyenó* as an apposition: ‘da flog ich als falke mit schnelligkeit heraus’; similarly, GRASSMANN (1876 [RV übers.]: I, 134); BERGAIGNE 1883: III, 322ff. (‘... alors je suis sorti d’un vol rapide sous la forme d’un aigle’). BLOOMFIELD (1893b: 153; 1896a: 1ff., esp. 17f.) followed the same syntactic analysis (‘Then as an eagle I flew forth swiftly’), but identified the speaker as Agni. ROTH (1882: 355 [= Kl.Schr. I, 557]) suggested that the subject in pāda d is the eagle, which has required the conjecture of the 3sg. form ⁺*adīyat*; this emendation was adopted only by HILLEBRANDT (1891 [VMyth II]: 282; 1913: 29, with fn. 1; 1924: 25 [= Kl.Schr., 499]);¹⁷⁹³ cf. in HILLEBRANDT’s (1913) translation: ‘mich bewachten hundert eherne Burgen, da schoß schnell ein Adler hervor’; for criticism, see esp. BERGAIGNE, *op.cit.*, 323f. and LUDWIG 1893: 90ff. Still less likely are SCHNEIDER’s (1963-64: 66f., with fn. 20; 1971: 12f.) emendation and interpretation: SCHNEIDER assumes a dual subject (‘the eagle and myself = Soma’, i.e. ‘Der Falke und ich flogen heraus’), and accordingly reconstructs the 1du. form ⁺*adīyāva* (which, incidentally, violates

¹⁷⁹³ More recently, also by MAURER (1995: 212, with fn. 14).

the metre). OLDENBERG (Noten, ad loc.) suggested that the whole stanza should be understood as pronounced by the eagle; cf. GELDNER's translation: '... Da flog ich Adler rasch davon'; thus also SCARLATA 267, fn. 370. SIEG (1902: 88) understood the stanza as pronounced by Indra and divided pāda d into two clauses: 'Da (kam) der Adler; durch den schnellen flog ich heraus.' The biclausal analysis of the pāda is also adopted by THIEME (1964: 41), but the speaker is identified as Soma (i.e., as in LUDWIG's and BERGAIGNE's translation): 'Da – der Falke! Mit dem Schnellen flog ich heraus.' This interpretation, accepted also by ELIZARENKOVA, appears most probable, in particular, for semantic reasons.

Middle forms

The two middle occurrences, attested in the SV, appear in RVic repetitions; thus the middle inflection must be secondary. SV 2.606 [= 2.5.2.2.1] *dīyate* substitutes for RV 9.3.1 *dīyati*.¹⁷⁹⁴ SV 2.314 [= 2.3.2.3.4] *paridīyase*, replacing RV 9.24.5 *paridhāvasi* '[you, O Soma], run around [the strainer]', has probably emerged under the influence of *nīyase* in the preceding stanza (*nībhir yató ví nīyase* SV 2.313 [= 2.3.2.3.3] = RV 9.24.3c).

dīv 'play': *dīvyā*-^{ti/te}

[i] 'X_{NOM} plays'; [ii] 'X^{pl.}_{NOM} play for Y^{stake}_{ACC}'

Simplex:

[[Act.]] [i] RV 10.34.13, AV 6.119.1 ≈ ⁺MS^m 4.14.7:245.7¹⁷⁹⁵ = TĀ^m 2.4.1 = 2.7.1 (*ádīvyan*), VādhAnv,¹⁷⁹⁶ Sū. +;

[ii] ĀpŚS^m 5.19.4 = BhārŚS^m 5.12.5 = HirŚS^m 3.5.8 [2pl.impv.] *dīvyata*, VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 4.49 (= VādhS 4.75:12 (= CALAND 1928: 191f. [= Kl.Schr., 491f.])) *dīvyāmaḥ*;

[[Med.]] [ii] ŚBM 1.8.3.6 *dīvyamānā* (≈ ŚBK 2.8.1.5 *vi-dīvyamānā*), ŚB^m 5.4.4.23 *dīvyadhvam*, ŚBK 7.1.4.11 ≈ 7.3.4.22 *dīvyante*;

+ *prāti* 'X_{NOM} plays against Z_{ACC}' AV 7.109.4;

+ *ví* [ii] MS^p 1.6.11:104.6 (⁺*vi-*)*dīvyeyuḥ* (ed. SCHROEDER *dīvyeyuḥ*)

¹⁷⁹⁴ See BLOOMFIELD & EDGERTON 1930 [Ved. Var. I]: 46; RENOU 1952c: 105.

¹⁷⁹⁵ See GOTÖ 241, fn. 528.

¹⁷⁹⁶ Also in VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 4.35 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 4.59a:12 (= CALAND 1928: 169 [= Kl.Schr., 469])), where CALAND reads *dīvyeta* against *dīvyē*[t] (*dīvyed* v^o) in all mss. (Yasuke IKARI, p.c.).

(≈ VārŚS 1.4.4.12 (*vi-)dīvyeyuḥ ≈ BhārŚS 5.12.7 dīvyeyuḥ), KS^P 8.7:90.11 *vi-dīvyante* ≈ KpS^P 7.4:75.2 *vi-dīvyanti* (≈ Pat. ad Pāṇ. 2.3.60 [ed. KIELHORN, vol. I, p. 466, l. 2] *pra-dīvyanti*), MS^P 4.4.6:57.10 *vī dīvyante* (≈ ĀpŚS 18.19.2 ^{nte} ≈ VārŚS 3.3.3.24 ^{nte} ≈ HirŚS 13.6.29 ^{nti}), ŚBK 2.8.1.5 *vi-dīvyamānā* (≈ ŚBM 1.8.3.6 *dīvyamānā*), MānŚS 9.1.4.22; [without accusative] VādhŚS [ed. IKARĪ] 11.21 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 3.91:3 (= CALAND 1926: 198 [= Kl.Schr., 381])) *vi-dīvyanti*

accented: AV, ŚB(K)

- (intr.) activity

The present *dīvyā-^{ti/te}*, attested in Vedic both with the active and middle inflection, occurs in early mantras (RV_X^{1x}, AV^{2x}) only inflected in the active. The only RVic occurrence appears in maṇḍala X, constructed with the instrumental of the dice:¹⁷⁹⁷

(RV 10.34.13a)

akṣáir mā́ dīvyah kṛ́śim ít kṛ́asva

‘Do not play with dice; plough your field.’

The compound *prāti-dīv* (attested in the AV) is constructed with the accusative of the adversary (governed by the preverb):

(AV 7.109.4cd)

vṛ́kṣám ivā́śányā jahi ' yó asmán pratidīvyati

‘Strike, like a tree with the thunderbolt, [the one] who plays against us.’

A similar syntactic pattern (with the pronominal object *naḥ*) occurs for the only attested perfect form (simplex) in AV 5.29.2 *yó no didéva* ‘who has played [against] us’ (see KÜMMEL 2000: 246).

In Vedic prose (YV, ŚB(K)) as well as in a few young mantras (ŚB, Sū.), the stem *dīvyā-* becomes particularly common with the middle inflection and typically occurs with the accusative of the stake: ‘X^{pl.}_{NOM} play for Y^{stake}_{ACC}’.¹⁷⁹⁸ In the Saṃhitās of the YV (MS, KS–KpS), this usage is mainly attested for the compound with the preverb *vī*, which expresses the reciprocal meaning ‘play (with each other)’, not ‘lose at play’, as PW III, 617 (‘verspielen’), and, subsequently, MONIER-WILLIAMS 965, translate this compound (see KULIKOV 2007a: 720). This interpretation is also supported by the fact that all Vedic occurrences employed in this usage have plural subjects. Cf.:

¹⁷⁹⁷ Cf. HAUDRY 254f.

¹⁷⁹⁸ For a comprehensive description of the play, see FALK 1986: 134ff. et passim.

(MS 1.6.11:104.6 (≈ VārŚS 1.4.4.12 ≈ BhārŚS 5.12.7))

gām asya tād áhaḥ sabhāyām (⁺*vi*) *dīvyeyuḥ* [VārŚS (⁺*vi*-)*dīvyeyuḥ*, BhārŚS *dīvyeyuḥ*]¹⁷⁹⁹

‘That day they should play for his cow in the assembly house.’ (see DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 178; FALK 1986: 154f.)

(MS 4.4.6:57.10 (≈ ĀpŚS 18.19.2 ≈ VārŚS 3.3.3.24 ≈ HirŚS 13.6.29))

tātra paṣṭhauhīm vi dīvyante [ĀpŚS, VārŚS ^o*nte*, HirŚS ^o*nti*]

‘There they play for a young [2,5 years old] cow.’ (see FALK, op.cit., 134, 169)

(KS 8.7:90.10-11 ≈ KpS 7.4:75.2 (≈ Pat. ad Pāṇ. 2.3.60))

gām ghnanti; tām vi dīvyante [KpS *vi dīvyanti*, Pat. *gām pradīvyanti*]¹⁸⁰⁰

‘They kill the cow; they play for it.’ (see FALK, op.cit., 155)

(MānŚS 9.1.4.22)

tām catvāro vi dīvyante: brāhmaṇo rājanyo vaiśyaḥ śūdraḥ

‘Four persons play for her (sc. a cow): a Brahman, a Kṣatriya, a Vaiśya, a Śūdra.’

Besides KpS *vidīvyanti*, which is likely to be a secondary replacement of the original middle *vidīvyante* (attested in the Kāṭhaka), the only active form encountered in Vedic prose (YV^p, ŚB) is opt. (*vi*)*dīvyeyuḥ* in the MS. On account of its reciprocal meaning, this form is quite irregular and perhaps belongs with -yet-optatives (see KULIKOV 2006d), rather than with -ya-presents.

The same pattern (‘X^{pl}_{NOM} play for Y_{ACC}’) is attested for the middle forms in the ŚB, but, in contrast to the usage in the YV, primarily for the

¹⁷⁹⁹ Ed. SCHROEDER *dīvyeyuḥ*; CALAND (1909: 52 [= Kl.Schr., 173]) conjectured ⁺*vidīvyeyuḥ*, and this conjecture was adopted by OERTEL (1934a: 66f. [= Kl.Schr. I, 697f.]). THIEME (1936: 702f.) and WACKERNAGEL (1942: 180 [= Kl.Schr. I, 394ff.]), on account of Patañjali’s quotation (Mahābhāṣya ad Pāṇ. 2.3.60) *gām pradīvyanti* (with the elsewhere unattested compound; see RAU 1985: 29, No. 235), considered this emendation unnecessary; MITTWEDE (1986 [Textkr. zur MS]: 58f., with bibl.) subscribes to the latter opinion. Although pattern [ii] ‘play for smth.’ is indeed attested for the simplex in the ŚB (see examples below) and some Sūtras, the present *dīvyā-^{ti}* does not occur as a simplex elsewhere in the YV, which favours CALAND’s conjecture.

¹⁸⁰⁰ For the secondary active in the KpS, cf. MS, ed. SCHROEDER, Einleitung, S. XVIII.; SCHROEDER 1883-84: 7; OERTEL 1934a: 66f. [= Kl.Schr. I, 697f.]. On the inexact quotation in Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya (ad Pāṇ. 2.3.60) *gām pradīvyanti*, see the preceding footnote.

simplex. The compound with *ví* occurs only once, in the Kāṇva recension (corresponding to the simplex in the Mādhyandina). Examples are:

(ŚB 5.4.4.23)

etēṣv akṣēṣv āha: gām dīvyadhvam iti

‘On those dice he says: “Play for the cow”.’ (see FALK, op.cit., 166f.)

(ŚBM 1.8.3.6 ≈ ŚBK 2.8.1.5)

tāsmād u samānād evā pūruṣād attā cādyāś ca jāyete. idāṁ hí caturthé pūruṣe tṛtīye sām gacchāmaha iti videvām dīvyamānā [ŚBK vidīvyamānā] jātyā āsate

Explaining this passage, WEBER-BROSAMER (1988: 86f., with fn. 195) rightly points out that *sām gacchāmaha* refers to fighting, not to sexual intercourse (as GELDNER (1889 [VSt I]: 281), and subsequently RAU (1957: 40), understood it):¹⁸⁰¹

‘Und deshalb entstehen aus einem gemeinsamen Mann (= Vorfahren) der Esser und der Zu-Essende. Denn: Jetzt leben die Kinder [dieses Mannes noch friedlich] ihren Einsatz¹⁸⁰² ausspielend zusammen [und denken:] “In der vierten, in der dritten Generation treffen wir [als Gegner] aufeinander”.’

In the Sūtras, active forms are also attested in usage [ii], as, for instance, in the following mantra:

(ĀpŚS^m 5.19.4 = BhārŚS^m 5.12.5 = HirŚS^m 3.5.8)

vrīhibhyo gām dīvyata

‘Play for a cow with rice.’¹⁸⁰³

To sum up, the development of the morphological encoding of the reciprocal pattern [ii] ‘X^{pl}_{NOM} play (with each other) for Y_{ACC}’ can be outlined as follows:

- | | | |
|------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| (1) YV ^p | : | <i>ví-dīvyā-^{te/(ti)}</i> |
| (2) ŚB ^(m) | : | <i>(ví-)dīvyā-^{te}</i> |
| (3) Sū. ^(m) | : | <i>dīvyā-^{ti/te}</i> |

¹⁸⁰¹ GELDNER: ‘Darum ... sitzen jetzt Blutsverwandte unerotisch spielend beieinander, indem sie denken: im vierten, im dritten Gliede (der Verwandtschaft) dürfen wir uns geschlechtlich vereinigen.’

¹⁸⁰² Cf. WEBER-BROSAMER, *ibid.*, fn. 195.

¹⁸⁰³ Inexactly CALAND (for the ĀpŚS): ‘Verspielet die Kuh um Reis’, apparently following the PW’s interpretation of *ví-dīv* as ‘lose at play’, mentioned above.

Thus, by the end of the Vedic period, middle and active forms of *dīvyā^{ti/te}* can be indiscriminately employed in the reciprocal usage; cf. especially the Sūtra parallels of MS 4.4.6, quoted above.

duṣ ‘spoil’: *duṣya^{ti}*

Simplex (AVP-Kashm. 5.8.6 ms. *duṣyaṃ*, ed. BARRET ⁺*aduṣyan*, read with AVP-Or. = AVŚ 4.6.7 *ádihan*¹⁸⁰⁴), AB 7.4 (*duṣyet* (3x), *duṣyeyuḥ*), ŚĀ^m 12.5 (23), ChU 8.10.1 = 8.10.3 +;

+ *ví* (AVP-Kashm. 19.46.13 ms. *viduṣā tam*, BARRET’s conjecture ⁺*viduṣyatām*¹⁸⁰⁵ is improbable), ViṣṇuSmṛ. 24.41 (*na viduṣyanti*)¹⁸⁰⁶

duṣya^{te} : VāsDhS 19.38 +

unaccented

• intr. process

pass. of caus. (?): *dūṣya^{te}*

Kāṭh-Saṃk. p. 141, l.12

The -ya-present *duṣya^{ti}* first appears in an AB passage (four occurrences in similar constructions):

(AB 7.4)

[1] *tad āhur: yasya sāyaṃdugdhaṃ sāñnāyyaṃ **duṣyed** vāpahared vā, kā tatra prāyaścittir? iti* [...] [2] *tad āhur: yasya prātardugdhaṃ sāñnāyyaṃ **duṣyed** vāpahared vā, kā tatra prāyaścittir? iti* [...] [3] *tad āhur: yasya sarvaṃ eva sāñnāyyaṃ **duṣyed** vāpahared vā, kā tatra prāyaścittir? iti* [...] [4] *tad āhur: yasya sarvāṇy eva havīm̐ṣi **duṣyeyur** vāpahareyur vā, kā tatra prāyaścittir? iti*

¹⁸⁰⁴ *yé ápiṣan yé ádihan* ‘[they] who mashed [the poison], who smeared [arrows with poison]...’ (see LUBOTSKY 2002: 51).

¹⁸⁰⁵ The pāda starts: *pāpāṃ dhiyam viduṣā tam* ... The passage is corrupt and unclear. The Orissa version is also corrupt (ms. [Pa.] *pāpāṃ dhiyaṃ jujuṣ(?)a* ..., transcript by A. GRIFFITHS) and does not help much, but, in any case, it does not support BARRET’s emendation.

¹⁸⁰⁶ See KORNEEVA 2007: 123 and 225; in KORNEEVA’s translation: ‘[на них] нет рпеха’ ([they] do not take the blame upon themselves).

‘[1] They say: “If someone’s *sāmnāyya*-milk¹⁸⁰⁷ obtained in the evening becomes spoiled¹⁸⁰⁸ or [someone] carries it away, what is the expiation here?” [...] [2] They say: “If someone’s *sāmnāyya*-milk obtained in the morning becomes spoiled or [someone] carries it away, what is the expiation here?” [...] [3] They say: “If finally someone’s total amount of *sāmnāyya*-milk becomes spoiled or [someone] carries it away, what is the expiation here?” [...] [4] They say: “If finally all oblations of someone become spoiled or [they] carry [these] away, what is the expiation here?”’¹⁸⁰⁹

In the late Vedic period this present remains rather rare, but becomes more common in post-Vedic texts.¹⁸¹⁰ The Vedic attestations are:

(ŚĀ^m 12.5 (23a))

nāsya prajā duṣyati jāyamānā

‘No offspring of his is spoiled when being born.’

(ChU 8.10.1 [ed. MORGENROTH 8.10.2] ≈ 8.10.3)

tad yady apīdañ śarīram andhaṃ bhavaty, anandhaḥ sa bhavati; yadi srāmam asrāmaḥ. naivaiṣo ’sya doṣeṇa duṣyati

‘Thus, if this body becomes blind, that one (sc. the Ātman) does not; if [the body becomes] lame, [the Ātman] does not. Verily, it does not become defect with deficiency of this [body].’

The transitive counterpart of *duṣya-*^{ti}, viz. the *-āya*-causative *dūṣāya-*^{ti} RV +, is discussed in JAMISON 95. The vowel length in the causative poses some problems. Since positing two suppletive roots, i.e. *duṣ* and *dūṣ* (WERBA [VIA I] 196 and 463f.), can hardly be a reasonable solution, we have to

¹⁸⁰⁷ The mixture of milk prepared in the evening and in the morning for the Agnihotra.

¹⁸⁰⁸ As CALAND (ad ĀpŚS 9.15.14) explains, “durch Hineinfallen fremder Gegenstände u.s.w.”

¹⁸⁰⁹ Thus KEITH. The syntax of the passage is rather unusual. On the assumption that *duṣya-*^{ti} can only be employed intransitively, the subordinate parts of all the four sentences can only be understood as consisting of two clauses, with necessary suppletion of the impersonal subject of *apahared/apahareyur*. Cf. also a similar construction in ĀpŚS 9.15.14: *yasya sarvāṇi havīṃṣi naśyeyur duṣyeyur apahareyur vā ...*

¹⁸¹⁰ For post-Vedic usages, see, in particular, THIEME 1955: 199 [= Kl.Schr. [I], 2, 678], fn. 20.

eliminate one of them as a secondary root variant. Assuming the original long root vowel (*dūṣ*, as in the -*aya*-causative), we have to explain the emergence of the short vowel variant; its explanation through the influence of the prefix *duṣ-* (MAYRHOFER, KEWA II, 55f.; EWAia I, 749; JAMISON 95, fn. 39) is doubtful and has no clear parallels. On the contrary, the long vowel variant might result from some secondary (morpho)phonological developments;¹⁸¹¹ see, e.g., KUIPER 1934: 224, fn. 4; KULIKOV 1999: 232, with fn. 14 (with bibl.); cf. also FRANKE's (1897: 174f.) account of the vowel lengthening as a functional equivalent of the full grade in some formations.

Middle forms; Caus. pass.

Forms with middle inflection first appear in the Dharma-Sūtras (VāsDhS 19.38 *steno'nupraveśān na duṣyate* 'a man is not considered guilty of theft simply by accompanying a thief' (OLIVELLE 2000: 429)); cf. BHARADWAJ 1982: 104. By contrast, the form *dūṣyate* (with the long root vowel), attested in the Kāth-Saṃk., is likely to be a passive of the -*aya*-causative *dūṣāya*-^{ti}:

(Kāth-Saṃk. p.141, l.12)

dūṣyate vā ṛco 'kṣaram yad etad

'If this syllable of the stanza (ṛc) is damaged ...'

dr̥p 'be/become bewildered, mad, ignorant': *dṛ̥pya*-^{ti}

RV 1.151.8, AB 2.7.9, ŚBK 7.4.2.2 (*dṛ̥pyet* ≈ ŚBM 5.5.1.2 *mādyet*), JUB 3.6.1.4 [ed. OERTEL 3.29.4]^{2x} +

accented: ŚBK

• intr. state

The verb *dr̥p* refers to an unstable intellectual state, bewilderment, confusion, lack of control over one's mind and other aspects of mental disability (see esp. HOFFMANN 1965a: 14 and 25 [= Aufs. 2, 443], n. 8: "geistige Verwirrung"). Cf., in particular, the following JUB passage, where *dr̥p* is opposed to *jñā* 'know':

¹⁸¹¹ Parallel cases are, for instance, opt. *pūṣema* AV, part. *rīṣant-*, with the secondary vowel length in an open syllable before *ṣ*.

(JUB 3.6.1.4 [ed. OERTEL 3.29.4])

taṃ hovāca: dṛpyāmi svīḥ, jñānāmīti. na dṛpyasīti hovāca, jñānāsi

‘He said to him: “Am I ignorant¹⁸¹² [or] do I know?” – “You are not ignorant, – [Uccaiśśravas] said, – you do know”.’¹⁸¹³

This present is only once attested in the mantras, in the negative participle *ádṛpyant-* ‘unconfused, non-bewildered, reasonable’:

(RV 1.151.8d)

ádṛpyatā mānasā revád āśāthe

‘You two have obtained rich [power] with the unconfused mind.’¹⁸¹⁴

Finite forms first appear in Vedic prose; cf. the JUB attestation quoted above and the AB occurrence:

(AB 2.7.8-9)

[8] *yāṃ vai dṛpto vadati, yām unmattaḥ; sā vai rākṣasī vāñi. [9] nātmanā dṛpyati, nāsyā prajāyāṃ dṛpta ā jāyate, ya evaṃ veda*

‘[8] Which [speech he] speaks, **bewildered**, [or] which [speech he speaks], being crazy, this is the speech of the rakṣases. [9] He, who knows thus, does not himself **become bewildered**,¹⁸¹⁵ nor in his offspring a bewildered son is born.’

dṛh ‘be/become firm’: *dṛhya-*^{ti/(te)}

RV 3.30.15, 8.24.10, 10.100.1 (*dṛhya*),¹⁸¹⁶ 8.80.7 (*dṛhyasva*)
accented: RV

¹⁸¹² OERTEL: ‘am I really crazy?’.

¹⁸¹³ Cf. also a similar context in BaudhŚS 18.44:396.7-8 *dṛpyāmi vai kileti [...] na vai dṛpyasi*, where *dṛpyāmi* rather means ‘I am mad’ (see GOTÖ 2000: 100f.).

¹⁸¹⁴ Cf. GELDNER: ‘Mit **besonnenem** Sinn habt ihr reiche (Kraft) erlangt!’; RENOU (EVP V, 76): ‘par un esprit **sans forfanterie**’. Cf. also RENOU’s comments on his translation: “Quand l’esprit s’attelle (à une œuvre poétique), on « oint » la parole, c’est-à-dire: on la prépare selon les canons poétiques, les préliminaires étant, comme dans une sorte de (pré-)Yoga, la pensée concentrée ([pāda] c) et un certain comportement moral (d)” (EVP VII, 36).

¹⁸¹⁵ Inexactly HAUG (‘become haughty’) and KEITH (‘become proud’).

¹⁸¹⁶ Unaccented in RV 8.24.10.

- intr. state

also in adv. deriv.:

-át: *drahyát* ‘solidly, firmly, to become firm’ RV 2.11.15

The intransitive present *dṛhya*^{ti/(te)} (see JOACHIM 96) occurs only in the RV (4x), attested in the 2sg. imperative *dṛhya(sva)* alone. All the four occurrences are addressed to Indra; three of these are met with in the fixed collocation *índra dṛhya(sva)* ‘O Indra, be/become¹⁸¹⁷ firm!’, cf.:

(RV 8.80.7a)

índra dṛhyasva pūr asi

‘O Indra, be/become firm! You are a stronghold.’

Another formation, probably related to this -ya-present, is the adverb *drahyát* (RVic hapax).¹⁸¹⁸ It is unclear whether we can see here a different (archaic?) morphological model of the (active) -ya-presents (with the deviating full grade root and final accentuation):

(RV 2.11.15b)

trpát sómam pāhi drahyád indra

The connection of this formation with the present *dṛhya*^{ti/(te)} (note that it appears in a similar context, i.e. expressing a wish addressed to Indra) prompts the translation ‘solidly, firmly, in order to become firm’.¹⁸¹⁹

‘Drink Soma, to become satiated, to become firm, O Indra!’

druh ‘deceive, be/become deceitful’: *drúhya*^{ti}

Simplex AVP 2.89.4, 9.19.7, YV^p +;

+ *abhí* YV^p

¹⁸¹⁷ See LIV 113, note 5.

¹⁸¹⁸ For the literature on this form and the morphological type (adverbials in -át, based on active participles) in general, see below, s.v. *stā* (*tā*) ‘steal’.

¹⁸¹⁹ Cf. RENO, EVP XVII, 56: ‘vigoureusement’; INSLEER (1970: 138, fn. 2): ‘solidly’ = ‘with determination’. Improbable is SCHULZE’s connection with the Germanic root for ‘drink’, adopted by WACKERNAGEL (1896 [AiG I]: 10, 126, 249) (and by HENRY in his review (1896b: 122, fn. 1)), albeit inconsistently: on pp. 71, 213 *drahyát* is connected with *dṛhya*-. Correctly DEBRUNNER 1957 [AiG, Nachtr. zu I]: 6.

accented: YV^p +

• intr. state

also in nom. deriv.:

-ú-: *druhyú-* (tribe name)¹⁸²⁰ RV +

The intransitive present *drúhya-ti* ‘deceive, be deceitful’ (for the meaning, see esp. THIEME 1973: 339f. [= Kl.Schr. II, 1090]), first attested in the AVic (Paippalāda) mantras, is employed either in objectless constructions (cf. AVP 2.89.4 *ye dhūrvanti ye druhyanti ye dviṣanti* ‘who harm, who deceive, who hate’) or with the dative, as in:

(TS 6.2.2.1-2)

tābhyah sā nīr ṛcchād, yāḥ ||1|| naḥ prathamò 'nyò 'nyásmāi drúhyāt

‘He who first among us will be deceitful to another will suffer loss of these [bodies].’¹⁸²¹

dhyā ‘think of, meditate, contemplate’: *dhyāya-ti/(te)*

dhyāya-ti

Simplex (RVKh. 3.10².16 (≈ BṛhDev. 6.145) *dhyāyét* – -yet-optative (?)),
AVP 9.21.1-12, YV^p +;

+ *abhi* TS^p +;

+ *ā* JB, BaudhŚS 18.2:345.1;

+ *abhy-ā* VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 5.15 (= VādhS [ed. CALAND] 4.115:1 (= CALAND 1928: 235f. [= Kl.Schr., 535f.]));

+ *ni* AB 3.2.7;

+ *pra* ManB 2.2.5 (= GobhGS^m 3.10.19)

accented: YV^p +

dhyāya-te

Simplex KS^p 24.3:92.1 = KpS^p 37.4:197.7 (*dhyāyate* ≈ TS^p 6.1.7.4 – MS^p 3.7.5:81.16-17 *dhyāyati*), KB 27.11.3 (ed. ĀnSS, ed. LINDNER [27.6])

¹⁸²⁰ I.e., etymologically, ‘deceitful, cheater’ (cf. WITZEL 1999: 3). See WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER AiG I, 141; II/2, 845, §681d); LUBOTSKY 1988: 48; MAYRHOFFER 2003: 47.

¹⁸²¹ For this passage, see HOFFMANN 1969b: 198 [= Aufs. 1, 293], fn. 19; on the relative clause structure, see also JAMISON 1991b: 48.

dhyāyante, ed. SARMA *dhyāyanti*),¹⁸²² JB 1.323:2, GB, MuṇḍU 3.1.8 +;
 + *abhi* PraśU (*abhi-dhyāyīta*), MaitrU 6.38 +;
 + *ā* Kāṭh-Saṃk. p. 71, 1.5 [Cūḍākaraṇa-Br.];
 + *ni* MaitrU 6.19
 • tr.

In earlier Indo-European and Sanskrit studies, *dhyā* was sometimes grouped with the so-called ‘long diphthong roots’ (**dhǵēi*), and, accordingly, *dhyāya-^{ii/(te)}* was treated as a class I present (*dhyāy-a-*).¹⁸²³ From the diachronic point of view, this analysis is doubtful for a number of reasons (for a survey of reconstructions, see MAYRHOFFER, EWAia I, 777f.). Synchronically, however, some forms point to the (secondary) reanalysis of this present as based on the root *dhyāy-* (*dhyai*), cf. esp. the post-Vedic 3sg.med. optative in *-īta*: *abhi-dhyāyīta* (PraśU, 3x in praśna 5),¹⁸²⁴ *dhyāyīta* VaikhŚS 17.6:240.9 (on this late morphological type, see WHITNEY 1889: 266, §738b; 382, §1043c and HOFFMANN (1952b [1957]) 136f. [= Aufs. 2, 371]). This formation can only be derived directly from roots or from quasi-roots, such as causative stems in *-ay[a]-*, and may betray a (weak) tendency to the reanalysis *dhyāy-a-*.

The present *dhyāya-^{ii/(te)}* ‘think of, meditate, contemplate’¹⁸²⁵ (mostly with the active inflection) is well-attested from Vedic prose onwards; evidence for its existence in the mantra language (after the RV) is scant. The only attestation in the RVKh (opt. *dhyāyēt*, with the final accentuation, impossible for a class IV present) is uncertain. The stanza runs:

(RVKh. 3.10².16 ≈ BṛhDev. 6.145)

pāvamānīm pitṛñ⁺ devān⁺ dhyāyéd⁺ yás ca⁺ sárásvatīm⁺
pítṛīms⁺ tásyópa tiṣṭheta⁺ kṣīrām⁺ sarpír mádhūdakām⁺

‘And who meditates on the Pāvamānī [verses], on the fathers, on the gods, and on Sarasvatī, his fathers [only] milk, ghee, honey, [and] water

¹⁸²² On this passage, see GONDA 1982b: 34 [= Sel.St. VI/2, 88]. The middle optative [*manasā*] *dhyāyeta* (ŚB 11.2.7.32) cited by GONDA, *ibid.*, is an inaccurate quotation of the active form *dhyāyet*.

¹⁸²³ Thus WACKERNAGEL 1896 [AiG I]: 87 (*√dhyai*); SPECHT 1935: 112; but cf. also PERSSON 700, with fn. 2, where *dhyāyati* is interpreted as a -ya-present, notwithstanding the ‘long diphthong’ analysis of the root.

¹⁸²⁴ See SALOMON 1991: 53.

¹⁸²⁵ On the meaning, see especially GONDA 1963: 292ff.

may approach.’

This stanza may be based on RV 9.67.32, which underwent essential changes:

*pāvamānīr yó adhyétiy ' ṛṣibhiḥ sámabhṛtaṃ rásam
tásmai sárasvatī duhe ' kṣīrāṃ sarpīr mádhūdakām*

‘Who knows by heart the Pāvamānī [verses], the sap brought together by the ṛṣis, Sarasvatī gives him milk, ghee, honey, water.’

dhyāyéd yás in pāda b of the RVKh. stanza undoubtedly copies RVic *yó adhyéti*, and the awkward form *dhyāyét* may result from misunderstanding RVic *adhyéti*, to which it may owe its unusual accentuation. The suffix accentuation could be further supported by the morphological model of the -yét-optative, see KULIKOV 2006d: 33f. Under this analysis, the accent conjecture (⁺*dhyāyét*)¹⁸²⁶ is unnecessary. This interpretation is indirectly corroborated by the parallel root aorist optative in -yāt (*dhyāyāt* ‘he should think’), attested in Vedic prose – for instance, in KB 8.7.6 [ed. LINDNER 8.5] and 9.5.19, ŚB^v 14.7.2.23 (= BĀUM^v 4.4.23 = BĀUK^v 4.4.21).¹⁸²⁷

Next to RVKh. *dhyāyét* (a -yét-optative?), an unaccented optative *dhyāyet* (which, theoretically, might belong either with -ya-presents, or with -yet-optatives)¹⁸²⁸ occurs in the refrain of the AVic (Paippalāda) hymn 9.21, which belongs to the prose parts (probably of younger age) of the AV:

(AVP 9.21.1-12)

*sa ya evaṃ vidvān prāśnīyād; etām eva devatām manasā dhyāyet*¹⁸²⁹

¹⁸²⁶ VWC-Saṃh. III, 1744a and fn. g (with a question mark).

¹⁸²⁷ One more mantra attestation occurs in the late post-Vedic ManB (pāda a is also quoted in GobhGS 3.10.19):

(ManB 2.2.5)

*yat paśavaḥ pradhyāyata ' manasā hṛdayena ca
vācā sahasrapāśayā ' prati badhnāmi vo manaḥ*

‘When you, O (sacrificial) animals, meditate with your mind and heart, I bind your mind with speech [consisting of] thousand fetters.’

Note the irregular use of *pradhyāyata* (imperative in the indicative usage? injunctive?).

¹⁸²⁸ See KULIKOV 2006d: 33f.

¹⁸²⁹ RENOU (1957a: 67) recorded this form with the erroneous BARRET’s (AVP-Kashm.) segmentation (*manasādhyāyet*), i.e. *adhyāyet*, and qualified it as “in all respects a “recent” formation”.

‘He, who knows thus, should eat; verily, he should think about this deity with his mind.’

In the Saṃhitā prose, the present *dhyāya*-^{ti/(te)} becomes quite common, typically constructed with the accusative of the object of meditation, cf.:

(TS 2.5.11.5)

dūtīr evā tvam manaso 'si; yád dhī manasā dhyāyati, tād vācā vādati

‘You are the messenger of mind; for of what one thinks with the mind, that one expresses with the speech.’

Middle forms

Middle forms are rare in Vedic prose. The only middle occurrence in the Saṃhitās (KS 24.3:91.22-92.1 = KpS 37.4:197.7-8 *dhīr asīti dhyāyate hi vācetham cettham ca*) seems to be a secondary replacement of the original active form, attested in the parallel passages TS 6.1.7.4-5 (*dhīr asīty āha. yád dhī manasā dhyāyati tād vācā vādati* ‘he said: “You are meditation”. For on what one meditates with mind, that one says with the speech’; cf. also TS 2.5.11.5, quoted above) and MS 3.7.5:81.16-17.

In younger texts (in particular, in the Upaniṣads), middle forms become more common. *dhyāya*-^{ti/(te)} could be secondarily grouped with the middle non-passive -ya-presents of mental activities constructed with the accusative, such as *mānya*-^{te} ‘think’, *būdhya*-^{te} (β) ‘perceive’, etc. (see Chapter C.II.2.2), which accounts for the expansion of middle forms.

dhvaṃs ‘become ruined, corrupted’: -*dhvasya*-^{ti}

+ *apa* GB 1.1.28:21.1

unaccented

• intr. process

The intransitive present -*dhvasya*-^{ti} occurs in the late GB:

(GB 1.1.28:21.1-2)

yajamāno rajasāpa dhvasyati, śrutiś cāpa dhvastā tiṣṭhati

‘The sacrificer becomes corrupted with impurity, and the śruti (sacred knowledge) becomes corrupted.’ (see BURROW 1947: 649)

In spite of the active inflection, WHITNEY (1885b [Roots]: 86) has

grouped this formation with -ya-passives; however, both the active diathesis and the non-passive meaning clearly point to a class IV present (see PATYAL 1973: 256); cf. esp. the (quasi-)synonymous *jasya*^{ti}, *náśya*^{ti}.

Together with other intransitive formations (class I pres. *dhvāṃsa*^{te} etc.), this -ya-present is opposed to caus. *dhvaṃsáya*^{ti/te} (see GOTÖ 189f. for details).

¹*naś* ‘perish, disappear’: *náśya*^{ti/(te)}

náśya^{ti} :

Simplex RV 1.120.12, 10.97.11, 10.97.13 +,¹⁸³⁰

+ *apa* AVP 1.29.2,¹⁸³¹ KB 30.4.21 [ed. LINDNER 30.5] (*apa-náśya* ≈ AB 6.33.4 *apehi* ≈ GB 2.6.13:264.8 *apa-rasya*, read +*apa-náśya*);

+ *prá* RV 10.146.1, ŚB, TB 2.5.5.6;

+ *ati-prá* ŚB;

+ *ví* RV 1.170.1, 8.27.18, AV 6.113.2, MS^p 1.6.6:96.2, ŚB (BĀU), SB 5.7.2 +

accented: RV 10.146.1 +

náśya^{te} :

Simplex ŚGS 5.8.5 +;

+ *vi* JB 3.227.1-2

• intr. process

The intransitive present *náśya*^{ti} ‘perish, disappear’¹⁸³² is attested from the RV (maṇḍalas I^{2x}, VIII^{1x}, X^{3x}) onwards. Examples are:

(RV 8.27.18cd)

eṣā cid asmād aśániḥ paró nú śásredhantī ví naśyatu

‘And [let] this thunderbolt [be] far from him, let it, the one which does not err, disappear.’

¹⁸³⁰ Also probably in ^AKS^m 38.12:113.13 (*ánaśyataḥ*) (≈ MānŚS^m 6.1.2.26 = VārŚS^m 2.1.2.1 *anaśva*^o) ≈ TĀ^m 6.5.2 (ed. ĀnSS *anáśya*^o, ed. MITRA, ed. ĀnSS (v.l.) *anáśśa*^o) (= ĀpŚS^m 16.6.4 [*anaśya*^o] = HirŚS^m 11.1.69).

¹⁸³¹ Th. ZEHNDER, p.c.

¹⁸³² For its meaning, see, in particular, THIEME 1952: 11ff., with fn. 3.

(AV 2.14.5d)

náśyatetáḥ sadān_uvāḥ

‘Disappear from here, O Sadānvās.’

Some compounds of *náśya*-^{ti} can be constructed with the accusative (“affiziertes Objekt”, in GOTÖ’s terminology), cf.:

(ŚB 6.7.4.11)

mádhye ha saṃvatsarásya svargó lokáḥ. sá yát kánīyo ’rdhāt krámeta, ná haitám svargám lokám abhiprāpnuyād; átha yád bhūyo ’rdhāt párāñ haitám svargám lokám atiprá ṇaśyet

‘... for the heavenly world is in the midst of the year. [Thus] were he to stride for less than half [a year], he would not reach that heavenly world; and were he [to do so] for more than half [a year], he would perish beyond that heavenly world.’

For the corresponding causative *nāśáya*-^{ti} and the reduplicated aorist *anīnaśat*, see JAMISON 141f.

Middle forms

Middle forms first appear in late Vedic (JB, cf. FRENZ 24) and, later on, in the Gr̥Sū.

²*naś* (*aś*) ‘reach’: -*áśyant*- (/ -*aś*[*nu*]vant-)

MS^m 1.11.3:164.2 (vy-*áśyant*-) ≈ ^AKS^m 14.1:201.10 (vy-*àśvan*-) ≈ TS 1.7.9.1 (vy-*áśniya*-) ≈ VS 9.20 (vināñśín-)

• absolute tr. (?)

(+ *pra* DrāhyŚS 2.3.10 = LātyŚS 1.7.9 *prāśyati* – fut.?)

The unclear form *vyáśyan*, attested in a MS mantra, denotes the last month of the year:

(MS^m 1.11.3:164.1-2)*svàr mūrdhā vaiyáśano; vyáśyann āntyáḥ*

‘... Heaven, the first, Vaiyaśana; Vyaśyan, the last one...’

Morphologically, -*áśyan* can be an active participle of a -ya-present derived from the root *aś*, but the variants of this mantra in other YVic Saṃhitās attest no participial forms: KS 14.1:201.10 reads the dative form

vyāśvane ‘to Vyaśvan’,¹⁸³³ TS 1.7.9.1.c has nom. *vyāśniyas*, VS 9.20.i has dat. *vinamśīne*.

It is unclear which prototype might underlie these four formations (*vyāśyant-*, *vyāśvan-*, *vyāśniya-*, *vinamśīn-*). SHARMA (1959-60: 273f.) considered *vyāśvan* (KS) as the original form (cf. also MITTWEDE 1986 [Textkr. zur MS]: 72)¹⁸³⁴ and reckoned it to ¹*aś* ‘eat’, tentatively translating the name of the last month as ‘gefrässig’. However, the forms *vyāśniya-* (TS) and *vinamśīn-* (VS) rather point to another root, ²*naś* (²*aś*) ‘reach’¹⁸³⁵ (thus VWC-Samh. V, 3039b, fn. 1 for the Kāṭhaka form *vyāśvant-*: “[√]*aś-* ‘vyāptau’ [in the sense ‘reach’]”); cf. also VS 22.32 *vyāśnuvīne svāhā* ‘Hail to Vyaśnuvin’, which can only belong with the present *aśnóti* ‘reaches’ (WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 343, §216dβ). The epithet *āntyā-* may further emphasize that this month ends a certain period or season, which prompts the translation ‘[the one] which reaches [the end of a period]’. WEBER’s (1892: 792) interpretation of the VS form *vinamśīn-* as belonging to the root ¹*naś* ‘perish, be lost’ (‘Vergehend’)¹⁸³⁶ is less probable for both morphological and semantic reasons, but the influence of the verb ¹*naś* might indeed explain some of the aforementioned forms; see below for discussion.

In my view, the morphological structure of the attested forms can be tentatively explained as follows. The original formation was the active participle of the class V present *aśnóti*, i.e. *aśn(u)vánt-*, which underwent the simplification of the heavy cluster *-śn(u)v-* to *-śv-*.¹⁸³⁷ The morphologically obscure form *aśvánt-*¹⁸³⁸ could further be replaced by the participle of a -ya-stem, i.e. *áśyant-*, perhaps built under the influence of the -ya-present *náśyati*

¹⁸³³ KS 18.12:273.18 *vyāśvāñ* (unaccented in mss.) ≈ KpS 29.1:129.8 *vyāśvān* is the nom.sg.m. form of the -vant-adjective *-aśvant-*.

¹⁸³⁴ Differently MITTWEDE (1989 [Textkr. zur KS]: 87): ⁺*vyāśana-*, without argumentation and translation.

¹⁸³⁵ On this root see, in particular, BEEKES 1979: 18f.

¹⁸³⁶ The same analysis may underlie WHITNEY’s interpretation of the form *-namśīn*, adduced s.v. *naś* ‘be lost’ (1885b [Roots]: 89).

¹⁸³⁷ Note that participles of the class V presents built on roots ending in a consonant are practically unattested in early Vedic (the only exception being *aśnuvān* in RV 1.116.25).

¹⁸³⁸ The form *vyāśvāñ* (KS 18.12:273.18, KpS °n) vindicates that this formation has been reanalysed as a -vant-adjective by the redactors of the KS–KpS, but this morphological type can only be built on nominal stems, not on primary verbal roots.

‘perishes’, supported both by the phonological similarity of the two roots and by the semantic affinity of their meanings, i.e. ‘reach [the end, the (natural) limit], end, expire’ and ‘perish’.

The isolated form *prāśyati*, attested in two closely related Śrauta-Sūtras (DrāhyŚS 2.3.10 = LāṭyŚS 1.7.9 (ed. VEDĀNTAVĀGÍŚA [B.Ind.]) *yathā bhūmim ājyaṃ prāśyati* ‘[the adhvaryu should pour libations] so that the clarified butter **will reach** the ground’) can hardly represent a -ya-present. °*aśyati* may result from simplification of the erroneous future form (← *°*aśsyati* (?), instead of the regular °*akṣyati*).¹⁸³⁹

nah (nadh) ‘tie, bind’: *nāhya*-^{ti/te}

Simplex

[[Act.]: [tr.] ‘X_{NOM} ties Y_{ACC}’ RV 10.53.7, 10.60.8, TS^p 2.5.7.2, KS^p 23.9:85.7 = KpS^p 36.6:192.5, KpS^p 37.5:198.8 (*nahyati* ≈ KS^p 24.4:93.4 *yacchati*), AB, KB, ŚB 1.3.3.14, GB 2.3.11:199.2

[[Med.]: [tr.-aff.] ‘X_{NOM} puts on Y^{arms, clothes}_{ACC}, X_{NOM} wraps oneself in Y^{arms, clothes}_{ACC}’ AVŚ 19.20.3, TS^p 7.4.2.4, KS^p 19.1:1.9 = KpS^p 29.8:136.1, ĀśGS 3.12.11; (AVP-Kashm. 16.120.1 *a-nahyamāna*- [pass.?] ¹⁸⁴⁰; read probably with Or. mss. *ava-hanyamāna*-)

+ *āpi* (/āpa TB)

[[Act.]: [tr.] ‘tie up/on, close, fasten’ RV 10.166.3, AVŚ 7.70.4-5 ≈ AVP-Or. 13.2.5cd-6ab (= AVP-Kashm. 13.13.1-2) ≈ TB 2.4.2.2-3 (*āpa*), KS^p 33.7:32.11-12, AB,¹⁸⁴¹ ŚBK 7.4.1.12 (*āpi-nahyati* ≈ ŚBM 5.4.5.13 *prātimuñcati*), ŚĀ^m 12.7 (33)

[[Med.]: [pass.] ‘be tied’ AV 12.5.25 (*apinahyāmāna*-), KauśS 65.1; [tr.-aff.] KātyŚS 14.1.23, ĀpM 2.8.10 (*api-nahye* ≈ HirGS^m 1.11.4 *prati-muñce*), PārGS^m 2.14.17

+ *ava*

[[Act.]: ‘fasten, fix’ ĀpŚS 18.18.6 ≈ HirŚS 13.6.18;

[[Med.]: VādhŚS

+ *ā* [tr.] ‘X_{NOM} binds, fastens Y_{ACC} to Z_{LOC}’

¹⁸³⁹ Thus interpreted in ed. RANADE, which has *prāpsyati*.

¹⁸⁴⁰ RENOUE (1957b: 75): ‘not tied up’.

¹⁸⁴¹ For the hybrid form *api-nahyuh* ‘they fastened [his eyes]’ (present form with a perfect ending, for pf. ⁺*api-nehuh*) in AB 6.1.4, built in analogy with the adjacent *api-nahyāma*, see LIEBICH 1891: 73, 77; WACKERNAGEL 1926: 5 [= Kl.Schr. I, 421].

[[Act.]: RVKh. 5.2.3 \approx AV 6.67.3 (*ā* ... *nahyá* in both texts, read °*nahya*)¹⁸⁴²

[[Med.]: RV 10.102.8

+ *pary-ā* [tr.] ‘cover (round)’

[[Act.]: TS^p 6.1.11.2 = MS^p 3.7.8:86.12 = KS^p 24.6:96.19 = KpS^p 37.7:202.2¹⁸⁴³, ŚB, ŚrSū.

+ *praty-ā* [tr.] ‘tie round, fasten’

[[Act.]: TS^p 6.1.11.4 \approx KS^p 24.6:96.20 = KpS^p 37.7:202.3, ŚB, VādhŚS

+ *ud*

[[Act.]: KauśS 64.5

+ *úpa* [tr.] ‘tie, bind (together)’

[[Act.]: YV^m, ŚB(K), JB 2.165:2 +¹⁸⁴⁴

+ *nī* ‘X_{NOM} binds, fastens Y_{ACC} to Z_{LOC}’

[[Act.]: ĀpŚS, HirŚS¹⁸⁴⁵

+ *pari*

[[Act.]: GrSū.

[[Med.]: [poss.-refl.] MānŚS 5.1.6.21

+ *vi*

[[Act.]: VādhŚS

+ *sām*

[[Act.]: [tr.] ‘X_{NOM} binds Y_{ACC} (together), girds Y_{ACC}, yokes Y_{ACC}’¹⁸⁴⁶
AV, YV, ŚB, TB, GB + (in the Sūtras also with *api*, *abhi*, *upa*)

[[Med.]: [refl.] ‘X_{NOM} girds oneself’ AV, AVP-Kashm. 20.34.10 [= Or. 20.35.10] \approx TS^m 1.1.10.1 = TB^m 3.3.3.2 = 3.7.4.10 (*sām nahye* \approx AVŚ

¹⁸⁴² Cf. LANMAN’s comm. ad loc.

¹⁸⁴³ MS, KpS read *paryā-ñahyati* (with the retroflex); TS, KS have °*nahy*° (with the dental). The same discrepancy in the Sūtras: *ñ* in the MānŚS, i.e. in a Maitrāyaṇī text (2.1.4.23 *paryāñahyati* [ed. VAN GELDER *payañihyati*, probably a misprint], 2.5.4.36 *paryāñahana-*), *n* in most other texts, cf. ĀpŚS 10.31.5, HirŚS 7.3.4, BhārŚS 10.19.5 *paryānahyati*; cf. also VaikhŚS 12.22:152.19 *paryānahyati*, v.l. *parīnahyati*.

¹⁸⁴⁴ Also in VādhŚS [ed. SPARREBOOM/HEESTERMAN 1.4.2.9 = ed. IKARI 1.4.2.12].

¹⁸⁴⁵ For HirŚS 14.3.31 *pr̥ṣṭha iṣudhiṃ vīnahyati* (thus in ed.) ‘he fastens the quiver on his back’, read ... *nīnahyati* (thus v.l. and ĀpŚS 20.16.8).

¹⁸⁴⁶ On the meaning of this compound, see, in particular, FALK 1984: 132, fn. 47; JAMISON 1996: 44f.

14.1.42 *sám nahyasva*), MS^p 3.6.7:69.7, TB 3.2.2.7, 3.3.3.1^{2x}, ŚrSū.

accented: RV +

• *náhya*-^{ti}: tr.; *náhya*-^{te}: tr.-aff., refl.; *nahyá*-^{te}: pass.

The original shape of this root is unclear because of the co-existence of derivatives based on the root variants *nah* and *nadh* within its verbal system (cf. pres. stem *náhya*-, pf. *anāha* ~ -*tá*-participle *naddhá*-, -*ti*-derivative *naddhi*- etc.). Very likely is WACKERNAGEL's (1896 [AiG I]: 250f., §217a; 1906: 165f. [= Kl.Schr. I, 166f.]) explanation of *nadh* as resulting from assimilation to the synonymous root *bandh* (cf., for instance, *naddhá*- // *baddhá*-).¹⁸⁴⁷

The transitive *náhya*-^{ti/te}, solidly attested from the late RV (maṇḍala X) onwards, is more common with the active inflection; middle forms are rare. Active forms are employed transitively, whilst their middle counterparts occur both in transitive (transitive-affective) and intransitive (reflexive and, rarely, passive) usages. This -ya-present is well-attested both as a simplex and with preverbs. Examples are:

- simplex, active:

(RV 10.60.8abc)

*yáthā yugám varatráyā ' náhyanti dhariṇāya kám
evā dādhāra te mánah*

'As they tie the yoke with a strap for holding, just so he holds your mind.'

- simplex, middle:

(TS 7.4.2.4)

ātmāna evá tát yájamānāḥ śárma nahyanté 'nārtiyai

'Verily, thus the sacrificers wrap themselves in a protection, to avoid perdition.' (see DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 244)

- with *ápa* (and *ápi* in the same context), active:

(AVŚ 7.70.4ab, 5ab ≈ AVP-Or. 13.2.5bc-6ab (= AVP-Kashm. 13.13.1bc-2ab) ≈ TB^m 2.4.2.2-3)¹⁸⁴⁸

ápāñcau ta ubháu bāhú ' ápi nahyām_iy ās_iyām

[...]

ápa nahyāmi te bāhú ' ápi nahyām_iy ās_iyām

¹⁸⁴⁷ See also DEBRUNNER 1957 [AiG, Nachtr. zu I]: 139; MAYRHOFER, EWAia II, 31f.

¹⁸⁴⁸ The AVŚ has twice *ápi*, once (at 7.70.5a) *ápa*; the AVP has *api* in all occurrences; the TB reads *ápa* in all occurrences.

‘I tie back your arms; I tie up your mouth.’¹⁸⁴⁹

The only Vedic attestation of the middle form with *ápi* is one of the few instances of a -yá-passive derived from a root which has an active -ya-present in its verbal system (see Chapter C.III.4):

(AV 12.5.25)

*śaravyā múkhe ’pinahyámāna,*¹⁸⁵⁰ *ṛtir hanyámānā*

‘[The Brahman’s cow is] an arrow when [her] mouth is being fastened up [for asphyxiation]; the strike [of an arrow] when being killed.’¹⁸⁵¹

The passive participle *apinahyámāna*- seems to be a nonce formation, created by the author of the AVic hymn 12.5 (which abounds in -yá-passives unattested elsewhere in Vedic; see Chapter A.III.3), perhaps under the influence of the phonologically similar *hanyámānā*, and thus supported by the word play *han/nah*.

In the Sūtras *api-nahya*^{1e} is employed in the transitive-affective usage (e.g. in ĀpM 2.8.10). The only attestation of a passive construction occurs in the KauśS (thus, again, in a text belonging to the AVic tradition):

(KauśS 65.1)

aḡhāyatām ity atra mukham apinahyamānam anumantrayate

‘With [the mantra] “[Fasten up the mouth] of those who wish to injure [us] ...” he addresses to the mouth [of the victim] being fastened up [for asphyxiation].’¹⁸⁵²

- with *ā* (active and middle forms are nearly synonymous):

(AV 6.67.3a)

āiṣu nahya vṛṣājīnam

‘Fasten, as bull, the skin upon them.’

- with *úpa*:

(TS^m 2.4.7.2.e (= 2.4.9.4))

vṛṣṇo áśvasya saṃdānam asi, vṛṣṭyai tvópa nahyāmi

¹⁸⁴⁹ Cf. GONDA (1968b: 186 [= Sel.St. II, 160]): “in *api-nah* ‘to fasten up, close’ (e.g. the mouth: AV. 7,70,4) *api* emphasizes the idea of ‘closely together’.”

¹⁸⁵⁰ Pp. *apinahyámāne* (loc.abs.); DELBRÜCK’s (1888 [AiS]: 269) emendation ⁺*o**mānā* is unnecessary; see WHITNEY 1892: 302.

¹⁸⁵¹ On this passage and, particularly, on the meaning of *ṛti*-, see H.-P. SCHMIDT 1963a: 22; KÜHN 1970: 102f., note 23.

¹⁸⁵² For this Sūtra passage and the corresponding mantra, see H.-P. SCHMIDT 1963a: 36f.; GONDA 1965: 94, 260f.

‘You are the fetter of the strong steed, for rain I bind you together.’

- with *pari-ā*:

(TS 6.1.11.2 = MS 3.7.8:86.12 = KS 24.6:96.19 = KpS 37.7:202.1-2)
vāsasā paryānahyati [MS, KpS °*nahy*°]; *sarvadevatyāṃ vāi vāsah*
 ‘He covers [Soma] round with a garment; verily, the garment is related to all the gods.’

- with *praty-ā*:

(TS 6.1.11.4 ≈ KS 24.6:96.20-97.1 = KpS 37.7:202.3-4)
kṣṇājīnām pratyānahyati,¹⁸⁵³ *rākṣasām āpahatyai*
 ‘He fastens the skin of a black antelope, to smite away the Rakṣases.’

- with *pari*:

(MānŚS 5.1.6.21)
saṃmukhaṃ pariṇahyate
 ‘... he ties his eyes [at the recitation].’ (possessive-reflexive usage)

- with *sām*, active:

(AV 14.2.70abc)
sām tvā nahyāmi pāyasā pṛthivyāḥ ‘*sām tvā nahyāmi pāyasāuṣadhīnām*
sām tvā nahyāmi prajāyā dhānena
 ‘I gird thee with the milk of the earth; I gird thee with the milk of the herbs; I gird thee with progeny, with riches ...’ (WHITNEY)

Middle forms of the compound with *sām* are employed in the reflexive usage, in the sense ‘gird oneself’, particularly often in constructions with the dative: ‘X_{NOM} girds oneself for Z_{DAT}’. This pattern occurs, in particular, in a very common mantra, encountered both in the AV and Taittirīya texts, attested in two versions: with the verb in 2sg.impv.med. and 1sg.ind.med. (*sām nahyasva* / *nahye* Z_{DAT} *kām*, where Z refers to a positive value: immortality, good action, etc.):¹⁸⁵⁴

(AVŚ 14.1.42cd ≈ AVP-Or. 20.35.10 (= Kashm. 20.34.10))
pātyur ānuvratā bhūtvā ‘*sām nahyasvāmṛtāya kām*
 ‘Having become obedient to your husband, gird yourself for immortality.’

¹⁸⁵³ KS, ed. SCHROEDER *pratyānahyanti*, read with TS and KpS °*ati* (KUIPER 1991b: 192).

¹⁸⁵⁴ For this mantra and the ritual significance of girding, see GONDA 1964: 22 [= Sel.St. III, 496]; 1980b: 391f.; 1989b: 86.

The 1sg.ind.med. form *-nahye* appears both in the Paippalāda version of the mantra (*sam nahye amṛtāya kam*) and in the Taittirīya tradition:

(TS^m 1.1.10.1.e = TB^m 3.3.3.2 ≈ KS^m 1.10:5.6)¹⁸⁵⁵

agnér ānuvratā bhūtvā ' sam nahye sukṛtāya kām

‘Having become obedient to Agni, I gird myself for good action.’

The same mantra occurs in a different context:

(TB^m 3.7.4.10)

āparimitānām pārimitāḥ ' sam nahye sukṛtāya kām

‘Of the unmeasured (in number) [stems of Darbha grass I take] those measured (in number); I gird myself for good action.’¹⁸⁵⁶

The same construction is also attested in Vedic prose, with the subject of a wife,¹⁸⁵⁷ e.g. in:

(TB 3.3.3.1)

yāt tiṣṭhantī samnāhyeta / priyām jñātīm rundhyāt / āsīnā sam nahyate / āsīnā hy eṣā vīryam karóti

‘If [the sacrificer’s wife] should gird herself while standing, she would be deprived of a dear relative. She girds herself while sitting, for, while sitting, she produces manly strength.’

(TB 3.2.2.7)

indrāṇyái samnāhanam ity āha / indrāṇī vā āgre devātānām sám anahyata / sárdhnot / řddhyai sám nahyati

‘[Tying the grass with the cord] he says: “[You are] the cord for Indrāṇī”. Verily Indrāṇī tied herself in front of the deities, and [she] prospered. [It is] for prosperity [that] he ties [the sacrificial grass].’¹⁸⁵⁸

¹⁸⁵⁵ KS °*nahya*.

¹⁸⁵⁶ DUMONT interpreted this construction as transitive with the self-beneficent sense (‘Of the ones that are unlimited in number I tie the ones that are limited in number together, for the good work (i.e., for the sacrifice)’), but this mantra can hardly be treated differently from its other attestations, and the reflexive interpretation is clearly preferable.

¹⁸⁵⁷ For the ritual significance of the girding of a wife, see, in particular, GONDA 1969: 27.

¹⁸⁵⁸ DUMONT takes the construction as passive (‘Indrāṇī was tied ...’), but, as in the case of TB 3.7.4.10, quoted above, the non-reflexive analysis of *sam-nahya-^{te}* is less probable.

(MS 3.6.7:69.7)

*yóktreṇa pátnī + sām nahyate*¹⁸⁵⁹

‘The [sacrificer’s] wife girds herself with a cord.’

nṛt ‘dance’: *nṛtya*-^{ti/(te)}*nṛtya*-^{ti}

Simplex RV 10.72.6, AV(P), ŚB 3.2.4.6, JB 3.246:5 [ed. CALAND §205], ŚB 5.10.2, GB 1.2.21:59.4, VādhŚS^m [ed. IKARI] 8.9 (= VādhS^m [ed. CALAND] 3.49:5 (= CALAND 1926: 161 [= Kl.Schr., 344])) +;

+ *ádhi* AV 5.20.10, 10.9.2;+ *anu* AVP 7.13.5;+ *apa* AVP 15.18.7, 15.18.9;+ *á* AV 4.37.7, AVP 17.14.3;+ *abhy-á* TB 1.5.1.2;+ *úpa* RVKh. 5.15.3;+ *nī* ‘repeat by dancing’¹⁸⁶⁰ KB;+ *pári* AV, TS^p 7.5.10.1 (≈ ŚrSū.);+ *prá* AV;¹⁸⁶¹+ *vī* TB 2.3.9.9

accented: +

• intr. activity

nṛtya-^{te}JB 2.69^{2x}:3, 10 [ed. CALAND §128]

• pass. of intr. with content acc.

The intransitive present *nṛtya*-^{ti} ‘dance’¹⁸⁶² is attested from the late RV

¹⁸⁵⁹ Thus ed. SCHROEDER; mss. *pátmñ sá nahyate*. Unnecessary is KNAUER’s conjecture *pátmñ sām nahyati* (ed. of MānGS, p.75f.); see MITTWEDE 1986 [Textkr. zur MS]: 122, with bibl.

¹⁸⁶⁰ PW IV, 61f.: ‘abtanzen so v.a. im Einzelnen wiederholen’; see also JOHANSSON 1927: 13.

¹⁸⁶¹ For *prá-nṛt* ‘dance violently’, see BAILEY 1972: 41.

¹⁸⁶² The meaning ‘dance’ may have developed from ‘manifest one’s strength’ (√*nar* < IE **H₂ner-* ‘man’); see KUIPER 1960: 275ff.; cf. RV 5.33.6, quoted below.

(maṇḍala X) onwards. It first appears in the famous description of the cosmogonic divine dance (“Göttertanz”):

(RV 10.72.6)

yád devā adáh salilé ' súsamrabdhā átiṣṭhata
átrā vo nṛtyatām iva ' tīvró reṇúr ápāyata

‘When you, O gods, were standing then in the (primordial) sea, firmly established, dense dust was arising there from you, as from the dancers.’¹⁸⁶³

This present is common in the AV but relatively rare in Vedic prose. Examples are:

(AV 12.1.41ab)

yásyām gāyanti nṛtyanti ' bhūmyām mártiyā vṛṇālabāh

‘The earth, on which mortals sing [and] dance with loud noises (?) ...’¹⁸⁶⁴

(ŚB 3.2.4.6)

yá evá nṛtyati, yó gāyati, tásminn evaitā nímiślatamā iva

‘Verily, who dances, who sings, to him they (sc. young girls) are most attached.’¹⁸⁶⁵

Middle forms

The only Vedic attestation of a middle form appears in the JB, in a passive sentence, which is based on the content accusative construction ‘X_{NOM} dances [Y^{dance}_{ACC}].’¹⁸⁶⁶

(JB 2.69:2-4 [ed. CALAND §128])

tad yad yajñe stūyate, yac chasyate, yat pracaryate, sā prajāpates senāsa;
/ atha yad vīṇāyām gīyate, yan nṛtyate, yad vṛthācaryate, sā mṛtyos
senāsa

‘What in the sacrifice is sung as stotra, what is recited as śastra, what is performed as ritual activity, this has been Prajāpati’s sacrificial weapon; and what is sung with a vīṇā, what **is danced**, what is performed uselessly

¹⁸⁶³ The hymn is discussed at length by SCHROEDER (1909) and FALK (1994a); for stanza 6, see SCHROEDER, op.cit., 5ff. and FALK, op.cit., 14f.

¹⁸⁶⁴ RENOU (1956 [HS]: 198): ‘avec les rythmes étranges’. For pādas cd, see s.v. *yudh*.

¹⁸⁶⁵ See RAU 1977: 350.

¹⁸⁶⁶ KUIPER (1979: 131, fn. 89) supplies the object (= passive subject) *nṛtta*- ‘dance’.

(= without a sacrificial goal), this has been weapon of the Death.’

Alongside this late Vedic occurrence, the only middle form attested in the IVS of *nṛt* is the thematic aorist participle¹⁸⁶⁷ *nṛtāmāna-* (RV 5.33.6), constructed with the accusative of scope/parameter (see Chapter A.II.3 and KULIKOV 1999: 236ff.): *nṛmṇāni ... nṛtāmānaḥ* ‘[Indra], having danced (i.e. having manifested by dancing) manly deeds.’¹⁸⁶⁸

paś ‘see’: *páśya*-^{ti/te}

RV + (also with preverbs)

accented: RV +

• tr.

also in nom. deriv.:

-á-: *°paśyá-* (in *a-paśyá-* RV 1.148.5; *mām-paśyá-* ‘look-at-me’ AV;¹⁸⁶⁹ etc.)¹⁸⁷⁰

-atá-: *paśyata-* ‘conspicuous’ AV¹⁸⁷¹

The present *páśya*-^{ti/te} ‘see’¹⁸⁷² typically occurs constructed with the accusative object¹⁸⁷³ or in absolute constructions. Examples are:

(RV 8.78.5c)

víśvam śṛṇoti páśyati

¹⁸⁶⁷ Thus e.g. WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]: 92; MACDONELL 373, §512; KÜMMEL 2000: 282; differently LUBOTSKY 1997a [RVWC]: 827 (class VI present). On the isolated character of this form, see OLDENBERG, Noten ad loc.

¹⁸⁶⁸ GELDNER: ‘wenn der Unsterbliche seine Mannestaten aufführt’.

¹⁸⁶⁹ This is the name of a magic herb, based on the conjuration *mām paśya*; see ALSDORF 1961: 110 [= Kl.Schr., 22].

¹⁸⁷⁰ See WACKERNAGEL 1905 [AiG II/1]: 179, §76bα; RENOU 1930 [GrS]: 215, §169a.

¹⁸⁷¹ See WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 168f., §71a. All attestations (only vocatives) occur in AVŚ 13.4, always adjacent to the imperative *paśya*.

¹⁸⁷² For a metaphoric sense ‘experience [divine manifestations etc.]’, see, for instance, GONDA 1963: 29.

¹⁸⁷³ For a survey of constructions with *paś*, see OERTEL 1941: 98ff. [= Kl.Schr. II, 1467ff.]; HETTRICH 2007: 102ff.

‘[Indra] hears [and] sees everything.’

(RV 1.164.16b)

páśyad akṣaṇvān ná ví cetad andhāḥ

‘[The one] who has eyes sees, the blind one does not see (lit. does not discern [objects]).’

The verbal root *spaś* (pf. *paspāse*, root aorist *aspaṣṭa* RV^{1x}, caus. *spāśáya*-^{te} RV^{1x}), albeit genetically related to *paś*, denotes an activity (‘watch over, behold, spy’; see JAMISON 167; GOTÖ 1988: 315; MAYRHOFER, EWAia II, 107f.; LIV 575f., with note 4), rather than a non-controllable (‘fientive’) process, and should probably be treated synchronically as a separate lexical unit.

Middle forms

Middle forms are less common than their active counterparts, but not rare. Generally, they are employed in the same syntactic usages as active forms, often with the self-beneficent sense, cf.:

(RV 10.124.2b)

prapáśyamāno amṛtatvām emi

‘I (sc. Agni) go, seeing the immortality for myself.’¹⁸⁷⁴

(AV 9.4.19cd)

púṣṭim só aghnīyānām ’ své goṣṭhé ’ va paśyate

‘He beholds prosperity of the inviolable [kine] in his own pen.’

For the middle form with the preverb *sám* in the obscure passage RV 10.82.5, the sociative interpretation (‘see (smth.) together, observe (smth.) together’, an absolute transitive construction) seems most likely:

(RV 10.82.5)

paró divá pará enā pṛthivyā ’ paró devébhīr ásurair yád ásti

kām svid gárbham prathamāṃ dadhra ápo ’ yátra devāḥ samápaśyanta

vísve

‘[That] what is beyond the heaven, beyond this earth, beyond the gods [and] the Asuras, – what was the primordial embryo indeed, which the waters established, where all the gods **observed** [it] **together**?’¹⁸⁷⁵

¹⁸⁷⁴ Or: ‘in front of myself’; cf. GELDNER: ‘die Unsterblichkeit vor mir sehend.’

¹⁸⁷⁵ Thus BROWN 1965: 31 [= 1978: 49]: ‘...what primeval germ indeed did the waters

Passive interpretations, suggested by some translators (GRASSMANN, GELDNER, LOMMEL) for the passage RV 10.82.5, are impossible for the middle forms of *pás*. As is well known, the passive present corresponding to *pásya*-^{ti/te} ‘see’ (‘be seen’) is supplied by the *-yá*-present of another root, *drś*,¹⁸⁷⁶ q.v., while the passive usage of the middle *pásya*-^{te} is prohibited by grammatical rules. Exceptions are extremely rare and belong to the post-Vedic period.

One of the earliest occurrences of *pásya*-^{te} which some scholars render as passive appears in a difficult (and probably corrupt) Upaniṣadic passage:

(KāthU 4.6)

yaḥ pūrvam tapaso jātam 'adbhyaḥ pūrvam ajāyata
guhām praviśya tiṣṭhantaṁ 'yo bhūtebhir vyapaśyata
etad vai tat

For a comprehensive survey of interpretations suggested for this passage, see WELLER 1953: 123ff., fn. 7 (with bibl.); see also OLIVELLE 1998: 608. A passive analysis of *vyapaśyata* was adopted by F.M. MÜLLER,¹⁸⁷⁷ REGNAUD,¹⁸⁷⁸ CHARPENTIER,¹⁸⁷⁹ FÜRST (1916: 28, fn. 1, without translation). Most other interpreters

set down where all the gods perceived it’; RENOU, EVP XV, 171 (‘...là où tous les dieux étaient témoins ensemble’); cf. also RENOU (1956 [HS]: 80): ‘...quand tous les dieux ensemble en étaient les témoins’. Translations suggested for this passage differ considerably. Sāyaṇa interpreted this form as reciprocal, glossing it with *saṃgatāḥ parasparam paśyanti*. Passive interpretations are suggested by GELDNER (‘...worin alle Götter mit eingerechnet waren’) and LOMMEL 1955: 118 (‘...wo alle Götter zusammen zu schauen waren’). GRASSMANN 1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 1606f.) registered this occurrence in his R̥gvedic dictionary as an anticausative with sociative meaning (‘sich zusammen zeigen’), but later suggested a reflexive translation (GRASSMANN 1876 [RV übers.]: I, 364): ‘...in dem die Götter alle sich beschauten’; thus also LUDWIG (‘...in dem alle götter sich schauten’). EDGERTON (1965: 63, with fn. 2) was hesitant between reflexive and sociative (‘...in which (waters) the gods all beheld themselves together’ or ‘[...] beheld (the scene) together’).

¹⁸⁷⁶ On the suppletive relationships between *pás* and *drś*, see CASARETTO 2002: 44f.

¹⁸⁷⁷ ‘He who (knows) him who was born first from the brooding heat (for he was born before the water), who, entering into the heart, abides therein, and **was perceived** from the elements. This is that’ (F.M. MÜLLER 1884: 15f.).

¹⁸⁷⁸ ‘Celui qui né, au commencement, de la chaleur naquit, au commencement, des eaux; celui qui ayant pénétré dans un lieu caché **est vu** se tenant debout au moyen des êtres, – c’est cela’ (REGNAUD 1898: 138).

¹⁸⁷⁹ ‘He who formerly born from heat was in an earlier time born from the waters,

(Śaṅkara in his commentary, RÖER, WHITNEY, GELDNER, RAWSON, OTTO, HUME, RENO¹⁸⁸⁰, DELLA CASA, OLIVELLE) prefer non-passive translations. In spite of the corrupt syntax of the verse and pessimistic claims expressed by BÖHTLINGK (1890: 151) (“mir unverständlich”), WELLER, op.cit. (“[die Strophen 4.6, 7] sind ... so überliefert, daß sie niemand verstehen kann”), and RAU (1971: 168) (“unübersetzbar, weil verdorben”), the non-passive analysis of the verb is doubtlessly preferable, and the sense of the passage can be tentatively rendered as follows:

‘Who (knows) him that was born before fervour, – and he was born before the cosmic waters, – (knows) him that having entered into the secret place, abides there, who looks abroad through (all) beings. Even this is that.’ (EDGERTON 1965: 188, with fn. 3)

A few instances of the passive usage of *pāśya^{-te}* occur in Epic and Classical Skt. (see RENO 1930 [GrS]: 465, §342; N.SEN 1949: 106; 1951-52: 128; SATYA VRAT 1964: 214f.; WERBA [VIA I] 430; OBERLIES 2003: 266, 464), but even in the post-Vedic period these such passives remain exceptional.

¹*pā* ‘protect’: **pāśya^{-ti}* (?)

only in nom. deriv.:

-*ú*:- *pāyú*- ‘protector’ RV +

The *-ya*-present **pāśya^{-ti}* ‘protect’ can be tentatively reconstructed for Proto-Indo-Iranian on account of the Vedic nominal derivative *pāyú*- ‘protector’¹⁸⁸¹ (this morphological type is usually associated with the active *-ya*-presents, see LUBOTSKY 1988: 48), on the one hand, and the Iranian *-ā*-present derived from the root ¹*pā* (OP *apayaīy*, Av. *paiia-* in Yt 5.89 °*paiiemī*, Yt 1.24 °*pāiīdīš* [both with *nī*-], etc.; see KELLENS 137f., with note (5)), on the other. It cannot be ruled out that *y* in *pāyú*- is part of the root or a root extension (WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 469, §287b; LUBOTSKY, op.cit., 41, 45). Whatever its original morphological structure, by virtue of the agentive semantics, *pāyú*- could have been (secondarily) grouped with agent nominals in (-*y*)-*ú*-, built on verbal *-ya*-stems, such as

who having entered the cave **was seen** by the living beings abiding there – just that is it’ (CHARPENTIER 1929: 1).

¹⁸⁸⁰ For full references, see WELLER, *ibid.*

¹⁸⁸¹ Cf. WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 845, §681d); MAYRHOFER 2003: 55.

druhyú- ‘deceitful’, *pīyú-* ‘scornful’, etc.

The meaning ‘protect’ does not necessarily imply the active diathesis (cf. *trāya-te* ‘rescue, protect’), but both the -ú-derivative and the predominantly active inflection of the Avestan cognate plead for the active diathesis of **pāya-ti*.

pis ‘prosper’: *písyā-ti*

ŚB 1.7.3.18, 9.5.1.17
 accented: ŚB 1.7.3.18
 • intr. state

The derivatives of the root *pis* (pf. *pipisuḥ*, -ya-present, adj. *pésuka-*) occur only in the ŚB. The verb shows striking similarity with the synonymous *púṣ*, q.v. (cf. pf. *pupuṣ-*, nom. *poṣuka-*; see MAYRHOFER, EWAia II, 170); in particular, the -ya-present *písyā-ti* is employed in the same usage as *púṣyā-ti*, also constructed with the instrumental of the scope/parameter of prosperity, cf.:

(ŚB 1.7.3.18)

*pésukaṃ vái vāstu písyati ha prajāyā paśúbhir, yásyaiváṃ vidúṣo
 ’nuṣṭúbhau bhávataḥ*

‘Verily, the one who knows thus and whose [invitatory and offering formulas] are two *anuṣṭubh* [verses], – his homestead (*vāstu-*) is prosperous, and [he himself] prospers in offspring and cattle.’

The dental *s* (instead of the expected retroflex *ṣ*) in the *RUKI*-context may point to the non-Indo-Aryan origin of this root,¹⁸⁸² perhaps secondarily assimilated to *puṣ*.

²*pī* (*pīy*) ‘blame, revile, scorn, speak evil’: *pītyā-ti*

Simplex RV 1.147.2 = VS 12.42 = KpS^m 25.1:94.6-7 (*pītyati* ≈ MS^m 2.7.10:88.16 = KS^m 16.10:232.115 *nīndati*), 8.21.14, 10.68.6, AV 5.18.15;

¹⁸⁸² For a general study of the problem, see VON BRADKE 1886: 677f.; WACKERNAGEL 1896 [AiG I]: 233, §203c); MAYRHOFER, *ibid.*; KUIPER 1991: 25; WITZEL 1999: 3.

- + *ní* TB^m 2.4.2.4;
- + *práti* RV 10.28.11
- accented: +
- tr.

also in nom. deriv.:

-*ú*:- *pīyú*- ‘scornful’ RV 1.174.8 = 2.19.7¹⁸⁸³ (also in *deva-pīyú*- AV, VS, ŚB)

˘-*aka*:- *pīyaka*- id. AV 16.6.8

-(*a*)*mú*:- *pīyatnú*- id. RV 8.2.15¹⁸⁸⁴

˘-*āru*:- *pīyāru*- id. RV, AV¹⁸⁸⁵

The root ²*pī* does not ablaut in Vedic; all attested derivatives (listed at the beginning of this lemma) are built on *pīy*-.¹⁸⁸⁶ The analysis of *pīyati* as a class I present (i.e. *pīy-a*-), adopted by Indian grammarians and by WHITNEY (1885b [Roots]: 98), is therefore synchronically possible; the remarkably large number of nominal derivatives based on *pīy*- indirectly supports this interpretation. Originally, however, -y- must have been part of the present suffix -ya-; see, in particular, PERSSON 698f., with fn. 3.

pīya-^{ti} occurs only in the mantras. Although this present is semantically transitive (i.e. suggests two semantic arguments, the subject and the object of blame), it is most commonly attested in absolute constructions [i] ‘X_{NOM} blames, is scornful’, cf.:

(RV 1.147.2abc = VS 12.42[abc] = KpS^m 25.1:94.6-7 ≈ TS^m 4.2.3.4.o ≈ MS^m 2.7.10:88.15-16 ≈ ^AKS^m 16.10:232.14-15)

*bódhā me asyá vácaso yaviṣṭha ' máṁhiṣṭhasya prābhṛtasya svadhāvaḥ
pīyati*¹⁸⁸⁷ *tvo ánu t_uvo gṛṇāti*

¹⁸⁸³ See LUBOTSKY 1988: 48.

¹⁸⁸⁴ WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER (1954 [AiG II/2]: 170, §73), and, subsequently, HOFFMANN (1957b [= Aufs. 2, 411]), consider *pīyatnú*- as a -*nú*-derivative based on the participle *pīyat*- (“nach dem Muster von *kṛ-t-nú*- ‘tätig’”); the same analysis is adopted for a few other formations in -*atnú*-.

¹⁸⁸⁵ See WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 288, §177a. For the secondary vowel shortening in the root, see KULIKOV 2005a.

¹⁸⁸⁶ *pāpá*- ‘evil’ and a few other derivatives of the same root (*√pā*?), even if genetically related to *pīyati* (which is rather dubious; see MAYRHOFER, EWAia II, 85, 120f.), cannot be connected with this verb synchronically.

¹⁸⁸⁷ MS and KS *nīndati*; the other YVic Saṃhitās (VS, TS, KpS) preserve the RVic

‘Notice this offered generous speech of mine, O youngest one (sc. Agni), presented by myself, O powerful one. One [sacrificer] blames [you], another praises.’

(AV 5.18.15cd)

sā brāhmaṇasyeṣur ghorā ' táyā vidhyati pīyataḥ

‘This arrow of the Brahman is terrible; with it he pierces those who blame.’¹⁸⁸⁸

Another syntactic construction, [ii], with the pronominal object *te* (genitive?), occurs in the following RVic stanza:

(RV 8.21.14ab)

nákī revāntaṁ sakhīyāya vindase ' pīyanti te surāśuvāḥ

‘You (sc. Indra) will never find a rich man for friendship; [those who are] liquor-brave,¹⁸⁸⁹ speak evil of you.’

The accusative construction [iii] ‘X_{NOM} blames Y_{ACC}’ is attested only once, for a compound with *ní* (in a Taittirīya mantra):

(TB^m 2.4.2.4)

yó mā náктаṁ dívā sāyám ' prātás cáhno nīpīyati

adyā tám indra vājreṇa ' bhrātṛyaṁ pādayāmasi

‘That enemy, O Indra, who reviles me day and night, in the evening, in the morning, and early in the day, we shall fell today with the vajra.’

puṣ ‘prosper; (make prosper)’: *púṣya*^{-ti/(te)}

púṣya^{-ti}:

(intr.) [i] ‘X_{NOM} prospers’ RV +;

[ii] ‘X_{NOM} prospers in/with regard to P_{ACC}’ RV +;

[iii] ‘X_{NOM} prospers in/with regard to P_{INS}’ TS, TB;

(tr.-caus.) [iv] ‘X_{NOM} makes P_{ACC} prosper, increases P_{ACC}’ RV

form *pīyati* (see RENOU 1933b: (91)).

¹⁸⁸⁸ *pīyat* is considered as a substantivization by WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER (1954 [AiG II/2]: 164, §70c).

¹⁸⁸⁹ See SCARLATA 540. Another possible translation might be ‘*brandy-brave*’, which nicely renders the assonance of Ved. *surāśuvā-* (W. KNOBL, p.c.).

accented: +

puṣya^{-te} :

(intr.) [i] MānGS^m 2.11.17, ViṣṇuSmṛ. 90.5¹⁸⁹⁰ +

• intr. state

also in inf. *puṣyāse* ‘in order to prosper, for prosperity’ RV¹⁸⁹¹

Since the time of BÖHTLINGK/ROTH’s Petersburg dictionary (PW IV, 808), *púṣya*^{-ti} was regarded as a rare instance of an active present that could be employed both intransitively (‘gedeihen’) and transitively, i.e. as the corresponding causative (‘gedeihen machen, gedeihen lassen’), thus displaying the labile syntax (see Chapter A.II.5). Accordingly, many interpreters adopted transitive-causative interpretations for a number of occurrences with the accusative attested both in the RV and in later texts. However, as noticed already by DELBRÜCK (1888 [AiS]: 177f.) and convincingly argued, above all, by OERTEL (1926: 31ff.), the causative analysis (‘make prosper’) holds true only for a few RVic occurrences, while most other attestations with the accusative are in fact intransitives with the content accusative;¹⁸⁹² the non-transitive character of such constructions has been repeatedly mentioned in the literature.¹⁸⁹³ For a survey of syntactic patterns attested with *púṣya*^{-ti}, see KULIKOV 1999: 233ff. A few typical examples of the main patterns are given below:

¹⁸⁹⁰ With the instrumental of manner: *anena karmaṇā puṣyate* ‘by [performing] this rite he obtains prosperity’.

¹⁸⁹¹ Constructed with the dative of the subject (in RV 7.57.5 *puṣyāse naḥ* ‘for us to prosper’); see MANESSY 1961: 198ff., 207f. See also SGALL 1958: 213; STÜBER 2000: 145.

¹⁸⁹² The content accusative may be either cognate (‘etymologischer Akkusativ’, i.e. the accusative of a noun derived from the root *puṣ*: *puṣṭí-* ‘prosperity’, *póṣa-* ‘abundance, prosperous things’ etc.), or non-cognate (‘non-etymological’); see KULIKOV 1999: 235ff. and cf. examples below.

¹⁸⁹³ See, for instance, HENRY 1891: 37f.; S. SEN 1927: 360, 366; RÖNNOW 1932-33: 19; MINARD 1949: 105, [§]292, fn. b; THIEME 1957: 64f., 81 [= Op.Mai. I, 258f., 275]; HAUDRY 1977: 195ff.; JAMISON 142, with fn. 77; KÜMMEL 2000: 313ff.; GOTÖ 2002: 32ff.; WITZEL et al. 2007: 604 (ad RV 1.64.14). Unconvincing is NEISSER’s criticism of the intransitive interpretation of such uses in his review of OERTEL 1926 (1928: 325 [= Kl.Schr., 300]).

[i] ‘X_{NOM} prospers’

(RV 7.32.9c)

tarāṇir iḥ jayati kṣéti púṣyati

‘Only the one who is fast is victorious, dwells (in peace), prospers.’

[ii] ‘X_{NOM} prospers in/with regard to P_{ACC}’

(KS^P 24.6:95.17-18)

sahasrapoṣaṃ puṣyantīty, eṣā hi paśūnām sahasrapoṣaṃ puṣyati

‘“[She is] prospering thousandfold prosperity”, – so [they say], since she prospers thousandfold prosperity in cattle.’

(PB 22.7.2)

... jamadagniḥ sarvān poṣān apuṣyat

‘... Jamadagni prospered in all prosperous things.’

(AV 14.2.37d)

prajāṃ kṛṇvāthām ihā puṣyataṃ rayīm

‘[O you, two parents], produce offspring, prosper here in wealth.’¹⁸⁹⁴

¹⁸⁹⁴ The correct syntactic analysis of such usages of *púṣya-*^{ti} has long become common knowledge. So more surprising is the fact that again and again one encounters erroneous (often odd and forced) causative translations of these constructions. A short selection of such translations picked up across the literature may be instructive:

‘Produce offspring and **increase** our wealth’ (HILLEBRANDT 1889: 191 [= Kl.Schr., 119], for AV 14.2.37, quoted above)

(RV 1.81.9ab)

eté ta indra jantávo ' víśvam puṣyanti vāṛyam

‘Diese Leute hier **bringen** für dich, Indra, allen begehrenswerten (Besitz) **zur Blüte**.’ (GELDNER)

(recte: ‘These peoples of yours, O Indra, prosper in all desirable goods’; see also WITZEL et al. 2007: 622)

(RV 6.2.1cd)

tuvām vicarṣaṇe śrávo ' váso puṣṭīm ná puṣyasi

‘[T]oi, tu **fais fleurir** le renom (des hommes) comme une floraison (de richesses), ô (dieu qui t’étends) au loin sur les populations, ô Vasu.’ (RENOU, EVP XIII, 36; see also RENOU 1958: 13)

(recte: ‘You, o Vasu, prosper in glory [= you are glorious], as one [prosper] in prosperity [= as one is prosperous]’)

[iii] 'X_{NOM} prospers in/with regard to P_{INS}'

(TS 2.1.9.4 = 2.4.6.2)

púṣyati prajāyā paśúbhiḥ

'He prospers (= abounds) in offspring and cattle.'

[iv] 'X_{NOM} makes P_{ACC} prosper, increases P_{ACC}'

(RV 8.39.7cd)

sá mudā kāvīyā purú ' víśvam bhūmeva puṣyati

'By [his] joy, he (sc. Agni) [makes thrive] many poetic inspirations, as the earth makes thrive everything.'

Most likely, the causative pattern has emerged on the basis of the

(RV 3.45.3ab)

gambhīrāṁ udadhīr iva ' krátum puṣyasi gā iva

'Du lässt deinen Geist **gedeihen** (tief, inhaltreich) wie tiefe Brunnen, (nahrungsreich oder dgl.) wie Kühe.' (OLDENBERG, *Noten ad loc.*); correctly RÖNNOW (1932-33: 19, with fn. 3): 'sich vervollkommen in bezug auf *kratu*'.

(RV 10.117.6abc)

mógham ānnaṁ vindate āpracetāḥ ' satyám bravīmi vadhá ít sá tāsya

nāryamāṇam púṣyati nó sákhāyam

'Ohne Nutzen erlangt der Unverständige Speise; / Ich spreche die Wahrheit: Sie ist sein Tod. / Er **nährt** weder Freund noch Gefährten [damit].' (WEBER-BROSAMER 1988: 59)

(recte: '... (lit.) he does not prosper in friend[s], nor in companion[s] [= he has no friends, no companions]')

(ŚB 13.2.9.8 ≈ TB 3.9.7.2)

ná puṣtām paśú mányata [TB many°] úti; tásmād rājā paśún ná puṣyati [TB púṣy°]

'[They say:] "It thinks not of the fat cattle", – whence the king does not **rear** cattle' (EGGELING);

'... Therefore ... the king does not **feed** cattle' (DUMONT)

(recte: '... the king does not prosper in cattle')

(ŚB 14.2.2.32)

ayāṁ vái pūṣā yò 'yām pávata, eṣá hīdāṁ sárvaṁ púṣyati

'Pūshan, doubtless, is he who blows here, for he (the wind) **supports** (push) everything here' (EGGELING) (recte: '... for he prospers in everything')

One should also mention the paper ZEILFELDER 1997, where most of the RVic construction of *púṣya*-ⁱⁱ with the accusative are erroneously taken as transitive-causative ('zum Gedeihen bringen'); see ZEILFELDER 1997: 203f., with fn. 71. For criticism, see KÜMMEL 2000: 315f.

content accusative constructions like *bhūma víśvam puṣyati* ‘the earth thrives in everything [what exists on it]’ ≈ ‘the earth makes thrive everything [what exists on it]’. The opposite scenario of development, i.e. from transitive-causative to intransitive pattern, proposed by CHARPENTIER (1912b: 143ff.) and, recently, by ZEILFELDER (1997: 203), is much less probable¹⁸⁹⁵; see KULIKOV 1999: 238ff.; KÜMMEL 2000: 313ff. and LIV 303f., with note 4, for details and discussion.

Middle forms

Middle forms first appear in the post-Vedic period (Gr̥Sū. +), in particular, in a late mantra attested in the MānGS:

(MānGS 2.11.17ab ≈ KātyŚS 25.5.28 ≈ ĀśGS 2.9.5)

praitu rājā varuṇo revatībhir' asmin sthāne tiṣṭhatu puṣyamāṇaḥ

‘Let king Varuṇa come here with the plentiful [waters], at this place let him stay, prospering.’

The variants of this mantra attested in the KātyŚS and ĀśGS read *modamāṇaḥ* ‘rejoicing’ in pāda b (see APTE 1940-41: 217 [= 51]). In contrast to *puṣyamāṇaḥ*, the form *modamāṇaḥ* does occur in Vedic, and this version of the verse may be more authentic. For this mantra and its variants, see GONDA 1972: 31f.

²*pū* ‘stink, rot, be/become putrid’: *pūya*-^{ti}

Simplex AVP-Or. 13.4.4 = Kashm. 11.7.9, TS^p 5.3.1.1, 6.4.7.2, 6.4.7.1 ≈ MS^p 4.5.8:75.5 = KS^p 27.3:142.3-4 = KpS^p 42.3:250.9, ŚB(K), JB, AĀ 3.2.2 = ŚĀ 8.2, Kāṭh-Saṃk. p.141, l.18, ChāgU, ed. RENOUE 7:6.73 [ed. Adyar Libr., Unpubl. Up., p.25, l.14], ĀśŚS 5.4.8;

+ *ā* ŚB 4.1.3.6 (also in *ān-āpūyita*- ‘non-putrified’ ŚBM 1.1.3.5 ≈ ŚBK 2.1.3.2 [v.ll. °*pūya*°, °*pūji*°])

accented: TS, ŚB

• intr. state

also in nom. deriv.:

¹⁸⁹⁵ ZEILFELDER’s statement that the transitive usage ‘zum Gedeihen bringen’ is primary in the RV is based on the erroneous interpretation of RVic evidence. Only one third of almost 30 instances of the transitive-causative type listed by her on p.203f., with fn. 71, belong in fact to this type.

-a-: *pūya-* ‘pus’ ŚBM 3.1.3.10 (\approx ŚBK 4.1.3.9 *pūyá*¹⁸⁹⁶) +
(also in *ka-pūya-* ‘stinking’ ChU)¹⁸⁹⁷

Like the phonologically similar root ²*pī* (*pīy*) (see above, s.v.), ²*pū* does not ablaut in Vedic, and the (late Vedic) -*tá*-participle *án-āpūyita-* ‘non-putrified’ (ŚBM 1.1.3.5) clearly points to the quasi-root *pūy*.¹⁸⁹⁸ Thus, the class I analysis of the present *pūya-*^{ti} (i.e. *pūy-a-*), adopted by Indian grammarians¹⁸⁹⁹ and WHITNEY (1885b [Roots]: 99) is synchronically preferable.¹⁹⁰⁰ However, as in the case of ²*pī*, originally, -y- has been part of the present suffix -ya- (cf. e.g. *pūti-* ‘stinking’; see MAYRHOFER, EWAia II, 155).

The present *pūya-*^{ti}, first attested in the AVP, is employed intransitively,¹⁹⁰¹ cf.:

(AVP-Or. 13.4.4cd = Kashm. 11.7.9cd)¹⁹⁰²
*rajju śma + datvatīḥ śere + pūyantīḥ*¹⁹⁰³ *pṛthivīm anu*

¹⁸⁹⁶ On the accentuation, see ŚBK, ed. CALAND, p. 32.

¹⁸⁹⁷ See WACKERNAGEL 1905 [AiG II/1]: 179, §76ba.

¹⁸⁹⁸ Cf. also an unclear form attested in JB 2.306:3 [ed. CALAND §157], where mss. read *apūyad* (which might represent a regular imperfect form). Ed. CALAND reads *apūyīt*, and his reading is adopted in ed. RAGHU VIRA/LOKESH CHANDRA. Accordingly, NARTEN 170 takes the form in question as a sigmatic aorist (nonce formation) and translates *apūyīt annādyam* as ‘gefault ist seine (des Lehrers) Speise’. By contrast, SCHRAPEL (1970: 41, 46f.), followed by EHLERS 80 and WEBER-BROSAMER (1988: 15, with fn. 27), took this construction as transitive-causative and conjectured a reduplicated aorist (*apū[pu]yad annādyam*): ‘verstärkert hat er [seine] Nutzgenießung’ (SCHRAPEL); ‘er hat [seine] Nahrungsmittel faulen (bzw. stinken) lassen’ (WEBER-BROSAMER). Both *apūyīt* and *apū[pu]yad* can only be derived from the secondary root *pūy*.

¹⁸⁹⁹ Cf. DhP I 513 (ed. BÖHTLINGK, p. 65*).

¹⁹⁰⁰ Cf. also DEBRUNNER 1935-37: 492, 498, where the pair *pūya-*^{ti} : *pūya-* ‘pus’ is grouped with class I presents with the (prosodically) long root syllable (*ī*, *ū* or *ī*, *ū*, *ī* before a consonant cluster), such as *jīva-*^{ti} : *jīva-*.

¹⁹⁰¹ For syntactic constructions and meaning of *pūya-*^{ti}, see OERTEL 1944: 61ff. [= Kl.Schr. I, 530ff.].

¹⁹⁰² I am thankful to Thomas ZEHNDER for having pointed to me the AVic attestation of this present.

¹⁹⁰³ Emendation by Th. ZEHNDER (p.c.); mss. *pūyantīm* (Or.), *payantīḥ* (Kashm.).

‘The ropes with teeth (= snakes) lie, rotting, over the earth.’

(TS 5.3.1.1)

yád vái yajñásya kriyāmāṇasyāntaryānti, pūyati vā asya tát

‘Verily, [the part] of the sacrifice being performed that they omit, becomes putrid.’

(TS 6.4.7.2)

tāsmād yát pūyati, tát pravāté ví śajanti, vāyúr hí tāsya pavayitā svadayitā

‘Therefore what becomes putrid, that they hang out in a windy place, for Vāyu is its purifier, its sweetener.’

(ŚB 14.1.2.12)

yáttra vā enam índra ójasā paryágrhñāt, tát asya párigṛhītasya rāso vy ākṣarat; sá pūyann ivāśeta

‘When Indra encompassed him [sc. Viṣṇu] with might, the vital sap of him, who was encompassed, flowed away; and he lay there stinking.’

(*praj(j)* ‘end, stop’ (of web warp): -*prj(y)a*-^{ti/(te)})

+ *áva* TB^p 2.5.6.5 (-*prjyanti*), TB^m 2.5.5.3 (-*prjyāte* ≈ AV 10.7.42 *āpa vrñjāte*)

• anticaus.

The original meaning of the verb *prajj* (*prjj*) is ‘end, stop’ (of the warp of a web), cf. *ava-prajjana-* ‘end of the warp of a web’ (see SHARMA 1959/60: 46ff.; RAU 1971b: 18 [662]; HOFFMANN 1985: 172f. [= Aufs. 3, 813f.]; MAYRHOFER, EWAia II, 175). The -ya-present -*prjya*-^{ti/te} (not mentioned in WHITNEY’s “Roots”) occurs only in the TB (2x). The only reliable attestation of the present stem -*prjya-* appears in a prose passage:

(TB 2.5.6.5)

imā evā tā uśāso, yāḥ prathamā vyāucchan | tā devyāḥ kurvate pāñca rūpā | śśvatīr nāva prjyanti | ná gamanty āntam

‘These are the dawns, which shined the first. These goddesses produce five colours. Endless, they do not stop, nor come to the end.’

Another occurrence of -*prjya-*, attested in a mantra which is also found

(with some modifications) in the AVŚ, is less certain. The TB version of the mantra runs:

(TB 2.5.5.3)

ávānyāṁś tántūn kiráto dhattó anyān ' nāvapṛjyāte ná gamāte ántam

A similar distich attested in the AV reads:

(AV 10.7.42cd)

prānyā tántūṁś tiráte dhatté anyā ' nāpa vṛñjāte ná gamāto ántam

The author compares the day and night with the two girls who weave the web of time; the first verbal form of the last pāda obviously refers to the termination of weaving/web. According to RAU, op.cit., the reading of the TB is more authentic; correspondingly, he proposes the emendation ⁺*nāvapṛjyāte* for the AVic variant and translates: 'Die eine verlängert die Kettenfäden, die andere schlägt ein. Sie machen keinen Abschluß. Sie gelangen nicht zum Ende.'

This interpretation, albeit semantically possible, poses grammatical problems. In contrast to the AVic forms *-vṛñjāte* and *gamātas*, *-pṛjyāte* and *gamāte* in the TB cannot be correct dual forms, as HOFFMANN, op.cit., rightly points out. The irregular accentuation of *áva-pṛjyāte* (pass.?) also requires an explanation (see SHARMA, op.cit., 47f.). The corrupt syntax of the TB variant (which can only be rendered, with HOFFMANN, as '(die eine) soll keinen Gewebeabschluß machen, (die andere) soll nicht an das Ende kommen') as well as some awkward forms in other pādas (cf. *kiráto* for *tiráte*), clearly point to its secondary character. Note also that the compound *ápa-vṛj* 'end, terminate' is attested from the RV (maṇḍala X) onwards,¹⁹⁰⁴ while the present *-pṛjya-* does not occur outside the TB, and its only other occurrence (quoted above) is an active form. *-pṛjyāte* could have replaced the original *-vṛñjāte* under the influence of *áva pṛjyanti* in the same section of the TB (2.5).

From the semantic and syntactic point of view, *-pṛjya-^{ti/te}* better fits in with class VI presents (most of which are transitives) than with class IV formations (see KULIKOV 2000b). Very likely is the explanation of *-jy-* as a hypersanskritized substitution of the original *-jj-*, suggested by SHARMA (hesitantly) and HOFFMANN. The present *-pṛjja-^{ti}* may conceal an original

¹⁹⁰⁴ Cf. RV 10.117.7b *yánn ádhvānam ápa vṛñkte carítraiḥ* 'the one who walks with feet finishes his way'; see, for instance, RENOU, EVP XVI, 164 ('maître' → 'venir à bout de').

-ske-present (A. LUBOTSKY, p.c.).

***pruṣ* ‘sprinkle, spurt’: -*pruṣya*-^{ti}**

- + *vī* ŚB 4.5.10.4
- unaccented
- intr. process

The intransitive present *-pruṣya*-^{ti} is a hapax, attested in the ŚB:

(ŚB 4.5.10.4)

*yātra vāi yajñāsya śiró 'chidyata, tāsya yó rāso vyápruṣyat tāta ādārāḥ
sámabhavan*

‘When the head of the sacrifice was cut off, then Ādāra plants arose from the sap which spurted¹⁹⁰⁵ from it.’

-pruṣya-^{ti} appears to be a recent formation. An older present formation derived from this root is the class V present (*pruṣṇuvānti* etc.), attested in the RV.

(bhr̥j(j))* ‘roast’: *bhr̥j(j)yéyuh

MS^p 1.10.11:151.6 *bhr̥jyéyur* ≈ ^AKS^p 36.6:73.1 *bhr̥jjyéyur* (PW, HOFFMANN ⁺*bhr̥jjyéyur*)

The suffix accentuation of the hapax *bhr̥j(j)yéyuh* ‘[when they] were to roast’, attested in two Saṃhitās of the YV, clearly shows that it cannot be a class IV present. This form may either represent a hypersanskritized class VI present *bhr̥jjá*-^{ti} (i.e. -*ji*- ← -*jj*-; thus PW V, 398 for the Kāṭhaka occurrence; HOFFMANN 1985: 172f. [= Aufs. 3, 813f.]), or belong with -*yet*-optatives; see KULIKOV 2006d: 35 and GOTÖ 2009: 109ff. for details and discussion.

¹⁹⁰⁵ In his Sanskrit grammar, WHITNEY (1889 [SktGr]: 277, §774) mentions this form among rare examples of passives with active inflection (although in WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]: 103 it is registered as a class IV present). I do not see good reasons to translate this construction passively (‘the sap which was sprinkled’?).

mād ‘be/become drunk, intoxicated; inebriate’: *mā́dya*-^{ti}

Simplex AB, KB, ŚB, ŚB^m 13.5.4.18 (= ŚŚS^m 16.9.10), JB +;
 + *abhi* AVP 19.29.6, ŚB (also in *abhimādyatká*- ‘tipsy’ ŚB);
 + *úd* TS^p, MS^p 4.4.9:60.9, KS^p 19.8:9.15, ŚB 5.5.1.2, TB, PB 18.10.10,
 BaudhŚS 14.18:183.14;¹⁹⁰⁶
 + *prá* ‘be careless, neglect one’s duty, be remiss, be inattentive’ ŚB, JB,
 TĀ, AĀ, Sū.;
 + *ví* ‘curdle, become intoxicating drink’ MS^p 3.10.6:138.6 ≈ KS^p
 29.1:167.8 (*vyamādyat*) = KpS 45.2:268.3 (ed. RAGHU VIRA *vyamāt* / *yat* ...,
 recte *vyamādyat*¹⁹⁰⁷) ≈ AB 2.22.10
 accented: +
 • intr. state

The secondary root *mād*, historically related to *mad* ‘rejoice’ (see Chapter B.I, s.v.), has probably been extracted from the causative *mā́dya*-. The intransitive class IV present *mā́dya*-^{ti} was built on the model of the active *-ya*-presents denoting emotional and physiological states (see GOTÖ 236f.). This present is rare in the mantras (AVP 19.29.6 *abhi mā́dyatu*, ŚB^m 13.5.4.18 *ámā́dyat*), but becomes more common in Vedic prose.¹⁹⁰⁸ Examples are:

(TS 7.3.10.3-4)

yád imám lokám ná ||3|| pratyavaróheyur, úd vā mā́dyeyur yájamānāḥ prá vā mīyeraṇ

‘If they were not to descend to this world, the sacrificers would either become intoxicated or perish.’

(ŚB 1.6.3.4)

abhimā́dyann iva hí sūrām pītṛvā́ vādati

‘For, having drunk *surā*, one speaks like a drunk.’

¹⁹⁰⁶ AVP-Or. 12.8.5 *unmā́dyantīr* is a mistake (misprint of the edition?) for *unmā́dayantīr*; correctly in the Kashmir version (13.4.15): *unmā́dayantīr abhiśocayantīr munim* [...] *apsarasaḥ* ‘the apsaras, making a muni mad, tormenting him ...’; see LUBOTSKY 2002: 154. This reading is also preferable for metrical reasons.

¹⁹⁰⁷ VWC-Samh. V, 2888a, fn. a; GOTÖ 237, fn. 523; KUIPER 1991a: 191.

¹⁹⁰⁸ For prose attestations and meaning of the compounds, see GOTÖ 237, fn. 523.

mādyati is also attested with the instrumental of the alcoholic drink, as in:

(ŚB^m 13.5.4.18)

āmādyad indraḥ sómen_aātr̥pyan brāhmaṇā dhānaiḥ

‘Indra was inebriated with Soma, and the Brāhmans became satiated with wealth.’

In the compound with *vī* this present refers to an oblation which curdles and becomes intoxicating drink (all attestations occur in the legend of Dīrghajihvī; see OERTEL 1899).¹⁹⁰⁹

(AB 2.22.10)

asurī vai dīrghajihvī devānām prātaḥsavanam avāleḥ; tad vy amādyat

‘An asura woman, [named] Dīrghajihvī [= Long-tongued] licked the morning pressing of the gods; it curdled (= became intoxicating drink?).’¹⁹¹⁰

muh ‘be/become confused, err’: *múhya*-^{ti}

Simplex RV 10.81.6 +;

+ *sám* ŚBK 4.4.1.12 (*sam-múhyāt* ≈ ŚBM 3.4.1.18 *saṃ-lúbhyāt*)

accented: RV +

muhya-^{le}:

Simplex MuṇḍU 3.1.2 = ŚvetU 4.7 (*muhyamāna*- ‘deluded [people]’), ĀpŚS 14.28.4 = HirŚS 15.7.12 (*muhyeyātām*);

+ *pari* ŚvetU 6.1 (*pari-muhyamāna*-)

• intr. state

The present *múhya*-^{ti}, first attested in the late RV (maṇḍala X), is a

¹⁹⁰⁹ I would like to thank Marianne OORT for valuable comments on this passage.

¹⁹¹⁰ GONDA (1974a: 205): ‘That became confounded (discomposed)’.

Instead of the form *vyamādyat*, Oertel (1899: 226f. [= Kl.Schr. I, 92f.]) gives the causative *vyamādayat* in his quotation of the AB and MS (3.10.6:138.6) passages, translating these with ‘she [sc. Dīrghajihvī] disturbed it’ – against the readings adopted in the editions and without any argumentation in favour of his conjecture. I do not see good reasons for this conjecture.

typical active -ya-present which can refer either to a state properly speaking ('be crazed', etc.) or to the corresponding inchoative – 'become crazed' (see Chapter A.II.6).¹⁹¹¹ This present occurs constructed both with animate subjects ('err', said of people, as in the RVic occurrence quoted below) and inanimate subject 'become confused', attested from Vedic prose onwards):

(RV 10.81.6c)

múhyant_uv anyé abhíto jánāsaḥ
'Let other people err around.'

(TS 6.5.5.1)

tāsya vṛtrám jaghnúṣa ṛtávo 'muhyan
'When he (sc. Indra) killed Vṛtra, the seasons were confused.'

On the corresponding -áya-causative *moháyati* (RV_x +), see JAMISON 143.

Middle forms

Forms with the middle inflection first appear in the (post-Vedic) Upaniṣads and Sūtras, cf.:

(MuṇḍU 3.1.2ab = ŚvetU 4.7ab)

samāne vṛkṣe puruṣo nimagno ' 'aṇīśayā śocati muhyamānaḥ
'In denselben Baum (= die Urmaterie) ist der Puruṣa eingesunken und leidet verwirrt (/ werdend) ob seines Nicht-Herrseins.' (OBERLIES 1998: 83)¹⁹¹²

mṛc 'be/become hurt, damaged': -*mṛcya*-^{ti}

+ *pra* JB 2.138:2

unaccented

• intr. state

¹⁹¹¹ On the meaning and possible cognates outside Indo-Aryan, see, in particular, CHARPENTIER 1912b: 136; MAYRHOFER, KEWA II, 662.

¹⁹¹² The passive interpretation ('being confused [by smb.]'), which OBERLIES mentions as possible (ibid., fn. 31: "Es ist naturgemäß nicht zu entscheiden, ob es sich bei *muhyamānaḥ* um ein Ātmanepada oder ein Passiv handelt"), can be ruled out. A passive derivation could only be based on a transitive verb (e.g. on the causative *moháyati*, which would yield a causative passive **mohyamānaḥ*), not on the intransitive *muh*.

The present -*mṛcya-*^{ti} is a hapax, attested in the JB:

(JB 2.138:1-2)

⁺yo¹⁹¹³ *vā agnidagdham adbhīr abhiṣiñcati, bhūyo waitat pramṛcyati
kilāsaṃ vā bhavati*

The passage is translated by OERTEL (1935: 140 [= Kl.Schr. I, 349]): ‘If one sprinkles one who is burnt by fire with water, he suffers more or becomes affected with skin disease’; likewise FRENZ 29 (‘Schmerz empfinden’). However, on account of the corresponding -*āya*-causative *marcayati* ‘harms’ (RV +; see JAMISON 86f.) the translation ‘is hurt, damaged’¹⁹¹⁴ seems preferable.

In spite of the lack of early Vedic attestations, the antiquity of this present is vindicated by the Av. cognate -*marəšaṇt-*.¹⁹¹⁵

(*mṛt* (*mrit*, *mlit*) ‘damage, destroy’: -*mrityét*, -*mrityeyuḥ*)

⁺*āpa ... mrityet* ŚBM 3.2.1.31 ≈ *āpa-mṛtyet* (v.ll. *āpaṃ mṛtyet*, *āyaṃ mṛtyet*) ŚBK 4.2.1.22;

vī-mrityét, *vī-mrityeyuḥ* ŚB 12.1.3.23 ≈ ⁺*nir-mṛtyet*, ⁺*nir-mṛtyeran* GB 1.4.13:104.13-14, ed. GAASTRA (mss., ed. MITRA °*mṛjy*°);

vī ... mrityet ŚBM 9.5.2.14 ≈ *vī ... mrityé*° (v.l. °*mṛtye*°) ŚBK

The forms -*mrityét* (ŚBM), -*mṛtyet* (ŚBK), *vī-mrityeyuḥ* (ŚBM) do not belong to a hypothetical -*ya*-present **mrityati*, but represent a separate formation, which I call ‘-*yet*-optative’; see KULIKOV 2006d: 36f. for details and discussion of the relevant passages.

¹⁹¹³ Conjecture by OERTEL (1935: 140 [= Kl.Schr. I, 349]); ed. RAGHU VIRALOKESH CHANDRA *yom*.

¹⁹¹⁴ Thus HINTZE (1994: 111f., fn. 106): ‘wenn man einen vom Feuer Verbrannten mit Wasser besprengt, wird das noch schadhafte oder es entsteht eine gefleckte Haut.’

¹⁹¹⁵ For discussion and bibliography, see HINTZE 1994: 111f.

med ‘be/become fat’: *médya*-^{ti}RV 2.37.3, TS^p 5.1.5.5, MS^p 3.10.3^{2x}:134.1, ŚB, TB, PB, JB

accented: +

• intr. state

As many other active -*ya*-presents, *médya*-^{ti} ¹⁹¹⁶ denotes either a state properly speaking (‘be fat’) or the corresponding inchoative, ‘become fat’ (see Chapter A.II.6), cf.:

(RV 2.37.3a)

médyantū te váhnayo yébhīr ŷyase

‘Let the draught-animals, with which you drive, be/become fat.’

(MS 3.10.3:134.1)

*sárvāṇi vái paśór médyatō*¹⁹¹⁷ *’ṅgāni medyanti*

‘All the limbs of the fat cattle become fat.’

(ŚB 11.1.6.34)

tāsmād u māṁśāny evā médyato médyanti, māṁśāni kṛśyataḥ kṛśyanti

‘Therefore the flesh of a fat [person] is fat, and the flesh of a lean [person] is lean.’

On the corresponding -*āya*-causative *medāyati* (RV+), see JAMISON 142f.***mlā*** ‘wither, relax’: *mlāya*-^{ti}

AVP-Or. 12.6.2 = AVP-Kashm. 13.3.12, ŚB

accented: ŚB

• intr. state

The intransitive present *mlāya*-^{ti} first appears in an AVic (Paippalāda) mantra:¹⁹¹⁸

¹⁹¹⁶ On the origin of the non-ablauting root *med*, see MAYRHOFER, EWAia II, 376f., with bibl.

¹⁹¹⁷ Ed. SCHROEDER *medy*^o (unaccented), probably a misprint.

¹⁹¹⁸ See RENOU 1957b: 96.

(AVP-Or. 12.6.2a = AVP-Kashm. 13.3.12a)

mlāyantu te khātamūlāḥ sapatnāḥ

‘May wither your rivals, [like the plants] whose roots are dug out.’

In Vedic prose this present only occurs in the ŚB. The corresponding causative *mlāpāya-^{ti}* is attested in the AV; see JAMISON 143.

yas ‘be/become heated, boil’: *-yāsya-^{ti}*

+ *prā* AVŚ 12.5.31, AVP-Or. 9.28.3 = AVP-Kashm. 9.25.3

accented: +

• intr. process

The rare present *-yāsya-^{ti}* is not an inherited formation,¹⁹¹⁹ attested only in the AV (2x).¹⁹²⁰

(AVŚ 12.5.31 = AVP 16.144.5)

viśāṃ prayāsyantī, takmā prāyastā

‘[The Brahman’s cow is] poison when boiling, takman (fever) when boiled.’¹⁹²¹

(AVP-Or. 9.28.3abc = AVP-Kashm. 9.25.3abc)

yathā kuṣṭhaḥ prayasyati ‘yathā dahyate arcīṣā

evā te dahyatām manah

‘Just as a kuṣṭha-plant boils, just as it burns with flame, so let your mind burn.’¹⁹²²

-yāsya-^{ti} could emerge as a replacement of the reduplicated present

¹⁹¹⁹ THIEME (1987: 336 [= Kl.Schr. II, 963], fn. 5): “Neubildung”.

¹⁹²⁰ The imperative *yasya*, attested in the late mantra ŚGS^m 1.19.6 = HirGS^m 1.15.1 *yasya yoniṃ, patireto gṛbhāya*, is correctly explained by OLDENBERG (in his ed., fn. ad loc.) as [v]yasya, i.e. ‘open the womb, receive the semen of the husband’ (on the meaning of *vy-as*, see above, s.v. *as*); cf. ĀpM 1.12.8a *vyāsya yoniṃ prāti réto gṛhāṇa*. See also PILLAI 1958: 318.

¹⁹²¹ The passage probably refers to the milk, which is in excess while being boiled; thus WÜST 1966: 237f. (‘Gift [ist die Brahmanen-Kuh,] welche überschiesst, Fieber, nachdem sie übergeschossen ist’).

¹⁹²² I am thankful to A. GRIFFITHS for valuable comments on this passage.

(*yayastu* RV 7.104.2), unattested after the RV. The only present formation of this verb in Vedic prose is the secondary present *yéṣa-ti* (RV, AV(P), TS^p; see GOTÖ 72), resulting from thematicization of the reduplicated stem *yay(a)s-* (JOACHIM 137f.).

***yudh* ‘fight’: *yúdhya-*^{*ti/te*}**

yúdhya-^{*ti*}

Simplex [intr.] (‘X_{NOM} fights (for Z_{LOC})’) RV, AV, MS^p, ŚB +;

[tr.] (‘X_{NOM} fights against Y_{ACC}, attacks Y_{ACC}’) RV 4.30.5, TB^m 2.4.7.4, MS^p 3.8.2:93.11, ŚB 3.4.4.21;

+ *abhí* [tr.] ‘X_{NOM} fights against Y_{ACC}, attacks Y_{ACC}’ RV, AĀ 1.3.4¹⁹²³

yúdhya-^{*te*}

[intr.] (also recipr.: ‘X^{non-Sg.}_{NOM} fight against each other’) RV, RVKh. 3.9.1, AV(P), KS^p, KpS^p, ŚB, TB 3.9.14.4, JB, TĀ 6.3.2 +

accented: RV+¹⁹²⁴

• intr. (/ tr.) activity

The present *yúdhya-*^{*ti/te*} typically occurs in objectless constructions:¹⁹²⁵

[i] (‘X_{NOM} fights’):

(RV 8.96.14d)

íṣyāmi vo vṛṣaṇo yúdhya-tājáu

‘I encourage you, O bulls: fight in a combat.’

Much rarer are constructions [ii] with the instrumental and [iii] with the locative:

[ii] (‘X_{NOM} fights against Y_{INS}’):

(RV 4.18.2d)

yúdhyaī t_uvena sām t_uvena pṛchai

‘I (sc. Indra) shall fight against one, negotiate with another.’

Most likely, the construction *yúdhyaī t_uvena* has borrowed the instrumental case-marking from the next clause (*sām t_uvena pṛchai*) and,

¹⁹²³ *abhiyudhyati*, gloss on RV 10.120.3 *abhí yodhīh*.

¹⁹²⁴ For AV 12.1.41 *yudhyānte* (WHITNEY +*yúdhya-nte*), see below.

¹⁹²⁵ For attested syntactic patterns, see, in particular, HETTRICH 2007: 142f.

likewise, the middle diathesis of *yúdhya*i may copy the middle diathesis of the form *pṛchai*.

[iii] ('X_{NOM} fights for Z_{LOC}):

(RV 6.26.2d)

tuvām caṣṭe muṣṭihā gōṣu yúdhyan

'The one striking with the fist¹⁹²⁶ looks at you, fighting for cows.'

The transitive pattern [iv] 'X_{NOM} fights against Y_{ACC}, attacks Y_{ACC}'¹⁹²⁷ is relatively rare in Vedic. Examples are:

(RV 4.30.5ab)

yátṛa devāṁ ṛghāyató' víśvāṁ áyudhya éka ít

'Where you (sc. Indra) alone fought against all impetuous gods ...'

(ŚB 3.4.4.21)

átha yáj juhótīdām vái púram yudhyanti, táṁ jitvā svāṁ satīm prá padyante

'And when he makes offerings, [it is as if people] attack here a fortress, and having conquered it, they enter it as their own.'

The rarity of the accusative pattern in early Vedic (only one attestation in the RV) puts into doubt JAMISON's (1983: 151) qualification of *yúdhya*-^{ti/te} as (primarily) transitive. Rather, the accusative pattern could secondarily emerge in analogy with the compounds with *abhí*, where the accusative case-marking is due to the preverb, as, for instance, in RV 6.31.3 *tvám ... abhí śúṣṇam indra ... yudhya kúyavam* 'fight you, O Indra, against Śuṣṇa, against Kuyava (= harvest-spoiler) ...'.

Middle forms

Middle forms are nearly as common as their active counterparts.¹⁹²⁸ They appear in the same usages as active forms or, quite commonly, with the reciprocal meaning 'fight against each other' (see KULIKOV 2007a: 715), cf.:

(KS^P 29.5:173.14-15 = KpS^P 45.6:272.21)

yad vai putrau yudhyete, pitā tābhyāṁ kalpayati

'When two sons fight against each other, the father reconciles them.'

¹⁹²⁶ See SCARLATA 690.

¹⁹²⁷ See S. SEN 1927: 365.

¹⁹²⁸ In post-Vedic Sanskrit active forms practically disappear.

The only form with suffix accentuation occurs in the AV:

(AV 12.1.41abcd)

yásyām gāyanti nṛtyanti ' bhūmyām mártiā vṛṣāilabāḥ
yudhyānte yásyām ākrandó ' yásyām vādati dundubhīḥ

WHITNEY considered the form erroneous and emended the accentuation both in his comm. ad loc. and in his concordance (1881: 242);¹⁹²⁹ his translation runs:

‘On which earth, mortals sing [and] dance with loud noises (?); on which **they fight**, on which speaks the shout, the drum ...’

Similar translations are given by most other scholars.¹⁹³⁰ The only attempt to reconsider the form in accordance with its “passive” accentuation was made by GONDA (1974b: 86), in the vein of his ‘eventive’ interpretation of the -*yá*-passives: ‘they become involved in combat’. Although the translation appears quite infelicitous, theoretically, it cannot be ruled out that the form in question was built as passive to the rare transitive usage [iv] ‘X_{NOM} fights against Y_{ACC}, attacks Y_{ACC}’ and thus should be rendered as ‘[on which earth] **they are attacked**’. Yet, this interpretation seems rather unlikely for both contextual and system-related reasons. Passive counterparts of the transitive -*ya*-presents (of the type *náhyati* ‘he binds’ ~ *nahyáte* ‘he is bound’) are exceptional in Vedic: there is no example of such a derivation in the RV and only two instances in the AV, viz. *apinahyámāna-* (AVŚ 12.5.25) ‘being fastened up’ and *preṣyate* (AVP 16.54.8) ‘is impelled’. Note also that both are built on fundamentally transitive verbs (‘bind, fasten’; ‘send, impel’), while for *yudh* the transitive syntactic pattern is probably secondary and marginal and could hardly serve as a basis for passive derivation.

The obvious parallelism of this construction with another passage from the same hymn, AV 12.1.38e *yujyānte yásyām ṛtvíjaḥ* ‘on which [earth] the priests are employed [in the ritual]’, prompts a simple explanation of this form: the “passive” accentuation of *yudhyānte* is due to the influence of the phonologically similar *yujyānte*, probably indirectly supported by the general tendency of the AV to introduce suffix accentuation in a few middle -*ya*-

¹⁹²⁹ Likewise NEGELEIN 1898: 37. This emendation is not mentioned, however, in LINDENAU’s Introduction to ed. ²ROTH/WHITNEY/LINDENAU.

¹⁹³⁰ Cf. LUDWIG 1878: 547; BLOOMFIELD 1897: 204; HENRY 1896a: 185; LINDENAU 1926: 253; GELDNER 1928: 26; RENOU 1938 [HP]: 66; 1956 [HS]: 198; EDGERTON 1965: 115.

presents attested with root accentuation in the RV (cf. RV 10.152.1 *j̥tyate* ≈ AV 1.20.4 *j̥tyáte* etc.; see Chapter C.II.3.2).

***ran*⁽ⁱ⁾ (*raṇ*⁽ⁱ⁾)¹⁹³¹ ‘rejoice’: *ránya*-^{ti}**

Simplex RV, AVP 1.39.2, (KāṭhŚiU^m 4.3.8 [WITZEL [*a*]*raṇyam* (?)]);
 + *ní* RV 1.112.18 (*nī-raṇyáthaḥ*; read ⁺*niránya*^o?)
 accented: +
 • intr./tr. (I/T)

The present *ránya*-^{ti} belongs to the intransitive/transitive (I/T) syntactic class (for details, see HETTRICH 2007: 149ff.). More common is the intransitive pattern [i] (‘X_{NOM} rejoices at Y_{LOC}’), as in:

(RV 10.43.6c)

yásyáha śakráḥ sávaneṣu ráṇyati

‘Verily, at whose pressings the mighty one (sc. Indra) rejoices ...’

The rarer transitive construction [ii] (‘X_{NOM} rejoices at Y_{ACC}’) occurs only twice, in maṇḍala V (see GOTŌ 289, with fn. 586; VELANKAR 2003: 165):

(RV 5.18.1)

prātár agníḥ purupriyó ‘*viśá stavet_aātithiḥ*

viśvāni yó ámart_iyo ‘*havyá márteṣu ráṇyati*

‘In the morning Agni should be praised, the most pleasant guest of the tribe, who, the immortal one, rejoices at all the oblations among mortals.’

(RV 5.74.3c)

kásya bráhmāṇi raṇyathaḥ

‘At whose prayers do you (sc. Áśvins) rejoice?’

The only occurrence of this present with the preverb *ní* attests the abnormal suffix accentuation and different syntax:

(RV 1.112.18ab)

yábhīr aṅgiro mánasā nirānyáthó ‘*’_agraṇ gáchatho vivaré góarṇasaḥ*

This stanza and the anomalous form *nirānyáthaḥ* were repeatedly

¹⁹³¹ According to OBERLIES (2000: 149), the correct notation for this root must be *raṇ*ⁱ.

discussed in the literature. SAUSSURE (1879: 234 [= Rec., 219], fn. 1) even saw here a unique trace of the original suffix accentuation of the non-passive (= class IV) *-ya*-presents. GELDNER left the form untranslated (“*niranyáthaḥ* ist gleichfalls dunkel”). OLDENBERG, *Noten*, ad. loc., assumed that *niranyá-^{ti}* should be taken as a denominative built on the unattested noun **niraṇa-*; this analysis is adopted by LUBOTSKY (1997a [RVWC]: 816). Nor did OLDENBERG rule out the class IV analysis, but his explanation of the abnormal suffix accentuation (“auch er [= der suffixale Akzent] wäre schließlich denkbar. Die Grenze zwischen den *-ya*-Formen und den *-yá*-Formen ist keine absolute (vgl. WHITNEY § 761^b. 773)”) is untenable. The suffix accentuation of the active *-ya*-presents occurs only exceptionally, in Vedic prose (MS^p *sám...jīryátaḥ*, see s.v.). Inappropriate is the reference to WHITNEY’s grammar (1889: 273, §761b; 277, §773), which only mentions middle *-ya*-presents with fluctuating accentuation, such as *múcyate/mucyáte* or *kṣīyate/kṣīyáte*.¹⁹³²

Most plausible is GOTŌ’s (258, fn. 582) semantic analysis of the compound *ní-raṇ* as ‘im inneren Freude haben’ (‘durch welche [Hilfen] ihr beide (Aśvins), O Aṅgiras, mit dem Herzen Freude findet...’) and his explanation of the abnormal suffix accentuation of *niranyá-* as due to the (purely formal) analogy with the *-anyá*-deverbatives, such as *iṣanyáti*, *riṣanyáti*, *bhurananyáti*; note that many of these formations are based on the roots of the same phonological structure, i.e. (C)IC- (where *I* stands for *i*, *u*, *r*).

The present *ránya-^{ti}* practically disappears after the RV. It occurs once in an AVic (Paippalāda) mantra (cf. RENOU 1964a: 434):

(AVP 1.39.2ab ≈ TS 2.4.5.1.b)

*savitā yaḥ sahasriyaḥ ' sa no gr̥heṣu raṇyatu*¹⁹³³

‘Savitar, who is thousandfold, let him rejoice at our houses.’

According to WITZEL, the present stem *raṇya-* may also underlie the unclear post-Vedic form [a]*raṇyam*, attested in the KāṭhŚiU (mantra). The relevant passage runs (in ed. WITZEL (1979: 20)):

(KāṭhŚiU^m 4.3.8)

asmin sahasraśāḁke 'raṇyam, ahan tvayi mṛje, svāhā

¹⁹³² Improbable is also the passive interpretation of this form proposed in GRASSMANN 1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 1144 (‘ergötzt werden durch ...’), abandoned in GRASSMANN 1877 [RV übers.]: II, 113 (‘Mit denen ihr, o Angira’s, euch gern erfreut ...’).

¹⁹³³ TS *rāraṇat*; cf. also AVP 1.39.3b *sa no gr̥heṣu rāraṇat*.

WITZEL sees here the imperfect *araṇyam* and translates (ibid., 27):

‘An diesem tausend Zweige besitzenden (Veda?) habe ich mich erfreut; an dir, (Opferwisch? Bhaga?) wische ich mich ab.’ (for a discussion of this verse, see also WITZEL 1980: 50f.)

This interpretation is semantically possible, but, by virtue of the lack of attestations of the present *rānya^{-ti}* after the AV (noticed by WITZEL himself (1980: 51, with fn. 94)), remains problematic.

Alongside *rānya^{-ti}*, there are three other intransitive presents derived from the root *ran⁽ⁱ⁾*, attested in the same usage: class I present *rāṇa^{-ti}* (RV, YV; cf. JOACHIM 142f.), *raṇaya^{-ti}* (RV), and the *-va*-present *raṇva^{-ti}* (TS^{2x}); see GOTÖ 259 for details and discussion of the IVS.

randh ‘be/become subject’: *rādhyā^{-ti/(te)}*

AV 17.1.6 (*rādhyatu* ≈ MānŚS^m 1.6.2.17 *radhyantām*), VS 10.28 (= ŚB 5.4.4.15-19) = TS^m 1.8.16.2h (– ŚrSū.^m) = MS^m 2.6.12:72.3 (= 4.4.6:57.7) = KS^m 15.8:215.18, TS^p 6.2.2.1, ŚB, TB 1.7.10.5, GB 2.2.2:166.8 (mss. *rudhy^o*, ed. GAASTRA ⁺*radhy^o*)

rādhyā^{-te} : MānŚS^m 1.6.2.17 (≈ AV 17.1.6)

accented: AV, TB

• intr. state

The intransitive present *rādhyā^{-ti}*, typically constructed with the dative (‘X_{NOM} is/becomes subject to Y_{DAT}’),¹⁹³⁴ first appears in post-RVic mantras (AV, YV^m):

(AVŚ 17.1.6cd = AVP-Or. 18.55.1cd (≈ MānŚS^m 1.6.2.17.b))

dviṣāṃś ca māhyaṃ rādhyatu ' mā cāhāṃ dviṣatē radham

‘Let my hater be subject to me, and let me not become subject to my hater.’¹⁹³⁵

¹⁹³⁴ For the original meaning of the root *randh* (‘sich senken’ → ‘unterliegen’) and its Indo-European sources, see GOTÖ 1985: 86 et passim; cf. also LUDWIG 1893: 31.

¹⁹³⁵ The mantra (for which see, in particular, GONDA 1980a: 58) is based on RV 1.50.13cd *dviṣāntam māhyaṃ randhāyan ' mó ahāṃ dviṣatē radham*, which has a causative construction in pāda c, however (‘making my hater subject to me ...’).

The variant of this mantra quoted in the MānŚS has a middle form instead:

(TS^m 1.8.16.2.h ≈ VS 10.28.g (= ŚB 5.4.4.15-19) ≈ MS^m 2.6.12:72.3 (= 4.4.6:57.7) ≈ KS^m 15.8:215.18 ≈ ŚrSū.^m)

īndrasya vājro 'si vārtraghnas; téna me radhya

‘You are Indra’s vajra, belonging to the Vṛtra-killer; therewith be subject to me.’ (on this mantra and its variants, see FALK 1986: 166ff.)

Cf. also the Brāhmaṇa passage related to this mantra, where both *rádhya*-^{ti} and the corresponding -áya-causative co-occur:

(TB 1.7.10.5)

vājro vái sphyaḥ | vājreṇaivāsmā avaraparāṁ randhayati | evāṁ hí tác chréyaḥ | yád asmā eté rádhya

‘The wooden spade (*sphyá-*) is a vajra. With the vajra he makes [people] subject to him (sc. the sacrificer) in descending succession; for in that way he [becomes] the best one, when they become subject to him.’ (see FALK, op.cit., 168f.)

Other formations attested in the intransitive usage are pf. *rāradhūḥ* (RV 7.18.18) and thematic aor. (*radham* etc. RV +). They are opposed to the -áya-causative *randháya*-^{ti} (RV +), reduplicated aor. (*rīradhat* etc. RV), sigmatic aor. (*randhīḥ* etc. RV) and isolated impv. *randhi* (RV 4.22.9); see NARTEN 217f.; KÜMMEL 2000: 415f. As NARTEN assumes, the full root degree *randh* may have been generalized for the transitive-causative usage, while the zero degree has been associated with the intransitive constructions (the only exception being the reduplicated aorist *rīradhat*, instead of ***rīrandhat*).

According to JAMISON 144, *rádhya*-^{ti} was secondarily built as the intransitive counterpart of the originally isolated transitive *randháya*ti, in analogy with other verbs of “hostility”, such as *násyati* ‘disappears, perishes’ – *nāśáyati* ‘makes disappear, destroy’. However, as GOTŌ rightly points out in his review (1988: 313), the lack of RVic attestations does not necessarily imply the recent age of this formation.

dviṣanto radhyantām mahyaṁ ' mā tv ahaṁ dviṣatām radham

The middle inflection must have replaced the original active ending secondarily, most probably, under the influence of the similar mantra *dviṣantas tapyantām bahu* (MānŚS 1.2.5.8) ‘let the haters suffer much’. VAN GELDER’s passive translation (‘may my enemies be subdued by me, but may I not be subdued by my enemies’) is impossible both for the middle form *radhyantām* and for the active form *radham*.

(ras: -rasya-)

The corrupt form *aparasya* (registered in VWC-Br. I, 166a) at GB 2.6.13:264.8 (*dhik tvā jālmāparasya*), is a ms. error for ⁺*apanaśya*, as attested in the parallel KB passage:

(KB 30.4.21 [ed. LINDNER 30.5])

apa naśya dhik tvā jālmāstu

‘Disappear! Shame on you, O fool!’

²*rā* ‘bark’: *rāya*-^{ti}

Simplex RV 1.182.4, 7.55.3 (*rāyasi*, *rāya*), AVP 5.34.5 (mss. *rāyabhyah*, ed. BHATTACHARYA ⁺*rāyadbhyah*), AVParīś. 72.2.2;

+ *abhí* TĀ^m 4.30^{2x}

accented: RV 1.182.4

• intr. activity

The present *rāya*-^{ti} is generally taken as a ‘-ya-present, although originally -y- could be part of the root (cf. MAYRHOFER, EWAia II, 443). In earlier scholarship, *rā* was often grouped with the so-called ‘long diphthong roots’ (cf. e.g. SPECHT 1935: 112; SCHMID 1956: 228: **rē(i)-*); and, accordingly, *rāya*-^{ti} was taken as a class I present (*rāy-a*-^{ti}).

The simplex is attested in the RV (with the goal accusative: ‘X_{NOM} barks at Y_{ACC}’) and in the AVP (in an absolute construction), cf.:

(RV 7.55.3abc)

stenám rāya sārameya ' táskaram vā punaḥsara

stotṛñ indrasya rāyasi

‘Bark at the thief, O Sarama’s child, or at the burglar, O you running back. You bark at Indra’s worshippers.’

(AVP 5.34.5cd)

atho śvabhyo ⁺rāyadbhyah ' prati sma gaṇḡaṇam kuru

‘And then howl back to the barking dogs.’ (see LUBOTSKY 2002: 154)

After the early Vedic period, this -ya-present appears in the TĀ (in a mantra), with the preverb *abhí*, constructed with the accusative:

(TĀ^m 4.30)*dviṣántaṃ me 'abhi rāya*

‘Bark at my hater!’

riṣ ‘be hurt, injured; injure’: *riṣya*-^{ti/(te)}*riṣya*-^{ti} :

Simplex

[intr.] RV, AV, YV^m, AB, ŚB, TB^m 3.7.7.14, JB, TĀ^m 1.11.7, ChU +;

[tr.-caus.] RV 8.48.10;

+ *nī* MS^p 4.2.1:23.2 (?),¹⁹³⁶+ *vi* KauśS 59.28, 72.30¹⁹³⁷

accented: RV +

riṣya-^{te} :

Simplex GB, ĀrṣB 1.9, MānGS 1.13.17 ≈ VārGS 15.13;

+ *vi* GB

The present *riṣya*-^{ti} almost exclusively occurs in intransitive constructions (‘X_{NOM} is hurt, injured’). Examples are:

¹⁹³⁶ This occurrence poses some problems. The relevant passage runs:

(MS 4.2.1:23.1-2)

yád agnér ánte páśyāmas, tád ásurāṇāṃ cákṣuṣā paśyāmā. úc ca vā eṣá dīpyate, ní ca riṣyati

‘What we see near the fire, that we see with the eye of the Asuras. It (sc. the fire) blazes up and extinguishes.’

Relying upon the variant reading *nīsvariṣyati* (or *nīkharīṣyati*), attested in one of the mss. [Bb.], ROTH (apud ed. SCHROEDER, Bd. IV, p.311) saw here a future of the root ²*svar* ‘shine’, but this analysis is certainly impossible (²*svar* has no finite paradigm and a future cannot be co-ordinated with a present). MUUSSES (1920: 29, with fn. 1) follows the reading of ed. SCHROEDER and translates ‘... Het (sc. vuur) flikkert op en slaat neer’; MITTWEDE (1986 [Textkr. zur MS]: 155) subscribes to this interpretation. However, the compound *nī-riṣ* is not attested elsewhere, and the form remains suspect. The context prompts the reading *nīr-vāyati* ‘extinguishes’ (cf. TS 6.2.2.7 quoted below, s.v. *vā*), but the required emendation (**nīś ca vāyati*?) is too heavy.

¹⁹³⁷ In the locative absolute construction: *virīṣyati* ‘when one is hurt’; see ed. BLOOMFIELD, Intro., p. liii.

(RV 1.18.4)

*sá ghā vīró ná riṣyati ' yám índro bráhmaṇas pátiḥ
sómo hinóti mártiḥyam*

‘That man is not hurt, whom Indra, Bṛhaspati, Soma stimulate, the mortal one.’

(ŚB 14.4.3.29 (= BĀUM 1.5.29 = BĀUK 1.5.20))

*sá vái dáivaḥ prāṇó, yáḥ saṃcāraṃś cāsaṃcaramś ca ná vyáthaté, 'tho
ná riṣyati*

‘This is verily a divine breath, which, be it moving about or not, is not agitated, neither harmed.’

The transitive-causative pattern ‘Y_{NOM} injures X_{ACC}’¹⁹³⁸ occurs only once in the RV (book VIII):¹⁹³⁹

(RV 8.48.10ab)

ṛdūdāreṇa sákhyaḥ saceya ' yó mā ná riṣyed dharīyaśva pītāḥ

‘I wish to be in friendship with the companion of pleasant nature, which may not harm me, when he is drunk up, O one with fallow horses (sc. Indra).’

The labile syntax of *riṣya-*^{ti}, albeit exceptional for Vedic -ya-presents,

¹⁹³⁸ Noticed already by DELBRÜCK (1897 [Vgl.Synt. II]: 29); see also JOACHIM 146; OETTINGER 1992: 136.

¹⁹³⁹ The form *riṣyati*, recorded in VWC-Br. II, 1242b for the parallel passages AĀ 3.1.3 = ŚĀ 7.11 (3x), is based on the erroneous segmentation of the text in all editions of these two Āraṇyakas. The relevant passage runs (in ed. KEITH):

(AĀ 3.1.3 = ŚĀ 7.11)

*pr̥thivīm devatām āraḥ; pr̥thivī tvā devatā riṣyati. [...] divaṃ devatām āro; dyaus
tvā devatā riṣyati. [...] antarikṣaṃ devatām āro; 'ntarikṣaṃ tvā devatā riṣyati*

Apparently, the verbal form of the second clause in each pair was mistaken by the editors for the -ya-present *riṣyati*. KEITH’s translation (‘Thou hast offended the earth, the deity. The earth, the deity **will strike** thee’ etc.) leaves unclear which form he might mean. In any case, he probably did not consider the verbal forms in the first and second clauses as derived from the same root. The correct reading must be *devatāriṣyati* (= *devatā āriṣyati*), where *āriṣyati* is a future form of the compound *ā-* ‘harm’:

‘You have harmed the earth, the deity; the earth, the deity, will harm you [...] You have harmed the heaven, the deity; the heaven, the deity, will harm you [...] You have harmed the atmosphere, the deity; the atmosphere, the deity, will harm you.’

matches well with the labile patterning of the thematic aorist *arīṣat* (cf. RV 1.94.1 *mā riṣāmā* ‘may we not be hurt’ ~ transitive participle *rīṣant-*, *rīṣant-* ‘injuring’, e.g. in RV 1.12.5),¹⁹⁴⁰ as well as with the syntax of the Avestan cognate *irišiiēiti*;¹⁹⁴¹ see KULIKOV 1999: 232f. for details and discussion. It is probable that the sole transitive-causative occurrence of the present *riṣya-ti* in book VIII of the RV is a syntactic feature of the dialect of the Kāṇvas, which may show some affinities with the Iranian languages (HOFFMANN 1940: 142 [= Aufs. 1, 9]; INSLER, p.c.).

Middle forms

Middle forms first appear in the late GB, where *riṣya-te* totally ousts the active *riṣya-ti*. The starting point for this replacement could be the similarity of contexts in which *riṣya-ti* and the (phonologically similar) *ricya-te* ‘become empty’ (see Chapter III, s.v.) occur, both constructed with the subject *yajña-* ‘sacrifice’, cf.:

(GB 1.5.21:133.11-12)

... *nāsyā yajño riṣyate*
‘... his sacrifice is not injured.’

(GB 1.2.24:62.10-11)

atha cen naivamvidam hotāraṃ vṛṇute, purastād evaiṣāṃ yajño ricyate
‘And if [someone] chooses for hotar the one who does not know thus, his sacrifice becomes empty in the east.’¹⁹⁴²

¹⁹⁴⁰ Note also the transitive usage of the desiderative *rīrikṣa-ti* ‘want to injure’ (see HEENEN 2006: 212) as well as of the nominal derivatives *reṣin-* (in *puruṣa-reṣin-* AVP-Kashm. 20.50.7 (?; ms. *°rīṣiṇīm*), KauśS ‘people-injuring’), *°riṣá-* ‘injuring’ (in *naghāriṣá-* AV (lit.) ‘surely-not-injuring’, i.e. ‘harmless’; see ZYSK 1985b: 316f., with fn. 15).

¹⁹⁴¹ Transitive (‘harm, make hurt’) e.g. in Vd 15.12 (*irišiiēiti*), 7.38 (subj. *irišiiāḥ*); intransitive (‘be hurt’) e.g. in Vd 13.37 (*irišiiāḥ*), Vd 15.48 (*irišiiqn* ‘they will not be hurt’); see BARTHOLOMAE 1904: 1485f.; LÜHR 1994: 89.

¹⁹⁴² Note that BÖHTLINGK (1896c: 96) translated *ricyate* as *riṣyati-te* in the latter passage: ‘... dann nimmt sein Opfer im Osten Schaden.’

rup ‘suffer (stomach) pain’: *rópya*-^{ti}

AVP (e.g. 8.15.7 [3pl.impf.act.] [*a*] *rupyan*; 11.10.8 [part.act.] *rupyant*-,
 Kashm. [12.3.8] ms. *ṛpyo*), KS^p 25.4:107.1 = KpS^p 39.1:213.1, TB 2.1.1.2
 accented: TB
 • intr. state

The intransitive present *rópya*-^{ti} is attested from the AV (Paippalāda) onwards. Examples are:

(AVP 8.15.7abc)

*sodaryāñāṃ pañcadaśānāṃ śatānāṃ 'trayastrimśad ud aśiṣyanta devāḥ
 ekasmin viddhe sarve 'a* *rupyan*

‘Thirty three gods were left from the hundred fifteen, born from the same womb. When one [of them] was wounded, all suffered pain.’ (see LUBOTSKY 2007: 28f.)

(TB 2.1.1.1-2)

tā jātāḥ pitāro viśeṇālimpan. ||1|| tāśāṃ jagdhvā rópyanty áit

‘When [the plants] were born, the fathers smeared them with poison. Having eaten of them, [the cow] went on suffering violent pain.’

The corresponding causative *ropáya*-^{ti} is attested from the AVP onwards.

lubbh ‘be/become disturbed, confused’: *lúbhya*-^{ti}

Simplex AVŚ 3.10.11 = AVP 1.105.3, AB 2.37.3, JB 1.103:12;
 + *ā* ŚB 10.3.1.7 = 10.3.1.8;
 + *sám* ŚBM 3.4.1.18 (*sam-lúbhyāt* ≈ ŚBK 4.4.1.12 *sam-múhyāt*)
 accented: ŚB
 • intr. state

The invariant meaning of *lúbhya*-^{ti} can be determined as ‘deviate in several aspects from the regular/normal state, be/become disturbed’.¹⁹⁴³ This present first appears in the AV:

¹⁹⁴³ On this verb, see BURROW 1956; DELBRÜCK 1897 [Vgl.Synt. II]: 33f.; MAYRHOFER 1966 (‘irre werden, in Unordnung geraten’).

(AVŚ 3.10.11cd ≈ AVP 1.105.3cd)

gṛhñān ālubhyato vayāṁ 'sām viśemópa gómataḥ

‘May we settle down to rest in houses which do not collapse and are rich in kine.’¹⁹⁴⁴

Finite forms first occur in the Brāhmaṇas. Examples are:

(ŚB 10.3.1.7 = 10.3.1.8)

yád dhy āsya cinvatá eśá prāṇā ālúbhyet, táta evāiśó 'gnír ná cīyeta

‘... for if the breath of him (sc. sacrificer), piling [the fire-altar], were dislodged,¹⁹⁴⁵ then this fire-altar, certainly, would not be [properly] piled.’¹⁹⁴⁶

(AB 2.37.2-3)

[2] *manuṣyarathasyaivāntarau raśmī vi harantī alobhāya*. [3] *nāsya devaratho lubhyati na manuṣyaratho, ya evaṁ veda*

‘[2] Verily, thus they separate the (two) inner reins of the chariot of men to avoid confusion. [3] His chariot, whether of the gods or men, does not become confused,¹⁹⁴⁷ who knows thus.’

On the corresponding *-āya*-causative *lobhāya-ti* (RV+), see JAMISON 144.

²*vā* ‘wane, fade, vanish’: *vāya-ti/(te)*

vāya-ti :

Simplex RV;

+ *úd* TS, TB, JB 2.49:9, ChU 4.3.1, Sū;

¹⁹⁴⁴ Thus BURROW 1956: 193; cf. also ELIZARENKOVA: ‘Да войдем мы вместе в дома, / **Не сбившиеся с пути**’; WHITNEY (‘Unto houses **not disorderly** (?)’, rich in kine, may we enter together). WEBER’s (1885: 230) passive analysis (‘activisch gebildetes Particip Praes. Pass.’: ‘durch Andere nicht begehrt’) is impossible. Syntactically and morphologically possible but semantically improbable is LUDWIG’s (1878: 190) translation of the form *ālubhyataḥ* as gen.sg.: ‘mögen wir gelangen zu den rinderreichen ländern dessen, **der** [uns] **nicht wünscht**’.

¹⁹⁴⁵ Thus BURROW 1956: 195; EGGELING: ‘become disordered’.

¹⁹⁴⁶ On this passage, cf. OERTEL 1926: 108.

¹⁹⁴⁷ According to BURROW (1956: 194), this passage describes the displacement of a chariot from its proper course.

+ *úpa* KS 35.16^{2x}:61.11, 16-17 ≈ KpS 48.14^{2x}:305.1, 7, PB 9.9.5^{2x} (*upa-vāyati*, *upa-vīyantam*, read ^{+o}*vāyantam* with Sāyaṇa, CALAND in transl.);

+ *nír* TS 6.2.2.7

accented: RV +

vāya^{te} :

+ *apa* ‘have fever’ GB 2.2.4:168.2;

+ *ud* ‘extinguish’ ŚrSū.

• intr. process

The active intransitive present *vāya*^{ti}¹⁹⁴⁸ ‘wane, fade, vanish, go out, become deficient, extinguished’¹⁹⁴⁹ is attested from the RV onwards. Examples are:

(RV 8.43.7ab)

dhāsīm kṛṇvāṇā oṣadhīr ‘*bápsad agnír ná vāyati*

‘Agni, making plants his food by chewing [them], does not become extinguished.’

(TS 6.2.2.7)

nír hy àgnīḥ śītēna vāyati

‘... durch etwas Kaltes verlöscht ja Feuer.’ (THIEME 1936: 700f., fn. 2)

Middle forms

Forms with middle inflection first appear at the very end of the Vedic period, in the late GB and Śrauta-Sūtras. In the Sūtras, the compound with *ud* is attested both with active and middle endings, meaning ‘be extinguished’ (of fire).¹⁹⁵⁰ The GB attests the compound *apa-vāyate*, with the idiomatic meaning ‘be/become ill, feverish’;¹⁹⁵¹ note that the middle diathesis could

¹⁹⁴⁸ In earlier scholarship, *vā* was sometimes grouped with the so-called long diphthong roots (**uā(i)*-/̥*uāi*-/̥*uī*-), and, accordingly, *vāya*^{ti} was taken as a class I present; cf. e.g. WACKERNAGEL 1896 [AiG I]: 87, §79aα; PERSSON 535ff.; SPECHT 1935: 112.

¹⁹⁴⁹ On the meaning of the root (originally, probably ‘empty, hole’), see JOHANSSON 1927: 30, with fn. 1; HOFFMANN 1967b: 34f. [= Aufs. 2, 466f.], note 3; NUSSBAUM 1998: 75, 82f. On the meaning ‘is deprived’, attested only at RV 8.47.6, see NUSSBAUM 1998: 83, fn. 260.

¹⁹⁵⁰ E.g. *ud-vāyet* ĀpSS 9.9.1, *ud-vāyeyātām* BaudhŚS 14.29:201.4, 5, etc.

¹⁹⁵¹ For the meaning of *apa-vā* and the -*ta*-participle *apa-vāta*- (‘fieberkrank’), see

have been triggered by the adjacent (quasi-synonymous) *mīyate*:

(GB 2.2.4:168.2-3)

yad evāsyāpavāyate, yan mīyate ...

‘Whatever of him is ill, whatever is diminished ...’

¹*vā* ‘blow’: *vāya*^{-ti/te} (/ *vāti* etc.)

vāya^{-ti}

Simplex ‘smell’ AĀ 3.2.4

vāya^{-te}

Simplex ṢB 5.8.2 *vāyante* (v.l. °*nti*);

+ *upa* JUB 3.5.1.1 [ed. OERTEL 3.20.1] *upa... vāyasva* (ed. OERTEL: v.l. °*vayasvi*; ed. SHARMA: v.ll. °*vasasvi*, °*vayasvīm*)

unaccented

• intr. activity

The root ¹*vā* ‘blow’, homonymous with ²*vā*, generally forms a class II present (*vāti* etc.). Some formations are “shared” by the IVSs of these two roots, however, cf. the sigmatic aorist (-)*vāsīt*, which can mean both ‘has extinguished’ and ‘has blown’ (see HOFFMANN 1967b: 26 [= Aufs. 2, 466f.]; cf. also KLAUS 1986: 92f. and fn. 43). The partial overlapping of the two paradigms may have caused the confusion of these two verbs from the late Vedic period onwards and, in particular, the use of *vāya*^{-ti/te} in the sense of *vāti* ‘blows’¹⁹⁵² in some late Vedic texts (ṢB, AĀ, JUB).¹⁹⁵³

(AĀ 3.2.4)

kākulāyagandhikam asya śiro vāyati

CALAND 1900: 99f., fn. 5 and OERTEL 1944: 72 [= Kl.Schr. I, 541], fn. 1.

¹⁹⁵² The rise of the secondary present *vāya*^{-ti/te} ‘blows’ could further be indirectly supported by the god name *vāyú-*, on account of the common paradigmatic association between (active) -ya-presents and agent nominals in (-y)-ú- (cf. *druhya*^{-ti} :: *druhyú-* ‘deceitful’, *pīya*^{-ti} :: *pīyú-* ‘scornful’, etc.).

¹⁹⁵³ Inexactly WERBA [VIA I] 318, s.v. *vā* ‘wehen’: “(°)*vāya*- (MBh +)”. A few instances of this confusion (*pra-vāyati/pravāti* etc.) in the Rām. are listed by N. SEN (1953: 156f.).

‘His head smells like a raven’s nest.’¹⁹⁵⁴

(ŚB 5.8.2)

atha yadāsyā vivātā vātā vāyante ...

‘Then, for whom vehement winds blow...’ (BOLLÉE)

(JUB 3.5.1.1 [ed. OERTEL 3.20.1])

guhāsi, devo ’sy, upavāsy; upa taṃ vāyasva yo ’smān dveṣṭi, yaṃ ca vayaṃ dviṣmaḥ

‘You are in secret, you are a god, you are upon blowing; blow upon him who hates us and whom we hate.’¹⁹⁵⁵

The opposite case, i.e. using the root present *vāti* in the sense of *vāyati* ‘become deficient’, is attested in AB 8.28.10 *udvānt-* ‘extinguishing’ (see HOFFMANN, *ibid.*).

vyadh ‘pierce, shoot’: *vidhya-*^{ti/(te)}

vidhya-^{ti}:

RV + (also with preverbs)¹⁹⁵⁶

accented: RV +

• tr.

-vidhya-^{te}:

Simplex [pass.] JB 2.426:4 (ed. RAGHU VIRA/LOKESH CHANDRA *vi-vidhyamāna-*, v.ll. °*vadhy*^o, °*vādhy*^o; ed. CALAND [§168] °*vadhy*^o) (+);¹⁹⁵⁷
+ *pra* [tr.] MānŚS 1.2.2.21 (+)

¹⁹⁵⁴ For this construction, see DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 78f., and cf. ŚB 3.2.1.11 *tāsmāt té pūṭayo vānti* ‘therefore they smell (of) putrid.’

¹⁹⁵⁵ Note, incidentally, that the root present *vāti* ‘blows’ is also attested in the JUB, e.g., in the same passage and in 3.5.2.2 [ed. OERTEL 3.21.2] *sa vāyū āha: yat purastād vāsīndro rājā bhūto vāsi* ‘He said to Vāyu: “In that you blow from the front, you blow as king Indra”.’

¹⁹⁵⁶ See, in particular, HOFFMANN 1975: 46ff. [= Aufs. 2, 549ff.] on *āti-vyadh* ‘durchbohren, hindurchschießen’; JAMISON 1991a: 267, fn. 227 on the meaning of *prā-vyadh* (lit.) ‘wound forth’ → ‘violently throw forth in(to)’; BODEWITZ 2002a: 214 on *nī-vyadh* ‘throw down’.

¹⁹⁵⁷ For Epic attestations, see OBERLIES 2003: 518f.

The transitive present *vidhya*-^{ti} is well-attested from the RV onwards. Besides the subject and object, its syntactic frame includes the instrumental of the weapon and the locative of the target: ‘X_{NOM} pierces Y_{ACC} (with Z_{INS} at W_{LOC})’. An example is:

(RV 10.87.4c)

tābhir vidhya hṛdaye yātudhānān

‘Pierce, [o Agni,] the sorcerers with these [arrows] at heart.’

A difficult semantic problem is posed by constructions of the type *svārbhānur vā āsurāḥ sūryaṁ tāmasāvidhyat* (e.g. in MS 2.5.2:48.11). According to JAMISON (1991a: 133ff., 267ff., 298ff.), this collocation should be translated as ‘Svarbhānu Āsura pierced the sun with darkness’. BODEWITZ (1997: 63ff.) believes that this refers to covering the sun, making it invisible (for instance, during the eclipse), rather than to piercing. Yet another (hyperbolic) interpretation is proposed by PINAULT (1992: 322f.): ‘le soleil perd (un peu de) son éclat, qu’il “cède devant le feu”, lequel peut briller autant que le soleil’.

vidhya-^{ti} is also attested with several preverbs, sometimes with idiomatic changes. Examples are:

- with *áva*:

(RV 9.73.8d)

ávājṣṭān vidhyati karté avratān

‘[Soma]¹⁹⁵⁸ throws the displeasing lawless ones down into the hole.’

- with *prá*:

(ŚBM 6.1.1.12 = ŚBK 8.1.1.9)

tām samklīśyāpsú právidhyat

‘[Prajāpati] compressed it (sc. the earth) and threw it into the waters.’

Middle forms

In the Vedic period, the stem *vidhya*- occurs with the middle inflection only once:

(JB 2.426:4 [CALAND §168])

*iyato no ’vyātsur iyanto vi vidhyamānānām + amukṣmahi*¹⁹⁵⁹

¹⁹⁵⁸ Or Varuṇa; see BRERTON 1981: 101, with fn. 54.

¹⁹⁵⁹ Conjecture by HOFFMANN, apud NARTEN 251; see also EHLERS 113.

I follow HOFFMANN/NARTEN's (see NARTEN 251) passive interpretation of the passage:

‘... so viele von uns haben sie erschossen, so viele von denen, auf die geschossen wurde, haben sich gerettet (= als so viele ... haben wir uns gerettet).’

*śam*ⁱ α ‘be/become extinguished’; β ‘be/become appeased’:

śāmya^{ti/(te)}

Simplex [[Act.]] (α) ŚB 14.2.2.28, SVB, Sū.; (β) AVP 17.28.5 (?)
[Kashm. *upa*^o], VS 14.31 (≈ ŚB 8.4.3.19^{2x}) = TS^m 4.3.10.3 = MS^m 2.8.6:111.2 = KS^m 17.5:249.7 = KpS^m 26.4:107.16, TS^p 2.5.8.2^{2x}, 5.6.2.4, MS^p 2.1.10:12.11 (= MānŚS 5.1.7.33), ŚB 1.2.5.26, GB 1.2.21:57.10, ŚB 5.10.6-7^{2x}, TĀ^m 1.3.4, MānGS^m 2.7.4, VaikhGS^m 1.6:8.1, KauśS^m 83.6 = 85.15, ŚGS^m 6.6.6, BaudhDhS^v 2.6.42;

[[Med.]] (β) BaudhDhS^v 2.6.42 (adjacent to act.)

+ *upa* [[Act.]] (α) AB 7.5.8 (≈ APrāyaśc. 1.5), 7.12.1, ChU 2.12.1, MaitrU, ed. VAN BUITENEN (p. 105) [4.0]/4.3^{2x} (ed. COWELL, ed. “18 Up.” 6.34) = MaitrāyaṇyU [ed. 108 Up.] 4.[4].1^{2x} (*upa-śāmyati* in all eds. except ed. COWELL °*śāmyate*), APrāyaśc.^{m,p}, (β?) KauśS^m 73.4;
[[Med.]] (α) AB 7.8.4, APrāyaśc. 2.5^{2x}

+ *sām* [[Act.]] (α) ŚB 2.3.2.12, VādhŚS [eds. SPARREBOOM/HEESTERMAN; IKARI] 1.4.1.17, [ed. SPARREBOOM/HEESTERMAN] 1.4.1.33 = [ed. IKARI] 1.4.1.32];

(β) [soc.] ‘come to peace’ ŚB 1.7.3.11, 3.4.3.1 (*sām-aśāmyan* ≈ ŚBK 4.4.3.1 *sām-ajānata*); ChU 2.12.1 (*saṃ-śāmyati*, probably a gloss on *upa-śāmyati*; omitted in eds. BÖHTLINGK, SENART)

accented: ŚB

pass. of caus. *śamāya*- ‘slaughter (lit. ‘pacify’) [sacrificial animal]’: *śāmya*^{te}

śamya^{te} GB 1.2.18:51.5, 52.2, 4

śāmya^{te} GB 1.2.21:58.10, VaitS 10.18

denom. (?) [← *śimī*-, *śāmī*- (?)]: *śVmya*^{ti} ‘perform sacrificial work’ (?)

TS^m, ^AKS-Aśvamedha^m *śimya*^{ti} ≈ VS *śāmya*^{ti} (≈ MS^m *śāmya*^{ti} (1x))

(also in nom. deriv. (?):

-ú-, '-u-: *śimýú-* (name of a king?) RV 7.18.5; *śimýu-* RV 1.100.18 (tribe name?)¹⁹⁶⁰

The intransitive present *śámya^{-ti/(te)}*, attested from the post-RVic mantras onwards (AVP (?),¹⁹⁶¹ YV^m +),¹⁹⁶² exhibits two closely related meanings, discussed at length by HOENS (1951) and THIEME in his review (1953: 397ff. [= Kl.Schr. [I], 2, 656ff.]): (α) 'be/become extinguished, cease; be/become tired' (THIEME: 'ermatten'), and (β) 'be/become appeased, peaceful' (THIEME: 'zur Ruhe kommen').¹⁹⁶³ The latter meaning is typical for the sacral context and particularly common for the simplex, while the compounds with *úpa* are attested in the "profane" usage (α).¹⁹⁶⁴ The transitive-causative meaning 'appease, make peaceful' is expressed by the *-áya*-causative *śamáya^{-ti}* AV + (HOENS 1951, passim; JAMISON 103f. and see below), but is unattested and, most likely, impossible for *śámya^{-ti/(te)}*; the transitive translations suggested by some interpreters for a few occurrences of this *-ya*-present (EGGELING for ŚB 1.7.3.11 and ŚB 3.4.3.1, BOLLÉE for ŚB 5.10.6, Sāyaṇa's gloss on TĀ 1.3.4) should be corrected accordingly. Examples are:

¹⁹⁶⁰ It is unclear whether the names (?) *śimýú-* RV 7.18.5 and *śimýu-* RV 1.100.18 (see MAYRHOFFER 2003: 93) belongs with *śímya^{-ti}* (i.e. 'stitchers', 'scratchers'? for the meaning of this *-ya*-present, see below), as WÜST (1931: 193, fn. 1) suggested (see also WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 845, §681d).

¹⁹⁶¹ The only AVic (Paippalāda 17.28.5, prose text) attestation is uncertain; both Kashmir and Orissa variants give corrupt forms. Kashm. ms. reads *soba śāmyat tasmād yo vrahma vedotāpas sa tañ śamayati*, for which BARRET conjectures the compound form ⁺*upaśāmyat*. The Orissa version, albeit probably corrupt as well, rather points to a simplex: *so sāmīyayat [...] śamayati*. The underlying text may be *so* ⁺*śāmyat*; *tasmād yo brahma vedotāpas sa tañ śamayati* 'he became appeased; therefore the one who knows Brahma and the waters makes him appeased.'

¹⁹⁶² Inexactly JAMISON 104 ("no intrans. formations attested in the early Vedic period"); correspondingly, her statement that intr. *śāmyati* is built back to the *-áya*-transitive *śamayati* is dubious.

¹⁹⁶³ Note that the subject of appeasement can belong both to the negative (evil, snakes) and to the positive/neutral sphere; see examples below.

¹⁹⁶⁴ The distinction between these two usages cannot be drawn with accuracy in some cases, in particular, with the subject *agní-*, both interpretations are often possible: (α) 'the fire becomes extinguished' and (β) 'Agni becomes appeased'.

- simplex, (α):

(ŚB 14.2.2.28-29)

yadā śāmyanti viprúṣaḥ ||28|| átha prāñ ivódaññ út krāmati

‘When the spillage [of the drops of the cooking milk] cease, he steps out towards the north-east.’ (see HOENS 111; THIEME 1953: 397 [= Kl.Schr. I], 2, 656ff.)

- simplex, (β):

(VS 14.31.c (≈ ŚB 8.4.3.19^{2x}) = TS^m 4.3.10.3 = MS^m 2.8.6:111.1-2 = KS^m 17.5:249.7-8 = KpS^m 26.4:107.16-17)

tráyastrīṃśatāstuvata: bhūtāny aśāmyan, prajāpatiḥ parameṣṭhy ádhipatir āsīt

‘With 33 praises they said: “The creatures became appeased, Prajāpati was the supreme Lord”.’ (see HOENS 128)

(TS 2.5.8.2)

táto vā imáu lokāv aśāmyatām, yád evám anvāhānāyor lokāyoḥ śāntyai; śāmyato ’smā imáu lokáu, yá evāṃ veda

‘Verily, then these two worlds became calm, when he repeats thus, for the calming of these two worlds; these two worlds become calm for one who knows thus.’ (see HOENS 9)

(TS 5.6.2.4)

yád apā upadādhāti śúcām evāsya śamayati; nārtim ā rchaty adhvaryúr ná yájamānaḥ; śāmyanti prajā yātraitā upadhīyānte

‘By putting waters [i.e. bricks filled with water] down he calms his [= Agni’s] heat; neither the adhvaryu nor the sacrificer come to ruin; [his] offspring come to appeasement where these [waters] are being put down.’ (see HOENS 127)

(MS 2.1.10:12.11-12 (= MānŚS 5.1.7.33))

yádi kāmāyeta: śāmyed ity, agnāye surabhimáte ’ṣṭākāpālaṃ nír vapet

‘If he wishes: “May [Agni-Rudra] be appeased”, – he must sacrifice [a cake] on eight dishes to the fragrant Agni.’ (see HOENS 62)¹⁹⁶⁵

(ŚB 1.2.5.26)

barhīṣā ha vái khálv eṣā śāmyati

‘By the sacrificial grass (barhis), verily, it (sc. the vedi-altar) becomes appeased.’ (cf. HOENS 6)

¹⁹⁶⁵ Inexactly VAN GELDER for the MānŚS quotation: ‘May he (sc. Agni) cease...’

(ŚB 5.10.6-7)

[6] *etaiḥ sambhārair yad upaspr̥ṣṭam tad abhyukṣec; chāmyati hātaḥ.*

[7] *brāhmaṇabhojanam hiraṇyaṁ gaur vāso 'śvo bhūmir dakṣiṇā iti śāmyati hātaḥ*

‘[6] He must besprinkle what is touched by these requisites; thereby (the guilt of having hurt something) is appeased. [7] [After the oblation] the meal for Brahmans, gold, a cow, a garment, a horse and land should be presented as a sacrificial gift; thus it is appeased.’¹⁹⁶⁶

(TĀ^m 1.3.4)

hlādayate jvalataś caiva ' śāmyataś cāśya cakṣuṣī

‘[The rainy season] refreshes [living being], its eyes burn¹⁹⁶⁷ and calm down.’¹⁹⁶⁸

(KauśS 83.6)

śaradī nidadhyāc: chāmyatv agham iti

‘With [the mantra]: “Let evil be appeased” he should bury [him] in the autumn.’

(MānGS^m 2.7.4)

śāmyantu sarpāḥ svaśayā bhavantu

‘Let the serpents be appeased, let them stay in their abodes.’

(BaudhDhS 2.6.42)

hutena śāmyate pāpaṁ ' hutam annena śāmyati

annaṁ dakṣiṇayā śāntim ' upayāṭīti na[h] śrutir iti

“‘Sin becomes appeased (removed) by offering, offering becomes appeased by food, food reaches appeasement by the sacrificial gift’ – thus [according to] our śruti[-knowledge].’

Note that in this late verse active and middle forms are employed

¹⁹⁶⁶ BOLLÉE inconsistently renders the first occurrence of *śāmyati* as transitive-causative, the second as intransitive: ‘He must besprinkle with the requisites what is touched; thereby he **appeases** (the guilt of having hurt something). [...] Then it **is appeased**.’ Correctly WEBER (1858: 336): ‘dadurch wird Sühne dafür’ and ‘so wird Sühne (für die Unzeichen)’.

¹⁹⁶⁷ This may mean that they are tearful; cf. SHARMA 1959/60: 244.

¹⁹⁶⁸ Sāyaṇa glosses both verbs with -āya-causatives (*atas tadīye cakṣuṣī sarvān padārthān ujjvalayataḥ* [...] *atas tadīye cakṣuṣī sarvān padārthān upaśamayataḥ*), which suggests a transitive interpretation: ‘his two eyes inflame and calm down [creatures]’ or the like. However, a transitive-causative analysis is certainly impossible for the class I present *jvāla-*^{ti} ‘burn’ (see GOTÖ 158) and should likewise be rejected for *śāmyātaḥ*.

indiscriminately.

Compounds with *upa* first appear in the AB; one of the occurrences is a middle form (with no difference in usage):

(AB 7.5.8)

tad āhur: yasyāhavanīye hāgnir vidyetātha gārhapatya upaśāmyet, kā tatra prāyaścittir iti

‘They say: “If there is a fire on a man’s Āhavanīya, but that on Gārhapatya is extinguished, what is the expiation here?”.’

(AB 7.8.4)

tad āhur: yasya sarva evāgnaya upaśāmyeran, kā tatra prāyaścittir iti

‘They say: “If all fires of someone are extinguished, what is the expiation here?”.’

Cf. also the following ChU passage, where *upaśāmyati* is glossed with *saṁśāmyati* (probably emphasizing the complete character of the extinction):

(ChU 2.12.1)

*upaśāmyati, tan nidhanaṁ; (saṁśāmyati, tan nidhanam)*¹⁹⁶⁹

‘[When the fire] is extinguished, this is nidhana (= the concluding part of a sāman); ([that is], [when the fire] is (totally) extinguished, this is nidhana).’

- with *sām*, (α):

(ŚB 2.3.2.12)

ātha yātraitāt pratitarām iva / tiraścīvārcīḥ saṁśāmyato bhāvati, tārhi haiṣā bhavati mitrāḥ

‘And when the flame of the [fire] being extinguished becomes lower and lower, and [burns] as it were sideways, then indeed that [fire] becomes Mitra.’ (see HOENS 35; GONDA 1972: 53)

(VādhŚS [eds. SPARREBOOM/HEESTERMAN; IKARI] 1.4.1.17)

te yadā saṁśāmyato ’thainor bhasmoddharanti

‘When the two [fires] become extinguished, they take out the ashes from them.’

- with *sām*, (β) (with the reciprocal meaning: ‘come to peace [together with smb.]’):

¹⁹⁶⁹ Omitted as a gloss in eds. BÖHTLINGK, SENART; see ed. BÖHTLINGK, p. 99; MORGENROTH 1980-81: 286.

(ŚB 1.7.3.11)

*tád asmā etāṃ devā āhutiṃ kalpayitvāthainenaitād bhūyaḥ sám
aśāmyan, priyā enaṃ dhāmann úpāhvayanta*

‘For, having arranged this oblation for him (sc. Agni), the gods then came again to peace [with him] by this [formula], and invited him to his pleasant abode.’¹⁹⁷⁰

(ŚB 3.4.3.1)

*ātithyēna vāi devā iṣṭvā, tānt samād avindat. té tātūnaptrāiḥ sám
aśāmyan*

‘When the gods had performed the guest-offering, discord arose between them. They came to peace¹⁹⁷¹ by means of the Tātūnaptra [oaths].’

Caus. pass.

The -āya-causative *śamāya-ti* is attested, besides its primary meaning (‘make peaceful, appeased’, meaning β), in the euphemistic sense ‘slaughter’ (of a sacrificial animal) (← (lit.) ‘pacify’); see OERTEL 1942a: 8f. [= Kl.Schr. II, 1508f.]. The late causative passive *śāmya-te* ‘be slaughtered, pacified’ is built to this secondary usage and occurs in texts of the AVic tradition (GB,¹⁹⁷² VaitS). The regular root degree of this formation should be the same as in the underlying causative (i.e. *śam*). The GB attests both variants (*a*: 3x; *ā*: 1x); the VaitS has only the latter. The long vowel variant *śāmya-* may have emerged under the influence of the -ya-present *śāmya-ti/(te)* (note the middle forms attested from the Brāhmaṇas onwards) with similar (albeit not identical) meaning ‘become appeased, peaceful’:¹⁹⁷³

(GB 1.2.18:51.5-6)

*tān vāg abhyuvācāśvaḥ śamyeteti. tatheti. tam ṛgveda etyovācāham
aśvaṃ śameyam iti*

‘The speech told them: “The horse should be slaughtered (lit. pacified)”. “So!” The Ṛgveda goes to him and says: “I will slaughter the horse”.’ (see HOENS 23)

¹⁹⁷⁰ Inexactly EGGELING: ‘the gods ... still further propitiated him (sc. Agni – LK) by this (formula)’; cf. HOENS 11.

¹⁹⁷¹ Inexactly EGGELING: ‘They allayed it by means of the Tātūnaptra (oaths)’; cf. HOENS 82.

¹⁹⁷² Cf. BÖHTLINGK 1896d: 16.

¹⁹⁷³ Less likely is the explanation of *śāmya-te* as built on the stem variant *śāmaya-*, which is a more recent formation (Ep. +).

(GB 1.2.21:58.10-11)

paśuṣu śāmyamāneṣu cakṣur hāpayanti. cakṣur eva tad ātmani dhatte
 ‘When the cattle are being slaughtered (lit. pacified), they take away their eye. [The priest] puts the eye in himself.’ (see OERTEL 1926: 290; HOENS 30)

(VaitS 10.18)

śāmyamāne pradakṣiṇam āvartante
 ‘While [the victim] is being slaughtered, they turn to the right.’ (see HOENS 175)

śVmya-^{ti} ‘prepare for sacrifice’

While the intransitive present *śāmya-^{ti/(te)}* poses no serious difficulties, the phonologically similar *śāmya-^{ti}/śīmya-^{ti}* is both morphologically and semantically unclear. This present occurs only in the YVic mantras, in the Aśvamedha section (VS 23.33-42 ≈ TS 5.2.11-12 ≈ ^AKS-Aśvamedha 5.10.5-6:185.5ff. ≈ MS 3.12.21:167.3ff.); for a description of the corresponding ritual, see DUMONT 1927: 182ff. For the sake of convenience, I will quote the relevant mantras in a synoptic form (basically following BHAWE 1939: 104f.), noticing the relevant differences between the versions attested in the four Saṃhitās, i.e. in the VS, MS, TS and KS:

(VS 23.33-42 ≈ TS 5.2.11-12 ≈ ^AKS-Aśvamedha 5.10.5-6:185.5ff. ≈ MS 3.12.21:167.3ff.)

[1] ab. *gāyatrī triṣṭúb jāgat_iy 'anuṣṭúp pañkt_iyā sahá*

c. [KS, MS, VS] *bṛhat_iy ūṣṇīhā kakúp*

[TS] *bṛhat_iy ūṣṇīhā kakút*

d. [only MS] *devānāṃ pátdayo víśaḥ*

e. [TS, KS] *sūcībhiḥ śīmyantu t_uvā*

[VS] *sūcībhiḥ śāmyantu t_uvā*

[MS] *sūcībhiḥ śamayantu tvā*

[2] ab. *dvīpadā yās cātuspadās 'trīpadā yās ca śātpadāḥ*

c. [TS, KS] *sácchandā yās ca vícchandāḥ*

[VS, MS] *vicchandā yās ca sácchandāḥ*

d. [TS, KS] *sūcībhiḥ śīmyantu t_uvā*

[VS] *sūcībhiḥ śāmyantu t_uvā*

[MS] *sūcībhiḥ śamayantu tvā*

[3] a. *mahānāmnī revátayo* ([VS] *mahānāmnīyo revát_iyo*)

b. [TS, KS, MS] *víśvā āśāḥ prasúvarīḥ*

[VS] *visvā āśāḥ prabhūvarīḥ*

- c. *még_iṽā* ([VS] *máighīr*) *vidyúto vácāḥ*
 d. [TS, KS] *sūcībhiḥ śim^yantu t_uvā*
 [VS] *sūcībhiḥ śam^yantu t_uvā*
 [MS] *sūcībhiḥ śamayantu tvā*
- [4] a. *rajatā hāriṇīḥ śísā*
 b. [TS, KS, VS] *yújo yujyante kármabhiḥ*
 [MS] *yújo yuñjantu kármabhiḥ*
 c. *ásvasya vājīnas tvací*
 d. [TS, KS] *sūcībhiḥ śim^yantu t_uvā*
 [VS] *símāḥ śam^yantu śam^yantīḥ*
 [MS] *syūmāḥ kṛṇvantu śām^yantīḥ*¹⁹⁷⁴
- [5] a. [TS, KS, VS] *nārīs te pát_nayo* ([VS] *náryas te pát_nyo*) *lóma*
 [MS] *yóṣās te pát_nayo lóma*
 b. [TS, KS, VS] *ví cinvantu manīṣáyā*
 [MS] *ví cinvantu yathāyathám*
 c. [TS, VS] *devā_nām pát_nīr* ([VS] *pát_nyo díśaḥ*
 [KS] *devā_nām pát_nīr víśaḥ*
 [MS] *supát_nīḥ pát_nayo vājīn*)
 d. [TS, KS] *sūcībhiḥ śim^yantu t_uvā*
 [VS] *sūcībhiḥ śam^yantu t_uvā*
 [MS] *prajāyā +bhukṣiṣīmahi*¹⁹⁷⁵
 [...]¹⁹⁷⁶
- [7] a. *kás tvā chyati*¹⁹⁷⁷ *kás tvā ví śāsti*
 b. [TS, KS] *kás te gātrāṇi śim^yati*
 [VS] *kás te gātrāṇi śam^yati*
 c. *ká u te śamitā kavīḥ*
- [8] a. [TS, KS] *ṛtávas ta ṛtudhā páruḥ*
 [VS] *ṛtávas ta ṛtuthā páruva*
 b. *śamitāro ví śāsatu*
 c. [TS, KS] *saṁvatsarásya dhāyasā*

¹⁹⁷⁴ [3] and [4] are in the reverse order in the VS and MS.

¹⁹⁷⁵ In the MS pādas cd run: *supát_nīḥ pát_nayo vājīn ' prajāyā +bhukṣiṣīmahi* (emendation by NARTEN 182f.; see MITTWEDE 1986 [Textkr. zur MS]: 147).

¹⁹⁷⁶ I omit the last stanza of this Chapter (*kuvid aṅgá* ...). Here end TS 5.2.11, KS-Aśvamedha 5.10.5, MS 3.12.21; the following mantras are absent from the MS.

¹⁹⁷⁷ On this verb, see below, Chapter VI, s.v. *chā*.

- [VS] *saṃvatsarāsya téjasā*
 d. [TS, KS] *śīmībhīḥ śīmyantu* *t_uvā*
 [VS] *śamībhīḥ śamyantu* *t_uvā*
 [9] ab. *dāivyā adhvaryāvas t_uvā* *ā chyantu ví ca śāsatu*
 c. *gātrāṇi parvaśās te*
 d. [TS, KS] *śīmāḥ kṛṇvantu śīmyantaḥ*
 [VS] *śīmāḥ kṛṇvantu śámyantīḥ*
 [10] a. *ardhamāsāḥ párūṁṣi te*
 b. [TS, KS] *⁺māsā ⁺ā¹⁹⁷⁸ chyantu śīmyantaḥ*
 [VS] *māsā ā chyantu śámyantaḥ*
 cd. *ahorātrāṇi marúto ' víliṣṭaṁ sūdayantu te¹⁹⁷⁹*

‘[1] Let [the metres] Gāyatrī, Triṣṭubh, Jagatī, Anuṣṭubh together with Pañkti, Bṛhatī, Uṣṇihā, Kakubh, <MS: the wives of the gods, the tribes> **prepare you for the sacrifice** with needles. [2] Let the [stanzas consisting of] two pādas, [those of] four pādas, and [those of] three pādas, [those of] six pādas, those of one metre and those of different metres **prepare you for the sacrifice** with needles. [3] Let [the stanzas] Mahānāmnīs and Revatis, reaching all quarters, the lightnings of clouds and voices prepare you for the sacrifice with needles. [4] The [needles made of] silver, gold, lead are yoked as yoke-fellows to the [sacrificial] works; on the skin of the run-horse, let them **prepare you for the sacrifice** with needles (VS, MS: let them **prepare/make** seams (?),¹⁹⁸⁰ **preparing** [you] **for the sacrifice**). [5] Let the human wives separate your hair with intelligence (MS: in a proper manner), let the wives of the gods, the quarters, **prepare you for the sacrifice** with needles. [...] [7] Who cuts your [skin]? Who dissects you? Who **prepares** your joints **for the sacrifice**? Who is your preparer, the poet? [8] Let the seasons, the

¹⁹⁷⁸ KS, TS *māsās chy°*.

¹⁹⁷⁹ [9] and [10] are in the reverse order in the VS.

¹⁹⁸⁰ I basically follow LUDWIG’s (1878: 409) interpretation: ‘in des renners, des rosses, haut sollen sie besorgend [das ross, das werk] nähte machen’; the translations given by DUMONT (1927: 183) (‘qu’elles-mêmes, travaillant, elles travaillent (qu’elles-mêmes, préparant, elles préparent)’) and RENOU (1938: 119) (‘... que toutes elles travaillent les travailleuses’) leave VS *śīmāḥ* unexplained. MS *syúmāḥ* (and, possibly, VS *śīmāḥ*) seem to be derived from the root *sīv* ‘sew’ and may refer to the trace (‘seam’) left by the ritual needles on the skin of the horse; cf. also Mahīdhara’s gloss *rekḥā* ‘scratch’.

preparers dissect your joints at the right time. With the strength (splendour, sharpness) of the year let them **prepare** you **for the sacrifice** with sacrificial preparations. [9] Let the divine adhvaryus cut you, and let them dissect [you]; let them make sacrificial preparations¹⁹⁸¹ (VS: seams (?)), **preparing** your members, joint by joint, **for the sacrifice**. [10] Let the half-months [and] months cut your joints, **preparing** [you] **for the sacrifice**. Let the days and nights, the Maruts put in order (lit. sweeten) [that] of your what is disordered.’

Whatever the exact meaning of *śVmya^{-ti}*, the parallel -*āya*-causative *śamayantu* in the MS and the accusative direct object *tvā* clearly point to the transitive syntax. Thus, at least synchronically, it should be treated separately from the intransitive *śām^{-ti}*. The analysis of *śām^{-ti}* ‘be/become extinguished; be/become appeased’ and *śVmya^{-ti}* ‘prepare’ (?) as derived from distinct roots is accepted by most Sanskritists; cf. WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]: 171;¹⁹⁸² GONDA 1936: 173 [= Sel.St. III, 13]; WERBA [VIA I] 319f. (*śamⁱ* ‘zur Ruhe kommen’) and 446f. (*śa(i)mⁱ* ‘sich (ab/be)mühen (mit/um), zureichten/bereiten’); see also LIV 323f., with note 1. THIEME’s (1953) treatment of all these usages within one single lexeme¹⁹⁸³ was not generally accepted (for criticism, see, in particular, TICHY 1995a: 38, fn. 39), although their genetic relationship is usually considered very likely.¹⁹⁸⁴

Besides the different syntax and semantics, *śVmya^{-ti}* ‘prepare’ displays the unusual variety of the root vowel (*a/i/ā*),¹⁹⁸⁵ which distinguishes it from *śām^{-ti}* and has no parallels in Vedic.¹⁹⁸⁶ The nominal *śāmī-/śīmī-*

¹⁹⁸¹ RENOU (EVP X, 89): ‘force violente’.

¹⁹⁸² Though with the note on √ 2 *śam* ‘be quiet’: “probably ultimately the same with the preceding” [=√ 1 *śam*, *śim* ‘labor’].

¹⁹⁸³ This semantic analysis is also adopted by H.-P. SCHMIDT (1973: 27, fn. 81).

¹⁹⁸⁴ KURYLOWICZ (1956: 248) treated *śam(yati)* and *śām(yati)* as the earlier and the younger realisations of the zero degree of one root (*śam(i)*), in accordance with his analysis of the Indo-European *TmC* roots; however, his semantic explanations of these presents as “travailler (*se fatiguer)” and “être tranquille (< *être fatigué)”, respectively (i.e. in terms of the process/state opposition?), is probably based on misunderstanding DUMONT/RENOU’s interpretation of *śamyati* in the VS.

¹⁹⁸⁵ The third variant occurs only in MS 3.12.21:167.8.

¹⁹⁸⁶ KUIPER (1947: 202; 1948: 30f.) explained the stem *śīm⁻* as resulting from the so-called “laryngeal Umlaut” (**k_smH-i-*), treating *śām⁻* as its more recent variant (“analogical new formation of the White Yajurveda”). The phenomenon of the

‘sacrificial work, etc.’ (WACKERNAGEL/ DEBRUNNER (1954 [AiG II/2]: 405, §251a): “wohl verwandt”; MAYRHOFER, EWAia II, 638, with bibl.), which shows a similar variety of the root vowel, seems to belong with *śVmya*^{-ti}.¹⁹⁸⁷ *śVmya*^{-ti} may be built on *śámī*-/śímī- (RV +), thus belonging to the same (rare) denominative type as *ārya*^{-ti} ‘treat as an *ārya*’; note that both are transitive. Its original meaning can be tentatively reconstructed as ‘perform *śámī*-/śímī- (‘sacrificial work’), apply *śámī*-/śímī- to [the sacrificial animal]’. The original shape of this noun and its denominative could be *śámī*-, *śámya*^{-ti} (as attested in the VS). The denominative could easily have been reinterpreted as a -ya-present and lengthen the root vowel, as required for *Cam*ⁱ roots and, particularly, under the influence of the phonologically similar (and, most likely, genetically and semantically related) *śámya*^{-ti} ‘become appeased’; the variant *śámya*- is attested in the MS (1×). Finally, on the basis of the morphophonological model *ā*//*i* (as in *sthā* : *sthitā*-, *śās* ‘order’ : *śiṣṭā*-), *ā* in *śámya*^{-ti} could be replaced by the “regular” zero grade variant *i*, yielding the stem variant attested in the KS and TS (*śímya*-), and the noun *śámī*- may have been rebuilt accordingly (*śímī*-).

The meaning of *śVmya*^{-ti} remains problematic. Most likely, it denotes a particular ritual activity performed on the sacrificial horse, preparing it for sacrifice after slaughtering. LUDWIG (1878: 409) translated this present as

“laryngeal Umlaut” in Sanskrit seems quite unlikely, however; for criticism, see BAILEY 1957: 63, fn. 24; BEEKES 1982/83: 204f. et passim; LINDEMAN 1987: 47, fn. 27. Hardly more probable is also RENOU’s (1952b [GrV]): 28, §24) explanation: “influence possible de l’échange *ir/r*.” For a survey of explanations, see MINARD 1964: 54.

¹⁹⁸⁷ Here it will be in order to mention RENOU’s suggestions on the origin of *śímyati* / *śámyati* and its relationship with the nominal stem *śímī* / *śámī*-. RENOU (1958: 56f.) poses the question on whether *śam* ‘peine’ (in *śaśamānā*-, *śamāyate* etc.) and *śim* (in *śímyā*, *śímivant*- [“qui éveille avant tout image de violence”]) might be related, but leaves it open. Later RENOU translated *śam* as ‘être au repos, se reposer’ rather than as ‘prendre peine’ (EVP V, 94 for RV 1.24.4; V, 96 for RV 4.41.3; VII, 72), albeit hesitantly (EVP VII, 76). In EVP X, 89 *śímī*- “« force violente, force dans le combat » plutôt que « zèle »” and *śímyati* ‘préparer la victime animale’ (← *‘faire un acte de violence’) are separated from *śam*. In EVP XII, 104f. *śímīvant*- ‘violent’ and *śímyā* ‘avec le bruit (de guerre)’ are treated separately from both *śímyati* (‘découper (la victime animale)’) and *śamyati*, *śamīṣva*, *śamīṭ*- (RV) ‘découpeur’, which are said to belong together. RENOU also posits (hesitantly) the third quasi-homonymous root, *śam* ‘prendre de la peine (au sacrifice)’ (in *śámnīte*, *śamāy*-). See also criticism in MINARD 1964: 54, with bibl. on *śímyati* / *śámyati*.

‘zum opfer zurichten’ (VS 23.34), ‘zubereiten’ (VS 23.34), ‘opfern’ (ibid., VS 23.35, 36), ‘besorgen’ (VS 23.37), ‘[glider] herrichten’ (VS 23.39 ... *gātrāṇi śamyati*), ‘schlachten’ (VS 23.40); DUMONT, op.cit. as ‘travailler, préparer’ (‘[ils] te travaillent (te préparent)’), e.g. for VS 23.33ff.), ‘dépecer’ (for VS 23.37), and RENO (1938 [HP]: 118f.) followed this interpretation; HOENS 175f. rendered MS 3.12.21:167.8 *śāmyant-* as ‘labouring’. Cf. also Mahīdhara’s gloss on VS 23.33 *saṃskurvantu* ‘let them prepare’. The constructions with *sīmāḥ* / *syūmāḥ* (VS *śamyantu śamyantīḥ* / MS *syūmāḥ kṛṇvantu śāmyantīḥ*) seem to point to a particular ritual action brought about with needles or thin knives, i.e. stitching, scratching or the like.

śuc ‘(flame up); suffer, pain’: *śúcya-*^{ti}

Simplex JB 2.69:7, 2.70:8 (ed. RAGHU VIRALOKESH CHANDRA *aśucyat*, v.l. *śúcya*^o);

+ *sām* ŚBM 6.4.4.20 = ŚBK 8.4.4.5

accented: ŚB

• intr. state

In contrast to the primary meaning of the verb *śuc* (‘shine’), attested from the RV onwards (for the class I present *śoca-*^{ti}), the secondary meaning ‘suffer, pain’ first appears in Vedic prose (GOTÖ 306f.). The rare -ya-present *śúcya-*^{ti}, attested only in the latter usage, has probably been built on the model of the active -ya-presents of (physiological) states; cf. esp. *kṛśya-*^{ti} ‘be/become lean’, *médya-*^{ti} ‘be/become fat’, *rūpya-*^{ti} ‘suffer (stomach) pain’.

This -ya-present occurs only in two Brāhmaṇas,¹⁹⁸⁸ in the ŚB and JB:

¹⁹⁸⁸ The compound *śucyad-akṣī-*, attested in the MS and interpreted by SCHROEDER (ad loc., fn. 13) as incorporating an alleged class IV present participle *śucyat-*, was emended by CALAND (1918: 9 [= Kl.Schr., 245]) to **śucy-akṣī-* ‘pure-eyed’:

(MS 3.7.4:78.12)

*yāruṇā babhrulomnī śvetopakāśā *śucyakṣī, tát somakráyaṇyā rūpām*

‘Which [cow is] reddish-brown, brown-haired, looking white, pure-eyed – this is the shape of [cow] serving as the price of the Soma plant.’

CALAND’s emendation is supported by the parallel Sūtra passage:

(ĀpŚS 10.22.4)

yā rohiṇī babhrulomnī pṛṣṇivālā pṛṣṇīśaphā śucyakṣī śvitropakāśā, tayā kṛṇīyād ity eke

(ŚBM 6.4.4.20 = ŚBK 8.4.4.5)

*tád yád evāsyātrópanaddhasya saṁśúcyati, tām evāsmād etác chúcam
bahirdhā dadhāti*

‘Whatever [part] of his [body] pains, when he (sc. Agni) is tied up, that pain he now puts away from him.’¹⁹⁸⁹

(JB 2.69:7 [ed. CALAND §128])

*tena mṛtyum ajayat. tasya parājitasya rājāśucyat*¹⁹⁹⁰

‘Therewith [Prajāpati] overcame death. When it was overcome, the king suffered pain.’

-i-aorist

In contrast to the late present *śúcyā^{ti}*, the -i-aorist *ásoci* occurs only in the RV (2x) and attests the primary non-passive intransitive usage ‘flame up’; see KÜMMEL 1996: 111f.; ROESLER 1997: 49, with fn. 103. *ásoci* could emerge under the influence of the synonymous *aroci* (INSLER 1968a: 317f.).

śu(n)dh ‘become pure, clean’: *śudhya^{ti/te}*

Simplex

[Act.] (AVP-Kashm. 1.21.4 *śudhyati*, read with Or. = AVŚ 6.83.3 *naśiṣyati*),¹⁹⁹¹ VS 6.15 (= ŚB 3.8.2.10) (*śudhyatu* ≈ MS^m 1.2.16:26.91 = 3.10.1:128.14 *śundhasva* ≈ TS^m 1.3.9.1 *śundhatām*), PB, GṛSū. +,¹⁹⁹²

‘Nach der Überlieferung einiger kaufe er den Soma für eine braunhaarige, buntschwänzige, bunthufige, helläugige, weisslich aussehende Kuh.’ (CALAND)

¹⁹⁸⁹ For the *genetivus personae* in this passage, see DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 5; OERTEL 1939: 653 [= Kl.Schr. I, 497]; 1944: 72 [= Kl.Schr. I, 541].

¹⁹⁹⁰ CALAND’s mss. (as well as two of the mss. used in ed. RAGHU VIRA/LOKESH CHANDRA) read °śūcy° with the abnormal long root vowel. CALAND left the second part of the passage without translation but suggested two possible conjectures (°śúcyā- and °śuṣya-), the latter of which seems less likely.

¹⁹⁹¹ AVP-Kashm. 1.21.4d *sakalaṁ tena śudhyati* must be a corruption of *sá galuntó* [Or. *gala°*] *naśiṣyati* (thus AVŚ 6.83.3d = AVP-Or. 1.21.4d) ‘this swelling (?) will disappear’ (Th. Zehnder, p.c.; see ZYSK 1985a: 86, 224f. on this verse).

¹⁹⁹² See also WEZLER 1995: 115, with fn. 88, on the meaning of the optative form *śudhyet* in the GautDhS (translated by WEZLER as ‘emphatic-indicativ’: “wird

[[Med.]] ŠB 5.10.4, TĀ 10.51-60 (= TĀ-Āndhra 65-66 ≈ MNU, ed. VARENNE 440-451), ŚrSū.^{v/p}, Smṛ. +

+ *vi*

[[Act.]] GṛSū.^v +;

[[Med.]] BaudhDhS^v 4.2.14

unaccented

• anticaus., refl.

also in nom. deriv.:

-ú-: *śundhyú-* ‘pure’¹⁹⁹³ RV +

(“pass. of caus.”): *śodhya-*^{te}

(without caus. semantics) ViṣṇuSmṛ. 22.91, ed. JOLLY *śodhyate*, ed. KRISHNAMACHARYA *śudhyate* (= ManuSmṛ. 5.108 *śudhyate*)

The intransitive present *śudhya-*^{ti} first appears in a YVic (VS) mantra:

(VS 6.15.f (≈ MS 1.2.16:26.8-9 = 3.10.1:128.13-14 ≈ TS 1.3.9.1.b))

*yát te krūrám yád āsthītam, tát ta á pyāyatām ní śtyāyatām, tát te śudhyatu*¹⁹⁹⁴

‘Whatever is wounded in you, whatever [sore] is arisen in you, let it swell up and become coagulated for you, let it become clean for you.’

Besides this mantra attestation, active forms occur in the PB, in the reflexive usage:

(PB 14.11.28)

sa etac chuddhāśuddhīyam apaśyat. tenāśudhyac. chudhyati śuddhāśuddhīyena tuṣṭuvānaḥ

‘He (sc. Indra) saw this śuddhāśuddhīya[-sāman]. He became pure [by praising] with it. He who has praised with the śuddhāśuddhīya[-saaman] becomes pure [with it].’

zweifellos rein”).

¹⁹⁹³ See WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 845, §681d; LUBOTSKY 1988: 48; MAYRHOFER 2003: 94. The quasi-root *śundh*, built on the nasal present *śundha-*^{ti} ‘cleanse’ RV_x +, underlies a number of other formations, too, such as the -āya-causative *śundhayati* (RVic hapax; see JAMISON 158).

¹⁹⁹⁴ MS, TS *śundhatām*.

Middle forms, (passives)

Forms with middle inflection, first attested at the very end of the Vedic period, appear in the same usage as the corresponding active forms. They become as frequent as their active counterparts in the Sūtras.¹⁹⁹⁵ Examples are:

(ŚB^v 5.10.4 ≈ VāsDhS^v 3.57)

*khananād dahanād abhimarśanād gobhir ākramaṇāc ca
caturbhiḥ śudhyate bhūmiḥ ' pañcamāc copalepanāt*

‘By digging, burning [away the grass], sweeping [with the hand] and by cows stepping upon it – in [these] four [manners], and in the fifth [manner], by besmearing [with cow-dung], the earth becomes clean.’

(TĀ 10.51.1 (= TĀ-Āndhra 65 = MNU, ed. VARENNE 440))

prāṇāpānavyānodānasamānā me śudhyantām

‘Let my outward breath, inward breath, distributive breath, upward breath and collective breath become clean.’¹⁹⁹⁶

(TĀ 10.52.1 (= TĀ-Āndhra 65 = MNU, ed. VARENNE 441))

*vānmanaścakṣuḥśrotrajihvāghrāṇareto buddhyākūtiḥ saṃkalpā me
śudhyantām*

‘Let my speech, mind, seeing, hearing, tongue, smelling, seed, intelligence and intention, my desires become clean.’¹⁹⁹⁷

(BaudhŚS^v 29.8:380.3-4)

śraddhayā śudhyate buddhiḥ ' śraddhayā śudhyate matiḥ

śraddhayā prāpyate brahma ' śraddhā pāpapaṇāśinī

‘Through devotion the mind becomes pure, through devotion the thought becomes pure, through devotion the Brahman is reached, devotion is destroyer of evil.’¹⁹⁹⁸

(ViṣṇuSmṛ.^v 22.92ab = VāsDhS^v 3.60ab = ManuSmṛ. 5.109ab)

adbhir gātrāṇi śudhyanti ' manaḥ satyena śudhyati

‘The limbs become pure by water, the mind becomes pure by truth.’

(VāsDhS^v 21.12)

brāhmaṇakṣatriyaviśāṃ ' striyaḥ śūdreṇa saṅgatāḥ

¹⁹⁹⁵ For Epic attestations of middle forms, see OBERLIES 2003: 525.

¹⁹⁹⁶ I am thankful to W. KNOBL for valuable comments on this passage.

¹⁹⁹⁷ Read probably °reto-buddhy° (in one word) for °reto buddhy° (W. KNOBL, p.c.).

¹⁹⁹⁸ For interpretation of this verse, see KÖHLER 1973: 28, where *śraddhā* is translated as ‘Hingabe’.

aprajātā viśudhyanti 'prāyaścittena netarāḥ

'The wives of Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, who have had sexual intercourse with a Śūdra, become pure with a penance, if they have not given birth [to a child from that intercourse]; the others (= those who have given birth) do not [become pure].'

The examples quoted above show that *śudhya*^{-ti/te} commonly occurs constructed with the instrumental, meaning 'X_{NOM} becomes pure with/by/through Z_{INS}'. This fact was probably the main reason for passive translations of this -ya-present, generally adopted in the literature, even for the active forms;¹⁹⁹⁹ BLOOMFIELD & EDGERTON (1930 [Ved. Var. I]: 44, 49) even mention *śudhyatu* in mantra VS 6.15 as one of the extremely rare examples of a -yá-passive with the active inflection. Although, at first glance, a passive analysis ('X_{NOM} is purified [by smb.]') seems appropriate in the context, it is impossible for several reasons:

1) *śudhya*^{-ti/te} usually refers to processes which come about spontaneously ('become pure, clean'), rather than are brought about by somebody.

2) We never find an overtly expressed instrumental passive agent in such constructions; the instrumental noun refers to the instrument or means of purifying (water, current, truth, devotion etc.). Note that this semantic role can also be encoded by the ablative, as in §B 5.10.4.

3) Passive usages are unlikely for active forms. Furthermore, as mentioned above, forms with middle inflection appear in the same usage as their active counterparts; cf., in particular, VāsDhS^v 3.57 *śudhyate*, VāsDhS^v 3.58 *śudhyate* (2x), *śudhyati* (2x);²⁰⁰⁰ VāsDhS^v 3.60 *śudhyanti*, *śudhyati* (2x).

Most likely, the late middle present *śudhya*^{-te} appears alongside the earlier active *śudhya*^{-ti} under the influence of the middle -ya-presents of change of state (one of the three main semantic subclasses of the middle class IV presents; see Chapter C.II.2.2). Correspondingly, the non-passive translation²⁰⁰¹ is preferable for *śudhya*^{-ti/te}, irrespectively of the diathesis.

¹⁹⁹⁹ E.g. BOLLÉE for §B 5.10.4 'the earth is purified' (and BÜHLER 1879: 24 for the parallel verse VāsDhS 3.57: 'land is purified'); VARENNE for MNU 440ff. *me śudhya(n)tām*: 'qu'en moi soit/soient purifié(s)...'; KÖHLER (1973: 28) for BaudhŚS 29.8:380.3 ('wird geläutert'), etc.

²⁰⁰⁰ For variant readings, see OLIVELLE 2000: 645.

²⁰⁰¹ Cf. e.g. WEBER (1858: 336) for §B 5.10.4: 'Rein wird die Erde'.

Caus. pass.

The post-Vedic (ViṣṇuSmṛ., ed. JOLLY) form *śodhyate*, which, in accordance with its full root grade, could be qualified as a causative passive, has no causative semantics ('is made become clean' or the like). This form is employed in the same usage as *śudhyati* in the following pāda and, most likely, owes the root vowel to the adjacent gerund *śodhya-*; ed. KRISHNAMACHARYA as well as the corresponding verse in the ManuSmṛ. read *śudhyate* instead:²⁰⁰²

(ViṣṇuSmṛ. 22.91ab = ManuSmṛ. 5.108 ≈ VāsDhS^v 3.58)

mṛtoyaiḥ śodhyate / śudhyate śodhyaṃ ' nadī vegena śudhyati [VāsDhS, ed. FÜHRER *śudhyate*]

'By water and earth becomes pure what is to be purified; a river becomes pure by its current.' (for this verse, see DOSSI 1998: 63)

śuṣ 'be/become dry, dry (up)': *śúṣya-*^{ti}

śúṣya-^{ti}:

Simplex AV(P), MS^p, KS^p, KpS^p, ŚB, AĀ 2.3.6^{2x}, JB 2.2:7 (+);

+ *ānu* RVKh. 4.5.17 ≈ 4.5.38 ≈ AVŚ 7.59.1 ≈ AVP 20.17.3, JB 2.257:10, KauśS;

+ *āpa* AVŚ 6.139.4;

+ *ud* ChU 4.3.2 [ed. MORGENROTH 4.3.1]²⁰⁰³;

+ *ūpa* TS^p 3.1.10.3;

+ *nī* AVŚ 6.139.2;

+ *pari* PraśU 6.1;

+ *pra* AVP 20.40.9^{2x};

+ *prāti* RV 7.104.11 ≈ AVP 16.10.1, RVKh. 4.5.38

accented: AV, TS, ŚB²⁰⁰⁴

• intr. state

-śuṣya-^{te}:

+ *upa* ChāgU (ed. RENOU 6:5.56, 58 [= ed. Adyar Libr., Unpubl.up. p. 25, l. 1ff.] *upa-śuṣyate*, ed. BELVALKAR *upaśu(ghu?)ṣyate*) +;

(+ *pari* ⁺JB 3.116:1, ed. CALAND §184 ⁺°*śuṣ*°, ed. RAGHU VIRA/LOKESH

²⁰⁰² On the secondary character of the middle form *śudhyate* in ManuSmṛ. 5.108, see BÖHTLINGK 1896a: 249.

²⁰⁰³ See KLAUS 1986: 107, fn. 39 on this passage.

²⁰⁰⁴ RVKh. 4.5.38 *anuśuṣyāti* with the erroneous accentuation.

CHANDRA ^{+°śiṣ°})

The intransitive present *śuṣya-*^{ti} occurs constructed [i] with the locative, [ii] with the instrumental or [iii] can be employed without non-subject arguments. Examples are:

[i] ('X_{NOM} pines away after Y_{LOC}'), [ii] ('X_{NOM} pines away because of Y_{INS}')

(AV 6.139.2)

śuṣyatu máyi te hṛdayam ' átho śuṣyat_av ās_iyām
átho ní śuṣya mām kámen_a átho śuṣkās_iyā cara

'Let thy heart dry up on me; then let [thy] mouth dry up; then dry thou up by loving me; then go thou about dry-mouthed.' (WHITNEY)

[iii]:

(RV 7.104.11cd)

prāti śuṣyatu yáso asya devā ' yó no dívā dípsati yás ca náktam

'Let the glory of the one who wants to hurt us by day and by night dry up, O gods.'

(RVKh. 4.5.38 [≈ ed. SĀTAVALEKAR 29.17] ≈ AVŚ 7.59.1 ≈ AVP 20.17.3)

*yáthā vidyúddható vṛkṣá ' á mūlād anuśuṣyáti*²⁰⁰⁵
evāñ sá prāti śuṣyatu ' yó me pāpāñ cikīrṣati

'Like the tree smitten by lightning dries up to the root, so let dry the one who wishes to make an evil against me.'²⁰⁰⁶

(ŚB 14.8.13.1 (= BĀUM 5.13.1 = BĀUK 5.12.1))

śuṣyati vāi prāṇá ṛté 'nnāt

'The life (breathing) dries up without [the support of] food.'

²⁰⁰⁵ Accentuation in *vidyúddható* (two accents!) and *anuśuṣyáti* (ed. SĀTAVALEKAR [pāda d] *tām á mūlād ānu śoṣaya*) is erroneous.

²⁰⁰⁶ The AVic version of this spell runs:

yó naḥ śápād áśapataḥ ' śápato yás ca naḥ śápāt

vṛkṣáⁱva vidyútā hatá ' á mūlād ānu śuṣyatu [AVP-Kashm. °śuṣyati]

'Whoever will curse us, the non-cursing ones, and whoever will curse us, the cursing ones, let him dry up to the root, like the tree smitten by lightning.'

It is interesting to note that the AVic Kubbikā-Upaniṣad (24.10; see ed. GOUDRIAAN & SCHOTERMAN, p. 68 and p. 147, with fn. 12, for translation) attests the version of this spell almost identical to that of the RVKh. (except for *samprati* in pāda c).

On the corresponding -āya-causative *śoṣāyati* (AV +), see JAMISON 145.

(Middle forms)

The only Vedic occurrence of a middle form is attested in a difficult JB passage, which runs in ed. RAGHU VIRA/LOKESH CHANDRA:

(JB 3.116:1 [ed. CALAND §184])

vihr̥tā agnayo bhavanti, vāstu pariśiṣyate, garbhā anuśoṣukā syuḥ

Mss. attest both °*śiṣyate* and °*śuṣyate*, CALAND adopts the latter reading and translates: ‘Die Feuer sind zu den verschiedenen Herden hingebracht worden, die Stätte (des Opfers) **wird** (dadurch) **ausgedör̥rt**, die neu konzipierten Lebensfrüchte würden hinterher ausdör̥ren’. Note, however, that the compound *pāri-śiṣya-te* ‘be left over, remain’ is well-attested in the Brāhmaṇas (see Chapter III, s.v.), whereas the middle *pari-śuṣya-te* would be a hapax. More likely is the interpretation given by EHLERS [Unpublished Habilschrift]: ‘Die Feuer sind verteilt, die Opferstätte bleibt (verlassen) übrig. Die Embryonen **dür̥ften** dementsprechend **vertrocknen**, wenn man (jetzt das Wasser) auf dem Cāt̥vāla ausgösse.’ The variant reading °*śuṣyate* could emerge under the influence of the adjacent *anuśoṣukā*.

Another attestation of a middle form appears in the post-Vedic ChāgU:²⁰⁰⁷

(ChāgU, ed. RENOU 6:5.55-58 [ed. Adyar Libr., Unpubl.up. p.25, l. 1ff.])

*yathaiṁśāṁ itaś ceto ’mutaś cāmutaś ca saṁpradravata ivopaśuṣyata
ivopaskandam abhigṛhṇītābhipātayed evaṁ haiṣa itaś cetaś cāmutaś ca
saṁpradravata ivopaśuṣyata ivopaskandam abhigṛhṇāty abhipātayati*

RENOU (1957d: 131; 1959a: 10, with fn. 22) interpreted *upaśuṣyata* in the metaphoric sense:

‘Et de même que ce (cheval) court de ci de là, **diminue sa vitesse**,²⁰⁰⁸ et qu’en faisant des sauts il se retient ou s’élance, de même cette (voiture) court de ci de là, **diminue sa vitesse**, et en faisant des sauts se retient ou s’élance’.

śyā ‘congeal, coagulate, freeze’: *śyāya-ti*

Simplex KS^p 6.2:51.6 = KpS^p 4.1:38.6, ŚB 4.3.1.19;

²⁰⁰⁷ For Epic attestations of middle forms, see OBERLIES 2003: 526.

²⁰⁰⁸ As RENOU (1959a: 10, fn. 22) explains, “littéralement « se dessèche », d’où « se rétrécit ».”

+ *sám* ⁺ŚBK^m 4.1.1.5, GB 1.5.12:129.3-4^{2x}
 accented: ŚB(K)
 • intr. proc.

The rare intransitive present *śyāya*-^{ti} 2009 occurs in the closely related KS and KpS as well as in two Brāhmaṇas (ŚBK, GB). The relevant passages are:

(KS 6.2:51.6 = KpS 4.1:38.6)

tād etāc chíśira ājyaṁ śyāyati

‘Then in the frost this butter coagulates.’

(ŚBK 4.1.1.5)

tām pári ghnanti: +nét +saṁ-śyāyā²⁰¹⁰ íti hémani ...

‘They encircle²⁰¹¹ it (sc. the sacrificial hall), [with the words]: “Lest it should freeze in the winter...”.’

The two unclear forms attested (with variant readings) in a GB passage must also belong here. The passage runs:

(GB 1.5.12:129.1-4)

śyeno ’si gāyatrachandā; anu tvārabhe; svasti mā sampārayeti. sa yad āha: śyeno ’sīti, somaṁ vā etad āhaiṣa ha vā agnir bhūtvāsmiṁ loka samśyāyati. tad yat samśyāyati, tasmāc chyenas. tac chyenasya śyenatvam

The passage offers an “etymological” explanation of the noun *śyená*- ‘falcon’, quite in the vein of the Brāhmaṇa etymologies. It is unclear, however, which verbal form the author(s) used for etymologizing. The mss. disagree as far as the first occurrence of the form in question is concerned

²⁰⁰⁹ For the alternative class I analysis of this present (*śyāy-a-*, *√śyāi*; cf. e.g. WACKERNAGEL 1896 [AiG I]: 87, §79aα; SPECHT 1935: 112), see also Chapter C.I.3. Note, incidentally, that among the *°ā-ya*-stems (*pyāya*-^{te}, *mlāya*-^{ti} etc.), consistently treated in WHITNEY 1885b [Roots] as class IV presents, only *śyāya*-^{ti} and *śráya*-^{ti} (p. 177f.) are accompanied with a question mark (“Pres. [4?]”).

²⁰¹⁰ Conjecture in ed. CALAND, mss. *nec chaṁśyāyā^o* (with the metathesis of the sibilants), *nēchaṁśāyā^o*. Ed. SWAMINATHAN rejects CALAND’s conjecture and adopts the reading found in most mss., but his interpretation (“the root is “śo tanūkarāṇe” [i.e., *śā*, meaning ‘make thin’]”) makes no sense in the context (‘lest it cause to sharpen ...?’). His actual translation (‘lest it become cold (freeze)’ is, in fact, based on CALAND’s reading.

²⁰¹¹ ŚBM 3.1.1.8 *tām vā etām pári śrayanti*.

(*saṁśyāyati*, *saṁśārayati*, *sadāśyāyati*, *saṁśāpayati*, *saṁśyāti*), but unanimously read *saṁśyāyati* for the second occurrence (see ed. GAASTRA, crit. app.). Ed. MITRA reads caus. *saṁśyāyayati*²⁰¹² (unattested elsewhere); ed. GAASTRA conjectures *saṁśāyayati* (caus. of *śā* ‘sharpen’?)²⁰¹³ against all mss. In my view, the reading *saṁśyāyati* is much more likely than MITRA’s and GAASTRA’s conjectures for a number of reasons: 1) *saṁśyāyati* is attested in most mss. 2) From the formal point of view, *śyena-* can be derived from the root *√śyai* (thus in Indian tradition; see above), although this etymology cannot of course be taken seriously; by contrast, it can by no means belong with *śā*. 3) Semantically, ‘coagulating Soma’ is at least possible (albeit somewhat awkward), while ‘Soma which makes [someone?] sharpen’ is nonsense. The passage under discussion can be translated as follows:

‘ “You are a falcon with the Gāyatrī for metre; I take hold of you; bring me across to well-being!”²⁰¹⁴ When he said “you are a falcon”, verily, he said this to Soma; verily, he, having become Agni, coagulates (?) in this world. Thus, [by virtue of the fact] that he coagulates (*saṁśyāyati*), [he is called] a falcon (*śyena*). This is the falcon’s falcon-ness (i.e. that is why falcon is called *falcon*).’

On possible etymological relationships between *śyāya-^{ti}* and the middle present *śīyá-^{te}* ‘fall’, see Chapter III, s.v. *śī*.

śramⁱ ‘become weary; toil’: *śrāmya-^{ti}*

Simplex RV 2.28.4, AVŚ 11.1.30 ≈ AVP 16.91.10, YV^p +;
+ *abhi* AVP 16.71.1 (*abhi śrāmya*), JB 1.357:4, GB, JUB 3.4.1.5 [ed. OERTEL 3.15.5], BaudhŚS 18.44:3; (+ *abhy-ā* JB 3.117:6 [ed. CALAND §185]);²⁰¹⁵

²⁰¹² Erroneously quoted by PATYAL (1973: 256) as *saṁśyāyati*.

²⁰¹³ Thus in PATYAL’s (1969: 176f.) translation (‘and this indeed, having become the fire **causes to sharpen** in this world’), which makes no sense; see also PATYAL 1973: 256.

²⁰¹⁴ This mantra occurs in AVŚ 6.48.1 ≈ AVP 19.44.4 ≈ TS 3.2.1.1 ≈ ŚB 12.3.4.3 etc. (with variants); see, in particular, CALAND & HENRY 264.

²⁰¹⁵ The compound *abhyā-śrāmya-^{ti}* is unattested elsewhere; OERTEL (1941: 102 [= Kl.Schr. II, 1471], fn. 1) emends ⁺*abhyaśrāmyan*. For a discussion of its meaning, see BODEWITZ 2007: 152ff., with fn. 21 (‘*abhy(ā)śram* and *abhitap* more or less

+ *upa* KauśS;

+ *vi* ‘take a rest’²⁰¹⁶ JB 1.165:3, 4 [ed. CALAND §55]

accented: AV, ŚB

• (α) intr. state, (β) intr. activity

The intransitive present *śrāmya*-ⁱⁱ can refer both to (α) a state/inchoative (‘be/become weary, exhausted, tire’) and to (β) a (controlled) activity (‘toil, make effort(s)’), which usually results in such a state.²⁰¹⁷ Examples are:

(α)

(RV 2.28.4bc)

ṛtām sīndhavo vāruṇasya yanti

nā śrāmyanti nā ví mucantīy eté

‘The rivers go according to the law of Varuṇa; they do not tire, nor do they relax.’²⁰¹⁸

(ŚB 14.4.3.31 (= BĀUM 1.5.31 = BĀUK 1.5.21))

tásmāc chrāmyaty evá vāk, śrāmyati cákṣuḥ, śrāmyati śrotram

‘Therefore the speech becomes tired, the eye becomes tired, the ear becomes tired.’

(β)

(AVŚ 11.1.30ab ≈ AVP 16.91.10ab)

śrāmyataḥ pácato viddhi sunvatáḥ ‘ pánthām s_uvargám ádhi rohayainam

‘[O Agni,] take note (lit. know) of the toiling one,²⁰¹⁹ the cooking one, the [soma-]pressing one; make him ascend the heavenly road.’²⁰²⁰

(AVP 16.71.1)

akravyādā tan_uvā jātavedo ‘ yā te s_uvargā tapasā sayoniḥ

tay_aaudanam abhi śrāmy_aaitam ‘ tayā no ‘ agne mahi śarma yaccha

denote the same”).

²⁰¹⁶ For the meaning of this compound, see, in particular, STRUNK 1983: 124, with fn. 222.

²⁰¹⁷ See also OLIVELLE 1993: 9ff. et passim and KÜMMEL 2000: 524f.; cf. also RENOU (1958: 56, fn. 1): ‘être fatigué; se fatiguer’. For a detailed analysis of the semantics of this verb, see BODEWITZ 2007.

²⁰¹⁸ For this stanza, see, in particular, BRERETON 1981: 110.

²⁰¹⁹ Differently BLOOMFIELD (1897: 184, 617f.): ‘Note ... him that takes pains’.

²⁰²⁰ See GONDA 1965: 87, 223; BODEWITZ 2007: 156.

‘O Jātavedas, with this body of yours, which does not eat raw flesh, which is heavenly, of the same origin with heat, toil at this (*etam*) rice-dish, with this [body] give us great protection, O Agni.’

For the reading *abhi śrāmyetam* attested in Kashm. ms., BARRET proposed the emendation *abhi +śrāpyetām* (which suggests the translation ‘the rice-dish should be cooked’ or the like). This emendation (adopted by RENOU (1957a: 64; 1957b: 102)) is improbable for several reasons: 1) the regular causative stem built on the root *śrā* has the short root vowel (*śrapaya-*, not *śrāpaya-*), as noticed by BARRET himself, p. 73; 2) the root *śrā* does not occur with the preverb *abhi*; and 3) passives derived from causatives are not attested before the YVic mantras (see Chapter C.II.1.2.2).

śrāmya-^{ti} is especially common in usage (β) in Vedic prose, where it typically refers to a particular creative activity (producing gods, worlds, etc.). This meaning is also attested for the compound with *abhi* (for instance, several times in GB 1.1; see Chapter III, s.v. *tap* and BÖHTLINGK 1896d: 12f.), often constructed with the accusative of the object, which is affected by this activity (‘X_{NOM} toils upon Y_{ACC}’). Examples are:

(TS 1.7.1.3)

pākayajñēna mánur aśrāmyat
‘Manu toiled with the cooked offerings.’

(TS 7.1.5.1)

táśyām aśrāmyat prajāpatiḥ; sá devān asṛjata
‘On her (sc. the earth) Prajāpati toiled;²⁰²¹ he produced the gods.’

(JUB 3.4.1.5 [ed. OERTEL 3.15.5])

tān imāñś trīñ lokāñ janayitvā ’bhyaśrāmyat
‘Having generated these three worlds, [Prajāpati] toiled upon [them].’²⁰²²

²⁰²¹ Said of sexual intercourse; see BODEWITZ 2007: 147f.

²⁰²² See BODEWITZ 2007: 153, fn. 21.

śrā ‘become ready’: *śrāya*-^{ti}

RV 8.99.3 (besides direct repetitions, also in *śrāyantīya*- [name of a sāman] TS^p, MS^p +), MS^p 1.8.2:117.11, TĀ^m 4.2.6 = 5.3.5 (= ĀpŚS^m 15.3.7)

accented: RV

• intr. process

śrāya-^{ti} is generally treated as a -ya-present (cf. e.g. NARTEN 1987b: 272f. [= Kl.Schr. 1, 342f.], fn.3; GOTÖ 44).²⁰²³ In the recent literature, the class I analysis is most explicitly presented in JOACHIM 162. Her argumentation is primarily based on paradigmatic grounds. The intransitive *śrāyati* is said to be opposed to the transitive nasal present *śrīṇāti* on the model *mayante* – *mināti*, *śóbhate* – *śumbhata*, *háyant-* – *hinóti*. This argumentation falters for a number of reasons. 1) *śrāyati* and *śrīṇāti* belong to different roots, viz. **ker* (**kreH*) and **krejH*, respectively (see already OLDENBERG 1918: 41f. [= Kl.Schr. 2, 836f.]; NARTEN, op.cit.). 2) In fact, only one of the three pairs, quoted by JOACHIM, exemplifies the paradigmatic opposition ‘intransitive class I present ≈ transitive nasal present’ (*śóbhate* – *śumbhata*), but these formations differ in diathesis, too (med. ~ act.); *mayante* and *mināti* belong to different roots (cf. Chapter I, s.v. *mī*); *háyant-* is a nonce formation, secondarily built to the nominal -*hayá-* (GOTÖ 346).

The Vedic attestations of *śrāya*-^{ti} are discussed by NARTEN (1987b: 272f. [= Kl.Schr. 1, 342f.], fn.3). The only RVic occurrence appears in a rather difficult passage:

(RV 8.99.3ab)

śrāyanta iva sūrīyaṃ ‘*viśvéd indrasya bhakṣata*

Most likely is HOFFMANN’s interpretation (apud JOACHIM 162 and NARTEN, op.cit.):

‘Wie gar werdende (= sich erhitzende) Leute (Anteil) an der Sonne (haben), so haben sie Anteil an allen (Gütern) des Indra.’²⁰²⁴

²⁰²³ In earlier literature the root *śrā* was often identified with the root *śrī* ‘mix’ (pres. *śrīṇāti*), and, accordingly, *śrāya*-^{ti} was qualified as a class I present (*śrāy-a*-^{ti}; cf. e.g. WACKERNAGEL 1896 [AiG I]: 87, §79aa; SPECHT 1935: 112).

²⁰²⁴ HOFFMANN’s interpretation is also adopted by GONDA (1989a: 99). Impossible is the connection with the root *śri* in GRASSMANN 1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 1423 (‘sich an jemand wenden’) and in CALAND’s translation of PB 15.4.1 (‘Leaning, as it were on

śrāya^{-ti} is attested in two texts of the Black Yajurveda (MS^p 1.8.2:117.11 *eṣā vāvā śāhutiḥ śrāyati* ‘diese Opferspende wird gewiß gar’; TĀ^m 4.2.6 = 5.3.5 (16) *sūryasya hārasā śrāya* ‘durch der Sonne Glut werde gar!’ [NARTEN’s translations]).²⁰²⁵ Besides, this present underlies the technical term *śrāyantiya*- (name of a sāman based on SV 1.267 [= 1.3.2.3.5] = RV 8.99.3; see CALAND ad PB 8.2.9; MYLIUS 1995: 125), attested from the Saṃhitā prose onwards.

***śrīv*: *śrīvya*^{-ti}**

⇒ s.v. *śrīv*

***śliṣ* (*śriṣ*) ‘adhere, stick, clasp, embrace’: *śliṣya*^{-ti/(te)}**

Simplex

[[Act.]] JB 2.304:13 (*śliṣyati*, v.l. *śviṣy°*), ManB 1.8.3, VādhŚS [ed. IKARI] 11.23 (*śliṣyati* ≈ VādhS [ed. CALAND] 3.95:2 (= CALAND 1926: 201 [= K1.Schr., 384]) *śliṣyate*²⁰²⁶), DhSū. +; [[Med.]] ChU 4.14.3^{2x} +; (+ *abhī* *KāthĀ 3.235:100.17 [ed. WITZEL **bhīśriṣyet?*]²⁰²⁷);

Sūrya’).

²⁰²⁵ For the TĀ mantra, see also RAU 1972: 59ff. [483ff.]. Note the variant of this mantra attested in MS 4.9.1:121.8-9 *sūryasya rāsā ā śrayasva* ‘adhere to the essence of the sun’, which may result from the reanalysis of *hārasā śr°* as (*ha*)*rasā ā śr°*, with the Maitrāyaṇī sandhi *-ā ā-* ← *-e ā-*.

²⁰²⁶ All mss. used by IKARI have the active form; *śliṣyate* in ed. CALAND may be based on his emendation (Yasuke IKARI, p.c.).

²⁰²⁷ The present *śriṣya*^{-ti} (derived from the root variant *śriṣ*) with the preverb *abhī* is reconstructed by WITZEL for the badly preserved passage KāthĀ 3.234-235:100.15-17 *yāsya mahāvīrō bhidyāte*, [*yā ṛté cid abhiśrī*]ṣa *īti karmanyaṃyā mṛdā dṛḍhikāraṇena vāsreṣava*[*tābhiśriṣyet*] ‘Wessen Mahāvīra(kessel) zerbricht, (dessen Kessel **klebt** er mit dem Spruch) [235] [“Wer auch ohne Verband zusammenfügt” mit zum Werk tauglichen Lehm oder mit einem als Binde(mittel) dienenden (Stoff) zum Festmachen (wieder **zusammen**)]’; cf. also WERBA [VIA I] 246. Note, however, that the transitive syntax in WITZEL’s translation (‘klebt zusammen’) may point to an *-āya*-causative (**abhiśreṣayer?*), rather than to an intransitive *-ya*-present. Besides, the root variant *śriṣ* practically disappears after the mantra period (MAYRHOFER, EWAia II, 670f.).

- + *ā* [Act.] MS^P 2.2.5:19.3; ‘associate’ MaitrU 7.8 (ed. VAN BUITENEN *ā-śliṣyanti* (-nte?)²⁰²⁸);
 [Med.] ĀpŚS 21.19.5;
 + *anūpa* BaudhŚS 1.15:24.1;
 + *sām* [Act.] ‘cling together’ (recipr.) TB 2.2.7.1, JUB 1.1.5.5 [ed. OERTEL 1.5.5];
 [Med.] ‘attach oneself to, adhere to’ (with acc.) BaudhDhS 2.11.26 [ed. ŚĀSTRĪ 2.11.28]
 accented: MS
 • anticaus.

The intransitive present *śliṣya-*^{ti} first occurs in Vedic prose, most often with preverbs. Examples are:

(MS 2.2.5:19.2-3)²⁰²⁹

yád adhò ’vamṛdyéta, yác ca sphya āśliṣyet, tád viṣṇava urukramāyāva dyet

‘That [part of the sacrificial cake] which may be rubbed off underneath [the cake] [onto the barhis], and that which may stick to the wooden spade (*sphyá-*), he should apportion to Viṣṇu the Wide-Striding.’²⁰³⁰

(JB 2.304:11-13)

śīro vā etad yajñasya yan mahāvrataṁ / tad yathā śiraś chittvā, tad upapakṣayor upagūhet, tad vai na śliṣyati; tādṛg akṛd iti hovāca

‘This Mahāvratā is the head of the sacrifice. “As one would cut off one’s

See now also KNOBL 2007b: 60, with fn. 83.

²⁰²⁸ The relevant chapter is discussed at length by VAN BUITENEN (1962: 88), where the beginning of the passage MaitrU 7.8 is reconstructed as *mohajālasyaiṣa vai yonir yad asvargyaiḥ saha svargyā āśliṣyante* ‘the origin of the net of confusion is that godly people consort with ungodly people’; however, the full text in the same ed., p. 120, has the active form *āśliṣyanti*, probably by misunderstanding; other eds. read *āśliṣyanti*. This *-ya*-present occurs both with the active and middle inflection from the Upaniṣads onwards, thus both readings are possible, but the active inflection, attested in this compound in the MS (albeit with a different meaning), seems more likely.

²⁰²⁹ Cf. also the parallel Sūtra passage:

(ĀpŚS 18.15.4)

yat sphya āśliṣyati, yac ca pratiśīryate, tad viṣṇave śipiviṣṭāya juhōti

‘Was an dem hölzernen Schwerte hängen bleibt und was vom Opferkuchen abgebrochen wird, opfert er dem Viṣṇu Śipiviṣṭa’ (CALAND).

²⁰³⁰ I am thankful to W. KNOBL for valuable comments on this passage.

head and hide it under one's armpits – it does not stick²⁰³¹ [there = under the armpits] – so he (sc. Kratu Kārirādi) has acted [by celebrating the Mahāvratā in the wrong place]²⁰³² – he said.’

The compounds with *sām* attest the reciprocal meaning ‘be united (together), embrace’, cf.:

(TB 2.2.7.1)

prajāpatiḥ prajā asṛjata. tāḥ sṛṣṭāḥ sām aśliṣyan

‘Prajāpati emanated creatures. They, emanated, were clinging together.’

(JUB 1.1.5.4-5 [ed. OERTEL 1.5.5])

[tad] divo 'ntaḥ. tad ime dyāvāpṛthivī saṃ śliṣyataḥ

‘[There] (sc. in the north of the sacrificial ground) is the end of heaven. There these two, heaven and earth, cling together.’ (W. KNOBL, p.c.)²⁰³³

Simplex forms appear only in the JB and, later, in post-Vedic texts, such as ManB,²⁰³⁴ cf.:

(ManB 1.8.3)

gavāñ śleṣmāsi. gāvo mayi śliṣyantu

‘Der Kühe Bindemittel bist du. Die Kühe sollen bei mir bleiben (mir anhängen).’

(STÖNNER)

²⁰³¹ WITZEL’s (1987: 387f.) conjecture and interpretation (*tad vai na *kliṣyati* ‘This does not hurt ...’) do not seem convincing. The -ya-present *kliṣyati* is post-Vedic; note that one of the earliest attestations of the stem *kliṣya-* is Pāṇ. 3.4.55 *parikliṣyamāne ca* ‘The absolutive suffix -am occurs after a verbal stem] also when [the body part (3.4.54 *svāṅge*) designated by the dependant nominal stem (3.1.92 *upapada-*) is] painfully affected [by the verbal action]’ (W. KNOBL, p.c.). The attestation of the passive *kliṣya-te* ‘be painfully affected’ in the Aṣṭādhyāyī does not prove the existence of the transitive -ya-present *kliṣya-ti* at Pāṇini’s times. Furthermore, the meaning of *kliṣyati* barely suits the context, while *śliṣyati* is quite appropriate.

²⁰³² I follow the interpretation suggested by W. KNOBL (p.c.). Cf. also EHLERS’ [Unpublished Habilschrift] interpretation: ‘Als ob er, nachdem er den Kopf abgeschnitten hat, ihn unter den Achseln versteckte hätte, und der dort nicht hängen bleibt, so hat er gehandelt.’

²⁰³³ I am thankful to W. KNOBL for valuable comments on this passage. See also GONDA 1974a: 99.

²⁰³⁴ For attestations in Dharma-Sūtras, see FALK 2001: 137, with fn. 15.

Middle forms

Middle forms are attested from the Upaniṣads (twice in the ChU) and Sūtras onwards. In the ChU, *śliṣya-te* is attested in the same usage as *lipyá-te*, in the construction ‘S_{NOM} sticks to R_{LOC}’ (generally said of the results of evil actions sticking to someone), thus replacing *lipyá-te*, which changes its syntactic pattern from the Brāhmaṇas onwards (see Chapter I, s.v.):

(ChU 4.14.3)

*yathā puṣkarapalāśa āpo na śliṣyanta, evam evaṃvidi pāpaṃ karma na śliṣyate*²⁰³⁵

‘As water does not stick to the leaf of a lotus-flower, so evil action does not stick to the one knowing thus.’

Most likely, the late middle forms owe their diathesis to the synonymous *lipyá-te*.

For the middle form *āśliṣyamāṇa-* in ĀpŚS 21.19.5 *ṛtīyete brahmacārī puṃścalī ca dakṣiṇāṃ dvārbāhum āśliṣyamāṇau* JAMISON (1996: 97 and 283, note 217) proposes a reciprocal interpretation (‘the student and the whore quarrel (at) the right doorpost while embracing each other’), instead of CALAND’s translation (‘es streiten sich der Vedastudent und die Hure, sich an den rechten Türpfosten (des Sadas) klammernd’), on account of “the middle voice of the participle *āśliṣyamāṇa-* and the erotic tone of the whole”. Note, however, that, with this verb, the reciprocal meaning is usually expressed by the preverb *sām* (cf. examples above). Thus, the meaning ‘embracing each other’ might be expressed by the form *saṃśliṣyant-* or *saṃśliṣyamāṇa-*. CALAND’s interpretation seems therefore more likely.

śvā (śū) ‘swell’: -*śūya-*^{ti}

+ *ūt* BĀUM 3.2.12 (*úcchūyati* ≈ BĀUK 3.2.11 *úcchvayati*)

unaccented

• anticaus.

²⁰³⁵ THIEME (1965: 91 [= Kl.Schr. I, 230]) quotes this passage (in his discussion of *lipyá-te*), with *lipyate* instead of *śliṣyate* (*evam evaṃvidi pāpaṃ karma na lipyate*), probably by mistake. I was unable to trace the source of this reading; all editions available to me (ed. BÖHTLINGK, ed. SENART, ed. ĀnSS, ed. Adyar Libr., etc.) have *śliṣyate*.

The regular present formation built on this root is *śvāya-*^{ti} 2036. The present *-śūya-*^{ti} is a hapax attested in the BĀU (Mādhyandina recension):

(BĀUM 3.2.12 (≈ ŚBM 14.6.2.12, BĀUK 3.2.11))

*yātrāyām pūruṣo mriyāte | úd asmāt prāṇāḥ krāmanti | āho nēti | nēti
hovāca yājñavalkyaḥ | ātraivā samāvanīyante | sá úc chūyati* [ŚBM,
BĀUK *úc chvayati*] | *ā dhmāyati | ādhmāto mṛtāḥ śete*

“...when a man dies, do the breaths go out of him or not?”. “No”, said Yājñavalkya. “They are gathered together right here. He swells up; he is being inflated; the dead man lies inflated”.’

-śūyati is undoubtedly a nonce formation; the parallel Kāṇva recension has the regular *śvayati* instead. Most likely, it has been built in analogy with the adjacent -yá-passive *ādhmāyati* (on this form, with the abnormal active inflection, see Chapter I, s.v. *dhmā*). Note, in particular, the zero root grade, very unusual for *CRā* roots, which typically do not show ablaut in the active -ya-presents (see Chapter C.I.3 for details).

sādh / ¹*sidh* ‘succeed, be successful’: *sídhya-*^{ti}

Simplex RV 1.18.7, MS^p 3.7.10:91.3-4^{2x} ≈ KS^p 24.10:102.7 = KpS^p 38.3:208.2, KS^p 24.10:102.8 = KpS^p 38.3:208.4, JB, GB, ŚĀ, BaudhŚS +;

+ *abhi* ChU;

+ *prá* AVP 7.9.4 (*sidhyatu* ≈ AVŚ 5.7.3 *kalpatām*) (+);²⁰³⁷

+ *sam* BaudhŚS 13.40:148.10 +

accented: RV, MS

• anticaus.

sídhya-^{te} : TĀ 1.31.5^{2x} (+)

²⁰³⁶ Usually treated as a -āya-present (cf. e.g. GOTŌ 44; LUBOTSKY 1989: 95f.). According to an alternative analysis, *śvāya-a-*^{ti} can be considered a class I present of the root *śvi* (thus in the Indian tradition, cf. DhP I 1059; also WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]: 175, with a question mark).

²⁰³⁷ In particular, several times in the VādhŚS, e.g., at 1.4.1.39, 1.4.2.1, 1.4.4.1 [eds. SPARREBOOM/HEESTERMAN; IKARI], where it occurs in the terminological usage *prasidhyati karmā* ‘the rite is accomplished, brought to an end, established’ (Y. IKARI, p.c.).

The earliest occurrences of the intransitive present *sídhyā-ti* ‘succeed, be successful’ appear in the late RV (maṇḍala I) and in the AVP. Similarly with the synonymous middle present *ṛdhyá-te* ‘be realized, successful, fulfilled’ (see Chapter III, s.v.), *sídhyā-ti* is typically constructed with the dative of the beneficiary and with the subject of the sacrifice, property, etc.:²⁰³⁸ ‘Y^{sacrifice} etc. succeeds, is successful, fulfilled for X_{DAT}’.²⁰³⁹ Like *ṛdhyá-te*, *sídhyā-ti* is attested in the impersonal (subjectless) construction ‘it goes well with X_{DAT}, there is success for X_{DAT}’ (from the YVic Saṃhitās onwards).

(RV 1.18.7)

*yásmād ṛté ná sídhyati 'yajñó vipaścítaś caná
sá dhīnām yógam invati*

‘Without whom even the sacrifice of an inspired one does not succeed, –
he (sc. Sadasaspati) incites the yoking of [our] thoughts.’

(AVP 7.9.4ab ≈ AVŚ 5.7.3ab)

pra ño vanir devakṛtā 'divā naktam ca sídhyatu [AVŚ *kalpatām*]

‘May [our] gain, made by the gods, be successful for us by day and at
night.’²⁰⁴⁰

(MS 3.7.10:91.3-4 ≈ ^UKS 24.10:102.7-8 = KpS 38.3:208.2-3)

*yó vái devānt sādhyān véda, sídhyati ha vá asmai, yátra kāmáyeta: ihá
me sídhyed ítīmé vái lokā devāḥ sādhyāḥ*

‘[That All] is successful for the one who knows the Sādhyā-gods, when
he wishes: “May it be successful here for me”; since the Sādhyā-gods are
these words.’

The compound with *abhi*, attested in the ChU, is constructed with the accusative, governed by the preverb, cf. ChU 7.4.3 = 7.5.3 *sa lokān dhruvān* [...] *abhisidhyati* ‘he reaches (lit. is successful with regard to) the firm worlds’.

After the RV, *sídhyā-ti* entirely ousts the older intransitive class I present *sádha-te* ‘id.’ (GOTÖ 326).

²⁰³⁸ Note the subtle semantic difference between *sídhyā-ti* and *ṛdhyá-te*, which is more common with the subject of ‘wish’.

²⁰³⁹ See RENOU 1964b: 164f.

²⁰⁴⁰ I am thankful to W. KNOBL for valuable comments on this and the following passages.

Middle forms

Middle forms, first attested in the TĀ (2x), are secondary and may owe their middle inflection to the synonymous *śdhyá^{te}*:

(TĀ 1.31.5)

mā sma pramādyantam ādhyāpayet. sarvārthāḥ śidhyante yá evaṃ veda
 ‘He should not [try to] make one who is inattentive think deeply. All things are successful [for the one] who knows thus.’²⁰⁴¹

sīv ‘sew, stitch’: *śīvyā^{ti/(te)}*

śīvyā^{ti} :

Simplex RV 2.17.4, 2.32.4, KSP 25.8:114.21 = 25.10:119.3 = KpSP 40.1:221.15 = 40.3:225.13, AB 3.37.6,²⁰⁴² TB 3.10.11.7 +;

+ *abhi* ŚSS;

+ *pari* ŚrSū.;

+ *prā* ŚB 3.5.3.25, 3.6.1.25 (≈ *nī* ŚBK 4.5.3.23, 4.6.1.25);

+ *prāti* ‘sew on’ KSP 23.3:77.17-18 = KpSP 35.9:186.1, ŚrSū.;

+ *vī* ‘embroider’ (?) MSP 2.4.5:43.7, KSP–KpSP;²⁰⁴³

+ *sam* late Sū.

accented: RV

• tr.

śīvyā^{te} :

Simplex RV 10.101.8 (*sīvyadhvam*)

• tr.-aff.

The transitive present *śīvyā^{ti}* is well-attested from the early Vedic period onwards, mostly with active inflection. Examples are:

(RV 2.32.4c)

śīvyat_uv āpaḥ sūcyāchidyamānayā

‘Let her (sc. Rākā) sew her work with an unbreakable needle.’

²⁰⁴¹ I am thankful to W. KNOBL for valuable comments on this passage.

²⁰⁴² With the cognate (“inner”) accusative: *rākā ha vā etām ... sevanīm sīvyati* ‘Verily, Rākā sews this suture’ (see WERBA [VIA I] 382).

²⁰⁴³ On the meaning of this compound, see GOTÖ 1980: 12 and 29f., n. 7.

(ŚB 3.5.3.25)

átha laspūjanyā spandyaṃ prā sīvyati: viṣṇoḥ syūr asīti

‘Nun näht er mit Nadel [und mit] Faden [die Faschinen an die Pfosten] an [mit dem Vers:] “Du bist Viṣṇus Pfriem!”.’ (MICHAELS 1978: 169; see also RAU 1971b: 35)

Middle forms

A middle form (2pl.impv.) is attested only once, in the late RV (maṇḍala X); the middle diathesis expresses the self-beneficial sense (‘sew for oneself’):

(RV 10.101.8b)

várma sīvyadhvam bahulā prthūni

‘Sew coats of mail for yourselves, abundant, broad.’

***stā (tā)* ‘steal, act secretly’: *(s)tāya-^{ti}**

in adv. deriv.:

-át: *stāyát* ‘secretly’ AVŚ 4.16.1, 7.108.1, AVP 1.87.3d = 1.87.4b, KSP 13.6:187.14^{2x} ((s)tāyat ... stāyat), JB 2.24:8 (in *stāyād bhavati* ‘verborgen bleiben’ (HOFFMANN)²⁰⁴⁴)

in nom. deriv.:

-ú-: *tāyú-* ‘thief’ RV

The active intransitive present *(s)tāya-^{ti} has been preserved only in the adverbial form *stāyát* ‘secretly’, based on the active participle **stāyant-* (see WEBER 1898a: 67f.; RENOU 1936: 57, note 55; INSLEER 1970: 138, fn. 2; PINAULT 1989: 86f.; RIX 1985: 205f., 217f., notes 47-52; WERBA 448; LIV 616),²⁰⁴⁵ attested in the AV and in Vedic prose. Note that in both Śaunakīya

²⁰⁴⁴ With the secondary lengthening of the thematic vowel on the analogy of *sākṣāt kṛ* ‘vor Augen führen’ (HOFFMANN 1952a [1956] / 1976, Nachtrag [Aufs. 2, 349]); note the reading *stāyāt bhavati* attested in the mss., against the sandhi rule.

²⁰⁴⁵ On this morphological type in general, see WACKERNAGEL 1918: 394 [= Kl.Schr. I, 313]; INSLEER, *ibid.*; RENOU 1936: 33 and 56f., note 55; WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 164, §70b; PINAULT, *ibid.*; RIX, *op.cit.*, with notes 51-52.

occurrences the stem can also be read without *s-* on account of the sandhi (see RIX, *ibid.*, with note 49; WERBA, *ibid.*), and the first of the two adjacent Kāṭhaka occurrences is attested in two variant readings ([Ch.] °*yatas stāyad i*° and [D.] °*yatas tāyad i*°):

(AV 4.16.1cd)

yá stāyán [or: *yás tāyán?*] *mānyate cārant* ' *sárvaṃ devā idám viduḥ*
 'Who believes himself going secretly – all this the gods know'.

(AV 7.108.1a)

yó na stāyád [or: *nas tāyád?*] *dípsati yó na āvíḥ*
 '[The one] who wishes to harm us secretly, who [wishes to harm] us
 openly ...'

The hypothetical Vedic present **stāya-ti* is supported by Hitt. *tājezzi* 'steals' (see OETTINGER 1979: 396f.; GOTÖ 44, with bibl.; LIV 616). Besides, additional (albeit indirect) evidence for this *-ya*-present is provided by the nominal derivative *tāyú-* 'thief' RV (see RIX, *ibid.*; LIV 616, note 2), for this morphological type is often associated with *-ya*-presents; see WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 469, §287b; LUBOTSKY 1988: 48.

srīv (*śrīv*) 'be aborted': *srīvyā-ti*

MS^m 4.6.9:92.12 (*śrīvyeyur*) (≈ [tr.] *srīvyeyur* ĀpŚS^m 13.9.11 ≈ *śrīvy*°
 VaikhŚS^m 16.11:224.17-18), AB 4.22.4 (*srīvyanti*)
 unaccented
 • intr. proc.

The root *srīv* (*śrīv*) 'be aborted, perish' (said of embryos which fail to develop; see NARTEN 282f.) is attested in two variants. Although its IE source and cognates are uncertain, the variant with the palatal (AV,²⁰⁴⁶ MS) is likely to be secondary (cf. MAYRHOFER, EWAia II, 787). The intransitive *-ya*-present, attested for both variants (*srīvyā-ti*, *śrīvyā-ti*), occurs twice in the MS and AB:

²⁰⁴⁶ Attested in AVŚ 6.73.2 *śrīvayāmi* ≈ AVP 19.10.11 *śrevayāmi*. On the confusion of *ś* and *s* in the AV, see WACKERNAGEL 1896 [AiGr I]: 225.

(MS 4.6.9:92.11-12)

yādi kāmāyeta: gārbhāḥ śrīvyeyur iti

‘If one would wish: “May the embryos be aborted” ...’

(AB 4.22.4)

*yāni vai purā saṃvatsarād retāṃsi jāyante, yāni pañcamāsyāni, yāni
ṣaṇmāsyāni, śrīvyanti vai tāni*

‘Whatever seeds are born before the year, whatever of five months,
whatever of six months, verily, they perish.’²⁰⁴⁷

Together with the intransitive sigmatic aorist *asrāvīt* (JB 2.2:6), this *-ya*-present is opposed to the transitive-causative *śrāvaya-^{ti}* RV^{1x}, *śrāvaya-^{ti}* AVŚ (~ AVP *śrevay°*); see Jamison 145.

It is interesting to note that *-aya*-causatives do not occur in the Sūtras, but the repetition of the above-quoted MS mantra in two YVic Sūtras makes the original construction transitive-causative:

(ĀpŚS 13.9.11 ≈ VaikhŚS 16.11:224.17-18)

yadi kāmāyeta: garbhān paśavaḥ śrīvyeyur [VaikhŚS śr°] iti ...

‘If one would wish: “May the cattle abort the embryos” ...’²⁰⁴⁸

Both Vedic attestations of *śrīvyaya-^{ti}* point to the fundamental intransitivity of this *-ya*-present, and the transitive syntax of the above-quoted construction in ŚrSū. quotation must be secondary.²⁰⁴⁹ It is not impossible that *śrīvyeyur* could be reanalyzed as a 3pl. *-yet*-optative, differing in syntax from the formally identical 3pl. optative of the *-ya*-present *śrīvyaya-^{ti}* (cf. the transitive syntax of the optative *krudhyet*; see s.v. *krudh* and KULIKOV 2006d: 43f., with fn. 42).

²⁰⁴⁷ See GONDA 1984 10f. on the concept of the “broken” year.

²⁰⁴⁸ CALAND’s (1902b: 552 [= Kl.Schr., 87]) emendation to **śrīvyeyuḥ* (‘may they sew’?) makes no sense; the reading attested in both Sūtras is undoubtedly correct, cf. also Rudradatta’s gloss *srāvayeyuḥ*.

²⁰⁴⁹ Labile syntax (‘be aborted’/‘abort’) is exceptional for the active *-ya*-presents: it is attested only for *rīṣya-^{ti}* ‘be hurt; harm’ (only once met with in transitive constructions) and for *pūṣya-^{ti}* ‘prosper; make prosper, increase’. For both of them transitive usages are rare and secondary (see KULIKOV 1999: 231ff. for details), and could hardly serve as a syntactic model for *śrīvyeyur* in the Sūtras.

svid ‘sweat’: *svidya*-^{ti}

ṢB 5.10.2 (*svidyanti*), AVPariś.²⁰⁵⁰ +
 unaccented
 • intr. proc.

The late intransitive present *svidya*-^{ti} ousts the late Vedic intransitive class I present *sveda*-^{te} in post-Vedic texts (GOTÖ 345f., with fn. 851).²⁰⁵¹ This present first appears in the late ṢB:

(ṢB 5.10.2)

athā yadā [...] daivatāpratimā hasanti rudanti gāyanti nṛtyanti sphuṭanti svidyanti unmīlanti nimīlanti ...

‘And if [...] statues of the gods laugh, weep, sing, dance, burst, sweat, open their eyes or close them ...’²⁰⁵² (a list of portents)

harⁱ (²*hr*) ‘enjoy; wish’: *hārya*-^{ti/(te)}

hārya-^{ti} :
 Simplex RV;

²⁰⁵⁰ Also with middle inflection (see GOTÖ 345).

²⁰⁵¹ As GOTÖ rightly points out, the identification with OHG *swizzit* and Toch. B /s(ə)y(a)-/ (cf. HACKSTEIN 1995: 186) is dubious because of the late character of this -ya-present.

²⁰⁵² One of the mss. used by WEBER (1858: 335) attests the variant reading *khidyanti* (‘are oppressed’?) instead of *svidyanti*. WEBER and EELSINGH (Inleiding, p. xvi-xvii) believed that this reading could underlie Sāyaṇa’s gloss *vidīryante* [‘split, burst’], which cannot of course be an explanation of *svidyanti* (see also WEBER 1850b: 41), but it rather comments on the form *bhidyanti*, attested in one of the mss. [ed. SHARMA’s ms. M]; see ed. SHARMA, crit.app. ad loc. and p. 234, note ad p. 218. The reading *bhidyanti* finds a parallel in the corresponding passage of the AVPariś., which misses *svidyanti*, but has *prachidyate* (at 67.6.3 in ed. BOLLING/NEGELEIN, immediately after *unmīlate caiva yadā 'tathā cāpi nimīlate*); see WEBER 1858: 340.

The form *khidyanti* is even included into the corresponding lemma in WERBA [VIA I] 175. However, *khidya*-^{ti/te} is unattested before Epic Sanskrit, which renders this reading rather dubious. Most probably, it results from mistaking the akṣara *svi*- for *khi*-; see also GOTÖ 2001: 71.

+ *abhí* ‘wish, like’ RV 10.112.6, AV 3.30.1, TB^m 2.5.4.5, ŚB 14.6.10.15 (= BĀUM 4.1.15 ≈ BĀUK 4.1.6);

+ *prāti* ‘expect, accept (for/with pleasure)’ RV, AV, MS^m, TB^m

hārya^{-te} :

Simplex RV 10.96.5 (*aharyathāḥ*), 3.6.4, 10.96.11 (*hāryamāṇaḥ*);

+ *abhí* BĀUK 4.1.6 (*abhí-hāryate* ≈ BĀUM 4.1.15 *abhí-haryati*);

+ *prāti* (RV 5.57.1 *prāti haryate*, for **pratihāryate* [part.act.:dat.sg.]?)

accented: RV

• intr. state

also in nom. deriv.:

-*atá*:- *haryatá*- ‘enjoyable’²⁰⁵³ RV, TB^m (also in *haryata-vant*- ‘[the verse] containing [the word] *haryata*-’ KB^(m) 25.1.10)

The root *har*ⁱ²⁰⁵⁴ does not ablaut and is attested only in a few derivatives, all²⁰⁵⁵ based on the present stem *harya*- (pr. *hārya*-^{ti/(te)}, deverbal adj. *haryatá*-).²⁰⁵⁶ This feature probably accounts for the class I analysis of *hāryati* in the Indian tradition, i.e. as derived from the root \sqrt{hary} (DhP I 547, ed. BÖHTLINGK, 65*).²⁰⁵⁷ In earlier Indo-European studies, *-ġ-* was also considered by some scholars as part of the root (root extension; see e.g. PERSSON 728f.), but such an analysis yields an improbable root structure. Yet, the full degree is quite remarkable for a class IV present (as against the morphologically regular zero grade); it may betray the archaic character of this formation (see LIV 176, note 3 s.v. 1.**ġ^her-*). Note also that this is the only active -ya-present built on a *CaR* root.

²⁰⁵³ See BENFEY 1866a: 197; WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 168f., §71a. An example (RV 9.43.1) is quoted in Chapter B.I, s.v. *añj*.

²⁰⁵⁴ The *seṭ* analysis of the root (questioned by KÜMMEL in LIV 176, note 1 s.v. 1.**ġ^her-*) is supported by the short root vowel of the causative *harayanta* (RV 4.37.2) ‘they will make [you] enjoy’ (for which see JAMISON 146) and the identification with Gr. $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$ < **ġ^hrH-i-* (LUBOTSKY 1989: 107).

²⁰⁵⁵ Except for the RVic hapax caus. *harayanta* (RV 4.37.2); see JAMISON 146.

²⁰⁵⁶ On the secondary connection with *hári*- ‘yellowish, brownish’ and frequent alliteration in hymns (*hāryati*, *hári*-, *harít*-, etc.), see, in particular, AUFRECHT 1906: 556.

²⁰⁵⁷ BÖHTLINGK (1885b: 537) even surmised that this analysis suggests some forms (unknown to us), which can only be derived from *hary*, but this assumption seems rather unlikely.

The present *hárya*-^{ti/(te)} (attested almost exclusively in the mantras) is intransitive/transitive (I/T), in terms of JAMISON's syntactic classification; specifically, it can be constructed either [i] with the accusative, or [ii] with the locative.²⁰⁵⁸ Constructions with accusative are more common. Examples are:

[i]:

(RV 10.96.11b)

návyaṃ-navyaṃ haryasi mánma nú priyám

‘You wish again and again a new pleasant religious thought.’

[ii]:

(RV 10.112.7cd)

asmákāṃ te mádhumattamān,īmā́ bhuvan sávanā téṣu harya

‘Let these Soma-pressings of ours be sweetest for you; enjoy them!’

In compounds with *práti* and *abhí*, *hárya*-^{ti/(te)} is constructed with the accusative, cf.:

(RV 1.144.7a)

ágne juṣásva práti harya tát vácaḥ

‘O Agni, enjoy this speech, accept it with pleasure.’²⁰⁵⁹

(MS^m 4.14.1:215.16 = TB^m 2.8.1.4)

idám no deva práti harya havyám

‘Accept with pleasure this our oblation, O god.’

(RV 10.112.6cd)

pūrṇā āhāvó madirásya mádhvo ' yáṃ víśva íd abhíharyanti devāḥ

‘The trough is full of exhilarating sweet drink, which all gods enjoy.’

(AVŚ 3.30.1cd = AVP 5.19.1cd)

anyó ^anyám abhí haryata ' vatsám jātám ivāghn, yá

‘Love each other, like a cow its calf, when it is born.’ (reciprocal construction)²⁰⁶⁰

²⁰⁵⁸ See, in particular, HETTRICH 2007: 247f. According to BARTON (1989: 143. fn. 26), the transitive construction is less archaic in the Indo-European perspective, i.e. as compared with the intransitive usage of the Greek cognate χαίρω ‘I am glad’.

²⁰⁵⁹ On *práti harya* with the object of speech, see CHARPENTIER 1906: 30f.

²⁰⁶⁰ See KULIKOV 2007a: 729. On this verse, see WEBER 1885: 306, with fn. 2-3; H.-P. SCHMIDT 1963a: 12.

Middle forms

Middle forms are rare and appear almost exclusively in the RV (4x). GELDNER consistently rendered all the four occurrences as passives ('begehrt werden/sein'; see also his comment on 10.96.11) – even notwithstanding the root accentuation in the participles (*háryamāṇa-*). The relevant passages run, with GELDNER's translations:

(RV 3.6.4abc)

*mahān sadhásthe dhruvā á níṣatto ' 'ntár dyāvā máhine háryamāṇaḥ
áskre sapátnī ajáre ámrkte ...*

'Der Große [sc. Agni – LK], der dauernd an seinen Platz gesetzt ist, (verkehrt) als **Begehrter** zwischen Himmel (und Erde), den mächtigen, den verträglichen Frauen des gleichen Gemahls, den alterlosen, unverletzbaren ...'²⁰⁶¹

(RV 10.96.5ab)

tuvām-tuvam aharyathā úpastutaḥ ' púrvebhir indra harikeśa yájbabhiḥ

'Immer nur du **wurdest begehrt**, von den früheren Opfern belobt, goldhaariger Indra.'²⁰⁶²

(RV 10.96.11ab)

á ródasī háryamāṇo mahitvā ' návyam-navyam haryasi mánma nú priyám

'Die beiden Welten er(fülltest du [sc. Indra – LK]), **der Begehrte**, mit deiner Größe; immer ein neues liebes Gedicht begehrt du.'

The passive interpretations as above are doubtful for a number of reasons:

1) Root accentuation is impossible for -yá-passives.

2) The subject of *har* (recipient of enjoyment) generally refers to a deity, whereas the object of enjoyment ("enjoyee") is a prayer, oblation or some other aspects of the sacrifice; consequently, Agni or Indra can hardly be enjoyed and thus cannot be the subjects of the corresponding passive construction.

²⁰⁶¹ Apparently, following Sāyaṇa (*yajamānādibhiḥ kāmymāṇaḥ*); similarly, GRASSMANN 1876 [RV übers.]: I, 62 ('der liebe'; otherwise in his Wb. zum RV; see below); LUDWIG (1876 [RV übers.]: I, 333): 'geliebt'; OLDENBERG (1897: 244): 'thou who art longed for'.

²⁰⁶² Similarly GRASSMANN 1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 1652 ('erfreut werden'); 1877 [RV übers.]: II, 377: 'Du [...] warst holdgestimmt'; RENOU: 'tu as été désiré' (EVP X, 90), "prob.[ablement] valeur passive" (EVP XVI, 154); ELIZARENKOVA.

3) *-yá*-passives can be built to the transitive active *-ya*-presents only exceptionally and only from the AV onwards (see above s.vv. ²⁰⁶³*iṣ*, *nah* and Chapter C.IV.1).

4) Imperfects of *-yá*-passives are extremely rare in early Vedic.²⁰⁶³

In my view, all the three occurrences can readily be interpreted as absolute transitive (objectless) constructions; this interpretation is free of the aforementioned shortcomings:

- (RV 3.6.4) ‘The great one, put on his firm place, enjoying, between the heaven [and the earth], the great ones ...’²⁰⁶⁴
- (RV 10.96.5) ‘It is you who enjoyed, O Indra, with golden hair, praised by the earlier sacrificers.’²⁰⁶⁵
- (RV 10.96.11) ‘[Filling] both worlds with your greatness, enjoying ...’ [for pāda b, see above]²⁰⁶⁶

More difficult is the fourth middle occurrence (with *prāti*):

(RV 5.57.1cd)

iyāṃ vo asmāt prāti haryate matīs ’ tṛṣṇāje nā divā útsā udanyāve

All interpreters unanimously translate this construction intransitively, cf. GELDNER: ‘Dieses Lied von uns **ist** euch **willkommen** wie dem Durstigen, der nach Wasser verlangt, die Quellen des Himmels.’²⁰⁶⁷

²⁰⁶³ Cf., for instance, MACDONELL 335, §448 and 333, §443 (where *aharyathāḥ* is grouped with non-passive *-ya*-presents); for a discussion of this constraint, see Chapter C.III.4.

²⁰⁶⁴ Thus RENO: ‘Le grand (Agni s’est) installé dans le solide séjour-commun, s’(y) plaisant, entre Ciel et Terre, (ces deux masses) puissantes ...’ (EVP XII, 55; cf. also his note *ibid.*, p. 116: ‘*hāryamāṇa*, participe moy. allant de pair avec l’act. *hāryati* (*hāryant*)’); ELIZARENKOVA.

²⁰⁶⁵ Thus already Sāyaṇa (*akāmayathāḥ*, which can hardly be taken as a passive); LUDWIG (1876 [RV übers. II]: 257): ‘du selber *namst mit freuden*, von den altvordern gepriesen den opfern, o Indra, goldhaariger.’

²⁰⁶⁶ Thus already Sāyaṇa (*kāmayamāno*); LUDWIG (1876 [RV übers. II]: 258): ‘die beiden welten durch deine grösze **erfaszend** ...’

²⁰⁶⁷ Similarly, GRASSMANN 1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 1652; F.M. MÜLLER (1891: 340): ‘This prayer from us **is acceptable** to you ...’; BERGAIGNE (1894: 267, with fn. 2): ‘Cette pensée de nous vous **agrée** ... / **est reçue** par vous **avec plaisir** ...’ [“sens passif”]; LOMMEL (1955: 89): ‘Euch **wohlgefällig ist** dies Andachtslied von uns ...’; RENO (EVP X, 34): ‘Cette pensée-poétique de notre (part) vous **est agréable** comme

Some scholars took *haryate* as a passive of ¹*hr̥* ‘bring, take’ (apparently resting upon Sāyaṇa’s commentary) – which is of course impossible (cf. GRASSMANN 1876 [RV übers.]: I, 208: ‘Von uns **wird** dieses fromme Lied euch **dargebracht**’; likewise LUDWIG 1876 [RV übers. II]: 305; LÜDERS 1959: 386).

GELDNER’s analysis suggests that the middle diathesis encodes here the following syntactic transformation: ‘X_{NOM} enjoys Y_{ACC}’ → ‘Y_{NOM} (*matīh*) is enjoyable, acceptable for X_{DAT} (*vas*)’. Such a transformation (which might be called ‘dative passive’) has no parallels in the Vedic verbal syntax, which practically rules out GELDNER’s passive analysis, and we have to look for another solution. It may be helpful to compare the contexts in which the form *haryate* appears in the RV, irrespectively of its grammatical characteristics. It turns out that all the four attestations are active participles (in the dative singular form):

(RV 8.43.2)

āsmāi te pratihāryate ' jātavedo vīcarṣaṇe
āgne jānāmi suṣṭutīm

‘For you, the expecting one, the wonderful one, O Jātavedas, I create an excellent praise, O Agni.’

(RV 8.43.17)

utā tvāgne māma stūto ' vāśrāya pratihāryate
goṣṭhām gāva ivāśata

‘And to you, O Agni, my praises have come, as cows to [their] pen for a lowing [calf], expecting [milk].’²⁰⁶⁸

(RV 10.96.6cd)

purūṇy asmai sāvanāni hāryata ' indrāya sōmā hārayo dadhanvire

‘For him, expecting/enjoying many soma-pressings, for Indra the yellowish [drops] have run.’

(le sont) pour (l’homme) assoiffé les sources du ciel, pour qui désire-de-l’eau’; GONDA 1979: 42 (‘to be agreeable pleasing’); ELIZARENKOVA: ‘Вам **правится** эта молитва от нас’; very freely VELANKAR (2003: 105, 258): ‘[t]his hymn from us **joyfully approaches** you’.

²⁰⁶⁸ For a detailed discussion of this passage see esp. BRERETON 1985: 261f., note 19, where *vāśrāya* is explained as directly referring to Agni: ‘And my praises have come to you for (you), the lowing (calf), expecting (them), as cows (come to) their stall for the lowing (calf) expecting (its milk from them).’

(RV 10.105.1ab)

*kadā vaso · stotrām haryata āva śmaśā rudhad vāh*²⁰⁶⁹

‘When [for you,] O Vasu, who expects/enjoys the praise, the beard will obstruct water?’

The parallelism between *asmāt prāti haryate* (RV 5.57.1), on the one hand, and *āsmāi te pratiharyate* (RV 8.43.2) and *asmāi ... haryate* (RV 10.96.6), on the other, prompts an alternative analysis of the form in question: *prāti haryate* in RV 5.57.1 may result from the misinterpretation of the active participle (as in RV 8.43.2). The original text might be *iyām vo asmāt *pratiharyate matīh* ‘this prayer from us [is addressed] for you – for the expecting one, like the springs from heaven – for a thirsty one, longing for water’. Note that this analysis yields better parallelism in comparison: *iyām matīh* (nom.) – *asmāt* (abl.) – **pratiharyate* (dat.) : *útsāh* – *divā* – *tṛṣṇāja udanyāve*.

harya^{-ii/(te)} is only once encountered in Vedic prose, in the BĀU (in compound with *abhī*): the Mādhyandina recension attests the regular active form, whereas the Kāṇva uses a middle form (which is the only middle occurrence of this present after the RV) with the abnormal long root vowel:

(ŚB 14.6.10.15 (= BĀUM 4.1.15 ≈ BĀUK 4.1.6))

mānasā vāi samrāt strīyam abhī haryati [BĀUK *abhī hāryate*]; *tāsyām prātirūpaḥ putrō jāyate*

‘By the mind, O supreme king, one desires a woman; through her a similar [to oneself] son is born.’

SENART (in his ed. of the ŚBK, p.125) considered the Kāṇva form corrupt as against the Mādhyandina version. From the formal point of view, it could be analysed as a passive of the unattested causative **hārayati* ‘makes wish, like’ (i.e. ‘is being made wished’?),²⁰⁷⁰ but this meaning makes little sense in the context. GONDA (1983a: 39 [= Sel.St. VI/2, 305]) renders this form as reflexive, which yields a rather forced translation, however: ‘by *manas* ... one **betakes oneself** to a woman; a ... son is born of her’. Most likely, the Kāṇva variant is secondary, resulting from confusion of active and middle, quite common in the language of some Upaniṣads; cf. FÜRST (1916:

²⁰⁶⁹ For the metrical scheme of these pādas (10 syllables in pāda a plus a pause equivalent to the length of a syllable after *vaso*; 7 syllables in pāda b), see VAN NOOTEN & HOLLAND 1994: 541, 662.

²⁰⁷⁰ Thus RENOU 1930 [GrS]: 434, §312.

22): “In Bṛh.-Up. entspricht oft dem Aktiv in der einen Rezension ein Medium in der andern und umgekehrt”.

To sum up, middle forms of the present *hárya-* are employed in (nearly) the same usage as their active counterparts. A semantic distinction between active and middle forms, if any, must be fairly subtle and can hardly be captured on the basis of the few middle attestations. In any case, the self-beneficent meaning (typically expressed by the middle diathesis) cannot be distinguished from the non-self-beneficent one for a verb of emotional state: ‘enjoy’ = ‘enjoy for oneself’.

hr̥ṣ ‘be/become excited’: *hr̥ṣya-^{ti}*

Simplex MānŚS 8.23.6, PārGS 1.16.25 +;

+ *ud* AB 3.4.5; + *ni* AB 3.4.5;

+ *pra* BaudhPS 3.1:17.3-4;

+ *ví* RV 10.86.7

unaccented

• intr. state

The intransitive *-ya*-present *hr̥ṣya-^{ti}* first occurs in the late RV (maṇḍala X), in the famous Vṛṣākapi-hymn. It refers to excitement of two kinds, produced by fear and by lust (cf. GELDNER, ad loc.; GOTÖ 347):

(RV 10.86.7cd)

bhasán me amba sákthi me ' śíro me vīva hr̥ṣyati

‘My bottom, O mummy, my thigh, my head become somehow excited.’²⁰⁷¹

After the RV, *hr̥ṣya-^{ti}* ousts the old class I present *hárṣa-^{te}*,²⁰⁷² but

²⁰⁷¹ See JAMISON 1996: 78f. On the meaning of the particle *iva* in such usages, see PINAULT 2004: 298ff.

²⁰⁷² See GOTÖ, *ibid.*, with fn. 856; HETTRICH 2007: 249f. on the semantic and syntactic features of the both formations; MAYRHOFER, EWAia II, 808 on the etymology. Cf. also KUIPER 1934: 284, where *hr̥ṣya-^{ti}* is explained as the *s*-present built to *hárya-^{ti}* ‘enjoy’. KÜMMEL (LIV 178, 198) connects *hr̥ṣya-^{ti}* and *hárṣa-^{te}* with two different etymons, **ḡ^hers-* ‘sich sträuben, erstarren’ and **g^{(u)h}ers-* ‘sich erfreuen’, but this semantic differentiation is not indisputable and cannot be firmly supported by scant evidence for the use of *hr̥ṣya-^{ti}*.

remains rare in Vedic prose and occurs only in the AB:

(AB 3.4.2, 5)

[2] *agner vā etāḥ sarvās tanvo yad etā devatāḥ* [...] [5] *atha yad uc ca hṛṣyati ni ca hṛṣyati, tad asya maitrāvaruṇaṁ rūpam*

‘[2] These deities are all forms of Agni. [...] [5] And when he leaps up and leaps down, this is his Mitra-Varuṇa form.’²⁰⁷³

On the corresponding *-āya*-causative *harṣāya*-^{ti} (RV +), see JAMISON 136f.

²⁰⁷³ See SIMSON 1971: 32, note 118.

VI. *Cyāti* presents

chā ‘cut [skin], flay’: $-ch_{(i)}yá^{-ti}$

+ *ānu* AVŚ 9.5.4 = AVP 16.97.3;

+ *ā* VS 23.39ff. (*ā chya°*) \approx TS^m 5.2.12.1 = KS-Aśvamedha^m 5.10.6:185.16ff. (simplex *chya°*, read ⁺*ā chya°* (?)),²⁰⁷⁴ MS^m 4.13.4:203.11-12 = ^AKS^m 16.21:244.13 = AB^m 2.6.14 = TB^m 3.6.6.2 (*ā chyātāt*, MS v.l. *ā tsyatāt*, KS v.l. *-chṛtā°*), ŚB 3.8.2.14, VādhŚS

accented: TS^m 5.2.12.1 = KS-Aśvamedha^m 5.10.6:186.1 (*chyāntu*), ŚB 3.8.2.14

• tr.

The transitive present $-chyá^{-ti}$ denotes a particular ritual cutting of skin and is generally constructed with the accusative *tvācam* ‘skin’; for the list of attestations and short discussion, see HOFFMANN 1966: 70f. [= Aufs. 2, 463f.].²⁰⁷⁵ It first appears in the post-RVic mantras (AV, YV^m); the only AVic attestation is a compound with *ānu*, which does not occur in later texts

²⁰⁷⁴ Note that Chambers ms. of the KS(-Aśvamedha) [Ch.] consistently reads this stem without *y*: *chatī* or *chṛtī* for *chyatī* at 5.10.6:185.16, *chāṇtu* for *chyantu* at 5.10.6:186.1, *chaṇtu* for *chyantu* at 5.10.6:186.3. For the loss of *y* after *ch* in $-vich[y]á^{-te}$ ŚBK (passive from the secondary root *vich*), see HOFFMANN 1966: 64 [= Aufs. 2, 457], fn. 3 and Chapter I, s.v.

²⁰⁷⁵ The form *chāyāti*, qualified by WHITNEY (1885b [Roots]: 50) as another present formation of *chā* (with a question mark), occurs in TB 1.1.9.9. The form belongs in fact to the secondary root *vich* ‘impel [an animal by brutal whacks]’ (discussed by CALAND (1916: 73 [= Kl.Schr., 236]; see Chapter I, s.v.). Thus, the passage *yátha rṣabhāya +vāśitām* [for *vāśitā*, emendation by HOFFMANN (1966: 61ff. [= Aufs. 2, 455f.])] *nyāvichāyāti* means ‘... wie man eine rindernde Kuh einem Stier zutreibt’ (HOFFMANN, *ibid.*).

(note the disyllabic stem *-ch_iya-*):

(AVŚ 9.5.4ab)²⁰⁷⁶

*ānu ch_iya śyāmēna tvācam etāṃ viśastar ' yathāpar_uvā āsīnā mābhī
maṃsthāḥ*

‘Cut along this skin with the black (iron) sword, O dissector, limb by limb; do not plot against [him]!’ (for this stanza, see GONDA 1965: 90, 243f.; SCHLERATH 1997: 825)

In the Aśvamedha mantras of the YV (VS, TS, KS), *chya^{-ti}* is attested with the preverb *ā* in the VS and as a simplex in the Taittirīya and Kāṭhaka versions; on the basis of this discrepancy, HOFFMANN (1966: 70 [= Aufs. 2, 464]) conjectures ⁺*ā-chyati* for TS 5.2.12.1 = KS-Aśvamedha 5.10.6:185.16; the relevant verses are quoted above, s.v. *śam*. Besides, *ā-chya^{-ti}* appears in a YVic mantra, which is also found in the AB and RVic Śrauta-Sūtras:

(MS^m 4.13.4:203.11-12 = ^UKS^m 16.21:244.13-14 = AB^m 2.6.14 = TB^m 3.6.6.2 (= ŚŚS^m 5.17.4 = ĀśŚS^m 3.3.1))²⁰⁷⁷

*ekadhāśya tvācam ā chyatāt
purā nābhyā apīśāso vapām út khidatād
antār evōṣmāṇaṃ vārayatāt*²⁰⁷⁸

‘Cut its skin in one piece; before ripping up the navel, draw out the omentum; keep its breath within.’

Forms without preverbs are unattested.²⁰⁷⁹

²⁰⁷⁶ The original metre is triṣṭubh, though violated by three redundant syllables in pāda a – *śyāmēna* or *viśastar* (WHITNEY, ad loc.).

²⁰⁷⁷ The metrical scheme (if any) is unclear, but, on the assumption that the first (and probably the last) pāda has 11 syllables, the verbal stem must be disyllabic: *ekadhāśya tvācam ā chyatāt* [...] *antār evōṣmāṇaṃ vārayatāt*.

²⁰⁷⁸ The KS, AB and both Śrauta-Sūtras read *vārayadhvāt*. This is the only attestation of the imperative form in *-dhvāt* (registered in WHITNEY 1889 [SktGr]: 214, §571d), probably built as the middle counterpart of the *-tāt*-imperative on the model of the 2pl.impv.act. *-ta* ~ 2pl.impv.med. *-dhvam*.

²⁰⁷⁹ Two verbal forms in ŚB 4.3.2.3 *tác chyati ... yád enác chyāti*, erroneously quoted in VWC-Br. I, 643b s.v. *√chā* (“cho”), belong in fact to the root *śā* ‘sharpen’ (i.e. ‘he sharpens it ... when he sharpens it’), q.v.

²*dā* ‘bind, tie’: -*d*_(i)*yá*-^{ti}+ *ā* AVŚ 12.5.15 (?);+ *nī* AVP 5.31.2 (≈ KauśS 62.21) (Kashm. *nadya*, KauśS *nī jyā*, recte Or. *nī dya*);+ *vī* TB^{m/p} (≈ ŚrSū.^m [or *√⁴dā*] (?));+ *sām* AVŚ 6.103.2-3, 11.10.6; (+ *upa sam* AVP 1.18.4 ?)²⁰⁸⁰

accented: TB

• tr.

³*dā* ‘mow, cut’: *dāti* etc.)^{3/4}*dā* (/ ^{1/2}*day*) ‘destroy, cut (in pieces)’: -*dyá*-^{ti/(te)}

(α) ‘cut (in pieces), destroy’

(+ *āpi* AVŚ 4.37.7 mss., ed. ²ROTH/WHITNEY/LINDENAU, ed. VIŚVA BANDHU *āpi yāmi* ≈ AVP-Or. 12.7.9 [Kashm. 13.4.9] -*yātu*; WHITNEY [et al.] *āpi* + *dyāmi*);+ *ā* RV 2.13.9, AVŚ 6.104.1-3, (12.5.15 (?));+ *vī* ‘cut in pieces, crush’ VS 26.4; ‘cut off, separate (?)’ ŚB 14.8.7.1 (= BĀU 5.7.1) (?), (ŚrSū.^m (?) [or *√²dā*])

(β) ‘make sacrificial cuttings, cut off as a sacrificial portion, divide, distribute’

+ *āva* YV^p +;+ *adhy-āva* ŚB 3.8.3.10;+ *upāva* LāṭyŚS 10.11.15;+ *nir-ava* ŚrSū.;+ *pary-āva* TS^p 2.3.7.5;+ *sam-āva* YV^p +

accented: VS +

²⁰⁸⁰ The passage is difficult. RENOU’s (1964a: 428) interpretation of *viśve vo devā upa saṁdyāmiha* (ed. BHATTACHARYA underlies the form as unclear: *saṁdyāmiha*) as ‘je veux vous attacher (= vous retenir) ici’ is problematic. Th. ZEHNDER (p.c.) hesitantly conjectures *viśve vo devā upa* + *sādayāmi iha* ‘die Allgötter werden euch hierhin setzen’.

-*dya*^{-te} :
 + *sam-áva* YV^p, ŚB(K), GB
 • tr.

also in nom. deriv.:
 -*a*:- °*dya*- (in *tāmodya*- ‘destroying darkness’ TĀ^m 1.10.4²⁰⁸¹)

All presents -*d*_(i)*yá*^{-ti}, irrespectively of their meaning (see below), are transitive and occur only with preverbs. In some occurrences they attest the disyllabic stem: -*d*_i*yá*-.

After NARTEN’s (1964: 138f.; 1968a: 92f. [= Kl.Schr. I, 130f.]) and HOFFMANN’s (1965b: 167 [= Aufs. 1, 178], with fn. 1; 171 [= Aufs. 1, 182], with fn. 2) studies on Vedic verb, it has become commonplace to sharply distinguish between the homonymous verbs ³*dā* ‘mow, cut off’ (of plants) [‘mähen, (ab)schneiden’] (which only has the root present *dāti*) and ²*dā* ‘bind’ [‘binden’], with the present -*dyá*^{-ti}. Both verbs, occurring already in the RV, are distinguished from ⁴*dā* ‘make sacrificial cuttings, divide, distribute’ [‘(ver)teilen’] (with the present -*dyá*^{-ti}, only in compounds with *áva*), attested as a technical ritual term from the YV onwards.²⁰⁸² The distinction between the presents of the two first roots can be illustrated by the following examples:

***dā*^{-ti}:**
 (RV 1.65.8b)
agnír ha dāti rómā pṛthivyāḥ
 ‘Agni shaves the hair of the earth.’

(RV 10.131.2ab)
kuvíd aṅgá yávamanto yávaṃ cid' yáthā dāntīy anupūrvāṃ viyútya
 ‘How, indeed, [people] cultivating corn mow the corn, separating [it] in regular order...’

²⁰⁸¹ See SHARMA 1959/60: 133.

²⁰⁸² Cf., most explicitly, NARTEN (1968a: 130 [= Kl.Schr. I, 92]): “Die Paradigmen von *dāti* und *dyati* [teilt ab, trennt ab] (Aor. *ádāt*) haben – jedenfalls innerhalb der ai. Sprache und somit für uns zugänglich und kontrollierbar – ebensowenig miteinander zu tun wie etwa *pāti* ‘schützt’ und *pībati* ‘trinkt’ (Aor. *ápāt*). Abgesehen von der morphologischen Unvereinbarkeit ist auch die semantische Nähe von ‘mähen’ und ‘teilen, zuteilen’ keineswegs so groß, daß eine Trennung als ungerechtfertigt erschiene.” See also MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 716f.; WERBA [VIA I] 293ff.; and, most recently, WERBA 2006: 293f., fn. 153.

-dyá-^{ti}:

(AV 6.103.2)

*sám paramānt sám avamān ' átho sám dyāmi madhyamān**índras tán páry ahār dāmnā ' tán agne sám dīyā t_uvám*

'I tie together the highest, together the lowest, also together the middle ones; Indra has encompassed them with a tie; tie them together, you, O Agni.'

(AVP 5.31.2ab (≈ KauśS 62.21))

badhāna vatsam abhi dhehi bhuñjatīm ' ni dīyā²⁰⁸³ godhug upa sīda dugdhi

'Bind the calf, halter the useful one (sc. the cow). Fasten [her legs], O cow-milker, sit down, milk [her]!'²⁰⁸⁴

However, besides a number of clear cases, where the interpretation of -dyá-^{ti} ('bind') raises no doubts, there are several occurrences (particularly, in the post-RVic mantras), for which the meaning 'bind' makes little sense, if possible at all. First of all, the meaning 'bind' is certainly impossible for one of the earliest attestations of the compound with *ví*:

(VS 26.4.a)

*índra gómann ihā yāhi ' pībā sómañ śatakrato**vidyádbhir grāvabhiḥ sutām*

The reference to pressing stones and Soma rules out the meaning 'bind'; the verb can only denote crushing, grinding, cutting in pieces soma's filament, as correctly translated already by SCHULZE (1888: 258f. [= Kl.Schr., 363]) ('zerstücken, zerkleinern; zerteilen, zertrennen, zerstören') and SHARMA (1959/60: 133) ('abschneiden, zerteilen'):²⁰⁸⁵

'O Indra, possessor of cattle, come here, you, having hundred powers, drink soma, pressed out by the pressing-stones cutting (in pieces) [the

²⁰⁸³ Kashm. ms. *nadya*, KauśS *nijya* (and thus in ed. BARRET). The form cannot of course belong to the root *nij* 'wash' (VWC-Sū. II, 1399b); recte Or. *ni dya*. The passage was correctly interpreted by HOFFMANN, apud SHARMA 1959/60: 169; see also LUBOTSKY 2002: 137f. and GRIFFITHS 2004b: 70f. (on the quotation of the mantra in the KauśS).

²⁰⁸⁴ I.e., as HOFFMANN (ibid.) explains, 'bind sie fest [an den Pflock, an dem auch das Kalb angebunden ist].'

²⁰⁸⁵ PW III, 578 groups this occurrence with *dā* 'divide' but further (ibid., 579) also mentions it among compounds of the root *dā* 'bind'.

soma filament].’

Most likely, *ví-dya^{-ti}* belongs with the full grade thematic (class I?) pres. *ví-daya^{-te}*²⁰⁸⁶ (thus already SCHULZE, op.cit.), attested in the early RV (2x) with the same meaning: ‘cut (in pieces), crush, destroy’, cf. RV 4.7.10d *sthirā cid ānnā dayate ví jámbhaiḥ* ‘[Agni] destroys/crushes even firm food with his teeth’; RV 3.34.1 *dāyamāno ví śātrūn* ‘[Indra,] destroying enemies’ (see JOACHIM 93; GOTÖ 173f.).²⁰⁸⁷

More intricate is the case of the attestations of *ví-dya^{-ti}* in the Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras, all in “etymological” contexts, explaining the origin of the noun *vidyút-*. The amplest and, most probably, the earliest version of this explanation occurs in the TB:

(TB 3.10.9.1-3)

[1] *prajāpatiḥ devān asṛjata | té pāpmānā sāmḍitā ajāyanta | tām vy ādyat*
| *yád vyadyát*²⁰⁸⁸ | *tāsmād vidyút | tām avṛscat | yád avṛscat | tāsmād*
vṛṣṭiḥ | tāsmād yātraité devāte abhiprāpnutaḥ | ví ca haivāśya tātra
pāpmānaṁ dyātaḥ ||1|| *vṛścātaś ca | sāiṣā mīmāṃsāgnihotrā evā*
+sāmpannā | átho āhuḥ: sārveṣu yajñakratúṣv iti | hóṣyann apá úpa sprṣet
| “*vidyút asi; ví dya me pāpmānam*” *íti | átha hutvópa sprṣet* | “*vṛṣṭir asi,*
vṛṣca me pāpmānam” *íti | yakṣyamāṇo veṣṭvā vā | ví ca haivāśyaité*
devāte pāpmānaṁ dyātaḥ ||2|| *vṛścātaś ca*

‘Prajāpati created the gods. When they were born, they were tied together with evil. He **untied** them. By virtue of the fact that he **untied** (*vyadyát*), [it is called] *lightning* (*vidyút*).²⁰⁸⁹ He cut it (sc. evil) off. By virtue of the fact that he cut off (*avṛscat*), [it is called] *rain* (*vṛṣṭi*). Therefore, wherever these two deities (sc. Lightning and Rain) are present, they **untie** his evil and cut [it] off. This explanation is valid in the case of Agnihotra; they say, it is also [valid] in the case of all sacrificial ceremonies. When going to make an oblation, [the priest] should touch the water, with [the formula]: “You are lightning, untie my evil!” And, having made an oblation, [he] should touch [the water], with [the

²⁰⁸⁶ Registered in LUBOTSKY 1997a [RVWC]: 676 s.v. *di* ‘destroy’.

²⁰⁸⁷ For the paradigmatic relationships between *ví-daya^{-te}* (class I present) and *ví-dya^{-ti}* (class VI (?) present), see e.g. HIRT 1921 [IdgG II]: 168; KLINGENSCHMITT 1982: 132, 146, fn. 5; KULIKOV 2000b: 277ff., with bibl.

²⁰⁸⁸ Read probably **vyādyat* contra all eds.

²⁰⁸⁹ Inexactly DUMONT: ‘From the fact that he released them lightning was produced.’

formula]: “You are rain, cut off my evil!” Either [he should also pronounce the first formula when] going to perform a sacrifice or [the first formula when] having performed a sacrifice. And these two deities **untie** the evil and cut [it] off.’

sāṃdita- ‘bound’ at the beginning of the passage clearly points to the meaning ‘tie/untie’, i.e. evil (*pāpmān-*) is considered as fetters which tie gods or human beings. By contrast, from the point of view of common sense, cutting, splitting in pieces appears a more probable effect of a lightning than untying fetters. For the more recent version of this explanation, in the late ŚB (= BĀU), the meaning ‘untie’ at least does not seem obvious, cf.:

(ŚB 14.8.7.1 (= BĀU 5.7.1))

*vidyūd brāhméty āhuḥ. vidānād vidyūd ví dyaty enám [sārvasmāt]*²⁰⁹⁰
pāpmāno, yá evāṃ véda

“‘Brahma is lightning’ – thus they say, because of untying/cutting (in pieces). Lightning unties (?) / cuts him from [any] evil, who knows thus.’

Finally, the mantra *vidyud asi; vidya me pāpmānam* “‘You are lightning, untie/split in pieces my evil!’” occurs in several Śrauta-Sūtras, in particular, at ĀpŚS 4.1.6, 6.5.3, 6.9.3, 19.13.19, ĀśŚS 2.3.16, ŚŚS 2.7.18,²⁰⁹¹ 4.8.3, BaudhŚS 19.5:423.12-13, BhārŚS 6.1.5, VārŚS 1.5.4.2, HirŚS 3.7.62 (see GONDA 1980a: 61).

Translators hesitate between the meanings ‘untie’²⁰⁹² and ‘separate, cut off; remove’.²⁰⁹³ Curiously enough, CALAND’s translations for the four quotations of this mantra in the ĀpŚS are all different: ‘trenne ab [mein böses Geschick]’ (4.1.6), ‘wende ab’ (6.5.3), ‘scheide aus’ (6.9.3), ‘zermalme’

²⁰⁹⁰ Only in Mādhyandina.

²⁰⁹¹ With *vidyā* ‘knowledge’ instead of *vidyut* (... *vidyāsi, vidya me pāpmānam*).

²⁰⁹² Cf. for the BĀU passage: BÖHTLINGK: ‘Der vom Ablösen benannte Blitz löst den ... von jeglichem Unheil’ (note the alliteration in German: **A**blösen – **B**litz); DEUSSEN (1897: 492): ‘den bindet der Blitz vom Übel los ...’; HUME (1931: 152): ‘Lightning unlooses him from evil...’.

²⁰⁹³ Cf. SENART (for BĀU): ‘il sépare du mal’; DUMONT (1939: 49, 57, 100, 169): ‘tu es l’éclair, détache de moi mon mal (mon péché)’ and *ibid.*, p. 187 (for ŚŚS 2.7.18 *vidyāsi* ...): ‘tu es la science; écarte de moi mon mal (mon péché)’; MYLIUS for ĀśŚS 2.3.16: ‘ein Blitz bist Du, trenne ab meine Sünde’; KASHIKAR for BaudhŚS 19.5:423.12-13: ‘Thou art remover; do thou remove my evil’ (ed. KASHIKAR, vol. III, p. 1269).

(19.13.19). For ŚŚS 2.7.18 CALAND even conjectured (as he explains, for etymological reasons) ⁺*vidhya* (‘Knowledge art thou, destroy (*vidhya*) my bad luck’), and GONDA (1980a: 61, with fn. 184) adopted this reading for all attestations of the mantra. This conjecture is unnecessary, since the meaning ‘destroy’ is perfectly appropriate for *vī-dya-ti* (VS) / *vī-daya-te* (RV) discussed above.²⁰⁹⁴

The compound *vī-dā* in the construction *pāpmānaḥ* // *pāpmāno vī dyati* belongs to the expressions of deliverance from evil and, as a matter of fact, merely substitutes for more common verbs of deliverance, such as *vī-/nīrmuc*, *áva-sṛj*, etc. (cf. RODHE 1946: 30ff., 35). The employment of a form of *vī-dā* in this usage is obviously triggered by the word play, which renders the discussion of the “true” meaning of *vī-dā* in such contexts rather scholastic. Yet it is not senseless to trace the semantic source of this usage, i.e. to determine which of the different roots *dā* might underlie such usages. Note the difference in case syntax of the examples, which may support one or another interpretation. The accusative *tān* (~ *vyādyat*) in the TB can only refer to beings which are untied and thereby saved (certainly not cut in pieces); for the accusative *pāpmānam* (~ *vī dya*) both in the mantra and in the prose passages of the TB both interpretations are possible: ‘untie the evil’; ‘destroy the evil’; the ablative *pāpmānaḥ* in the ŚB (= BĀU) suggests the meaning ‘cut off’ (*ablativus separationis*).

It seems that the translation ‘untie’ is correct for the TB version, but the redactors of the ŚB (BĀU) may have reinterpreted this etymology, connecting *vī-dya-ti* with *√dā* (*dī*) ‘destroy, cut’ – perhaps, bearing in mind the participle *vī-dyānt-* attested in the VS, which also belongs to the White YVic tradition. As for quotations of the mantra in the Śrauta-Sūtras, the lack of attestations of this present in the Sūtra (prose) properly speaking does not allow to draw any conclusion on understanding this verb by the authors and redactors of these younger texts. Yet, the lack of the present *-dyá-ti* ‘bind’ from Vedic prose onwards (except in the TB passage quoted above), in contrast to the well-attested *(-)áva-dya-ti* ‘cut’ (for which see below) seems to support the second interpretation (‘separate, cut off / cut in pieces’).

Returning to the attestations of *-dyá-ti* in early Vedic (RV, AV), one should notice that the meaning ‘cut in pieces, destroy’ is also very probable for most occurrences of the compound with *ā*, generally translated as ‘bind’. Cf. the short AVic hymn 6.104, where this present appears in each stanza:

²⁰⁹⁴ Impossible is CALAND’s translation for another attestation of the mantra in the ŚŚS (4.8.3): ‘Thou art the lightning, drive (*vidya*) my bad lot.’

(AV 6.104.1-3)

- [1] *ādānena saṃdānenāāmītrān ā dīyāmasi*
apāñā yé caiṣām prāñā ' āsunāsūnt sám achidam
 [2] *idām ādānam akaram ' tāpaséndreṇa sámśitam*
amītrā yé 'tra naḥ sánti ' tāt agna ā dīyā tāvām
 [3] *áinān dīyatām indrāgnī ' sómo rájā ca medīnau*
indro marútvān ādānam ' amītrebhyaḥ kṛṇotu naḥ

WHITNEY's translation runs:

- [1] 'With tying-up, with tying-together, we tie up the enemies; the expirations and breaths of them, lives with life have I cut off.
 [2] This tying-up have I made, sharpened up with fervor by Indra; our enemies that are here – them, O Agni, do thou tie up.
 [3] Let Indra-and-Agni tie them up, and king Soma, allied; let Indra with the Maruts make tying-up for our enemies.'

The same interpretation is adopted by other translators (cf. LUDWIG 1878: 518; GONDA 1974a: 308; ELIZARENKOVA 1976: 135); the indigenous commentary explains that, together with the preceding hymn 6.103 (cf. stanza 6.103.2 quoted above), this hymn accompanies throwing fetters in places where the hostile army will pass (cf. WHITNEY ad 6.103). Yet, this interpretation of the hymn does not appear self-evident. In my view, the translation 'by cutting, by complete cutting, we cut the enemies in pieces (destroy) ...' etc. is at least possible;²⁰⁹⁵ moreover, it is supported by the context in stanza 1, pāda d ('we cut the enemies ... I cut off their lives') and, especially, in stanza 2: 'sharpening' (*indreṇa sámśitam*) is more appropriate for cutting, not for tying up.

The only RVic occurrence of the present *-dyá-^{ti}* (also with *ā*) may belong to the same usage:

(RV 2.13.9ab)

śatām vā yásya dáśa sākām ādīya ' ékasya śruṣṭáu yád dha codám āvitha

GELDNER translates the verbs as 'du hast gefesselt', but the meaning 'destroy' seems appropriate as well:

'Or, when listening to one person whose enemies (?) are ten [times] hundred [in number], you destroyed [them] immediately, you have helped

²⁰⁹⁵ Thus SHARMA (1959/60: 133) for AV 6.104.1.

Coda.²⁰⁹⁶

The meaning ‘bind’ is corroborated by the context only for one AVic occurrence of the compound *ā-dya^{ti}*:

(AVŚ 12.5.15)

sā brahmajyām devapīyūṁ brahmagavy ādīyāmānā mr̥tyóḥ páḍbīśa ā dyati

‘This Brahman’s cow, when being cut in pieces (being taken for oneself? being bound?), binds (destroys?) the one who deprives Brahmans of property, the god-blamer, in the shackle of death.’

The locative *páḍbīśe* ‘in the shackle’ might plead for the meaning ‘bind’; but note also the word play *ādīyāmānā* // *ā dyati*. *ādīyāmānā* is ambiguous (‘being cut in pieces’/‘being taken for oneself’/‘being bound’), and, in any case, the meaning ‘destroys’ cannot be ruled out for *ā dyati* in this context.

Alongside the compounds with *ā*, *vī* and *sām*, each of which is attested at least a few times in the mantras, there is an unclear AVic form, which does not occur elsewhere, encountered in a spell against some superhuman beings:

(AVŚ 4.37.7 ≈ AVP-Or. 12.7.9 = AVP-Kashm. 13.4.9)

*āñṭyataḥ śikhaṇḍīno ' gandharvásyāpsarāpatēḥ
bhinádmi muṣkāv āpi yāmi śépaḥ²⁰⁹⁷*

The verb *yāmi* ‘I go’ makes little sense in the context (‘I go towards/near the penis [of Gandharva]’?); besides, the compound *āpi-yā* is not attested elsewhere. All translators unanimously conjectured ⁺*dyāmi* instead, interpreting it in different ways, however:

(1) LUDWIG (1878: 352), ELIZARENKOVA (2005: 211 and 450) (hesitantly), and WHITNEY (hesitantly) connected this form with ²*dā* ‘bind’: ‘dessen hoden zerreise ich, dessen rute binde ich fest’ (LUDWIG); ‘of the hither-dancing, crested Gandharva, Apsaras-lord, I split the testicles, I bind fast (?) the member’ (WHITNEY); ‘Я скывываю (?) уд’ (ELIZARENKOVA).

(2) Other interpreters, starting with KUHN, saw here the meaning ‘cut off’: KUHN (1864: 120): ‘hoden spalte ich, schneid’ ihm an das glied!’; BLOOMFIELD (1897: 33): ‘I crush the two mushkas and cut off the śepas’; WEBER (1898: 146): ‘beide Hoden spalte ich, penis beschneide ich’.

²⁰⁹⁶ Thus SHARMA (1959/60: 133), who groups this RVic occurrence with the VS attestation discussed above (‘abschneiden, zerteilen’).

²⁰⁹⁷ AVP reads 3sg.impv. forms in pāda c (*bhinattu ... āpi yātu*).

Relying upon common sense, the second interpretation seems preferable, going along with the destructive semantics of *(vi)-dya^{-ti}*, as attested in the VS. However, neither of the roots ²⁻⁴*dā* occurs with the preverb *āpi*, and the loss of the initial *d-* (ms. error?) can hardly be explained. Nor does the reading attested in the Paippalāda version (*bhinattu ... api yātu*) support this conjecture, since the stem vowel should be short (*dyatu*).

It seems that a possible interpretation is prompted by the following AVic stanza, where we also find the noun *śépaḥ*, in the subject position:

(AV 7.90.3a, ef)

yáthā śépo apāyātai [...]

yád ātatam áva tát tanu ' yád úttatam ní tát tanu

‘So that [your] penis will go off [i.e. will be unerect, impotent]; [...] what is stretched, that make unstretched; what is stretched up (i.e. erect), that do stretch down.’

The forms *āpi yāmi* and *apāyātai* are likely to belong together. *-ayātai* (subj.med. of the verb *i*) could easily be reanalysed as built on the root *yā*; this reanalysis could further be supported by the synonymous compounds *abhí-i* and *abhí-yā* ‘attack, go, act against (with hostile intentions)’, employed in similar contexts.²⁰⁹⁸ Again, under the influence of the pair *abhí-i* / *abhí-yā*, the preverbs *āpa* and *abhí* could have contaminated in *āpi*. Note that, in contrast to *āpa-i*, the compounds with *abhí* are constructed with the accusative (cf. examples in the footnote) and could trigger the transitive syntax in AVŚ 4.37.7.

The original (Proto-AVic) text might run as follows: *bhinádmi muṣkāv *āpa *yātu (*āpaaitu?) śépaḥ* ‘I crush the testicles, let the penis be unerect (impotent)!’ Then the Śaunakīya and Paippalāda recensions have probably generalized the 1sg.ind. or 3sg.impv. forms, respectively. Whatever the original form, it hardly belongs to any of the roots ²⁻⁴*dā*.

After the mantra period, the present *-dya^{-ti}* survives only in compounds with *áva*,²⁰⁹⁹ mainly with the technical meaning ‘cut, make sacrificial cuttings, divide etc.’²¹⁰⁰ (but cf. also the meaning ‘cut, shave’ (of hair)

²⁰⁹⁸ Cf. AVŚ 5.13.4 *pratyág abhy ètu tvā viṣám* ‘let [your = snake’s] poison go back against you’; AVŚ 6.40.2 *anyātra rájñām abhí yātu manyúḥ* ‘let the fury of kings act elsewhere’; AVŚ 4.29.7 *yáyo ráthaḥ ... mithuyā cārantam abhiyāti* ‘whose (sc. Mitra-Varuṇa’s) chariot goes against the one who behaves falsely’.

²⁰⁹⁹ Not counting the unclear *ví dya^{-ti}* in the TB.

attested in TS 7.4.9.1, which will be mentioned below). Examples are:

(TS 2.6.6.5)

yád agnáye sviṣṭakṛte 'vadyāti bhāgadhēyenaivá, tād rudráṁ sám ardhayati

'In that he cuts off as a share for Agni Sviṣṭakṛt, he gives Rudra a share.'

(ŚB 11.2.6.8)

udāram evāsyēdā tād yáthaivādā ídāyāṁ samavadyānty, evám evēdām viśvárūpam ánnam udāre samāvadhīyate

'This Iḍā, indeed, is the belly; even as there, at the [invocation of] Iḍā, they cut off [portions and put them] together, so now food of all kinds is [cut off and] put together in the belly.'

The middle inflection is attested only for compounds with *sam*, where it expresses the sociative²¹⁰¹ meaning, as in:

(TS 6.2.2.1)

yā na imāḥ priyās tanúvas, tāḥ samāvadyāmahai

'Welche diese unsere lieben Gestalten sind, die wollen wir gemeinsam als Anteil geben.' (HOFFMANN 1969b: 198 [= Aufs. 1, 293], fn. 19)

For the middle form *sam avādyanta* in KS 24.9:100.6 (corresponding to the the active form *samāvādyan* in the parallel passage MS 3.7.10:90.4), see Ch. B.I, s.v. *vad*.

Beside the primarily active present *áva-dya^{-ti}*, we find in the same usage the middle present *áva-daya^{-te}*, cf. TS 6.3.10.5 *tād avadānair evāva dayate* 'verily, he cuts it (= performs *avadāna*) by sacrificial cuttings'.²¹⁰²

Conclusions.

The relationships between the present systems of the verbs ²*dā* 'bind', ³*dā* 'mow, cut off' and ⁴*dā* 'make sacrificial cuttings, divide, distribute' (thus presented e.g. in MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, s.vv.) can be outlined as follows.

²¹⁰⁰ For the technical meaning of *áva-⁴dā* in the ritual, see RENOU 1954: 21; SEN 1978: 42; EINO 1988: 232ff.; MYLIUS 1995: 34. See also VERPOORTEN 2005: 397, with fn. 34, on the distinction between the compounds *ava-dyá^{-ti}* ('partager') and *sam-ava-dyá^{-ti}* ('prélever en même temps, à la fois').

²¹⁰¹ The term 'reziprok', used by HOFFMANN (1965b: 167 [= Aufs. 1, 178], fn. 1), is employed in the present study only in the narrow sense of the word, i.e. for the verbs incorporating the meaning 'each other'.

²¹⁰² On *áva-daya^{-te}*, see GELDNER 1901 [VSt III]: 132f.

Alongside *-dyá-^{ti}* ‘bind’ (²*dā*), which is rather rare in Vedic, and *ava-dyá-^{ti}* (⁴*dā*), which first appears in Vedic prose, there existed also pr. *-dyá-^{ti}* ‘cut (in pieces), destroy’ (with *ví* and, possibly, with *ā*), attested both in the mantras (AV, VS, probably also RV) and in the prose (ŚB/BĀU). There are no good reasons to distinguish this present from *ava-dyá-^{ti}*, which is semantically very close and could have developed its technical meaning from ‘cut (off)’ in this particular compound (*áva* = ‘off’). The identity of these two presents (resp. verbs) is supported by their common paradigmatic feature: both are in competition with the middle present *dāya-^{te}*.

The present *-dyá-^{ti}* ‘destroy, cut (in pieces)’, which is of much earlier date than *ava-dyá-^{ti}*, seems to bridge the gap between ³*dā* and ⁴*dā*, posited by NARTEN and HOFFMANN. Note, above all, that, unlike *-dyá-^{ti}* ‘cut (in pieces), destroy’, the supposed root present *dāti* ‘mow, cut’ occurs only as simplex, and the semantic difference from compounds (with *ví*, *áva*, etc.) can easily be accounted for by the meaning of preverbs. Moreover, we even find the compound *ava-dyá-^{ti}* in the meaning, typical of *dāti*, as in TS 7.4.9.1 *dvābhyāṃ lómāva dyanti* ‘with the two [Sattrā-days] they cut hairs’ (for this passage, see FALK 1986: 37). This being the state of affairs, we are faced with the question on the paradigmatic status of this formation: is *dāti* an authentic present? In my view, *dāti*, rather scarcely attested in Vedic (see HOFFMANN 1965b: 171 [= Aufs. 1, 182]), originates in the root aorist subjunctive, and AV 12.3.31 *dāntu* may be qualified as a root aorist imperative. The root aorist *ádāt* is indeed attested for *dā* ‘cut’ (see NARTEN 1964: 139; 1968a: 92 [= Kl.Schr. 1, 130]; HOFFMANN 1965b: 167 [= Aufs. 1, 178], fn. 1). The root aorist subjunctive and imperative *dāti*, *dāntu* (RV) of the verb ¹*dā* ‘give’ (see JOACHIM 91) offer a good parallel for such a development. Such forms could easily be reinterpreted as presents, replacing the hypothetical simplex **dyá-^{ti}*, in accordance with the general tendency to use *Cyāti* presents almost exclusively with preverbs (see KULIKOV 2000b: 273 and 278).

The relationship between the roots ²*dā* ‘bind’ and ^{3/4}*dā* ‘cut’ requires a separate study. Here it will suffice to point out that there are some overlappings between their IVSs. In particular, the part.pf.pass. *ditá-* ‘cut’ could be borrowed from the paradigm of ²*dā* ‘bind’, while the original distribution probably was ²*dā* ‘bind’: *ditá-*; ^{3/4}*dā* ‘cut’: *diná-*.²¹⁰³ Note, in

²¹⁰³ See MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 716f.; cf. also HOFFMANN’s (1965b: 171 [= Aufs. 1, 182], fn. 1) remark on RV 8.102.14 *ásam̐dina-* with “bei *dā* ‘schneiden’ ungewöhnlichen Präp. *sam̐*” (perhaps under the influence of ²*dā* ‘bind’?).

addition, that the boundary between the meanings ‘bind’ and ‘destroy, cut’, however distinct they might appear, is not absolutely insuperable (on destroying by tying up, see, in particular, SCHEFTELOWITZ 1912: 12ff.).

To sum up, the IVSs of ²*dā* and ^{3/4}*dā* can be schematized as follows:

	² <i>dā</i> ‘bind’	^{3/4} <i>dā</i> ‘cut’
pres.	-dyá- ^{ti} AV, TB ^{m/p} (+ <i>ní</i> , <i>sám</i> , <i>ví</i> , <i>ā</i>)	-dyá- ^{ti} RV (?) + (+ <i>ví</i> , <i>ā</i> , <i>áva</i> [YV ^p +])
		(-) <i>dáya</i> - ^{te} RV +
		(<i>dāti</i> RV +)
		↑
aor.		<i>ádāt</i> MS + <i>-diṣīya</i> RV
pass.:		
pres.	-dīyá- ^{te} YV ^m	-dīyá- ^{te} AV (?), YV ^p +
aor.	-dāyi RV (+ <i>sám</i>)	
p.p.p.	<i>ditá</i> - RV	<i>diná</i> - RV + <i>ditá</i> - Br.+ <i>-ttá</i> - KS etc.

Thus we return to essentially the same distinguishing between two roots as outlined by WHITNEY (1885b [Roots]: 72), s.vv. $\sqrt{2}$ *dā* and $\sqrt{3}$ *dā*, with some minor modifications.²¹⁰⁴

Passives

The *-yá*-passive of the verb ²*dā* ‘bind’ occurs in the YVic mantras (TS^m 7.1.19.1 = KS-Aśvamedha^m 5.1.10:154.2 *saṃ-dīyāmāna*-). The earliest occurrence of the passive of ^{3/4}*dā* ‘cut’ seems to be attested in AVŚ 12.4.3 (more problematic is AVŚ 12.5.15, discussed above); the passive of *áva-dā* ‘cut, divide’ first appears in a young mantra (TS^m-AB^m-ŚBK^m); see Chapter I, s.v.

²¹⁰⁴ For a criticism of this analysis, see now WERBA 2006: 293f., fn. 153.

śā ‘sharpen, hone’: (-)ś_(i)yá-^{ti/(te)} (AV -s_(i)ya-^{ti})

ś_(i)yá-^{ti}

Simplex ŚB 4.3.2.3^{2x};

+ *sám* RV 1.130.4^{2x}, AVŚ 3.19.2 = AVP 3.19.2, AVŚ 3.19.5 ≈ AVP 3.19.6, AVP-Or. 6.1.5 (*saṃ* ... *syāmi* ≈ RV 10.120.5 = AVŚ 5.2.5 = AVP-Kashm. *sám* ... *śiśāmi*), YV^p,²¹⁰⁵ ŚB, GB, TB, TĀ 5.8.13 (= ĀpŚS 15.12.13);

+ *vi-sam* KS^p 37.12:93.13-14²¹⁰⁶

accented: ŚB 4.3.2.3

-śya-^{te}

+ *sam* JB 2.259:3

• tr.

The transitive present (-)śyá-^{ti} ‘sharpen’ (also in the metaphorical sense ‘make stronger, more effective’), almost exclusively attested with the preverb *sám*, first appears in the late RV (maṇḍala I), sometimes with the disyllabic stem:

(RV 1.130.4ab)

dādr̥hāṇó vájram índro gábhast̥yoh̥ ‘*kṣádmeva tigmám ásanāya sám̐ śyat*
‘Holding the vajra in his hands, Indra sharpens it, like a sharp knife, in order to cast [it].’

In the AV, this present is attested with the non-palatal *s* in the stem (once disyllabic):

(AVŚ 3.19.2ab = AVP 3.19.2ab)

sám ahám eṣám̐ rāṣṭráṇi syāmi ‘*sám ójo vīr̥yāṇi bálam*

‘I sharpen (= make stronger) their dominion, [their] vigour, manliness, strength.’

(AVŚ 3.19.5a ≈ AVP 3.19.6b)

eṣám̐ ahám áyudhā sám̐ syāmi

²¹⁰⁵ Note MS 3.1.9:12.22-13.1 mss. *śám̐syāti* for ⁺*sám̐-śyati* (thus emended in ed.), with the metathesis of the palatal and non-palatal sibilants (see BLOOMFIELD & SPIEKER 1886: cxviii).

²¹⁰⁶ AVP 3.5.5 *viśya*, quoted in VWC-Sam̐h. V, 2913a s.v. *vi-śā* (“-śo”), originates in the misprint of ed. RAGHU VIRA; both ed. BARRET and AVP-Or. correctly read *vidhya* (*vidhya śatrūn* ‘pierce the enemies’).

‘I sharpen their weapons.’²¹⁰⁷

The mss. of both AVŚ and AVP-Or. have *s*, which seems to be the authentic AVic reading, probably representing a dialect feature, in accordance with the common change $\acute{s} \rightarrow s$ before *i/y* in the AV (for a general discussion, see Chapter II, s.v. *vāś*), therefore the emendation ⁺*śya*^{o2108} is unnecessary. Note, incidentally, that AVic *-syá-*ⁱⁱ is one of the rare instances of the change $\acute{s} \rightarrow s$ in a stem which occurs already in the RV (though only in a hymn of the late maṇḍala I).

The only simplex occurrence of this present is attested in a ŚB passage, in an “etymological” explanation of the noun *śastra-* ‘recitation’, quite in the vein of the Brāhmaṇa tradition:

(ŚB 4.3.2.3)

*prajāpatiṛ vā udgātā, yośā rg ghótā. sā etāt prajāpatiṛ udgātā yōṣāyām
ṛcī hótari rétaḥ siñcati, yāt stuté. tád dhótā śastréna prá janayati. tác
chyati, yáthāyām púruṣaḥ śítás; tád yád enác chyāti, tásmāc chastrām
nāma*

‘Verily, the Udgātṛ is Prajāpati, [and] the Hotṛ, as a ṛc (hymn), is female. Thus Prajāpati, the Udgātṛ pours the semen in the Hotṛ, in the ṛc when it is chanted, as in a female. Thus the Hotṛ produces that by recitation. He sharpens it, as this man is sharpened; [by virtue of the fact] that he sharpens it (*śyāti*), therefore it is called recitation (*śastrá*).’

The secondary character of this pseudo-etymological usage may account for the unique lack of preverb.

Another present formation of *śā* is *śísāti*, *śísīte* RV +. Worthy of special mention is also the middle participle AB 7.16.2 *niḥśāna*-²¹⁰⁹ ~ ŚŚS 15.21.11 *niśyāna-* ‘having wet [the knife]’, which vindicates that *y* could early be taken as part of the root; see KULIKOV 2000b: 276, with fn. 33 for details and discussion.

²¹⁰⁷ On these two passages, see GRIFFITHS 2009: 11f.

²¹⁰⁸ Thus WEBER (1885: 271) and WHITNEY (1893: 90 and in his translation, ad loc.; also ed. ²ROTH/WHITNEY/LINDENAU) for the Śaunakīya, BHATTACHARYA and GRIFFITHS (2009: 10ff.) for the Paippalāda.

²¹⁰⁹ The variant attested in the AB is generally considered corrupt (KEITH 1920: 303, fn. 3); BÖHTLINGK (1900: 414; 1909: 32, line 14; 394, line 23) conjectures ⁺*niśyāna-* in accordance with the reading of the ŚŚS; see also WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 274, §162bβ; 1957 [AiG, Nachtr. zu I]: 149.

Middle forms; passive

The only middle form is found in the JB, in the reflexive usage (with *ātmānam*):

(JB 2.259:3)

brāhmaṇa ātmānaṃ saṃśyate satyaṃ vadan

‘A Brahman makes himself stronger (lit. sharpens himself) [by] speaking the truth.’ (for this passage, see OERTEL 1935: 169 [= Kl.Schr. I, 378]; RAU 1977: 349)

-yá-passives are not derived from this root, nor does the rare middle -śyá-^{te} occur in passive constructions, but the middle root aorist -áśīta is attested in the passive usage:

(RV 1.57.2cd)

yát párvate ná samáśīta haryatá ' índrasya vājraḥ śnáthitā hiraṇyáyaḥ

‘... when the enjoyable Indra’s vajra was sharpened like at a mountain, the striking one, the golden one.’ (see DAS GUPTA 1975: 27)

sā (si) ‘bind’: -s_(i)yá-^{ti/(te)}

-syá-^{ti}

+ *abhí* ‘fasten’ AVŚ 4.16.9, TB^m 2.4.1.4 (*abhí-śya*) ≈ ^AKS^m 2.5:21.3

(*abhí-śyāḥ*) ≈ Sū.^m;

+ *áva* ‘unharness’ RV + (also in compounds with two preverbs)²¹¹⁰;

+ *upā* ĀpŚS 11.8.2 (*upā-syati* ≈ HirŚS 7.5.27 *anv-ava-syati*);

+ *ví* ‘untie, release’ RV +

accented: RV +

-sya-^{te}

+ *ví* RV (*ví-śyasva*, *ví-śyadhvam*), KpS^m 29.5:133.15 (*vi-śyatām*, ms. *vi-śyatam* ≈ MS 2.12.6:150.16-17, ^UKS^m 18.17:278.3 *vi-śya*²¹¹¹), JB 3.279:3

²¹¹⁰ E.g.: + *adhy-áva* ‘decide, determine; take up one’s abode in’ (see BODEWITZ 1990: 223, note 21) YV^p +; + *anv-áva* Br. +; + *ud-áva* AV +; + *praty-áva* ŚB +; + *vy-áva* ŚB 13.2.4.4, TB +.

²¹¹¹ The mantra runs (in the MS variant): *tváṣṭaḥ suvīryam / rāyás póṣaṃ ví śya nābhim asmé* ‘o Tvaṣṭar, release the navel at us for good manly vigour, wealth, prosperity’. The KpS modifies the mantra as follows: *tváṣṭā suvīryaṃ rāyaspoṣaṃ*

(*viṣyamāṇāḥ*), ŚrSū.;

+ *anv-ava* ŚĀ 6.20 (= KauṣU 4.20) (most eds. *anv-ava-syante*; ed. ĀnSS ^o*nti*);

(+ *ā* (?) RV 10.30.2 *āsyadhvam*, probably to \sqrt{as} ²¹¹²)

• tr.

The transitive present *-s_(i)yā^{-ti/(te)}* is a ‘two pattern’ verb, which can be constructed with the object of the knot (fettors etc.), or with the object of the bound being, as noticed already by BERGAIGNE (1887: 84), and subsequently by HIRZEL (1890: 84, with fn. 26); cf. also HAUDRY 260. It typically occurs in compounds with “reversive” preverbs (*áva*, *ví*), thus denoting activities opposite to binding: untying, releasing.²¹¹³ This semantic opposition (‘bind’ ~ ‘untie, release’) partly correlates with the distinction between the root variants *si* and *sā*, often treated as synchronically distinct roots; see INSLER 1971a: 580ff.; KÜMMEL 2000: 548ff. The stem is often disyllabic: *-s_iyā-*. Examples are:

(RV 9.97.18a)

granthūṃ ná ví śya grathitām punānáḥ

‘You, purifying yourself, let loose what is bound, as a knot.’

(RV 9.95.5b)

punāná indo ví śyā manīṣām

‘Being purified, O sap, release the religious thought.’

The compounds with (-)*áva* are common in the absolute (objectless)

viṣyatām nābhim asme; see BLOOMFIELD & EDGERTON 1930 [Ved. Var. I]: 229, §329; 275, §368; OERTEL 1934a: 97 [= Kl.Schr. I, 728].

²¹¹² The form occurs in RV 10.30.2d *tām āsyadhvam ūrmīm adyā suhastāḥ*. LUDWIG (1883 [Comm. zu RV übers., II]: 390), and subsequently OLDENBERG, *Noten ad loc.*, and NEISSER (1902: 9 [= Kl.Schr., 177]; 1930 [Zum Wb. des RV II]: 25f.), reckoned it to *sā* ‘bind’; the compound *ā-sā* is not attested elsewhere, however. More likely is the analysis of this form as *ā asyadhvam* (\sqrt{as} ‘throw’) in the Pp., adopted by GRASSMANN (1873 [Wb. zum RV]: 152), GELDNER (‘Diese Welle fasset heute, ihr Handfertigen!’), RENOU (EVP XV, 127f.) (hesitantly) and ELIZARENKOVA.

²¹¹³ Cf. GONDA 1948: 169f. [= Sel.St. III, 182f.]. This fact cannot serve as sufficient evidence for GONDA’s assumption (ibid., 200 [= Sel.St. III, 213]), however, that the original meaning of *sā* was ‘untie, release’ – which would leave unexplained the non-reversive compound *abhí-śā* (see below) as well as other formations of the IVS meaning ‘bind’, such as *sināti*.

transitive usage, meaning ‘unharness’ (said of horses) → ‘take a rest’,²¹¹⁴ as in:

(RV 4.16.2a)

áva sya śūrādhvano nānte

‘Unharness, O hero, as at the end of the route.’

The only non-reversive compound (i.e. denoting binding, rather than untying) is *abhī-ṣā*,²¹¹⁵ attested in the AV and in a YVic mantra:

(AVŚ 4.16.9a)

tāis tvā sārvaīr abhī ṣyāmi pāśaiḥ

‘With all these fetters I fasten you.’

(TB^m 2.4.1.4 (≈ ^AKS^m 2.5:21.3 (≈ ŚrSū.^m)))

*saviṣṭam agne abhī tát pṛṇāhi*²¹¹⁶ *viśvā deva pṛtanā abhī ṣya*

‘O Agni, make full this excellent sacrifice; fasten all armies, O god!’

The Kāthaka mantra has the 2sg.opt. form *-ṣyāḥ* instead (*viśvāś ca deva pṛtanā abhī ṣyāḥ* ‘... and may you fasten all armies, O god!’). It is unclear which of the two variants is more authentic. The mantra does not occur in the White YV (VS), but the PārGS, which belongs to this tradition, attests yet another form, found in a number of variant readings (PārGS 3.1.3 *viśvāś ca devaḥ pṛtanā* [ed. STENZLER] *abhiṣyāk* / [ed. BÄKRE] *aviṣyat*). The corrupt readings *abhiṣyāk* / *aviṣyat* may be based on 3sg.subj. **abhiṣyāt* (‘the god will fasten all armies’).

-s(i)yá-^{ti} is in competition with the nasal present *siná-^{ti}* (RV +), which, in contrast to the former, occurs both as a simplex and in compounds (with *ví*).

Being well-attested already in the RV, *-s(i)yá-^{ti/(te)}* seems to be the oldest representative of the type *Cyāti*. This formation could serve as the starting point for the development of this morphological type; see KULIKOV 2000b: 275f.

The secondary stem variant without *y* sporadically occurs in post-Vedic texts

²¹¹⁴ For the meaning of this compound, see already BENFEY 1874: 627ff. [= Kl.Schr. II, 178ff.]; further, MINARD 1956: 31, [§]72, fn. a; RAU 1957: 10f.; SPARREBOOM 1985: 23, 136. See also MINARD 1956: 67, [§]156, fn. a on *praty-áva-sya-^{ti}* ‘stay, remain on the same place’; OERTEL 1926: 223f.; MINARD 1949: 39, [§]108, fn. c; EDS III, 1774 on *adhyáva-sya-^{ti}* ‘select, choose, approve to; settle down on’.

²¹¹⁵ Cf. KÜMMEL 2000: 549.

²¹¹⁶ KS *gṛṇāhi*.

before the optative *e*, for instance, in BaudhŚS 21.11:88.18-19, KauśS 137.1 (*adhy-ava-set*), MānŚS 5.2.8.20 (*vy-ava-set*); cf. the regular *-syet* at ĀpŚS 10.19.16, VaikhŚS 13.8:161.15. For details, see KULIKOV 2005a: 307f. For Epic forms, see OBERLIES 2003: 531.

Middle forms

The stem *-s_(i)yá-* is well-attested with the middle inflection already in the RV. Alongside middle imperatives (*ví-ṣyasva*, *ví-ṣyadhvam* RV), middle forms occur twice in Vedic prose, in ŚĀ 6.20 (= KauṣU 4.20) *anv-ava-syante*,²¹¹⁷ with the reflexive *ātman-*, and in JB 3.279:3 *varuṇasya pāśān evaitad viṣyamāṇā yanti* ... ‘they go releasing Varuṇa’s fetter’s.’²¹¹⁸

The abnormal middle optative form *-sāyeta* in MānŚS 5.2.10.26 (*paṇḍako yatra bhūmer jāyeta, tad adhyavasāyeta* ‘may a eunuch settle there, where on earth he is born’) was undoubtedly created under the influence of the adjacent *jāyeta*; on the other hand, it seems to represent the same tendency to avoid the cluster *Cy* before the optative *e* which has given rise to the active optative *-set*. Note, incidentally, that this is the only middle optative form attested for *Cyāti* presents in Vedic (including Sūtras).

²¹¹⁷ But KauṣU in ed. ĀnŚS has °*nti*.

²¹¹⁸ Erroneously recorded in VWC-Br. II, 1370*b* s.v. *viṣ* ‘be active’.

Part C

A SYSTEMATIC ANALYSIS
AND CLASSIFICATION
OF *-ya*-PRESENTS

I. Morphophonological classes of -ya-stems

In this chapter the verbal roots from which -ya-presents are derived will be classified according to their phonological structures. The main subdivision holds between the middle and active -ya-presents, regardless of the accent placement.

For the symbols used in the notation (*C*, *R*, *H*, etc.), see Chapter A.I. Brackets are used for (i) secondary roots (i.e. quasi-roots extracted from present and perfect stems as well as old denominatives); (ii) nonce and/or uncertain formations. The -yá-passives corresponding to the transitive -ya-presents with the predominant active inflection (e.g. *asya-te* ‘be thrown’; see Chapter C.III.4) are marked with “(pass.)”, in order to distinguish them from non-passive (transitive-affective, reflexive, etc.) -ya-presents with middle inflection derived from the same roots (e.g. -ásyā-te ‘throw for oneself’ etc.).

I.1. Roots from which middle -ya-presents are derived

(m1) Consonant roots: *Ca(R)K⁽ⁱ⁾*-, *CRaK⁽ⁱ⁾*-, *CṛK⁽ⁱ⁾*-

<i>aj</i> ‘drive’	(<i>ajyá-te</i> RV)	<i>ukṣ</i> ‘(be)sprinkle’	- <i>ukṣya-te</i> ŚB+
^{1/2} <i>añc</i> ‘bend; bail’	<i>acyá-te</i> RV+	<i>ud</i> ‘moisten, wet’	<i>udya-te</i> RV ^{1x} , JB ^{1x}
^{1/2} <i>añj</i> ‘anoint etc.’	<i>ajyá-te</i> RV+	<i>uṣ</i> ‘scorch, burn’	- <i>uṣya-te</i> PB+
<i>ad</i> ‘eat’	<i>adyá-te</i> YV ^p +	(<i>ūh</i>) ‘shift etc.’	- <i>ūhya-te</i> MS ^p +
<i>aśⁱ</i> ‘eat’	<i>aśyá-te</i> AV+	<i>ṛc</i> ‘praise, sing’	<i>ṛcyá-te</i> RV, SV
<i>as</i> ‘throw’ (pass.)	<i>asya-te</i> AĀ+	<i>ṛj</i> ‘direct, stretch’	<i>ṛjya-te/(ti)</i> RV
<i>āp</i> ‘obtain’	<i>āpyá-te</i> YV ^m +	<i>ṛdh</i> ‘be successful’	<i>ṛdhyá-te</i> RV _x +
(<i>iñg/añg</i>) ‘move’	- <i>iñgya-te</i> (- <i>ánḡ</i>)	<i>kṛt</i> ‘cut’	- <i>kṛtyá-te</i> AV ^{1x} , AB
	ŚB	<i>kṛṣ</i> ‘drag, plough’	<i>kṛṣyá-te</i> MS ^p +
<i>idh</i> ‘kindle’	<i>idhyá-te</i> RV+	(<i>gup</i>) ‘protect’	<i>gupyá-te</i> Br.
¹ <i>iṣ</i> ‘seek, wish’	<i>iṣya-te</i> RV ^{1x} , AVP	<i>gūh</i> ‘hide’	<i>guhýá-te</i> RV+
² <i>iṣ</i> ‘send’ (pass.)	- <i>iṣyate</i> AVP ^{1x}	<i>gra(b)hⁱ</i> ‘seize’	<i>grāhyá-te</i> AV+
(<i>īr</i>) ‘move’	- <i>īrya-te</i> YV ^p +	(<i>cāy</i>) ‘observe etc.’	- <i>cāyya-te</i> TB ^{1x}

<i>cṛt</i> ‘bind’	- <i>cṛtyá</i> ^{-te} AVP ^{1x} , YV ^{m1x}	<i>manth</i> ‘stir etc.’	<i>mathyá</i> ^{-te} RV+
<i>chid</i> ‘break, cut off’	<i>chidyá</i> ^{-te} RV+	<i>muc</i> ‘release, free’	<i>múcyá</i> ^{-te} RV+
<i>jīv</i> ‘live’	- <i>jīvyá</i> ^{-te} ŚB ^{1x}	<i>muṣ</i> ‘steal, rob’	<i>muṣyate</i> “Lost-Br.”
<i>tap</i> ‘heat etc.’	<i>tápyá</i> ^{-te} RV _{LX} +	<i>mṛj</i> ‘wipe, cleanse’	<i>mṛjyá</i> ^{-te} RV+
<i>tuj</i> ‘set in motion’	<i>tujyá</i> ^{-te} RV ₁ ^{2x}	<i>mṛt</i> ‘destroy’	- <i>mṛtya</i> ^{-te} GB ^{1x}
<i>tṛh</i> ‘crush’	<i>tṛhyá</i> ^{-te} AV	<i>mṛd</i> ‘rub, crush’	<i>mṛdyá</i> ^{-te} MSP+
(<i>dad</i>) ‘hold’	- <i>dadyá</i> ^{-te} RV ^{1x}	<i>mṛś</i> ‘touch’	- <i>mṛśyá</i> ^{-te} KSP+
<i>dabh</i> ‘deceive’	<i>dabhya</i> ^{-te} RV ₁ ^{1x}	<i>mṛś</i> ‘forget’	<i>mṛśya</i> ^{-te} RV+
<i>dah</i> ‘burn’	<i>dáhyá</i> ^{-te} RVKh.+	<i>yaj</i> ‘sacrifice’	<i>ijyá</i> ^{-te} YVP+
<i>diś</i> ‘point (out)’	<i>diśyá</i> ^{-te} KB+	<i>yabh</i> ‘copulate’	<i>yabhya</i> ^{-te} RVKh. ^{1x}
<i>dih</i> ‘smear’	<i>dihya</i> ^{-te} TĀ ^{m1x} +	<i>yuj</i> ‘yoke, join’	<i>yujyá</i> ^{-te} RV+
(<i>dīp</i>) ‘shine, blaze’	<i>dīpya</i> ^{-te} AV+	<i>raj</i> ‘color, redden’	<i>rajyá</i> ^{-te} AV ^{1x} , ŚB ^{1x}
<i>duh</i> ‘milk’	<i>duhyá</i> ^{-te} RV+	<i>rabh/labh</i> ‘seize’	- <i>rabhyá</i> ^{-te} (<i>la</i> ^o) YVP+
<i>dṛś</i> ‘see’	<i>dṛśyá</i> ^{-te} RV _X +	<i>rādh</i> ‘succeed’	<i>rādhyá</i> ^{-te} AV+
(<i>dhāv</i>) ‘rub’	- <i>dhāvya</i> ^{-te} KSP ^{2x}	<i>ric</i> ‘empty etc.’	<i>ricyá</i> ^{-te} RV+
<i>dhūp</i> ‘fumigate’	<i>dhūpyá</i> ^{-te} KSP ^{1x}	<i>ribh</i> ‘creak; sing’	<i>ribhya</i> ^{-te} RV ^{1x}
<i>nah</i> ‘tie’	- <i>nahyá</i> ^{-te} AV ^{1x} (+)	<i>rudh</i> ‘obstruct, keep’	<i>rudhyá</i> ^{-te} RV+
<i>nid</i> ‘revile’	<i>nidyá</i> ^{-te} RV ^{1x}	<i>lip</i> ‘stick, stain’	<i>lipyá</i> ^{-te} VS+
<i>nud</i> ‘push’	<i>nudyá</i> ^{-te} TĀ ^{1m} (+)	<i>lup</i> ‘damage, tear’	<i>lupyá</i> ^{-te} AV+
<i>nṛt</i> ‘dance’ (pass.)	<i>nṛtya</i> ^{-te} JB ^{2x}	<i>vac</i> ‘speak, call’	<i>ucyá</i> ^{-te} RV+
<i>pac</i> ‘cook; ripen’	<i>pácyá</i> ^{-te} RV+	<i>vañc</i> ‘move’	<i>vacyá</i> ^{-te} RV–AV (waveringly)
(<i>pat</i>) ‘rule; possess’	<i>pátya</i> ^{-te} RV–YV ^m	<i>vad</i> ‘speak’	<i>udyá</i> ^{-te} RV+
<i>pad</i> ‘fall, move’	<i>pádyá</i> ^{-te} RV+	<i>vap</i> ‘sow, scatter’	<i>upyá</i> ^{-te} RV+
<i>piś</i> ‘adorn, dress’	<i>piśyá</i> ^{-te} AV ^{1x}	<i>vah</i> ‘carry’	<i>uhyá</i> ^{-te} RV+
<i>piṣ</i> ‘crush, grind’	<i>piśyá</i> ^{-te} AVP ^{1x} , ŚB	<i>vās</i> ‘bellow’	<i>vásya</i> ^{-te} AV, Br.+
<i>pīḍ</i> ‘press, squeeze’	<i>pīḍyá</i> ^{-te} TSP (+)	<i>vic</i> ‘sift, separate’	- <i>vicyá</i> ^{-te} AV+
<i>pṛc</i> ‘fill, unite’	<i>pṛcyá</i> ^{-te} RV–Br. ^m	(<i>vich</i>) ‘impel’	- <i>vich[y]á</i> ^{-te} ŚBK ^{1x} (by whacks)
(<i>prach</i>) ‘ask’	<i>pṛchyá</i> ^{-te} RV	¹ <i>vid</i> ‘find’	<i>vidyá</i> ^{-te} RV+
<i>bandh</i> ‘bind’	<i>badhyá</i> ^{-te} RV+	<i>viś</i> ‘be active’	- <i>viśya</i> ^{-te} PB+
<i>budh</i> ‘awake; perceive’	<i>búdhyá</i> ^{-te} RV+	<i>vṛj</i> ‘prepare, do; lay’	<i>vṛjyá</i> ^{-te} RV _{LX} +
(<i>bhakṣ</i>) ‘consume’	<i>bhakṣyá</i> ^{-te} YV ^m +	<i>vṛh/bṛh</i> ‘tear (off)’	- <i>vṛhya</i> ^{-te} (/– <i>b</i> ^o) YVP+
<i>bhaj</i> ‘share, divide’	- <i>bhājya</i> ^{-te} YVP+; - <i>bhājyá</i> ^{-te} AV, MSP	<i>vyadh</i> ‘pierce’ (pass.)	- <i>vidhya</i> ^{-te} JB ^{1x}
<i>bhañj</i> ‘break’	<i>bhajya</i> ^{-te} RVKh.+	<i>vraśc</i> ‘cut off etc.’	<i>vṛśc(y)á</i> ^{-te} RV _X +
<i>bhāś</i> ‘speak’	(<i>bhāśya</i> ^{-te} ŚĀ ^{1x})	<i>śaṃs</i> ‘recite, praise’	<i>śasyá</i> ^{-te} RV+
<i>bhid</i> ‘split’	<i>bhidya</i> ^{-te} RVKh.+	<i>śas</i> ‘cut’	- <i>śasyá</i> ^{-te} ŚB ^{1x}
<i>bhuj</i> ‘consume’	<i>bhujyá</i> ^{-te} ŚB ^{1x} +	<i>śiṣ</i> ‘leave’	<i>śiśyá</i> ^{-te} AV+
<i>bhrj(j)</i> ‘roast’	<i>bhrj(j)ya</i> ^{-te} GB+	(<i>ślāgh</i>) ‘laud, brag’	<i>ślāghya</i> ^{-te} GB ^{1x}
<i>bhra(m)ś</i> ‘fall’	<i>bhra(m)śya</i> ^{-te} TĀ ^m +	<i>sa(ñ)j</i> ‘hang, attach’	<i>sajyá</i> ^{-te} TSP+
<i>mad</i> ‘rejoice’	- <i>madyá</i> ^{-te} RV		

<i>sad</i> ‘sit’	<i>sadyá-^{te}</i> TS ^p	<i>stj</i> ‘set free, emit’	<i>stjyá-^{te}</i> RV+
<i>sic</i> ‘pour (out)’	<i>sicyá-^{te}</i> RV+	(<i>hi(m)s</i>) ‘injure’	<i>-himśya-^{te}</i> RV ^{1x}
² <i>sidh</i> ‘repel’	<i>-sidhya-^{te}</i> JB ^{1x}		

(m2) Sonant roots

(m2.1) Short sonant roots: *CaR-/CṚ-*(m2.1.1) *Ci-*

<i>i</i> ‘go’	<i>-īya-^{te}</i> YV ^p +
³ <i>kṣi</i> (<i>kṣī</i>) ‘perish, disappear’	<i>kṣīyá-^{te}</i> RV+
<i>ci</i> ‘pile, build’	<i>cīyá-^{te}</i> YV ^m +
<i>mi</i> ‘fix, set up’	<i>mīyá-^{te}</i> RV+
<i>śri</i> ‘lay on’	(-) <i>śrīyá-^{te}</i> (AVP, VS ^{1x} (?)), YV ^p +

(m2.1.2) *Cu-*

<i>u</i> (³ <i>vā</i>) ‘weave’	<i>ūya-^{te}</i> YV ^p	<i>sku</i> ‘poke, brand’	<i>skūyá-^{te}</i> MS ^{p1x}
<i>du</i> (<i>dū</i>) ‘burn’	<i>dūya-^{te}</i> RVKh. ^{1x} +	<i>stu</i> ‘praise’	<i>stūyá-^{te}</i> RV+
<i>śru</i> ‘hear’	<i>śrūyá-^{te}</i> RV _X +	<i>hu</i> ‘offer, pour’	<i>hūyá-^{te}</i> RV+
<i>su</i> ‘press out’	<i>sūyá-^{te}</i> RV+		

(m2.1.3) *Cṛ-*

<i>kṛ</i> ‘make’	<i>kriyá-^{te}</i> RV+	<i>mṛ</i> ‘die’	<i>mriyá-^{te}</i> RV _I +
<i>ghṛ</i> ‘drip’	<i>ghriya-^{te}</i> MS–KS ^{m1x}	¹ <i>vṛ</i> (<i>vṛ</i>) [‘choose’]	<i>-varyá-^{te}</i> MS ^p +
<i>car^j</i> ‘perform’	<i>caryá-^{te}</i> YV ^p +		<i>-vriya-^{te}</i> GB+
	<i>-cārya-^{te}</i> Br.	² <i>sṛ</i> ‘stretch’	<i>-sriya-^{te}</i> KS ^{p1x}
<i>dṛ</i> ‘heed’	<i>-driyá-^{te}</i> Br.+	<i>smṛ</i> ‘remember’	<i>smarya-^{te}</i> TĀ ^{1m} +
<i>dhr̥</i> ‘stay; decide’	<i>dhr̥iyá-^{te}</i> RV+	<i>hr̥</i> ‘bring, take’	<i>hr̥iyá-^{te}</i> AV+
<i>bhr̥</i> ‘carry, bring’	<i>bhr̥iyá-^{te}</i> RV+		

(m2.1.4) *Can-, Caṇ-*

<i>paṇ</i> ‘bargain’	<i>paṇyá-^{te}</i> YV ^m
<i>maṇ</i> ‘think; respect’	<i>mānya-^{te}</i> RV+
<i>haṇ</i> ‘kill, smite’	<i>hanyá-^{te}</i> RV+

(m2.1.5) *Cam-*

<i>gam</i> ‘go’	(-) <i>gamyá-^{te}</i> AV ^{1x} , Br.+
<i>nam</i> ‘bend’	<i>namya-^{te}</i> RVKh. ^{1x} , TĀ (TaiU) ^{1x} +
<i>yam</i> ‘hold’	<i>yamyá-^{te}</i> RV, Br.+

(m2.2) Long sonant roots: *CaRⁱ-/C[̄]R[̄]-***(m2.2.1) *C[̄]-***

<i>krī</i> ‘buy’	<i>krīyá^{-te}</i> AVP+	<i>lī</i> ‘dissolve; adhere’	<i>-līyá^{-te}</i> RVKh.+
<i>nī</i> ‘lead’	<i>nīyá^{-te}</i> RV+	<i>vī</i> ‘pursue, strive after’	<i>vīyá^{-te}</i> YV–TB ^m
<i>prī</i> ‘please’	<i>prīyá^{-te}</i> JB+	<i>vlī</i> ‘oppress, collapse’	<i>vlīyá^{-te}</i> YV ^p +
¹ <i>mī</i> ‘damage, perish’	<i>mīyá^{-te}</i> RV+	<i>śī</i> ‘fall’	<i>śīyá^{-te}</i> AV+
<i>rī</i> ‘whirl, swirl’	<i>rīyá^{-te}</i> RV, VS ^{1x}		

(m2.2.2) *Cu-*

<i>dhū</i> ‘shake’	<i>-dhūyá^{-te}</i> AV ^{1x} , YV ^{p1x}
<i>pū</i> ‘purify’	<i>pūyá^{-te}</i> RV+
¹ <i>sū</i> ‘impel, consecrate’	<i>sūyá^{-te}</i> RV _X +
² <i>sū</i> ‘generate’	<i>sūyá^{-te}</i> ŠB+
<i>hū</i> (<i>hvā</i>) ‘call’	<i>hūyá^{-te}</i> RV+

(m2.2.3) *C[̄]-*

<i>k[̄]</i> ‘scatter’	<i>-kīryá^{-te}</i> KS ^p +	<i>m[̄]</i> ‘crush, destroy’	<i>-mūryá^{-te}</i> ŠB ^{2x}
<i>t[̄]</i> (<i>tīr</i>) ‘pass’	<i>-tīryá^{-te}</i> TB ^{m1x}	<i>ś[̄]</i> ‘break, collapse’	<i>śīryá^{-te}</i> RV _I +
<i>d[̄]</i> (<i>d_r</i>) ‘crack’	<i>dīryá^{-te}</i> YV ^p +	<i>st[̄]</i> ‘strew, spread’	<i>stīryá^{-te}</i> KS ^p +
<i>p[̄]</i> (<i>pūr</i>) ‘fill’	<i>pūryá^{-te}</i> RV _I +		

(m2.2.4) *Canⁱ-*

<i>khanⁱ</i> ‘dig’	<i>khāyá^{-te}</i> MS ^p +
<i>janⁱ</i> ‘be born’	<i>jāyá^{-te}</i> RV+
¹ <i>tan⁽ⁱ⁾</i> ‘stretch’	<i>tāyá^{-te}</i> RV _{LX} +
<i>panⁱ</i> ‘admire, glorify’	<i>-panyá^{-te}</i> RV _I ^{1x} (?)

(m2.2.5) *Camⁱ-*

<i>amⁱ</i> ‘swear’	<i>-amyá^{-te}</i> MS ^{p1x}
<i>kramⁱ</i> ‘stride’	<i>kramyá^{-te}</i> TS ^{p1x}
<i>dhamⁱ</i> ‘blow’	<i>dhamyá^{-te}</i> RV _X ^{1x}

(m2.2.6) *C[̄]v-*

<i>mīv</i> ‘move, impel’	<i>-mīvyá^{-te}</i> KS ^{p1x}
--------------------------	---

(m3) Roots in *-ā*: *Cā-*

<i>kā</i> ‘long (for), yearn’	<i>kāyá^{-te}</i> RV ^{1x}	<i>trā</i> ‘rescue, protect’	<i>trāyá^{-te}</i> RV+
<i>khyā</i> (<i>kśā</i>) ‘see etc.’	(-) <i>khyāyá^{-te}</i> Br.+	¹ <i>dā</i> ‘give’	<i>dīyá^{-te}</i> AV+
<i>gā</i> ‘sing’	<i>gīyá^{-te}</i> RV+	² <i>dā</i> ‘bind’	<i>-dīyá^{-te}</i> YV ^{m1}
<i>jyā</i> (<i>jī</i>) ‘deprive of’	<i>jīyá^{-te}</i> RV+	^{3/4} <i>dā</i> (<i>dī</i>) ‘destroy etc.’	<i>dīyá^{-te}</i> AV+
<i>jñā</i> ‘know, recognize’	<i>jñāyá^{-te}</i> RV+	<i>dhā</i> ‘put’	<i>dhīyá^{-te}</i> RV+

<i>dhmā</i> ‘blow’	<i>dhmāya</i> ^{-te} Br.+	<i>styā</i> ‘coagulate’	<i>-styāya</i> ^{-te} AVP–VS
² <i>pā</i> ‘drink’	<i>pīyā</i> ^{-te} AV ^{1x} , YVP	<i>sthā</i> ‘stand’	<i>-sthāya</i> ^{-te} YVP+
<i>pyā</i> ‘fill, swell’	<i>pyāya</i> ^{-te} RV+	<i>sphā</i> ‘swell’	<i>sphāya</i> ^{-te} AVP ^{1x} ;
¹ <i>yā</i> ‘drive, speed’	<i>īya</i> ^{-te} RV+		(<i>sphīya</i> ^{-te} SVB ^{1x})
² <i>yā</i> (<i>ī</i>) ‘implore, request’	<i>īya</i> ^{-te} RV	<i>hā</i> ‘leave’	<i>hīyā</i> ^{-te} RV+
<i>vyā</i> (<i>vī</i>) ‘envelop, cover’	<i>vīyā</i> ^{-te} AV+		

I.2. Roots from which active -ya-presents are derived

(a1) Consonant roots: *Ca(R)K⁽ⁱ⁾*–/*CṚK⁽ⁱ⁾*–

<i>as</i> ‘throw, shoot’	<i>āśya</i> ^{-ti/te} RV+	<i>paś</i> ‘see’	<i>pāśya</i> ^{-ti/te} RV+
² <i>iś</i> ‘send’	<i>īśya</i> ^{-ti/(te)} RV+	<i>pis</i> ‘prosper’	<i>pīśya</i> ^{-ti} ŚB ^{2x}
(<i>īrṣ</i>) ‘be angry’	<i>īrṣya</i> ^{-ti} TS ^{p1x} +	<i>puṣ</i> ‘prosper’	<i>pūśya</i> ^{-ti} RV+
<i>uc</i> ‘be accustomed’	<i>-ucya</i> ^{-ti} RV ^{1x} +	<i>praj(j)</i> ‘end, stop’	(<i>-prj(y)a</i> ^{-ti/(te)} TB ^{2x})
<i>kup</i> (<i>/kubh</i>) ‘be angry’	<i>-kupa</i> ^{-ti} AV ^{1x}	<i>pruṣ</i> ‘sprinkle, spurt’	<i>-pruśya</i> ^{-ti} ŚB ^{1x}
<i>kṛś</i> ‘be lean’	<i>kṛśya</i> ^{-ti} Br.	(<i>mād</i>) ‘be drunk’	<i>mādyā</i> ^{-ti} AVP+
<i>kruḍh</i> ‘be angry’	<i>kṛḍhya</i> ^{-ti} RVKh.+	<i>muh</i> ‘be confused, err’	<i>mūhya</i> ^{-ti} RV _X +
<i>kṣudh</i> ‘be hungry’	<i>kṣūdhya</i> ^{-ti} RV _I +	<i>mṛc</i> ‘be hurt’	<i>-mṛcya</i> ^{-ti} JB ^{1x}
<i>gṛdh</i> ‘be greedy’	<i>gṛdhya</i> ^{-ti} RV ^{1x} , ŚB ^{1x}	<i>med</i> ‘be fat’	<i>mēdyā</i> ^{-ti} RV+
<i>jas</i> ‘disappear’	<i>-jasya</i> ^{-ti} RV _I –Sū. ^m	<i>yas</i> ‘be heated, boil’	<i>yāśya</i> ^{-ti} AV(P) ^{2x}
<i>tuṣ</i> ‘be satisfied’	<i>tuṣya</i> ^{-ti} (AVP), Sū.+	<i>yudh</i> ‘fight’	<i>yūdhya</i> ^{-ti/te} RV+
<i>tṛp</i> ‘be satisfied’	<i>tṛpya</i> ^{-ti} RVKh.+	<i>randh</i> ‘be subject’	<i>rādhya</i> ^{-ti} AV+
<i>tṛṣ</i> ‘be thirsty’	<i>tṛṣya</i> ^{-ti} RV+	<i>riṣ</i> ‘be hurt’	<i>rīśya</i> ^{-ti/(te)} RV+
<i>das</i> ‘waste’	<i>dāśya</i> ^{-ti} RV+	<i>rup</i> ‘suffer a pain’	<i>rūpya</i> ^{-ti} AVP+
<i>duṣ</i> ‘spoil’	<i>duśya</i> ^{-ti} AB+	<i>lubh</i> ‘be disturbed’	<i>lūbhya</i> ^{-ti} AV ^{1x} , Br.
<i>dṛp</i> ‘be bewildered’	<i>dṛpya</i> ^{-ti} RV _I +	<i>vyadh</i> ‘pierce’	<i>vīdhya</i> ^{-ti} RV+
<i>dṛh</i> ‘be firm’	<i>dṛhya</i> ^{-ti/(te)} RV	<i>śuc</i> ‘suffer’	<i>śūcya</i> ^{-ti} Br.
<i>druh</i> ‘be deceitful’	<i>dṛūhya</i> ^{-ti} AVP+	<i>śudh</i> ‘purify’	<i>śudhya</i> ^{-ti} AVP+
<i>dhva(m)s</i> ‘be ruined’	<i>-dhvasya</i> ^{-ti} GB ^{1x}	<i>śuṣ</i> ‘dry’	<i>śūśya</i> ^{-ti} RVKh.+
¹ <i>naś</i> ‘perish’	<i>nāśya</i> ^{-ti/(te)} RV+	<i>śliṣ</i> ‘adhere, stick’	<i>ślīśya</i> ^{-ti} MS ^p +
² <i>naś</i> (² <i>aś</i>) ‘reach’	(<i>-āśyant</i> – MS ^{m1x})	<i>sādh</i> ‘succeed’	<i>sīdhya</i> ^{-ti/(te)} RV _I +
<i>nah</i> (<i>nadh</i>) ‘tie’	<i>nāhya</i> ^{-ti/te} RV _X +	<i>svid</i> ‘sweat’	<i>svidya</i> ^{-ti} ŚB(+)
<i>nṛt</i> ‘dance’	<i>nṛtya</i> ^{-ti} RV _X +	<i>hṛṣ</i> ‘be excited’	<i>hṛṣya</i> ^{-ti} RV _X +

(a2) Sonant roots

(a2.1) *Cṛ*–

¹ <i>dī</i> ‘fly’	<i>dīya</i> ^{-ti/te} RV+
² <i>pī</i> (<i>pīy</i>) ‘blame, revile’	<i>pīya</i> ^{-ti} RV–TB ^m

(a2.2) *Cū*–

² <i>pū</i> (<i>pūy</i>) ‘stink, rot’	<i>pūya</i> ^{-ti} AVP+
--	---------------------------------

(a2.3) Car, Cṛ-

(<i>ār</i>) ‘treat as an ārya’	(-) <i>ārya</i> - ^{ti} RV ^{2x}
<i>jṛ</i> ‘grow old, decay’	<i>jūrya</i> - ^{ti} RV; <i>jṛrya</i> - ^{ti} AV+
<i>tṛ</i> ‘surpass’	(<i>tūrya</i> - ^{ti} RV ^{1x})
<i>har</i> ⁱ (² <i>hr</i>) ‘enjoy’	<i>hārya</i> - ^{ti/(te)} RV–TB ^m

(a2.4) Can⁽ⁱ⁾-

² <i>tan</i> ⁽ⁱ⁾ ‘thunder’	<i>tanya</i> - ^{ti} RV(+)
<i>ran</i> ⁽ⁱ⁾ (<i>raṇ</i> ⁽ⁱ⁾) ‘rejoice’	<i>rānya</i> - ^{ti} RV, AVP ^{1x}

(a2.5) Camⁱ-

<i>kram</i> ⁱ ‘stride’	<i>kramyá</i> - ^{te} TS ^{p1x}
<i>tam</i> ⁱ ‘be exhausted’	<i>tāmya</i> - ^{ti} YV ^{p+}
<i>dam</i> ⁱ ‘control oneself’	<i>dāmya</i> - ^{ti} ŚB
<i>śam</i> ⁱ ‘become appeased’	<i>śāmya</i> - ^{ti/(te)} AVP+;
(<i>śVm</i> ⁱ) ‘prepare [for sacrifice]’	<i>śm</i> ⁱ <i>ya</i> - ^{ti} , <i>śāmya</i> - ^{ti} , <i>śāmya</i> - ^{ti} YV ^m
<i>śram</i> ⁱ ‘become weary; toil’	<i>śrāmya</i> - ^{ti} RV+

(a2.6) Cṛv-

<i>dṛv</i> ‘play’	<i>dṛvya</i> - ^{ti/te} RV _x +
<i>sṛv</i> ‘sew’	<i>sṛvya</i> - ^{ti/(te)} RV+
<i>srṛv</i> ‘be aborted’	<i>srṛvya</i> - ^{ti} AB ^{1x} , <i>srṛvya</i> - ^{ti} MS ^{m1x}

(a3) Roots in -ā: Cā-

<i>kṣā</i> ‘burn’	<i>kṣāya</i> - ^{ti} AVP+	² <i>vā</i> ‘become extinguished’	<i>vāya</i> - ^{ti} RV+
<i>glā</i> ‘be weary’	<i>glāya</i> - ^{ti} AV+	<i>śyā</i> ‘congeal, freeze’	<i>śyāya</i> - ^{ti} YV ^{p+}
<i>dhyā</i> ‘think of’	<i>dhyāya</i> - ^{ti/(te)} RVKh.+	<i>śrā</i> ‘become ready’	<i>śrāya</i> - ^{ti} RV+
<i>mlā</i> ‘wither, relax’	<i>mlāya</i> - ^{ti} AVP ^{1x} , ŚB	<i>śvā</i> (<i>śū</i>) ‘swell’	(- <i>śūya</i> - ^{ti} BĀUM ^{1x})
² <i>rā</i> ‘bark’	<i>rāya</i> - ^{ti} RV+	<i>stā</i> (<i>tā</i>) ‘steal’	<i>stāyāt</i> AV+
¹ <i>vā</i> ‘blow’	(<i>vāya</i> - ^{ti/te} ŚB+)		

I.3. Remarks on phonological types of the root structures in *-ya*-presents

Middle *-ya*-presents and, in particular, *-yá*-passives, are derived from the roots of all possible phonological types. This is understandable, since *-yá*-passives, quite numerous already in the RV, tend to become a productive formation from the very beginning of the Vedic period and reach the absolute productivity by its end. There are no absolute constraints on root types, and we

can only note weak tendencies to avoid some phonological structures. In particular, only three middle *-ya*-presents are derived from the roots in short *-i-*: *ci* ‘pile’, *mi* ‘fix’, and *śri* ‘lay on’,²¹¹⁹ whereof only *mīyá-te* is attested in the RV (1×); *-yá*-passives of some well-attested *i* roots, such as *ji* ‘win’ and *hi* ‘impel’, are lacking in Vedic.

By contrast, in the class of **active** *-ya*-presents some phonological types of root structures are not attested or exceptional. Since the active *-ya*-presents are not as productive as the *-yá*-passives, this may be accidental for some types. Yet the lack of certain phonological types at least should not be neglected and, moreover, may be a clue to the rise of some phonological patterns attested for these formations. The following facts about the root structures attested in the active *-ya*-presents are worthy of mention:

(1) We find very few sonant roots in this class. Only two phonological types in a long sonant (< **RH*) are well-represented among the roots which build active *-ya*-presents: *Camⁱ* and *Cīv*; the presents built on other types (a2.1-4, i.e. *Cī*, *Cū*, *Cī*, *Can⁽ⁱ⁾*) are few in number. Among them, only *jūrya^{-ti}/jūrya^{-ti}* is a solidly attested formation; *tūrya^{-ti}* and *tanya^{-ti}* are RVic (quasi-)hapaxes and *rānya^{-ti}* does not appear after the RV. ²*pī* and ²*pū* very early tend to incorporate *-y-* into the root (*pīy-a-*, etc.; see s.vv.).

(2) Noteworthy is the absence of roots in short sonants, except for two *Can⁽ⁱ⁾* roots, ²*tan⁽ⁱ⁾* (*stan⁽ⁱ⁾*) ‘thunder’ and *ran⁽ⁱ⁾* (*rañ⁽ⁱ⁾*) ‘rejoice’. Evidence for the phonological type of both roots is controversial: the *-iṣ*-aorist (*arāṇiṣuḥ*, *rāṇiṣṭana*), nom.ag. *rāṇitr-*, caus. *raṇaya^{-ti}* plead for the *seṭ*-type, while *rāṇyati* (instead of the supposed **rāyati*; cf. *jāyate* built on the *seṭ* root *jan*) rather points to the *aniṭ*-analysis (thus INSLER 1972a: 553, fn.6); and see evidence for the *seṭ*-type of ²*tan⁽ⁱ⁾* (*stan⁽ⁱ⁾*) in MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 619, with bibl.

(3) In contrast to the middle *-ya*-presents built on the *ā* roots, the active *-ya*-presents derived from the roots of the same structure do not show ablaut (type a3), the only exception being the nonce formation *-śūya^{-ti}* (BÄUM^{1x}), see s.v. Note, furthermore, that all roots of this class, except for *kṣā*, display the phonological structure *CRā*. From the diachronic point of view, the class of *CRāya^{-ti(te)}* presents²¹²⁰ appears rather heterogeneous, and the full grade of the

²¹¹⁹ The present *kṣīyá-te* is derived from the root ³*kṣi* ‘perish, disappear’ that tends to shift to the *seṭ*-class in the post-RVic language; see Chapter B.III, s.v. ³*kṣi* (*kṣī*).

²¹²⁰ On this class and the lack of ablaut in the corresponding roots in general, see, in particular, BRUGMAN[N] 1878b: 1ff. (where *-ā-* is regarded as a suffix/“wurzel-erweiterung”); SAUSSURE 1879: 255ff. [= Rec., 238ff.]; HÜBSCHMANN 1885: 30-50 et

root may have different sources:

(i) In some of these presents, the full grade has replaced the original zero in order to avoid morphologically opaque formations, such as **ūyati* ($\sqrt{v}\bar{a}$).

(ii) A few $^{\circ}\bar{a}$ -*ya*- stems may have been transferred to the *-ya*-class from class I presents (of the type *gāy-a^{-ti/te}*). Here must belong, above all, *rāya^{-ti}* ($\sqrt{^2r}\bar{a}$) and, perhaps, some other stems; see s.vv.

(iii) Finally, some of these presents could have introduced full grade in analogy with other formations built on the roots of the same phonological structure (*CRā*). This morphophonological pattern could also be expanded to most middle *-ya*-presents built on the roots of this structure (see class m3), cf. *jñā: jñāyá^{-te}* (not **jāyá^{-te}*), *trā: trāyá^{-te}* (not **tṛyá^{-te}* (?)). The only subclass of the *CRā* roots which (partly) resisted this generalization of the full grade is the *CYā* type (where *Y* stands for *y*, *v*). Thus, we have *jīyá^{-te}* ($\sqrt{j}\bar{y}\bar{a}$), *tīyá^{-te}* ($\sqrt{t}\bar{y}\bar{a}$), *vīyá^{-te}* ($\sqrt{v}\bar{y}\bar{a}$); the nonce hapax *-śūyá^{-ti}* ($\sqrt{ś}\bar{v}\bar{a}$ (*śū*)) was obviously created on the same morphological model; full grade is, however, generalized in *khyāyá^{-te}* (not **khīyá^{-te}*) and *pyāyá^{-te}* (not **pīyá^{-te}*).

The aforementioned morphophonological differences between middle (including passives) and active *-ya*-presents may be indirect evidence for the different origin of the suffixes *-ya^{-te}* and *’-ya^{-ti}*; for further details, see Chapter VII.2.4.

II. Semantics of -ya-presents

One of the aims of the present study is to corroborate the systematic correlation between the accent placement and the passive/non-passive distinction in the middle -ya-presents: passives bear the accent on the suffix, whilst non-passives have the accent on the root. This correlation, known already from the indigenous Indian grammarians, was much disputed and repeatedly questioned in the literature. It is argued in this monograph that all exceptions to this rule typically quoted in grammars and handbooks can be explained by a small number of secondary accent shifts and/or semantic developments. In what follows, I will present a comprehensive semantic classification of the Vedic middle -ya-presents.²¹²¹

II.1. Passive -yá-presents

II.1.1. A synopsis

(P1) Passives derived from primary roots²¹²²

(P1.1) Passives derived from primary transitives²¹²³

<i>aj</i> ‘drive’	(<i>ajyá</i> - ^{te} RV)	<i>idh</i> ‘kindle’	<i>idhyá</i> - ^{te} RV+
² <i>añc</i> ‘bail’	<i>acyá</i> - ^{te} AV+	¹ <i>iṣ</i> ‘seek, wish’	<i>iṣya</i> - ^{te} RV ^{1x} , AVP
^{1/2} <i>añj</i> ‘anoint etc.’	<i>ajyá</i> - ^{te} RV+	² <i>iṣ</i> ‘send’ (pass.)	<i>iṣyate</i> AVP ^{1x}
<i>ad</i> ‘eat’	<i>adyá</i> - ^{te} YV ^p +	<i>u</i> (³ <i>vā</i>) ‘weave’	<i>ūya</i> - ^{te} YV ^p
<i>am</i> ⁱ ‘swear’	<i>-amya</i> - ^{te} MS ^{p1x}	<i>ukṣ</i> ‘(be)sprinkle’	<i>-ukṣya</i> - ^{te} ŚB+
<i>as</i> ⁱ ‘eat’	<i>aśyá</i> - ^{te} AV+	<i>ud</i> ‘moisten, wet’	<i>-udya</i> - ^{te} RV ^{1x}
<i>as</i> ‘throw’ (pass.)	<i>asya</i> - ^{te} AĀ+	<i>uṣ</i> ‘scorch, burn’	<i>-uṣya</i> - ^{te} PB+
<i>āp</i> ‘obtain’	<i>āpyá</i> - ^{te} YV ^m +	(<i>ūh</i>) ‘shift etc.’	<i>-ūhyá</i> - ^{te} MS ^p +

²¹²¹ As a rule, post-Vedic formations (Sū., post-Vedic Up.+) are not listed. Exception is made for some rare types, such as (i) passives derived from intransitive verbs which become transitives in compounds and (ii) passives derived from desideratives. The -ya-formations the position of which within the classification is uncertain are bracketed.

²¹²² Including secondary fossilized roots extracted from present and perfect stems as well as old denominatives.

²¹²³ Including intransitive/transitive (I/T) verbs (JAMISON 1983).

<i>rc</i> ‘praise, sing’	<i>rcyá</i> ^{-te} RV, SV	<i>paṇ</i> ‘bargain’	<i>paṇyá</i> ^{-te} YV ^m
<i>kr</i> ‘make’	<i>kriyá</i> ^{-te} RV+	<i>pan</i> ⁱ ‘admire, glorify’	<i>panyá</i> ^{-te} RV _I ^{1x(?)}
<i>kṛt</i> ‘cut’	<i>-kṛtyá</i> ^{-te} AV ^{1x} , AB	² <i>pā</i> ‘drink’	<i>pīyá</i> ^{-te} AV ^{1x} , YV ^p
<i>kṛṣ</i> ‘drag, plough’	<i>kṛṣyá</i> ^{-te} MS ^{p+}	<i>piś</i> ‘adorn, dress’	<i>piśyá</i> ^{-te} AV ^{1x}
<i>kṛ</i> ‘scatter’	<i>-kṛtyá</i> ^{-te} KS ^{p+}	<i>piś</i> ‘crush, grind’	<i>piśyá</i> ^{-te} AVP ^{1x} , ŚB
<i>krī</i> ‘buy’	<i>krīyá</i> ^{-te} AVP+	<i>pīḍ</i> ‘press, squeeze’	<i>pīḍyá</i> ^{-te} TS ^{p(+)}
<i>khan</i> ⁱ ‘dig’	<i>khāyá</i> ^{-te} MS ^{p+}	¹ <i>pū</i> ‘purify’	<i>pūyá</i> ^{-te} RV+
<i>khyā</i> ‘see, consider’	<i>(-khyāyá</i> ^{-te} Br.+	<i>(prach)</i> ‘ask’	<i>prchyá</i> ^{-te} RV
<i>gā</i> ‘sing’	<i>gīyá</i> ^{-te} RV+	<i>prī</i> ‘please’	<i>prīyá</i> ^{-te} JB+
<i>(gup)</i> ‘protect’	<i>gupyá</i> ^{-te} Br.	<i>bandh</i> ‘bind’	<i>badhyá</i> ^{-te} RV+
<i>gūh</i> ‘hide’	<i>guhýá</i> ^{-te} RV+	<i>(bhakṣ)</i> ‘consume’	<i>bhakṣyá</i> ^{-te} YV ^{m+}
<i>gra(b)h</i> ⁱ ‘seize’	<i>grhyá</i> ^{-te} AV+	<i>bhaj</i> ‘share, divide’	<i>bhājyá</i> ^{-te} YV ^{p+} ;
<i>car</i> ⁱ ‘perform’	<i>caryá</i> ^{-te} YV ^{p+}		<i>-bhājyá</i> ^{-te} AV, MS ^p
<i>(cāy)</i> ‘observe’	<i>-cāyá</i> ^{-te} TB ^{1x}	<i>bhuj</i> ‘consume’	<i>bhujyá</i> ^{-te} ŚB ^{1x+}
<i>ci</i> ‘pile, build’	<i>cīyá</i> ^{-te} YV ^{m+}	<i>bhṛ</i> ‘carry, bring’	<i>bhriyá</i> ^{-te} RV+
<i>cṛt</i> ‘bind’	<i>-cṛtyá</i> ^{-te} AVP–YV	<i>bhṛj(j)</i> ‘roast’	<i>bhṛj(j)yá</i> ^{-te} GB+
<i>jñā</i> ‘know’	<i>jñāyá</i> ^{-te} RV+	<i>mad</i> ‘rejoice’	<i>-madyá</i> ^{-te} RV
¹ <i>tan</i> ⁽ⁱ⁾ ‘stretch’	<i>tāyá</i> ^{-te} RV _{LX} ⁺	<i>manth</i> ‘stir’ etc.	<i>mathyá</i> ^{-te} RV+
<i>tuj</i> ‘set in motion’	<i>tujyá</i> ^{-te} RV _I ^{2x}	<i>mi</i> ‘fix, set up’	<i>mīyá</i> ^{-te} RV+
<i>tṛh</i> ‘crush’	<i>tṛhyá</i> ^{-te} AV	<i>mīv</i> ‘move, impel’	<i>-mīvyá</i> ^{-te} KS ^{p1x}
<i>tṛ</i> (<i>tīr</i>) ‘pass’	<i>-tīryá</i> ^{-te} TB ^{m1x}	<i>muṣ</i> ‘steal, rob’	<i>muṣyate</i> “Lost-Br.”
<i>(dad)</i> ‘hold’	<i>-dadyá</i> ^{-te} RV ^{1x}	<i>mṛj</i> ‘wipe, cleanse’	<i>mṛjyá</i> ^{-te} RV+
<i>dabh</i> ‘deceive’	<i>dabhya</i> ^{-te} RV _I ^{1x}	<i>mṛt</i> ‘destroy’	<i>-mṛtyá</i> ^{-te} GB ^{1x}
¹ <i>dā</i> ‘give’	<i>dīyá</i> ^{-te} AV+	<i>mṛd</i> ‘rub, crush’	<i>mṛdyá</i> ^{-te} MS ^{p+}
² <i>dā</i> ‘bind’	<i>-dīyá</i> ^{-te} YV ^{m1x}	<i>mṛś</i> ‘touch’	<i>-mṛśyá</i> ^{-te} KS ^{p+}
^{3/4} <i>dā</i> (<i>dī</i>) ‘cut, distribute’	<i>dīyá</i> ^{-te} AV+	<i>mṛ</i> ‘crush, destroy’	<i>-mūryá</i> ^{-te} ŚB ^{2x}
<i>diś</i> ‘point, prescribe’	<i>diśyá</i> ^{-te} KB+	<i>yaj</i> ‘worship’	<i>ijyá</i> ^{-te} YV ^{p+}
<i>dih</i> ‘smear’	<i>dihya</i> ^{-te} TĀ ^{m1x+}	<i>yabh</i> ‘copulate’	<i>yabhya</i> ^{-te} RVKh. ^{1x}
<i>du</i> (<i>dū</i>) ‘burn’	<i>dūyá</i> ^{-te} RVKh. ^{1x+}	<i>yam</i> ‘hold’ etc.	<i>yamyá</i> ^{-te} RV, Br.+
<i>duh</i> ‘milk’	<i>duhyá</i> ^{-te} RV+	² <i>yā</i> (<i>ī</i>) ‘implore, request’	<i>īyá</i> ^{-te} RV
<i>dṛś</i> ‘see’	<i>dṛśyá</i> ^{-te} RV _X ⁺	<i>yuj</i> ‘yoke, join’	<i>yujyá</i> ^{-te} RV+
<i>dham</i> ⁱ / <i>dhmā</i> ‘blow’	<i>dhamya</i> ^{-te} RV _X ^{1x} ;	<i>rabh/labh</i> ‘seize’	<i>-rabhyá</i> ^{-te} / <i>la</i> ^o YV ^{p+}
	<i>dhmāyá</i> ^{-te} Br.+	<i>ribh</i> ‘creak; sing’	<i>ribhya</i> ^{-te} RV ^{1x}
<i>dhā</i> ‘put’	<i>dhīyá</i> ^{-te} RV+	<i>rudh</i> ‘obstruct’	<i>rudhyá</i> ^{-te} RV+
<i>(dhāv)</i> ‘rub’	<i>-dhāvya</i> ^{-te} KS ^{p2x}	<i>vac</i> ‘speak, call’	<i>ucyá</i> ^{-te} RV+
<i>dhū</i> ‘shake’	<i>-dhūyá</i> ^{-te} AV–YV ^p	<i>vañc</i> ‘move (waveringly)’	<i>vacyá</i> ^{-te}
<i>dhūp</i> ‘fumigate’	<i>dhūpyá</i> ^{-te} KS ^{p1x}		RV–AV
<i>nam</i> ‘bend’	<i>namya</i> ^{-te} RVKh. ^{1x+}	<i>vad</i> ‘speak’	<i>udyá</i> ^{-te} RV+
<i>nah</i> ‘tie’	<i>-nahyá</i> ^{-te} AV ^{1x(+)}	<i>vap</i> ‘sow, scatter’	<i>upyá</i> ^{-te} RV _I ⁺
<i>nīd</i> ‘revile’	<i>nīdyá</i> ^{-te} RV ^{1x}	<i>vah</i> ‘carry’	<i>uhyá</i> ^{-te} RV+
<i>nī</i> ‘lead’	<i>nīyá</i> ^{-te} RV+	<i>vic</i> ‘sift, separate’	<i>-vīcyá</i> ^{-te} AV+
<i>nud</i> ‘push’	<i>nudyá</i> ^{-te} TĀ ^{1m(+)}		

(<i>vich</i>) ‘impel (by whacks)’ - <i>vich</i> [y]á- ^{te} ŚBK ^{1x}	<i>sa(ñ)j</i> ‘hang, attach’ <i>sañj</i> á- ^{te} TS ^p +
¹ <i>vid</i> ‘find’ <i>vidy</i> á- ^{te} RV+	<i>sic</i> ‘pour (out)’ <i>sicy</i> á- ^{te} RV+
<i>vī</i> ‘pursue’ etc. <i>vīy</i> á- ^{te} YV–TB ^m	² <i>sidh</i> ‘repel’ - <i>sidhya</i> - ^{te} JB ^{1x}
<i>vṛj</i> ‘prepare, do; lay’ <i>vṛjy</i> á- ^{te} RV _{LX} +	<i>su</i> ‘press out’ <i>sūy</i> á- ^{te} RV+
<i>vṛh</i> /(<i>brh</i>) ‘tear(off)’ - <i>vṛhya</i> - ^{te} (/–b°) YV ^p +	¹ <i>sū</i> ‘impel, consecrate’ <i>sūy</i> á- ^{te} RV _X +
<i>vyadh</i> ‘pierce’ (pass.) - <i>vidhya</i> - ^{te} JB ^{1x}	² <i>sū</i> ‘generate’ <i>sūy</i> á- ^{te} ŚB+
<i>vyā</i> (<i>vī</i>) ‘envelop’ <i>vīy</i> á- ^{te} AV+	<i>srj</i> ‘set free, emit’ <i>srjy</i> á- ^{te} RV+
<i>vraśc</i> ‘cut off etc.’ <i>vṛśc</i> (y)á- ^{te} RV _X +	<i>sku</i> ‘poke, brand’ <i>skūy</i> á- ^{te} MS ^{p1x}
<i>vṛ</i> ‘oppress’ <i>vṛy</i> á- ^{te} YV ^p +	<i>stu</i> ‘praise’ <i>stūy</i> á- ^{te} RV+
<i>śaṃs</i> ‘recite, praise’ <i>śasy</i> á- ^{te} RV+	<i>stṛ</i> ‘strew, spread’ <i>stūy</i> á- ^{te} KS ^p +
<i>śas</i> ‘cut’ - <i>śasy</i> á- ^{te} ŚB ^{1x}	<i>smṛ</i> ‘remember’ <i>smarya</i> - ^{te} TĀ ^m +
<i>śri</i> ‘lay on’ <i>śṛy</i> á- ^{te} YV ^p +	<i>han</i> ‘kill, smite’ <i>hany</i> á- ^{te} RV+
<i>śru</i> ‘hear’ <i>śrūy</i> á- ^{te} RV _X +	(<i>hi</i> (<i>m</i>)) <i>s</i> ‘injure’ - <i>hiṃsya</i> - ^{te} RV ^{1x}
(<i>ślāgh</i>) ‘laud, brag’ <i>ślāghya</i> - ^{te} GB ^{1x}	<i>hu</i> ‘offer, pour’ <i>hūy</i> á- ^{te} RV+
	<i>hū</i> (<i>hvā</i>) ‘call’ <i>hūy</i> á- ^{te} RV+
	<i>hṛ</i> ‘bring, take’ <i>hrīy</i> á- ^{te} AV+

(P1.2) Passives derived from secondary transitives**(P1.2.1) Passives derived from intransitives which become transitives in compounds**

<i>i</i> ‘go’ - <i>īy</i> á- ^{te} YV ^p + (+ <i>úpa</i>), ŚrSū. + (+ <i>prati</i>)
<i>gam</i> ‘go’ - <i>gamy</i> á- ^{te} AV ^{1x} , Br. + (+ <i>ádhi</i> , <i>sam-adhi</i> , <i>ánu</i> , <i>abhi</i>)
<i>jīv</i> ‘live’ - <i>jīvy</i> á- ^{te} ŚB ^{1x} (+ <i>úpa</i>)
<i>dhṛṣ</i> ‘dare’ - <i>dhṛṣya</i> - ^{te} ĀśŚS ^{1x} (+ <i>pra</i>)
<i>bhū</i> ‘become’ - <i>bhūy</i> á- ^{te} MaitrU (+ <i>abhi</i>)
<i>viṣ</i> ‘be active’ - <i>viṣya</i> - ^{te} PB + (+ <i>pari</i>)
<i>vṛṣ</i> ‘rain’ - <i>vṛṣya</i> - ^{te} ŚrSū. (+ <i>abhi</i>)
<i>sthā</i> ‘stand’ - <i>sthīy</i> á- ^{te} YV ^p + (+ <i>ádhi</i> , <i>úpa</i>)

(P1.2.2) Passives derived from intransitives with content accusatives

<i>kram</i> ⁱ ‘stride’ <i>kramy</i> á- ^{te} TS ^{p1x}
<i>nṛt</i> ‘dance’ <i>nṛty</i> á- ^{te} JB ^{2x}

(P2) Passives derived from quasi-denominatives (see Appendix II)

<i>vāṣaṭ-kṛ</i> - (≡ <i>vaṣaṭ-kār</i> á-) ‘pronounce vaṣaṭ’ <i>vāṣaṭ-kriy</i> á- ^{te} Br.
<i>hiṃ-kṛ</i> - (≡ <i>hiṃ-kār</i> á-) ‘pronounce hiṃ-sound’ <i>hiṃ-kriy</i> á- ^{te} Br. (<i>hiṃ-kriyamāñá</i> - ŚB (BĀU) ^{1x})
<i>úd-gā</i> - (≡ <i>udgāth</i> á-) ‘sing [udgātha]’ <i>udgāyamāñá</i> - ŚB (BĀU) ^{1x}
<i>ā</i> - ¹ <i>dā</i> - (≡ <i>ādi</i> -) ‘perform [ādi]’ <i>ā-dīy</i> á- ^{te} JB ^{1x}
<i>ánu-vac</i> - (≡ <i>anuvāk</i> yā-) ‘recite [anuvākya]’ <i>anūcy</i> á- ^{te} YV ^p +
<i>prá-vṛ</i> (≡ <i>pravara</i> á-) ‘perform [pravara]’ <i>pra-vary</i> á- ^{te} MS ^p +; - <i>vriy</i> á- ^{te} GB+

<i>prá-vṛj</i> (⇐ <i>pravargyā</i> -) ‘perform [pravargya]’	<i>pra-vṛjyá</i> ^{-te} YV ^p +
<i>úpa-sad</i> (⇐ <i>upasad</i> -) ‘perform [upasad]’	<i>upa-sadyá</i> ^{-te} TS ^{p2x}
<i>stu</i> (⇐ <i>stotrā</i> -) ‘sing [stotra]’	<i>stūyá</i> ^{-te} MS ^p +
<i>prá-stu</i> (⇐ <i>prastāva</i> -) ‘sing [prastāva]’	<i>pra-stūyá</i> ^{-te} PB, JB+
<i>prāti-hṛ</i> (⇐ <i>pratihāra</i> -) ‘chant [pratihāra]’	<i>prati-hriyá</i> ^{-te} JB+

(P3) Passives derived from secondary stems**(P3.1) Passives derived from -āya-causatives**

<i>kalpāya</i> - (√ <i>kṛp</i> ‘be arranged, fit’)	<i>-kalpya</i> ^{-te} ŚB+ (<i>-kṛpya</i> ^{-te} ŚBK)
<i>krāmāya</i> - (√ <i>kram</i> ‘stride’)	<i>-kramya</i> ^{-te} GB+
<i>krūdāya</i> - (√ <i>krūd</i> ‘burn (of milk)’)	<i>krūḍya</i> ^{-te} KS ^p
<i>khyāpāya</i> - (√ <i>khyā</i> (<i>kṣā</i>) ‘see, consider’)	<i>-kṣāpyā</i> ^{-te} MS ^{p1x}
<i>ghārāya</i> - (√ <i>ghṛ</i> ‘drip’)	<i>-ghāryā</i> ^{-te} YV ^p +
<i>jñāpāya</i> - (√ <i>jñā</i> ‘know’)	<i>-jñāpyā</i> ^{-te} ŚB, TB+
<i>jyotāya</i> - (√ <i>jyut</i> ‘shine’)	<i>-jyotyā</i> ^{-te} ŚB
<i>jvālāya</i> - (√ <i>jval</i> ‘burn, flame’)	<i>-jvālyā</i> ^{-te} GB
<i>dūṣāya</i> - (√ <i>duṣ</i> ‘spoil’)	<i>dūṣya</i> ^{-te} Kāth-Samk. ^{1x}
<i>dohāya</i> - (√ <i>duh</i> ‘milk’)	<i>-dohyā</i> ^{-te} ŚB+
<i>dhārāya</i> - (√ <i>dhṛ</i> ‘hold’)	<i>-dhāryā</i> ^{-te} MS ^p +
<i>pādāya</i> - (√ <i>pad</i> ‘fall, move’)	<i>-pādya</i> ^{-te} Br.+
<i>pyāyāya</i> - (√ <i>pyā</i> ‘swell’)	<i>-pyāyāyā</i> ^{-te} VS+
<i>mārāya</i> - (√ <i>mṛ</i> ‘die’)	<i>-māryā</i> ^{-te} MS ^p (+)
<i>yātāya</i> - (√ <i>yāt</i> ‘be/put in place’)	<i>-yātyā</i> ^{-te} KB ^{1x} +
<i>rocāya</i> - (√ <i>ruc</i> ‘shine’)	<i>-rocya</i> ^{-te} KāthĀ(+)
<i>rohāya</i> -/ropaya- (√ <i>ruh</i> /rup ‘rise’)	<i>-ropyā</i> ^{-te} KāthĀ+; (<i>-rohya</i> ^{-te} VaitS)
<i>vartāya</i> - (√ <i>vṛt</i> ‘turn’)	<i>-vartyā</i> ^{-te} MS ^p , Br. ^m +
<i>vādāya</i> - (√ <i>vad</i> ‘speak’)	<i>-vādyā</i> ^{-te} Br.+
<i>vāsāya</i> - (√ ³ <i>vas</i> ‘dwell, stay’)	<i>-vāsyā</i> ^{-te} MS ^p +
<i>veṣṭāya</i> - (√ <i>viṣṭ</i> ‘wrap, cover’)	<i>-veṣṭyā</i> ^{-te} MS ^p +
<i>śamāya</i> - ‘slaughter’ (√ <i>śam</i>)	<i>-śāmyā</i> ^{-te} GB(+)
<i>śrapāya</i> - (√ <i>śrā</i> ‘cook’)	<i>-śrapyā</i> ^{-te} ŚB+
<i>sādāya</i> - (√ <i>sad</i> ‘sit’)	<i>-sādyā</i> ^{-te} YV ^m +
<i>-sārāya</i> - (√ ² <i>sṛ</i> ‘stretch’)	<i>-sāryā</i> ^{-te} JB ^{1x} +
<i>sthāpāya</i> - (√ <i>sthā</i> ‘stand’)	<i>-sthāpyā</i> ^{-te} Br.+

(P3.2) Passives derived from non-causative -āya-presents

<i>kālaya</i> - (√ <i>kal</i> ‘drive’)	<i>-kālyā</i> ^{-te} SVB+
<i>kṣālāya</i> - (√ <i>kṣal</i> ‘wash’)	<i>-kṣālyā</i> ^{-te} Sū.
<i>cintāya</i> - ‘think, consider’ (⇐ <i>cintā</i> -)	<i>-cintya</i> ^{-te} KāthU+
<i>chādāya</i> - (√ <i>chad</i> ‘cover, veil’)	<i>-chādyā</i> ^{-te} JB+
<i>tārāya</i> - (√ <i>tṛ</i> ‘pass’)	<i>-tāryā</i> ^{-te} JB ^{1x}
<i>dhūpāya</i> - (√ <i>dhūp</i> ‘smoke’)	<i>-dhūpyā</i> ^{-te} KS-KpS ^{p1x}

<i>mantráya-</i> ‘address’ (← <i>mántra-</i>)	<i>-mantryá-te</i> Br.
<i>-lakṣaya-</i> (√ <i>lakṣ</i> ‘mark’)	<i>-lakṣya-te</i> ŚrSū.+

(P3.3) Passives derived from **desideratives**

<i>dítsa-</i> (√ ¹ <i>dā</i> ‘give’)	<i>-ditsya-te</i> JB ^{1x}
<i>mīmāṃsa-</i> ‘doubt’ (√ <i>man</i> ‘think’)	(+) <i>mīmāṃsyámāna-</i> AV ^{1x} (?)
* <i>yīyapsa-</i> (√ <i>yabh</i> ‘future’)	<i>yīyapsya-te</i> ŚrSū.
<i>rúrutsa-</i> (√ <i>rudh</i> ‘obstruct’)	<i>-rurutsyá-te</i> KS ^p
<i>līpsa-</i> (√ <i>rabh/labh</i> ‘take’)	<i>-lipsyá-te</i> ŚB

II.1.2. Semantics of -yá-passives

II.1.2.1. Passives derived from primary verbs

The great majority of the middle -ya-presents with suffix accentuation are passives in all or most of their occurrences (for the type *mriyáte* and middle -ya-presents with fluctuating accentuation, for which the suffix accentuation is secondary, see below, Chapter C.II.2.3). A number of middle -yá-presents which at least in some usages behave as non-passives, in spite of the non-secondary accent on the suffix, belong to the following two semantic groups:

(1) -yá-passives built to **verbs of perception and knowledge**: *khyāyá-te* ‘be seen, be considered’, *jñāyá-te* ‘be known, be recognized’, *drśyá-te* ‘be seen, be visible; appear’, *vidyá-te* ‘be found; exist’ (√¹*vid*), *śrūyá-te* ‘be heard, be known, be famous’, *smārya-te* ‘be remembered, known from memory’; cf. also *ucyá-te* (√*vac*) ‘Y is called Z’, i.e. ‘Y is known as/under the name “Z”’. The semantic development from agentive to agentless passives, which, in turn, can easily be transformed to non-passives, as in the case of ‘Y is seen (known etc.) by smb.’ → ‘Y is seen (known etc.) [by smb.]’ → ‘Y is seen (known etc.) [by ø]’ → ‘Y is visible (famous, etc.)’, is typical for such verbs. All these verbs incorporate the semantic primitive “know” (‘see’ ≈ ‘know by seeing’, ‘hear’ ≈ ‘know by hearing’, etc.),²¹²⁴ which accounts for the agentless usages of their passives.²¹²⁵

(2) -yá-passives built to some **verbs of caused motion**, such as *-kīryá-te*

²¹²⁴ Note, incidentally, the common origin of the synchronically distinct roots ¹*vid* and ²*vid* ‘know’.

²¹²⁵ On the epistemic roots of this linguistic phenomenon (‘objectivization of knowledge’, i.e. knowledge without a knowing subject), see, for instance, LYONS 1979: 129; ZIFF 1984: 12ff. For a discussion of this passive to anticausative development in a general typological perspective, see KULIKOV 2011b.

‘be scattered; fall (down)’ ($\sqrt{k\bar{r}}$), *rudhyá-^{te/(ti)}* ‘be kept; move, adhere’ (in some compounds) (\sqrt{rudh}), *sicyá-^{te}* ‘be poured; pour (out)’ (\sqrt{sic}), *sr̥jyá-^{te}* ‘be set free, be emitted; run’ and, especially, *vacyá-^{te}* ‘move (waveringly)’ ($\sqrt{vañc}$). Again, the origin of such non-passive usages must lie in their semantics, but the scenario of the passive to anticausative transition is different from the one attested for verbs of perception. Verbs belonging to the class of caused motion, such as *throw*, *pour* or *send*, can easily be conceptualized as causatives: *throw* = ‘make fall, make fly’, *send* = ‘make go, make move’, etc. Since for many such verbs, present passives with the suffix *-yá-* are the only regular intransitive derivative within the IVS, they could occasionally take over the anticausative function. This secondary function could further be supported by the influence of the middle non-passive *-ya*-presents of motion (see class R2 below). As I will argue below (Chapter C.II.2.2), in the case of passives derived from morphological causatives of some verbs of motion, this semantic reinterpretation could even result in the accent shift from the suffix to the root.

To sum up, all *-ya*-presents with the genuine suffix accentuation (i.e. not including the type *mriyáte* and *-yá*-presents) undoubtedly belong to or at least originate in the passive type, which thus can be taken as the primary value of the present suffix *-yá-* within the Vedic verbal system. Thus, there are no good reasons to deny the existence of passive as a verbal category within the present system, contra, *inter alios*, GONDA (1951: 73 et passim) and LEHMANN (1974: 151f.).²¹²⁶

II.1.2.2. Passives derived from causatives

Passives derived from *-áya*-causatives represent a relatively late formation. They are unattested in early Vedic (RV, AV).²¹²⁷ The earliest attestations of causative passives appear in the young YVic mantras (*-pyāyá-^{te}* VS+, *-vartyá-^{te}* MS^p, ŚB-KB^m+, *sādyá-^{te}* YV^m+.). Other formations of this type are attested from Vedic prose onwards and become more common in the Brāhmaṇas, particularly, in the ŚB, JB, GB. However, until the very end of the Vedic period only causatives derived from intransitives can passivize.²¹²⁸ Passives of causatives derived from transitives (including

²¹²⁶ For criticism of such views, see JAMISON 1979b: 196ff., esp. fn. 1.

²¹²⁷ On the only seeming exception, part. *vibhājyámāna-* (AV 12.5.28), see Chapter B.I, s.v.

²¹²⁸ For the only possible exception, *saṃ-kṣāpyámāna-* MS, traditionally translated as ‘being made look at’, see Chapter B.I, s.v.

intransitive/transitive [I/T] verbs), such as *ni-dhāpya-te* ‘be caused to be put down’, *-pāyya-te* ‘be caused to drink’, *yājya-te* ‘be caused to perform a sacrifice’, *vācyā-te* ‘be made (be caused to) speak, recite’, first appear in early post-Vedic texts, i.e. from the Śrauta-Sūtras onwards; see s.vv.²¹²⁹

The increasing productivity of the -yá-passives in later texts goes hand in hand with the increasing productivity of the -áya-causatives, which are derived in early Vedic only from intransitives and intransitive/transitives (I/T), while causatives of transitives first appear in Vedic prose and become common in the Brāhmaṇas (see THIEME 1929; KURYŁOWICZ 1931-32; JAMISON 186f.; HOCK 1981: 15ff.). The parallelism of these processes (noticed already by WHITNEY (1885: xxxiv-xxxv); cf. also LEHMANN 1974: 183f.) is presented on the diagram below:

	early Vedic (RV, AV)	Vedic prose	post-Vedic (Sūtras)
causatives of intransitives	+	+	+
passives of non-causative transitives	+	+	+
causatives of transitives	—	+	+
passives of causatives of intransitives	—	+	+
passives of causatives of transitives	—	—	+

Table C.1. Parallelism between increasing productivity of -yá-pass. and -áya-caus.

Since the post-Vedic formations are beyond the scope of this study, I will only briefly touch upon one of the most interesting syntactic issues related to passives of causatives of transitive verbs. As is well-known, causativization increases the valency of the base verb by introducing a new subject (causer), and the initial subject (causee) surfaces either in the accusative or in the instrumental in the causative construction (see e.g. SPEIJER 1886 [SktS]: 36f.; HOCK 1981; 1991). In the former case, the resulting verb (= causative derived

²¹²⁹ Passives of caus. *vādyā-^{ti}*, derived from transitive *vad* ‘speak’ (*vādyā-te* Br.+), are actually based on intransitive usages: *vadati* ‘sounds’ (of a musical instrument) (see KURYŁOWICZ 1931-32: 99 and Chapter B.I, s.v.).

from a transitive) takes two complements in the accusative (as e.g. in ‘X_{NOM} drinks Y_{ACC}’ ⇒ ‘Z_{NOM} makes X_{ACC} drink Y_{ACC}’).²¹³⁰ This syntactic feature raises the following question: which of the two accusative nouns, i.e. the causee or the initial object, becomes the subject of the passive construction based on such a causative?

Evidence from early post-Vedic is rather scarce: we find only a few causative passives derived from transitives in the Sūtras. Three of the four attested verbs of this type exemplify the former pattern (passive subject = causee):²¹³¹ *upapāyāyāmānaḥ* (ĀpŚS 9.18.11) ‘[the sacrificial animal] which is being caused to drink’,²¹³² *evamvidādhvaryuvā yājyamāno yajamānaḥ* (VādhS 4.101:9) ‘the institutor of the sacrifice (*yajamāna*), being caused by the well-knowing adhvaryu to perform a sacrifice’, *dātā vācyamānaḥ* (KauŚS 63.20) ‘the giver who is being caused to pronounce [the ritual words]’.²¹³³ The only instance of a different pattern, with the initial object becoming the subject of the passive construction, is found in VaitS 5.17 *aśvapādaṃ lakṣaṇe nidhāpyamānam* ‘the horse’s foot which is being caused to be put down on the (demarcation) line [of the āhavanīya-fire]’ (for details, see Chapter I, s.vv.). Note that in all four examples quoted above the verb in question (passive of causative of transitive) is represented by a participial form, and the initial object mostly remains unexpressed,²¹³⁴ which helps to avoid the coding conflict between two accusatives in the causative construction.

By contrast, we do not find reliable examples of the second option (passive subject = initial object). Even if such a transformation existed in (early) post-Vedic, it was much rarer than the former (passive subject = causee). This assumption is supported by evidence from Epic and Classical Skt., where both causee and initial object can become passive subject, but the latter pattern is less common (for details and examples, see HOCK 1981: 24ff.; BUBENIK 1987).

²¹³⁰ On general aspects of this coding conflict, see KOZINSKY & POLINSKY 1993.

²¹³¹ Cf. HOCK 1981: 22f.

²¹³² I.e.: ‘The (sacrificial) animal_{NOM} drinks [water_{ACC}]’ ≈> ‘The priest causes the animal_{ACC} to drink [water_{ACC}]’ ≈> ‘The **animal**_{NOM} is caused to drink [water_{ACC}]’.

²¹³³ Cf. also the same pattern (passive subject = causee) in NārSmṛ. 19.26ab *yadi vā dāpyamānānām tasmin moṣe tu samśayaḥ* ‘or if those **who are caused to pay** are in doubt about that theft ...’.

²¹³⁴ Cf. HOCK 1981: 22.

II.1.2.3. Passives derived from desideratives²¹³⁵

Desiderative passives are rare in Vedic. Only three formations of this type are attested in Vedic prose: *āditsyamāna-* JB ‘being desired for taking’, *apa-rurutsyamāna-* KS^P ‘being desired for expelling’, *ālipsyamāna-* ŚB ‘being desired for sacrificing’; in addition, the Śrauta-Sūtras attest *yīyapsya-te*.²¹³⁶ To begin with, it might be advisable to take a closer look at the derivational scenario of their semantic structure.

As is well-known, the desiderative derivation suggests the application of the desiderative operator ‘want/desire to’²¹³⁷ (DES) to the base verb (V⁰). In particular, the derivation of a desiderative from a transitive can be schematized as follows:

$$(DES) \text{ X}_{NOM} + \text{Y}_{ACC} + \text{V}^0 \Rightarrow \text{X}_{NOM} + \text{Y}_{ACC} + \text{DES}(\text{V}^0)$$

Obviously, the subject of the base verb and the experiencer of desire (i.e. the one who desires to bring about V⁰) are referentially identical, and thus the desiderative derivation does not induce any changes in the argument structure of the base verb, cf. *ā-labhate* ‘X_{NOM} sacrifices Y_{ACC}’ \Rightarrow *ā-lipsate* ‘X_{NOM} desires to sacrifice Y_{ACC}’.

In the case where both the desiderative and passive derivations apply, there are two logical possibilities:

(1) Passivization operates **after** the desiderative derivation applies. The desiderative verb is treated as one complex transitive predicate. Thus, the initial accusative object promotes to the passive subject, while the initial subject (which is at the same time the actor and the experiencer of desire) degrades and typically remains unexpressed:

$$(\text{Pass}(\text{DES})) \text{ X}_{NOM} + \text{Y}_{ACC} + \text{DES}(\text{V}^0) \Rightarrow \text{Y}_{NOM} + (\text{X}_{INS}) + \text{Pass} [\text{DES}(\text{V}^0)]$$

In case of *ā-labh* this transformation yields: *ā-lipsate* ‘X_{NOM} desires to

²¹³⁵ I would like to thank François HEENEN for commenting on my discussion of the attested desideratives. Of course, all responsibility for possible misinterpretations is mine.

²¹³⁶ I do not mention *+mīmāṃsyāmāna-*, which is one of possible conjectures for *mīmāṃsāmāna-* (AV 9.6.24), since the original meaning of *man* idiomatically changes in *mīmāṃsa-te* ‘doubt’.

²¹³⁷ For the sake of simplicity, I will proceed from the prototypical desiderative meaning, that is ‘X wants/desires to do sth.’, but the same forms are also quite common with the “weakened” desiderative meaning, thus functioning as futures with some modal nuances (cf. e.g. MACDONELL 387f.): ‘X is going to do sth.’, etc.

sacrifice Y_{ACC} $\Rightarrow \acute{a}$ -lipsyate ‘ Y_{NOM} is desired for sacrificing (by X_{INS})’, or, using a more artificial notation, ‘ Y_{NOM} is [desire-to-sacrific]-ed (by X_{INS})’.

(2) Passivization operates before the desiderative derivation, i.e. the desiderative derivation applies to the passive structure $Y_{NOM} + (X_{INS}) + Pass [V^0]$:

$(DES(Pass)) Y_{NOM} + (X_{INS}) + Pass [V^0] \Rightarrow Y_{NOM} + (X_{INS}) + DES(Pass [V^0])$

Here, the actor and the experiencer of desire are referentially non-identical: the former is expressed by the initial subject (= passive agent), the latter – by the initial object (= passive subject). In the case of \acute{a} -labh this transformation would yield: \acute{a} -labhyate ‘ Y_{NOM} is sacrificed (by X_{INS})’ $\Rightarrow \dots (?)$ ‘ Y_{NOM} desires to be sacrificed (by X_{INS})’.

In an agglutinating language, one might expect these two complex derivations, i.e. Pass(DES) and DES(Pass), to be encoded iconically and thus distinguished by the morpheme order, i.e. by attaching the passive morpheme (suffix) after or before the desiderative morpheme. In Sanskrit, the passive suffix *-yá-* can only be added after the desiderative morpheme, and all the three desiderative passives attested in Vedic belong indeed to the former type: *aparurutsyámānaḥ* KS ‘who is desired for expelling’ (not ‘who desires to be expelled’), *tá ālipśyámānā údacikramiṣan* (ŚB 7.5.2.4 \approx 7.5.2.28) ‘these [animals], being desired for sacrificing, desired to run away’ (not ‘who desires to be sacrificed’, otherwise the animals would not have wished to run away), *āditsyamānam* JB ‘what is desired for taking’ (rather than ‘what desires to be taken’). Both Sūtra attestations of the desiderative *yīyapsya*^{-te} (*yīyapsyate* ĀśŚS 8.3.24 \approx *yīyapsyamānā* ŚŚS 12.23.5) are unanimously interpreted by all translators as belonging to another type, i.e. DES(Pass) (cf. e.g. HOFFMANN: ‘Die Gattin möchte begattet werden’; CALAND: ‘The wife who wishes for coitus ...’); however, as I argued above (Chapter B.IV, s.v. *yabh*), these occurrences should be translated as passives of desideratives, not *vice versa*: ‘the wife is sought for copulation’ etc. Most likely, the type DES(Pass) did not exist in Vedic.

To conclude this short discussion of desideratives, one should mention a few rare middle forms built on the stems in *-sya-*, which are formally indistinguishable from desiderative passives, but cannot be passives, as the corresponding contexts clearly show: *mīmāṃsyamāna-* (\sqrt{man}) ĀśŚS 11.2.6 ‘the one who doubts’, *ārips[y]amāṇa-* (\sqrt{rabh}) VaitS 8.1 (~ GB) ‘the one who wishes to offer’, *ava-rurutsyamāna-* (\sqrt{rudh}) ĀśŚS 11.2.18 ‘those who desire to lock up [animals]’. For these forms we should probably adopt the analysis suggested by HOFFMANN (1976: 572, with fn. 22) for act.part. *yiypasyant-* ŚŚS

16.4.6 (~ ĀśŚS 10.8.11 *yīy°*). HOFFMANN considers this formation as a future form built on desiderative stems, where *-sya-* is likely to result from ***s-sya-* by cluster simplification (LUBOTSKY, p.c.), rather than by contamination of the two stems, as HOFFMANN suggested.

II.1.2.4. Passives derived from denominatives and quasi-denominatives

Passives are not derived from denominatives in Vedic. A few *-áya*-presents of denominative origin to which passives are built (*mantráya^{te/(ti)}* → *-mantryá^{te}* ŚB, JB ‘be addressed’, *bhakṣáya^{ti}* → *bhakṣyá^{te}* YV^m ‘be consumed’, *cintaya^{ti}* → *cintya^{te}* KāthU + ‘be object of meditation’) synchronically belong with the (non-causative) *-áya*-presents; see JAMISON 76f.; Chapter B.I and Appendix I, s.vv. Besides, one should mention a few *-yá*-passives built on the roots of denominative origin, which synchronically behave as primary roots: *gupyá^{te}* ‘be protected’, *dhūpyá^{te}* ‘be fumigated’; see s.vv.

By contrast, *-yá*-passives can be easily derived from a particular type of verbs, which are usually treated as primary formations but syntactically behave as denominatives (called in the present study ‘quasi-denominatives’), such as *prá-vī* ‘perform [pravara]’: *-varyá^{te}*, *-vriya^{te}* MS^p +, *úpa-sad* ‘perform [upasad]’: *upa-sadyá^{te}* TS^p. For a detailed discussion of this verbal type, see Appendix II.

II.1.3. Syntax of passive constructions, objecthood and transitivity

As I mentioned in Chapter A.II.3, the passivization test can serve as a criterion for distinguishing direct objects (DO) properly speaking from other accusative noun phrases: DOs can be promoted to passive subjects whereas other accusatives cannot. Thus, the syntactic behaviour of the passive verbs furnishes important evidence for the definition of objecthood and, eventually, for better understanding transitivity as a syntactic phenomenon in Vedic. In what follows I will briefly discuss some syntactic aspects of the transitivity from the viewpoint of the passive derivation.

II.1.3.1. Passives of ‘two pattern’ verbs

The passivization test allows to determine the syntactic subclass of transitives which can be constructed with two kinds of the accusative objects, referred to, for short, as first (= proximate) and second (= distant) objects (see Chapter A.II.5). Each of them can promote to the subject in passive

constructions, which proves their DO status.²¹³⁸

Most of the ‘two pattern’ verbs belong to one of the two semantic classes: verbs of speech (with the second object of the addressee of the speech) and verbs of putting/spraying, which denote putting things or substances on surfaces:

verbs	syntactic patterns	
	passive subject = first object	passive subject = second object
(1) verbs of speech		
<i>ṛc</i> ‘sing, praise’	‘Y ^{prayer} _{NOM} is sung’ RV ^{3x}	‘Z ^{deity} _{NOM} is praised’ RV ^{1x} , SV ^{1x}
<i>gā</i> ‘sing’	‘Y ^{prayer} _{NOM} is sung’ RV+	*‘Z ^{deity} _{NOM} is praised’ RV (with <i>abhī</i> (?); cf. <i>abhīgāta</i> -‘praised’)
<i>vac</i> ‘pronounce, call’	‘Y ^{speech} _{NOM} is pronounced’ RV	‘Z ^{deity} _{NOM} is called’ RV+
<i>śams</i> ‘recite, praise’	‘Y ^{prayer} _{NOM} is recited’ RV+	‘Z ^{deity} _{NOM} is praised’ RV, RVKh. ^{1x} ; with <i>abhī</i> YV ^{P+}
(2) verbs of putting/spraying		
<i>ukṣ</i> ‘(be)sprinkle’	‘Y ^{liquid} _{NOM} is sprinkled’ ŚB ^{1x}	‘Z ^{barhis etc.} _{NOM} is besprinkled’ ŚrSū.+
<i>ghṛ</i> _{caus.} ‘pour, (be)sprinkle’	‘Y ^{oblation} _{NOM} is poured’ TB+	‘Z ^{altar} _{NOM} is besprinkled’ YV ^P
<i>yuj</i> ‘yoke, join’	‘Y ^{animal} _{NOM} is yoked’ RV+	‘Z ^{vehicle} _{NOM} is yoked’ RV+
<i>vap</i> ‘sow, scatter’	‘Y ^{seed etc.} _{NOM} is sewn’ RV+	‘Z ^{altar} _{NOM} is besprinkled’ YV ^{P+} (with <i>nī</i>)

²¹³⁸ I do not see good reasons to see, with HAUDRY 425, some crucial difference between these two types of passive (“seul le passif du modèle 1 [i.e. passive subject = second object – LK] est susceptible d’une définition *sémantique* positive ..., alors que le passif du modèle 2 [i.e. passive subject = first object – LK] n’est susceptible que d’une définition *grammaticale*”).

<i>sic</i> ‘pour (out)’	‘Y ^{liquid} _{NOM} is poured’ RV+	‘Z ^{person} _{NOM} is besprinkled, consecrated’ AV+ (with <i>abhí</i>)
<i>stī̃</i> ‘strew, spread’	‘Y ^{barhis} _{NOM} is strewn’ KB ^{1x} +	‘Z ^{altar} _{NOM} is covered [with barhis]’ KS ^m , TB ^m +
<i>hu</i> ‘offer, pour’	‘Y ^{oblation} _{NOM} is poured’ RV+	‘Z ^{fire} _{NOM} is poured on’ ŚB ^{1x} +
other verbs		
<i>kr̥ṣ̥</i> ‘drag, plough’	‘Y ^{plough} _{NOM} is drawn’ ŚB	‘Z ^{field} _{NOM} is ploughed’ MS ^{p1x}
<i>duh</i> ‘milk, obtain [milk]’ (also caus.)	‘Y ^{substance} _{NOM} is obtained’ AV+ (in caus. pass.: ŚB+)	‘Z ^{animal} _{NOM} is milked’ RV ^{1x} (in caus. pass.: ŚB+)
<i>muṣ</i> ‘steal, rob’	‘Y ^{property} _{NOM} is stolen’ DhSū.	‘Z ^{person} _{NOM} is robbed’ Lost-Br.
<i>yaj</i> ‘perform a sacrifice’	‘Y ^{sacrifice} _{NOM} is performed’ YV ^p +	‘Z ^{deity} _{NOM} is worshipped’ YV ^p +

Table C.2. Semantic classes of ‘two pattern’ verbs

Obviously, this syntactic feature was amenable to changes. Some verbs have been transferred to the ‘one pattern’ type (e.g. *vac* after the RV); some others have preserved the second pattern only in compounds (cf. *vap*, *śams*).

II.1.3.2. Passivization test and transitivity of compounds

It is commonplace that intransitive verbs typically become transitive with certain preverbs.²¹³⁹ The passivization test clearly shows, however, that such compounds are to be taken as intransitives constructed with accusatives rather than as true transitives.²¹⁴⁰ Only a few fundamentally intransitive verbs can be passivized in compounds, see class P1.2.1 above. Note that such transitives are

²¹³⁹ Cf. e.g. GAEDICKE (1880: 91): “Jedes Intransitivum wird im Indischen durch gewisse Richtungswörter oder Präpositionen zu einem Transitivum”; cf. also SPEIJER 1886 [SktS]: 32, §43; 1896 [VSS]: 7, §18; S. SEN 1927: 368ff.

²¹⁴⁰ This means, in particular, that the repeatedly noticed affinity between these compounds and, for instance, such German verbs as *bearbeiten*, *bedrohen*, etc. Holds only for case-marking, not for the objecthood property: the German prefix *be-* transfers intransitive verbs to the transitive class, making them passivizable (cf. *wird bearbeitet* etc.), while the corresponding Vedic preverbs (such as *abhí*, *úpa*, *ánu* etc.) typically do not.

unattested in early Vedic (with the exception of *adhigamyáte* AV) and remain rare in Vedic prose. Most of them show some idiomatic semantic changes, i.e. the meaning of the resulting compound cannot be deduced from the simplex and preverb(s); cf. *ádhi-sthā* ‘stand’ + ‘over’ (← ‘govern’); *úpa-i* ‘sexually approach, impregnate’ (← ‘go’ + ‘to, near’), *pari-viṣ* ‘serve; surround (with a halo)’ (← ‘be active’ + ‘(a)round’), *ánu-gam* ‘extinguish’ (← ‘go’ + ‘along’), etc. Most likely, such an idiomatic change (Univerbierung) was a necessary condition for a compound to lose its regular link with the intransitive simplex and, as a result, to become a true transitive.

The passivization criterion can also distinguish preverbs by “transitivizing force”. We find a few examples of secondary transitives with *úpa* and *abhí* that can be passivized (cf. also numerous compounds built on transitive roots, such as *abhí-car*, *abhí-śams*, *abhí-sic*), but not a single instance of a passivizable compound with the preverb *ánu* – in spite of the fact that this preverb can easily combine with a number of intransitives and typically introduces an accusative noun into intransitive constructions.²¹⁴¹

II.1.3.3. Other non-direct accusative objects

Exceptional are passives of intransitive verbs constructed with content accusatives. Only two examples are found: *-kramāṇī kramyánte* TS ‘... the steps are stridden’; *nṛtyate* JB ‘[the dance] is danced’.

Examples of passives derived from intransitives constructed with accusatives of relation (scope) or duration are not attested.

In late post-Vedic (Classical) Sanskrit we find passives of verbs of all syntactic types, including intransitives, and even accusatives of duration can become passive subjects (for examples and discussion, see CARDONA 1976; OSTLER 1979: 351ff.). On the one hand, this may be due to the artificial character of syntactic constructions and stylistic techniques used in these texts; on the other hand, such phenomena may testify to some crucial changes in the syntactic type of late Sanskrit and, indirectly, point the rise of the ergative construction in contemporaneous Middle and New Indo-Aryan languages.

²¹⁴¹ Cf. similar arguments for the intransitivity of the compounds with *ádhi* in DASH 1991: 152ff.

II.2. Non-passive middle -ya-presents with stable (root) accentuation

II.2.1. A synopsis²¹⁴²

(R1) ‘Change of state’ class

<i>janⁱ</i> ‘be born’	<i>jāya-te</i> RV+
<i>pyā</i> ‘fill, swell’	<i>pyāya-te</i> RV+
<i>budh</i> (α) ‘(a)wake’	<i>búdhya-te</i> RV+
<i>mṛ</i> ‘die’	<i>mriyá-te</i> RV _I +
[<i>raj</i> ‘color, redden’	<i>rajya-te</i> AV ^{1×} , ŚB ^{1×} (+)]
<i>rādh</i> ‘succeed’	<i>rādhya-te</i> AV+
<i>lī</i> (α) ‘dissolve’	<i>līya-te</i> RVKh.+ (or → F1.1)
[<i>styā</i> ‘coagulate’	<i>-styāya-te</i> AVP–VS]
[<i>sphā</i> ‘swell’	<i>sphāya-te</i> AVP ^{1×} ; (<i>sphīya-te</i> SVB ^{1×})]

(R2) ‘Motion and body posture’ class

(i) -ya-presents derived from **primary** roots

[¹ <i>añc</i> ‘bend’	<i>-acya-te</i> RV+]
<i>rj</i> ‘direct, stretch’	<i>ṛjya-te/(ti)</i> RV
[<i>ghṛ</i> ‘drip’	<i>ghriya-te</i> MS–KS ^{m1×}]
<i>dhṛ</i> (α) ‘stay’	<i>dhriyá-te</i> RV+
<i>pad</i> ‘fall, move’	<i>pádyā-te</i> RV+
[<i>bhra(m)ś</i> ‘fall’	<i>bhra(m)śya-te</i> TĀ ^{m+} (or → F2)]
¹ <i>yā</i> ‘drive, speed’	<i>īya-te</i> RV+
<i>rī</i> ‘whirl, swirl’	<i>rīya-te</i> RV, VS ^{1×}
<i>lī</i> (β) ‘adhere’	<i>-līya-te</i> Br.+
[² <i>sr</i> ‘stretch’	<i>-sriya-te</i> KS ^{p1×}]

(ii) -ya-presents derived from **secondary** (causative) stems

(<i>iṅg/aṅg</i>) ‘move, stir’	<i>-iṅgya-te</i> (<i>-áṅgya-te</i>) ŚB (← caus. pass.)
(<i>īr</i>) ‘move’	<i>-īrya-te</i> YV ^{p+} (← caus. pass.)
[<i>bhram</i> ‘move (chaotically)’	<i>bhrāmya-te</i> ŚvetU, MaitrU+ (← caus. pass.?)]

²¹⁴² -ya-presents which do not occur accented are given in square brackets; their position within the semantic classification will be discussed in Chapter II.4. “R” and “F” in the notation of the morphological types are abbreviations for R[oot] and F[luctuating] accentuation.

(R3) Mental activities

<i>i</i> ‘(go), learn’ (with <i>adhi</i>)	<i>-īya-te</i> GB, JUB+
<i>kā</i> ‘long (for), yearn’	<i>kāya-te</i> RV ^{1x}
<i>dr̥</i> ‘heed’	<i>-driyá-te</i> Br.
<i>dhṛ</i> (β) ‘decide’	<i>dhriyá-te</i> YV ^p +
<i>budh</i> (β) ‘perceive’	<i>búdhya-te</i> AV+
<i>man</i> ‘think, respect’	<i>mánya-te</i> RV+
<i>mṛṣ</i> ‘forget’	<i>mṛṣya-te</i> RV+

(R4) Verbs of speech/sound

<i>rc</i> (<i>arc</i>) ‘sing [praise]’	(<i>-arcya-te</i>) ŚĀ (= KauṣU) ^{1x}
<i>bhāṣ</i> ‘speak’	(<i>bhāṣya-te</i>) ŚĀ ^{1x}
<i>vāś</i> ‘bellow’	<i>vāśya-te</i> AV, Br.+

(R5) Other verbs

<i>trā</i> ‘rescue, protect’	<i>trāya-te</i> RV+
(<i>dīp</i>) ‘shine, blaze’	<i>dīpya-te</i> AV+
(² <i>pat</i>) ‘rule; possess’	<i>pátya-te</i> RV–YV ^m

II.2.2. Semantics of middle *-ya*-presents

The three main semantic subclasses of the middle non-passive *-ya*-presents with the stable (root) accentuation are: (1) verbs denoting changes of state²¹⁴³ (mostly of spontaneous and non-controllable character); (2) verbs of motion and body posture; (3) verbs of mental activities, constructed with the accusative. No doubt, the similar morphological marking of these present formations reflects their semantic affinity within the Vedic verbal system. Note that for all these semantic types, middle voice marking is typical in the world languages (see KEMMER 1993; 1994: 182f. et passim). I will confine myself to one typological parallel. In his seminal *English Grammar*, Otto JESPERSEN (1927: 332–337; cf. also SMITH 1978) pointed out that many verbs referring to motion and/or change of state (*move*, *turn*, *boil*, *improve*, etc.) undergo causative alternation, i.e. can be employed both transitively and intransitively, and labelled this group *Move* and *Change*-class.²¹⁴⁴ JESPERSEN’s *Move* and *Change*-class neatly corresponds to groups R1–2 of the Vedic middle *-ya*-presents.

²¹⁴³ See LEVIN 1993: 240ff., with bibl.

²¹⁴⁴ For the syntactic affinity of these two semantic classes in English, see also FILLMORE (1970: 130).

The semantic ranking of the middle class IV presents shows a good match with the main semantic groups attested for Indo-European middle in general; cf., for instance, the ‘motion, emotion and cognition’ class of middle verbs in Ancient Greek, discussed in BAKKER 1994: 32f.,²¹⁴⁵ and semantic types of the Latin deponent verbs, registered by FLOBERT (1975a: I, 92ff. = 1975b: 37f.).²¹⁴⁶

The majority of the *-ya*-presents of classes R1-3 are old formations, built on primary roots and attested in early Vedic (RV, AV, RVKh.). A secondary origin is likely only for a small subclass of the verbs of motion and body posture (R2.ii), which are, incidentally, poorly attested. Their root accentuation (albeit recorded only a few times in texts) and the non-passive meaning indicate that they actually belong with class IV presents, but could originate in *-yá*-passives. It seems that *-iṅgya-te* (*-áṅgya-te*), *-īrya-te* and *bhrāmya-te* go back to causative passives (see s.vv.), thus instantiating the rare transfer from the class of *-yá*-passives to class IV.

The rest of class IV presents are of secondary origin. *pátya-te* ‘rule, possess’ is of denominative origin; *dīpya-te* is derived from the secondary root extracted from the causative *dī-p-aya-*. Within the small class of verbs of sound or speech, the only old (AV +) formation, *vāśya-te*, is built on a root of (probably) onomatopoeic origin (GOTÖ 297), and the two others, *-arcyā-te* and *bhāṣya-te* (both attested only in the ŚĀ), could be created on that model (note especially the phonological similarity of roots *vāś* and *bhāṣ*).

II.2.3. Non-passive *-ya*-presents with suffix accentuation: the type *mriyá-te*

For a discussion of this morphological type, see KULIKOV 1997; below I will briefly summarize the conclusions of this article. From the semantic and syntactic point of view and in spite of their suffix accentuation, the presents *-driyá-te*, *dhriyá-te*, *mriyá-te* (as well as *ghriya-te* and *-sriya-te*, which do not occur unambiguously accented) can be easily grouped with the non-passive middle *-ya*-presents of the three main classes R1-3.²¹⁴⁷ Specifically, *mriyá-te*

²¹⁴⁵ κλίνομαι ‘lean’, ἔρχομαι ‘come, go’, βούλομαι ‘want’, etc. ~ Vedic classes R2-3.

²¹⁴⁶ Three of the four groups listed by FLOBERT neatly correspond to our classes R1-3: “b) mutatifs (être, paraître, situation) ...; c) éthiques (effort, pensée, sentiment) ...; d) translatifs (mouvement, position, relation)”.

²¹⁴⁷ The non-passive character of these three presents was probably the main reason which caused the Indian grammarians to group these formations (together with the post-Vedic *-priyate* [with *ā*] ‘be busy, occupied, employed’; cf. DhP VI 109) with class

denotes a change of state (note, particularly, the parallelism with *jā́ya-te*),²¹⁴⁸ *dhriyá-te* (together with the hapaxes *ghriya-te* and *-sriya-te*) belongs with verbs of motion and body posture; *-driyá-te* refers to a mental activity. Moreover, even the secondary meaning of *dhriyá-te* (β) ‘decide, determine’, attested from the Brāhmaṇas onward, perfectly fits class R3 as well. Thus, within the verbal system, all these *Criyá-* presents belong with the middle *-ya*-presents, and even their later developments are determined by the semantic skeleton R1-3, as shown in the table below:

-yá-presents	passives <i>(kriyáte, dīyáte, hanyáte, ...)</i>		
	<i>mriyáte</i>	<i>dhriyáte</i> (α), <i>-sriyate, ghriyate</i>	<i>-driyáte,</i> <i>dhriyáte</i> (β)
middle -ya-presents	change of state <i>(jáyate,</i> <i>búdhate</i> (α), ...)	motion and body posture (<i>pádyate,</i> <i>ríyate, ...</i>)	mental activities <i>(mányate,</i> <i>búdhate</i> (β), ...)
	R1	R2	R3

Table C.3. The main semantic classes of the middle *-ya*-presents and the corresponding presents of the type *Criyá-te*

Thus, the suffix (“passive”) accentuation in the first three presents of the type *mriyáte* must be of secondary origin. All these stems are derived from *Cṛ* roots and, together with *-yá*-passives of the same structure (*kriyáte* ‘is made’, *bhriyáte* ‘is carried’ etc.), represent a specific development of *r* before the present suffix *-ya-*. Most likely, the regular reflex of **CṛiV-* was such that it disturbed the morphological transparency of the formation (for instance,

VI presents; cf. Pāṇ. 1.3.61. In the Western scholarship this analysis was usually regarded as a mere misunderstanding (see e.g. J. SCHMIDT 1875: 244ff.; cf. also BENFEY 1866a: 198f.). In fact, however, the segmentation *mriy-á-* is the only possible *synchronic* solution of the descriptive conflict between the “passive” form and the non-passive meaning of these presents: class VI is the only thematic present with the accent on the thematic vowel (cf. *kṣi* ‘dwell’ – *kṣiy-á-ti*).

²¹⁴⁸ Cf. M. LEUMANN 1940: 232 [= Kl.Schr., 323]; GONDA (1951: 92): “the two verbs [= *mriyáte* and *jáyate* – LK] ‘formed a pair’ and influenced each other”.

***múryate*).²¹⁴⁹ The only way to preserve the transparency of the form was to introduce the accent on the suffix: **Cṛ-ia-* → *Criyá-*. Here the type *kriyáte* (where *-ri-* goes back to the accentless *-r-* before *-i-*) may have served as a model.²¹⁵⁰ Due to this accent rule, presents of the type *mriyáte*, which originally belonged with middle *-ya*-presents, formally fell together with *-yá*-passives.²¹⁵¹

On the partial overlapping of the *-ya*-stems built on some *Cṛ* and *CRī* roots (vacillation *CRīya-/CRiya-*), see Chapter I, s.v. *śri*, Chapter IV, s.vv. *prī*, *vlī*, and KULIKOV 2005a.

II.3. Middle -ya-presents with fluctuating accentuation

II.3.1. A synopsis

(F1) Verbs of **entropy increase**²¹⁵²

(F1.1) Verbs of **destruction**

³ <i>kṣi</i> (<i>kṣī</i>) ‘perish, disappear’	<i>kṣīyá-te</i> RV+
<i>chid</i> ‘break, cut off’	<i>chidyá-te</i> RV+
<i>dṛ</i> (<i>dṛ</i>) ‘crack, split, burst’	<i>dṛyá-te</i> YV ^p +
[<i>bhañj</i> ‘break’	<i>bhajya-te</i> RVKh.+]
<i>bhid</i> ‘split’	<i>bhidya-te</i> RVKh.+]
¹ <i>mī</i> ‘damage, perish’	<i>mīyá-te</i> RV+
<i>lup</i> ‘damage, tear’	<i>lupyá-te</i> AV+
[<i>vlī</i> ‘crush, collapse’	<i>vlīyá-te</i> (/ <i>-plī</i> ^o) YV ^p +]]
<i>śṛ</i> ‘break, collapse’	<i>śṛyá-te</i> RV _I +
[<i>sraṃs</i> ‘fall asunder, break’ <i>-srasya-te</i> BaudhŚS+ (or → R1/2)]	

²¹⁴⁹ Cf. *dūrṇā-* < **dūr̥neH-* (LUBOTSKY 1997b: 148, with fn. 29). On the Avestan reflexes of **Cṛī-* (*Crii-*, *Cirii-*), see BEEKES 1999: 64.

²¹⁵⁰ This must also hold true for the presents *ghriya-te* and *-sriya-te*, which do not occur accented, but, by virtue of their phonological structure, can only have the accent on the suffix: **ghriyá-te*, **-sriyá-te*.

²¹⁵¹ On the secondary accent shift in *mriyáte*, see SZEMERÉNYI 1964: 184, fn. 1. It is worth mentioning that a number of Indo-Europeanists and Sanskritists, without explicitly formulating the conditions of this process, suggested the secondary character of the suffix accentuation in this present type; cf., for instance, the remark by KELLEN (1984: 121, note (8)): “Le sens ne permet pas de considérer *mriyá-* comme le passif de *mára-*: l’accent suffixal paraît donc secondaire”.

²¹⁵² For a detailed discussion of the relevant semantic classes, see below, Chapter II.3.3.

(F1.2) Verbs of destructuring

<i>ṛdh</i> ‘be successful’, etc.	<i>ṛdhyá-^{te}</i> RV _x +
<i>jyā</i> (<i>jī</i>) ‘deprive of’	<i>jīyá-^{te}</i> RV+
<i>muc</i> ‘release, free’	<i>múcyá-^{te}</i> RV+
<i>ric</i> ‘empty, surpass, leave’	<i>rícyá-^{te}</i> RV+
[<i>lip</i> ‘stick, stain’	<i>lipyá-^{te}</i> VS+]
<i>śiṣ</i> ‘leave’	<i>śíṣyá-^{te}</i> AV+
<i>śī</i> ‘fall’	<i>śīyá-^{te}</i> AV+
<i>hā</i> ‘leave’	<i>hīyá-^{te}</i> RV+

(F1.3)

<i>pṛ</i> (<i>pūr</i>) ‘fill, become full’	<i>pūryá-^{te}</i> RV ₁ +
[<i>pṛc</i> ‘fill, unite’	<i>pṛcyá-^{te}</i> RV–Br. ^m (RV <i>pṛcyá-</i> ← <i>pṛcya-?</i>)]

(F2) Verbs of heating

<i>tap</i> ‘heat, suffer’ etc.	<i>tápyá-^{te}</i> RV _{1,x} +
<i>dah</i> ‘burn’	<i>dáhyá-^{te}</i> RVKh.+
<i>pac</i> ‘cook; ripen’	<i>pácyá-^{te}</i> RV+

II.3.2. Accentual patterning of *-yá*-presents**II.3.2.1. General rule**

As noticed in the individual lemmata (Chapter B.III), the accent fluctuation does not follow any semantic regularity (except for *pácyá-^{te}*). The explanation of the place of the stress in terms of the passive/non-passive distinction (cf. GONDA 1951: 98f.), parallel to the opposition *pacyáte* ‘is cooked’ vs. *pácyate* ‘ripens’, has failed. We find forms with different accentuation in nearly identical contexts (cf. examples s.vv. ³*kṣi*, *bhid*, *śiṣ*, *pṛ*) and even in parallel passages which differ only in accentuation; cf. RV 10.152.1 *jīyate* = AV 1.20.4 *jīyáte*. The accentuation of the *-yá*-presents is not random, however, as the table below shows (the numbers in superscript indicate the number of accented occurrences; the occurrences which form exceptions to the rule formulated below are shown with **outline letters**):

<i>-yá</i> -presents	<i>-ya-</i> : attestations with root accentuation	<i>-yá-</i> : attestations with suffix accentuation
Verbs of destruction and destructuring ('entropy increase')		
<i>ǵdhyáte</i> 'is successful'; + <i>ví</i> 'loses'	TS ¹ , ŠB ¹	TS ¹ , MS ¹ , ŠB ¹ , ŠBK ¹
<i>kštyáte</i> 'perishes'	RV ¹ , TS ² , ŠB ² (BĀU), TĀ (act.) ¹	AV ¹ , ŠB ⁶ , TB ¹
<i>chidyáte</i> 'breaks, is cut off'	TS ¹ , ŠBK ¹	MS ² , ŠB ³
<i>jtyáte</i> 'suffers loss'	RV ¹ , RV-SV ¹ , TS ¹ , ŠB ¹ (BĀU)	AV ³ , MS ²
<i>dīryáte</i> 'cracks, is split'	TS ² , *MS ²	ŠB ⁴
<i>pūryáte</i> 'becomes full'	RV ¹ , MS ¹ , TB ^{m2} , TĀ (act.) ²	MS ¹ , ŠB ¹² , TB ¹
<i>bhidyáte</i> 'breaks'	RVKh. ¹ , TS ²	MS ² , ŠB ¹⁰ , ŠBK ¹ , KaṭhĀ ¹
<i>mtyáte</i> 'is damaged, perishes'	RV ² , TS ⁷ , TB ³ , TĀ ²	MS ⁴ , ŠB ¹
<i>mūcyáte</i> 'becomes free'	RV ¹ , RVKh. ¹ , AV ¹ , TS ²	AV ³ , ŠB ⁹ , ŠBK ³
<i>ricyáte</i> 'is emptied'; + <i>āti</i> , <i>prā</i> 'surpasses; is left over'	TS ⁷ , TB ⁹ , (*TĀ ¹ (?))	MS ⁶ , MS-KS ¹ , ŠB ¹² , ŠBK ⁵
<i>lūpyáte</i> 'is damaged, torn'	TS ¹	AV ¹ , TB ^{m1}
<i>śiṣyáte</i> 'is left over'	*AV ¹ , TS ² , TB ³	MS ¹ , ŠB ¹⁰ , ŠBK ⁴
<i>śtyáte</i> 'falls (off)'	TS-TB ¹ , MS ² , ŠB ¹ , TB ¹	ŠB ¹ , TB ^{m3}
<i>śtīryáte</i> 'breaks, collapses'	ŠB ¹ (BĀU)	MS ¹ , KS ¹
<i>hīyáte</i> 'is left, abandoned'	TS ⁴ , ŠB ¹	MS ² , ŠB ²
Verbs of heating		
<i>tāpyáte</i> 'heats; suffers'	VS (act. ¹ , med. ¹), TS ^{m1} , MS ^{m1} , ŠB ³ , TB ²	AV ⁶ , TS ^{m1} , ŠB ⁴
<i>dāhyáte</i> 'burns'	RVKh. ²	TS ¹ , MS-KS ¹ , ŠB ⁴
<i>pācyáte</i> 'is cooked; ripens, is digested'	'ripen': RV ¹ , *RVKh. ¹ , ŠB ¹ , TB ¹	'is cooked': RV ¹ , RV-VS- TS- MS ¹ , RV-AV ¹ , AV ² ; 'ripens': MS ¹ , ŠB ¹¹ , ŠBK ¹

Table C.4. Accentuation of *-yá*-presents

The simple regularity, which immediately follows from the table above can be formulated as follows:

In the Ṛg-Veda (together with the RV-Khilāni) and in the texts of the Taittirīya school (Taittirīya-Saṃhitā, Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa and, probably, Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka), *’-yá*-presents show root accentuation; in the Atharva-Veda, Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa and, most likely, in the texts of the Kāṭhaka school, *’-yá*-presents show suffix accentuation.

While evidence provided by the RV, AV, MS and the accentuated texts of the Taittirīya school is sufficient to make decisive conclusions on the accentual patterning of the *’-yá*-presents in these texts, the case of the Kāṭhaka is less clear. The overwhelming majority of the *’-yá*-presents occur in the unaccentuated parts of the text in ed. SCHROEDER; evidence consists of only three attestations (*dahyámānā* KS 10.5:130.6-7, *atī-ricyáte* KS 14.10:209.6, *api-śīryáte* KS 35.16:62.2). Yet, in spite of the scarcity of attestations, the three accented occurrences (to which one form in the Kāṭhā can be added) as well as the close affinity of the language of the Kāṭhaka and Maitrāyaṇī schools lead to the assumption that the corresponding dialects belong together as far as the accentual patterning of the *’-yá*-presents is concerned.

Still more problematic is the position of the dialect of the Vājasaneyins. The only *’-yá*-present which occurs accented in the VS is *tápyá^{-te}* (*tápyamānāya* VS 39.12).²¹⁵³

The aforementioned distinction holds foremost for the ‘entropy increase’ class. More intricate is the case of the verbs of heating. In the RV, the place of the accent in *pácyá^{-te}* depends on its meaning (‘be cooked/ripen’). The ŚB and MS have generalized the suffix accentuation (except for one root-accented occurrence in the ŚB), as in the case of the ‘entropy increase’ verbs. The root accentuation of the only accented occurrence in the TB matches both its semantics (‘ripen’) and the rule of accent placement in the Taittirīya and therefore does not prove anything. Likewise, *dáhyá^{-te}* (unattested in the RV) essentially follows the model of the ‘entropy increase’ verbs, except for one occurrence in the TS. Most complicated is the situation with *tápyá^{-te}*. In the

²¹⁵³ The nonce formation *tápyate* (dat.sg. act.prt.) is a secondary replacement of the class I active participle (*tápate*) and thus cannot serve as evidence for the accentual patterning of *tápyá^{-te}* in this text; moreover, it may even have triggered the root accentuation of the adjacent *tápyamānāya*.

AV, all the accented forms have accent on the suffix, whilst in the TB the accent is on the root, which meets our rule. The accent placement in the Samhitās of the Yajurveda (TS, MS) seems to be random; note, however, that both occurrences which do not meet the rule (TS^m 3.2.8.2 *anu-tapyāmāna-* ≈ *anu-tápyamāna-* MS^m 2.3.8:37.1) appear in a mantra (see below on the main types of exceptions) and thus may represent an earlier situation as compared to what we observe at the later stage of the development of the same Vedic dialects, in Vedic prose. All three root-accented occurrences attested in the ŚB are imperatives (met with in one passage), while the suffix accentuation is attested in indicative forms.

From the rule formulated above it immediately follows that (i) the suffix accentuation of the '-yá-presents in the AV, MS and ŚB does not suggest their passive value or any particular semantic difference from the corresponding forms with the root accentuation attested in the RV(Kh.) and Taittirīya – contra GONDA 1951; (ii) there are no good reasons to emend the suffix accentuation in these texts on the basis of non-passive semantics (cf. INSLEER 1987: 62f. on AV *kṣīyáte*). The accent fluctuation does not depend on the semantics of the -ya-presents in question, but instantiates a difference between Vedic schools/dialects.

II.3.2.2. Exceptions

Exceptions to the rule formulated in the preceding Section (shown with outline letters in Table C.4) are relatively few among the 'entropy increase' verbs; for convenience, they are summarized in Table C.5 below:

	'-ya-	-yá-
<i>ṛdhyá-^{te}</i>	vy-ṛdhyai ŚB 2.1.2.4	ṛdhyáte TS 1.5.2.2
<i>kṣīyá-^{te}</i>	kṣīyate ŚB 14.4.2.28, kṣīyeta ŚB 14.4.3.7	apa-kṣīyáte TB 1.5.10.5
<i>chídya-^{te}</i>	vy-ava-chídya ŚBK 2.8.3.18	
<i>jīyá-^{te}</i>	jīyate ŚB 14.4.3.23	
<i>dīryá-^{te}</i>	+dīryeta MS 2.1.8 ^{2x} :9.14, 15	
<i>pūryá-^{te}</i>	prati-pūryeta MS 3.2.2:17.11	ā-pūryáte TB 1.5.10.5
<i>múcyá-^{te}</i>	múcyātai AV 8.8.6	
<i>lúpyá-^{te}</i>		lupyáte TB ^m 2.8.8.2
<i>śīṣyá-^{te}</i>	+uc-chīṣyātai AV 2.31.3	
<i>śīyá-^{te}</i>	atī-śīyante MS 2.6.1 ^{2x} :64.1, 6, ava-śīyante ŚB 3.2.6.8	ava-śīyante TB ^m 3.12.7.2-3 ^{3x}
<i>śīryá-^{te}</i>	śīryate ŚB 14.6.9.28 etc.	
<i>hīyá-^{te}</i>	hīyate ŚB 3.6.2.14 ≈ 3.6.2.15	

<i>tápyá</i> ^{te}	<i>anu-tápyamānāḥ</i> MS ^m 2.3.8:37.1, <i>tápyadhvam</i> , <i>tápyasva</i> ^{2x} ŚB 6.1.3.2-4	<i>anu-tapyámānā</i> TS ^m 3.2.8.2
----------------------------	---	--

Table C.5. Exceptions to the regular accentual patterning of *-yá*-presents

Most exceptions fall into one of the following types:

(1) eleven non-indicative forms with suffix accentuation instead of root accentuation:

(1.a) subjunctives: *vy-ḥdhyai* ŚB 2.1.2.4, ⁺*vy-ava-chídyai* ŚBK 2.8.3.18, *múcyātai* AV 8.8.6, ⁺*uc-chíṣyātai* AV 2.31.3;

(1.b) optatives: *kṣṭyeta* ŚB 14.4.3.7, ⁺*dīryeta* MS 2.1.8^{2x}:9.14, 15, *prati-pūryeta* MS 3.2.2:17.11;

(1.c) imperatives: *tápyadhvam*, *tápyasva*^{2x} ŚB 6.1.3.2-4.

The tendency to bear the accent on the root in the non-indicative forms of *-yá*-presents in the AV, MS and ŚB was by no means a strict rule, however: we find subjunctives and optatives with the accent on the suffix as well, cf. *jīryeta* MS 1.6.10:103:2, *dīryeta* ŚB 4.5.10.7^{2x}, *bhidyéyātām* ŚBK 4.9.4.15, etc. On the assumption that in the corresponding Vedic dialects the accent was retracted from the suffix to the root (see Chapter II.3.7 below), the root-accented forms listed above can be regarded as preserving the original accentuation. I will return to this issue in Chapter IV.1.

(2) six occurrences attested in the YVic mantras: *anu-tápyamānāḥ* MS^m 2.3.8:37.1 ≈ *anu-tapyámānā* TS^m 3.2.8.2, *lupyáte* TB^m 2.8.8.2,²¹⁵⁴ *ava-śīryānte* TB^m 3.12.7.2-3^{3x}. One may assume that the accent shift in some YVic dialects was completed by the beginning of the Brāhmaṇa period, while the mantras attest the transitional period and vacillation in accent placement (see below, Chapter C.II.3.7).

(3) four exceptions in the last chapters of book 14 of the ŚB [= BĀU] (*kṣṭyate* ŚB 14.4.2.28 [= BĀUM 1.4.28], *kṣṭyeta* ŚB 14.4.3.7 [= BĀUM 1.5.7],²¹⁵⁵ *jīryate* ŚB 14.4.3.23 [= BĀUM 1.5.23 = BĀUK 1.5.15], *śīryate* ŚB 14.6.9.28 [= BĀUM 3.9.28] = ŚB 14.6.11.16 [= BĀUM 4.2.6] = ŚB 14.7.2.27 [= BĀUM 4.4.27]) must be due to the late character of the text, which sometimes gives erroneous accents; cf. *īryāmāna-* ŚB^v 14.7.1.14 [= BĀUM^v 4.3.14], *manyāsai* ŚB 14.6.9.26 [= BĀUM 3.9.26], *manyáte* ŚB 14.9.2.7 [thus mss.; ed. WEBER *mányate*], *sájyate* ŚB 14.6.9.28 [v.l. apud ed. WEBER].

²¹⁵⁴ The suffix accentuation of *lupyáte* could also be triggered by the adjacent *-yá*-passives; see s.v.

²¹⁵⁵ This occurrence belongs to the first group of exceptions as well.

(4) for *śīya-te*, there may have existed additional semantic rules which determined accent placement in some usages, see s.v.

(5) only four exceptions seem unmotivated: *ṛdhyāte* TS 1.5.2.2, *hīyate* ŚB 3.6.2.14 ≈ 3.6.2.15, *apa-kṣīyāte* and *ā-pūryāte* in TB 1.5.10.5.

II.3.2.3. Semantically motivated accent shifts

To sum up, for the majority of -yá-presents the accent fluctuation does not involve any semantic or syntactic features. Thus, the standard explanation of the accent shift in -yá-passives as motivated by the non-passive (reflexive or anticausative) syntax²¹⁵⁶ finds no or little support in the linguistic facts. The only clear instance of an opposition correlated with the place of accent is *pácyá-te*, employed in the sense ‘be cooked’ or ‘ripen’, depending on its accentuation (on the suffix vs. on the root; for references, see s.v.). This correlation seems to hold true only for the language of the RV, however (where, incidentally, the root accentuation is attested only once, at RV 1.135.8, against three instances of suffix accentuation). Note, furthermore, that the semantic opposition ‘be cooked’ ~ ‘ripen’ does not amount to the passive/non-passive distinction, but suggests an idiomatic change (lexicalization).

Another instance of semantic motivation may be *dáhyá-te*, which occurs with the root accentuation in the RVKh. (‘burn [by itself]’) and with the suffix accentuation in Vedic prose (TS, MS–KS, ŚBK) (‘be burned [by fire]’), but this semantic distinction is too subtle and evidence rather scant. Besides, four of the five occurrences follow the accentual patterning of class F1, the only exception being TS 5.5.2.3 *dahyámānā*.

II.3.2.4. History of the problem

As has been mentioned in Chapter A.I.4, the first scholar who noticed correlations between Vedic schools (Maitrāyaṇī and Taittirīya) and accent placement was Berthold DELBRÜCK.²¹⁵⁷ For more than hundred years DELBRÜCK’s observation had remained practically forgotten. We only find

²¹⁵⁶ Cf. Pāṇ. 6.1.195 *acaḥ kartṛ yaḥ* ‘before [the passive suffix] -ya- [in verbs with the roots ending] in a vowel (aC-) [the root optionally bears the accent if the verb is employed] in the reflexive [usage]’ (as, e.g., in examples from the Kāśikā Vṛtti commentary: *lūyate* / *lūyāte* ‘[the field] is reaped by itself’).

²¹⁵⁷ We can only admire DELBRÜCK’s excellent knowledge of Vedic texts and his fascinating intuition, which have helped him to discover this regularity at the time when concordances for the Saṃhitās of the Yajurveda did not yet exist.

short remarks in passing on the accentual patterning in Vedic texts. In particular, as noticed in Chapter B.III, s.v. *muc*, WHITNEY's conjecture ⁺*mucyātai* for AV 8.8.6 probably relies upon his assumption (though never explicitly formulated) of the prevalent suffix accentuation of this *'-yá*-present in the AV. For the TS, the predominant root accentuation was noticed by WEBER (1873a: 93) and later by KEITH (1914: cxlix).²¹⁵⁸ The suffix accentuation of *mucya-te* in the ŚB was mentioned by MINARD (1956: 171, [§]413, fn. d), but his statements on the accentuation of some other *'-yá*-presents in the ŚB are not free of errors and inaccuracies (see s.vv. *ṛdh*, *kṣṛ*). Finally, a few pairs of the type *kṣṛyate* RV // *kṣṛyāte* AV, ŚB were correctly registered in GARCÍA RAMÓN 1990: 19, note 19.

Only recently, DELBRÜCK's idea has been recalled by KÜMMEL (1996: 77, fn.132; 82 et passim), who appended three more Vedic texts to DELBRÜCK's list: ŚB, TB and TĀ.

II.3.3. Semantics of *'-yá*-presents

The middle *-ya*-presents with fluctuating accentuation, i.e. those which are attested both with the accent on the root and on the suffix, are, in a sense, a 'bridge' between *-yá*-passives and non-passive middle *'-ya*-presents, being therefore in the spotlight of the present study. This small class reveals a remarkable semantic and structural similarity.²¹⁵⁹

The main subclass F1 of the *'-yá*-presents can be defined in semantic terms as follows. The verbs of subclass F1.1 (*kṣṛyá-te* etc.) denote processes of spontaneous **destruction**: breaking, bursting (in the Brāhmaṇas often said of sacrificial vessels), splitting as well as destruction in general ('disappear', 'perish', etc.). The definition of another subclass, F1.2 (*múcyá-te*, etc.) poses some problems. Intuitively, the meanings of *mucyate* 'becomes free', *śṛyate* 'falls', *śiṣyate* 'is left over', etc. are rather close to the semantic domain of destruction, but their common denominator is difficult to capture. Yet, one may argue that they all denote processes in which an element ceases to be incorporated into a system or structure; for instance, some part(s) of an object

²¹⁵⁸ WEBER rightly quotes such *-ya*-presents as *ṛdhyate*, *kṣṛyate* etc. because of their root accentuation in the TS; but including *ava-pádyate* (TS 5.5.1.6) and *jāyamāna-* (TS 4.3.11.3) into this group is due to a misunderstanding: these verbs always have the accent on the root (see s.vv.). KEITH omitted *jāyamāna-* from the list, but retained *ava-pádyate*, probably reproducing WEBER's mistake.

²¹⁵⁹ For a discussion of the semantic features of the *'-yá*-presents, see KULIKOV 1998a; 1998b.

break off and fall down, which, ultimately, results in the destruction of a system. Specifically, *mucyate* ‘becomes free, is released’ can be determined as ‘ceases to be bound, included into a bound system’; *śiṣyate* ‘is left over’ and *hīyate* ‘is abandoned, is left over’ amount to ‘remains outside a structure’; *śīyate* ‘falls (out)’ ≈ ‘ceases to be included into a structure through falling out of it’. At first glance, *ṛdhyate* ‘is successful, fulfilled, goes well’ does not belong to this semantic type; but its meaning changes to the opposite in compounds with the preverb *vī*: ‘is deprived of [a property], loses’, i.e. ‘ceases to be connected with some (structural) elements’; cf. *jīyate* ‘suffers loss’, which is very close. *ricyate* belongs here both when employed as a simplex (‘is emptied’ ≈ ‘is deprived of its content’) and with the preverbs *āti*, *prá* (‘surpasses, is redundant’ ≈ ‘goes beyond the scope of a structure’; ‘is left over’). For subgroup F1.2 I propose the tentative label ‘verbs of **destructuring**’.

In my view, we are able to determine an even more general semantic feature which encompasses the meanings of both ‘destruction’ and ‘destructuring’. All these verbs denote spontaneous “fatal” processes which result in the destruction of some natural or artificial systems or organisms, and, to put it in general terms, in **entropy increase**.²¹⁶⁰

²¹⁶⁰ The concept of entropy was proposed in 1850 by R. CLAUSIUS, a German physicist, and is sometimes presented as the second law of thermodynamics. According to this law, entropy increases during irreversible processes such as the spontaneous mixing of hot and cold gases, the uncontrolled expansion of a gas into a vacuum, and the combustion of a fuel. Very soon the notion of entropy has been extrapolated to many other domains, in particular, to a number of mechanical phenomena, so that many spontaneous processes, such as destruction or simplification of a system, death of a living being, etc., are often referred to as entropy increasing processes (on the notion of entropy and its developments, see e.g. CHAMBADAL 1963).

Note that any event concerned with (spontaneous) falling down of an object leads to decrease of energy of this object and, hence, to decrease of total energy of the system consisting of this object and the source of gravitation (normally, the earth), which implies increase of entropy. Furthermore, the falling of an element out of a system simplifies this system, so that its total energy decreases while entropy increases, again.

Finally, here belong a number of phenomena concerned with some natural chemical processes, such as burning of fuel, souring of milk, etc.

All spontaneous processes of such kind are irreversible; hence, it has been said that the entropy of the universe is increasing. That is, more and more energy becomes unavailable for conversion into mechanical work, and because of this the universe is said to be “running down”. According to the same law, everything in the universe is

In this new semantic perspective, instructive is the present *śṭyá-^{te}*, whose semantics does not amount to falling down. In one of its usages, *śṭyá-^{te}* refers to a particular kind of falling, which accompanies natural decay, growing old: falling out of hairs, teeth, etc., i.e. typical instances of entropy increase. Cf. also JB 1.1 *bhasmāvaśīyate* ‘some borings fall down [from the piece of kindling wood being churned]’, on which BODEWITZ (1973: 21f., note 4) comments that “*bhasma* refers to wooden dust falling of the wood sticks during the churning, a product of **erosion** [emphasis is mine – LK]” – again, a typical instance of entropy increase.

The verb *pṛ* ‘fill’ cannot be included into groups F1.1-2 in any of its usages. Yet, in the compound with the preverb *ā* it functions as the counterpart of an ‘entropy increase’ verb, *kṣī* (with the preverb *āpa*): *ā-pṛ* ‘wax’ and *āpa-kṣī* ‘wane’ denote opposite changes of the half-moon (see examples s.vv.).

The semantic affinity of the ‘entropy increase’ verbs is also supported by the fact that they often co-occur in texts. To mention a few passages (most of which are cited s.vv.): TB 1.5.10.5, ŚB 1.7.2.22, 2.1.3.1, 2.4.4.18, 19, 8.4.1.10, 10.4.2.17 (co-occurrence of *āpa-kṣī* and *ā-pṛ*); PB 6.7.15 (*ava-chid*, *vy-ṛdh*, *jī*); MuṇḍU 2.2.8 (³*kṣi*, *chid*, *bhid*); ŚB 14.3.2.1 (*vy-ṛdh*, *vī-dṛ*); TS 7.2.1.4, MS 1.6.10, 1.8.7, KB [ed. LINDNER] 16.9 = 25.14 = 26.4 (*hā*, *pra-mī*), PB 16.1.2 (*jī*, *pra-mī*); JB 2.422 (*jī*, *hā*); AVŚ 11.3.56 (*jī*, *hā*²¹⁶¹); AVŚ 10.1.32 (*muc*, *hā*); ŚB 3.1.1.3 ((*abhy*)*āti-ric*, *śiṣ*), TS 3.2.9.5, AB 6.2.6 (*lup*, *hā*).²¹⁶²

The three ‘-yá-presents of subclass F2 (*tápyá-^{te}* ‘heat, suffer’, *dáhyá-^{te}* ‘burn’, *pácyá-^{te}* ‘cook; ripen’) are labelled ‘verbs of heating’, for the lack of better term.

II.3.4. Remarks on the syntax of ‘-yá-presents

The ‘-yá-presents share several syntactic features, which point to their affinity with the class IV middle -ya-presents rather than with the -yá-passives:

(i) They are typically employed in the non-passive (anticausative) usage; occurrences for which passive interpretations are possible are relatively few.

irrevocably moving in the direction of random chaos and waste.

This notion has not only a physical significance but has also been largely conceptualized within human culture and world view (cf. RIFKIN 1989), which, eventually, means that the concept of entropy and entropy increase is relevant within a system of language meanings (for further details and a discussion of the linguistic significance of this concept, see KULIKOV 1998a).

²¹⁶¹ *hā* is attested in the transitive present *jáhāti*.

²¹⁶² Cf. GONDA 1959: 204.

An important piece of evidence for their non-passive treatment is the lack of “complete” passive constructions (with an overtly expressed passive agent in the instrumental). The only exception may be *dáhyá-te* ‘burn’, attested with the instrumental (i.e. ‘is burned by/with the fire’), but even for such cases an anticausative analysis is not impossible.²¹⁶³

(ii) Some ‘-yá-presents are attested with content accusatives, which is impossible with true passives. Cf., in particular, *tápas tápyá-te* ‘perform penance’, *sarvajyānīm jīyá-te* ‘be deprived of / lose the whole property’.

II.3.5. Paradigmatic features

The most remarkable paradigmatic feature shared by the ‘-yá-presents of entropy increase is their opposition to transitive-causative presents with nasal affixes (cf. *kṣīyáte – kṣiṇāti, kṣiṇóti, chidyáte – chināti, lūpyáte – lumpāti*, etc.). By contrast, the three ‘-yá-presents of heating are opposed to class I presents (*tápyá-te – tápa-ti, dáhyá-te – dáha-ti, pácyá-te – páca-ti*); for details, see Chapter C.III.2.

It seems that the paradigmatic similarity of the ‘-yá-presents was an important feature of this verbal class, which supported their semantic affinity and, in some cases, could even trigger the rise of secondary transitive presents with nasal suffixes for some -ya-presents of class F1 (see Chapter II.3.7 on *śināṣṭi, śiṃṣati*).

II.3.6. Phonological similarity

Some types of phonological structures are particularly common among the ‘-yá-presents of entropy increase, while some others are unattested. Specifically, five stems (one third) show the structure *Cīya-* (in addition, *vīya-te*, unattested with accent, may also belong here; see below), four stems belong to the type *CiCya-*, three stems belong to the type *Cīūrya-*. By contrast, all the three verbs of heating are derived from *CaC* roots, uncommon among verbs of ‘entropy increase’. It is of course impossible to posit a strict correlation between phonological structures and semantic classes; however, the phonological similarity could additionally support the structural affinity of the verbs in question²¹⁶⁴ and cause accent shift in some -ya-presents of similar

²¹⁶³ The instrumental constructions at AV 10.8.15 *ūnéna hīyate* and RV 10.34.5 *hīye sākhibhiḥ*, traditionally interpreted as passive (‘abandoned by smb./smth.’) seem to belong to the anticausative type (‘fall off smb./smth.’); see s.v.

²¹⁶⁴ Recall the old theory of ‘rime-words’ and ‘rime-ideas’ (Reimwortbildungen) (BLOOMFIELD 1895; WOOD 1907/1908; GÜNTERT 1914: 30ff. [on *chid/bhid*]; 65f. [on

structures, even in spite of different semantics, in particular, in *-vīṭyante* ‘are impregnated’ TS 6.1.7.1 ($\sqrt{\text{vyā/vī}}$), *īyāmāna-* ‘speeding, driving’ ($\sqrt{\text{yā}}$) MS^m 2.6.11:70.12, v.l. [three mss.], ŚB^v 14.7.1.14 = BĀUM^v 4.3.14); cf. esp. the parallelism *vyā/vī*, *yā/ī* ~ *jyā/jī*.

II.3.7. Accent fluctuation in a diachronic perspective

The features shared by the *-yá*-presents (semantics, non-passive syntax, opposition to transitive nasal presents, partial phonological similarity) belong to different layers of the language structure and are essentially independent of each other. This implies that the similarity of *-yá*-presents cannot be mere coincidence, and they form a morphologically relevant verbal class, rather than a random group. Their semantics (entropy increase, heating) seems to be the main parameter organizing these verbs to a structural class and, eventually, determining their properties. For instance, this feature could trigger the emergence of the nasal presents *śināṣṭi*, *śimṣati* (Br. +), built as transitive-causative counterparts of *śiṣyá-^{te}*.

The ‘entropy increase’ semantics could also influence the accentual behaviour of a *-ya*-present even in the cases where it was registered only with some preverbs; cf. *ḥdhyá-^{te}* ‘be successful’, which changes its meaning to the opposite (‘be deprived, lose’) in compounds with *ví*, and therefore follows the accentual pattern of the verbs of entropy increase. The same explanation probably holds true for the suffix accentuation of the non-passive *vi-lipyáte* (MS) ‘comes unstuck [and falls off]’ (~ simplex *lipya-^{te}* ‘stick, smear’).

Furthermore, the parallelism between *ā-pṛ* ‘wax’ and *āpa-kṣī* ‘wane’ (the latter of which belongs to the ‘entropy increase’ type) has probably triggered changes in accent patterning of *-pūryá-^{te}*, in spite of the fact that this present does not show any meaning related to entropy increase.

On the other hand, some middle *-ya*-presents with the root accentuation were not grouped with the *-yá*-presents (and hence did not change their accentuation) unless their semantic affinity with the entropy increase class was supported by other features. Thus, for instance, *pádyá-^{te}* ‘fall’, albeit similar to *śīyá-^{te}* in meaning, does not show other features of class F1 (note the root structure *CaC* and the lack of a transitive-causative counterpart with the nasal

kṣī/mī). Note, incidentally, that the first of WOOD’s lists of rime-words (op.cit., 142f.), labelled ‘dwindle’ group, includes all the five aforementioned *Cīyá-* presents of the ‘entropy increase’ (class F1): *kṣīyate*, *[jīyate]* (WOOD gives only the nasal present *jināti*), *śīyate*, *mīyate*, *hīyate* (though WOOD does not mention accent fluctuation).

affix) and does not change to *padya-te* in the AV, MS and ŚB.²¹⁶⁵

The “intermediate” position of *-ya*-presents between *-ya*-passives and non-passive middle *-ya*-presents probably results from their peculiar semantics. Judging from their non-passive meanings and syntax (see above) as well as from their root accentuation in the Ṛgveda, originally these formations probably belonged with the class IV presents. Later on, in some contexts they could be re-interpreted as passives (in accordance with the scenario: ‘breaks’ → ‘is broken [by smb.]’; ‘becomes free’ → ‘is released [by smb.]’, or the like) and, due to the increasing productivity of the *-ya*-passives, undergo accent shift in several Vedic dialects – in particular, in the dialects of the AV, Maitrāyaṇī-Kāṭhaka and ŚB.²¹⁶⁶

The high number of exceptions in the YVic mantras (cf. group (2) in Chapter II.3.2.2) and the root accentuation of *tāpyamāna-* in the Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā as against the prevalent suffix accentuation in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, which belongs to the same Vedic school (White Yajurveda), may point to the fact that the accent shift from the root to the suffix in the corresponding YVic dialects was only completed by the period of Vedic prose (Brāhmaṇas properly speaking).

II.4. Unaccented middle *-ya*-presents: reconstructing accentuation

On the basis of the classification of middle *-ya*-presents outlined above, we are able to determine the semantic types of the middle *-ya*-presents which do not occur accented and, eventually, to reconstruct their accentuation.

(1) The rare presents *raja-te* ‘color, become red’, *-styāya-te* ‘become coagulated’ (quasi-hapax) and *sphāya-te* ‘swell’ (hapax) belong to type R1 (changes of state), i.e. we can reconstruct root accentuation for these present stems: **rája-te*, **-styáyā-te*, **spháyā-te*.

(2) *-acya-te* ‘bend’ ($\sqrt{1}a\tilde{n}c$), *r̥ja-te* ‘direct, stretch’, *-līya-te* ‘adhere’, and,

²¹⁶⁵ Not counting three occurrences with suffix accentuation in the late ŚB (books 11 and 14).

²¹⁶⁶ Our knowledge of the Vedic dialectology is still rather poor (for a systematic treatment of the issue, see WITZEL 1989), and we are thus far unable to draw any decisive conclusions on the localisation of the dialects in which this accent shift was operative. Nevertheless, relying upon WITZEL’s preliminary outline, one might tentatively assume that one of the centres of this process was the Kuru region (KS, early ŚB), whereas the dialect(s) of the Pāṇcala (where the TS can be tentatively located) were more conservative and have preserved root accentuation.

probably, *bhra(ṁ)śya-te* ‘fall’ belong with the verbs of motion and body posture (the latter, however, fits type F1.2 of *-yá*-presents as well): **-ácyā-te*, **fjya-te*, **-līya-te*, **bhrá(ṁ)śya-te* (or **bhrá(ṁ)śyá-te*). The hapaxes *ghriya-te* ‘drip’ and *-sriya-te* ‘stretch’, which, by virtue of their phonological structure (*Criya-*), can only have the accent on the suffix (**ghriyá-te*, **-sriyá-te*), but originally belonged with *-ya*-presents (see Chapter II.2.3) fall into the same semantic class. On the post-Vedic present *bhrāmya-te* (probably, of passive origin), see above.

(3) *mṛśya-te* ‘not heed, forget’ belongs with verbs of mental activities; cf. especially, the antonymous *-driyá-te* ‘heed’, thus: **mṛśya-te*.

(4) Fluctuating accentuation (i.e. root accentuation in the RV(Kh.), TS, TB, TĀ; suffix accentuation in the AV, MS and KS, ŚB) can be reconstructed for a few verbs of entropy increase (destruction, falling): **līpyá-te* ‘stick, smear’ (with *ví*: ‘comes unstuck [and falls off]’), attested only with suffix accentuation (*vi-lipyáte* MS; see above),²¹⁶⁷ **bhájyá-te* ‘break’ (cf. *bhidyá-te* ‘id.’), **vlīyá-te* (*-plīya-te*) ‘crush, collapse’ and post-Vedic *-srasya-te* ‘fall asunder, break down’; on **bhrá(ṁ)śya-te* (or **bhrá(ṁ)śyá-te*), see above; on *pṛcyá-te* (← **pṛcyá-te* ?), only once attested accented in the RV, see s.v. The affinity with *-yá*-presents is supported by the paradigmatic properties (cf. transitive nasal presents *limpá-ti*, *bhanákti*, *vlīnāti* (/plī^o), *srasnīṣya*, *pṛnākti*) and, in the case of *vlīya-te*, by its phonological structure (*Cīya-*).

I abstain, however, from reconstructing fluctuating accentuation for a few other verbs of destruction, such as *-vr̥hya-te* (*-br̥hya-te*) ‘be torn, destroyed’²¹⁶⁸ (which has no nasal present; its transitive-causative counterpart is *vr̥há-ti*) and *tṛhya-te* AV ‘be crushed’, *piśyá-te* ‘be crushed, ground’ (accented in the ŚB), *mṛdyá-te* ‘be rubbed, crushed’²¹⁶⁹ (accented in the MS and ŚB), *-mūryá-te* ŚB ‘be crushed, destroyed’ (the three last presents are opposed to transitive nasal presents: *tṛṇedhi* etc.; *pináṣṭi*, *piṁṣá* etc.; *mṛdnā-ti* Sū.+; *mṛñīhi*, *mṛñāti* etc.). In spite of some affinity with *-yá*-presents of class F1.1, these presents are generally employed in passive usages and do not denote spontaneous uncontrolled processes.

²¹⁶⁷ Cf. especially the quasi-synonymous *śītyá-te* ‘falls’, as well as *f̥dhyá-te*, which reveals the entropy increase semantics only in compounds with *ví* (‘be deprived, lose’).

²¹⁶⁸ Cf. also the *-i*-aorist (inj.) *-varhi*, attested in the non-passive usage (RV 3.53.17 *méṣā ví varhi* ‘may the pole not break in pieces’) and adjacent within the same passage to *-i*-aor. *śāri* (which belongs with the *-yá*-present *śīryá-te*).

²¹⁶⁹ Cf., in particular, the parallel passages MS 2.2.5:19.2 *yád ... avamṛdyéta* ≈ ĀpŚS 18.15.4 *yac ... pratiśīryate*.

II.5. Active -ya-presents

(A1) Non-controllable situations

(A1.1) States

(īṛṣ) ‘be angry’	īṛṣya- ^{ti} TS ^{p1x} +	pis ‘prosper’	písya- ^{ti} ŚB ^{2x}
uc ‘be accustomed’	-ucya- ^{ti} RV ^{1x} +	puṣ ‘prosper’	púṣya- ^{ti} RV+
kup (/bh) ‘be angry’	-kupa- ^{ti} AV ^{1x}	(mād) ‘be mad’	māḍya- ^{ti} AVP+
kṛś ‘be lean’	kṛśya- ^{ti} Br.	muh ‘be confused’	múhya- ^{ti} RV _X +
krudh ‘be angry’	krúdhya- ^{ti} RVKh.+	mṛc ‘be hurt’	-mṛcya- ^{ti} JB ^{1x}
kṣudh ‘be hungry’	kṣúdhya- ^{ti} RV _I +	med ‘be fat’	médya- ^{ti} RV+
gṛdh ‘be greedy’	gṛdhyā- ^{ti} RV ^{1x} , ŚB ^{1x}	ran ⁽ⁱ⁾ (raṇ ⁽ⁱ⁾) ‘rejoice’	rāṇya- ^{ti} RV, AVP
glā ‘be weary’	glāya- ^{ti} AV+	randh ‘be subject’	rādhyā- ^{ti} AV+
tam ⁱ ‘be exhausted’	tāmya- ^{ti} YVP+	rup ‘suffer a pain’	rúpya- ^{ti} AVP+
tuṣ ‘be satisfied’	tuṣya- ^{ti} (AVP), Sū.+	lubh ‘be disturbed’	lúbhya- ^{ti} AV ^{1x} , Br.
tṛp ‘be satisfied’	tṛpya- ^{ti} RVKh.+	śuc ‘suffer’	śúcya- ^{ti} Br.
tṛṣ ‘be thirsty’	tṛṣya- ^{ti} RV+	sādh ‘succeed’	sádhyā- ^{ti} RV _I +
dam ⁱ ‘control oneself’	dāmya- ^{ti} ŚB	svid ‘sweat’	svidya- ^{ti} ŚB(+)
dṛp ‘be bewildered’	dṛpya- ^{ti} RV _I +	har ⁱ (² hr) ‘enjoy’	hārya- ^{ti} RV-TB ^m
dṛh ‘be firm’	dṛhya- ^{ti} RV	hṛṣ ‘be excited’	hṛṣya- ^{ti} RV _X +
druh ‘be deceitful’	drúhya- ^{ti} AVP+		

(A1.2) Processes

kṣā ‘burn’	kṣāya- ^{ti} AVP+	² vā ‘become extinguished’	vāya- ^{ti} RV+
jas ‘disappear’	-jasya- ^{ti} RV _I -Sū. ^m	śam ⁱ ‘become appeased’	śāmya- ^{ti} RV
jī ‘grow old, decay’	jūrya- ^{ti} RV;		AVP+
	jīrya- ^{ti} AV+	śudh ‘purify’	śudhya- ^{ti} AVP+
das ‘waste’	dāsyā- ^{ti} RV+	śuṣ ‘dry’	śúṣya- ^{ti} RVKh.+
duṣ ‘spoil’	duṣya- ^{ti} AB+	śyā ‘congeal’	śyāya- ^{ti} YVP+
dhvaṃs ‘be ruined’	-dhvasya- ^{ti} GB ^{1x}	śram ⁱ (α) ‘become weary’	śrāmya- ^{ti} RV+
¹ naś ‘perish’	nāśya- ^{ti} RV+	śrā ‘become ready’	śrāya- ^{ti} RV+
² pū (pūy) ‘stink, rot’	pūya- ^{ti} AVP+	śliṣ ‘adhere, stick’	ślīṣya- ^{ti} MS ^p +
praj(j) ‘end, stop’	(-prj(y)a- ^{ti} TB ^{2x})	śvā (śū) ‘swell’	(-śūya- ^{ti} BĀUM ^{1x})
pruṣ ‘sprinkle, spurt’	-pruṣya- ^{ti} ŚB ^{1x}	srīv ‘be aborted’	srīvyā- ^{ti} AB ^{1x}
mlā ‘wither, relax’	mlāya- ^{ti} AVP ^{1x} , ŚB		śrīvya- ^{ti} MS ^{m1x}
yas ‘be heated, boil’	yāsya- ^{ti} AV(P) ^{2x}		
riṣ ‘be hurt’	riṣya- ^{ti} RV+		

(A2) Intransitive activities

² tan ⁱ ‘thunder’	tanya- ^{ti} RV(+)	² rā ‘bark’	rāya- ^{ti} RV+
¹ dī ‘fly’	dīya- ^{ti} RV+	¹ vā ‘blow’	(vāya- ^{ti} ŚB+)
dīv ‘play’	dīvya- ^{ti} RV _X +	śram ⁱ (β) ‘toil’	śrāmya- ^{ti} AV+
nṛt ‘dance’	nṛtya- ^{ti} RV _X +	stā (tā) ‘steal’	stāyāt AV+
yudh ‘fight’	yúdhyā- ^{ti} RV+		

(A3) Transitives

<i>as</i> ‘throw, shoot’	<i>ásya</i> - ^{ti/te} RV+	<i>paś</i> ‘see’	<i>pásya</i> - ^{ti/te} RV+
(<i>ār</i>) ‘treat as an ārya’	(-) <i>ārya</i> - ^{ti} RV ^{2x}	² <i>pī</i> (<i>pīy</i>) ‘blame’	<i>pīya</i> - ^{ti} RV-TB ^m
² <i>iṣ</i> ‘send’	<i>iṣya</i> - ^{ti/(te)} RV+	<i>vyadh</i> ‘pierce’	<i>vidhya</i> - ^{ti} RV+
<i>tī</i> ‘surpass’	(<i>tūrya</i> - ^{ti} RV ^{1x})	(<i>śVm</i>) ‘prepare [for sacrifice]’	
<i>dhyā</i> ‘think of’	<i>dhyāya</i> - ^{ti/(te)} RVKh.+		<i>śVmya</i> - ^{ti} YV ^m
² <i>naś</i> (² <i>aś</i>) ‘reach’	(-) <i>áśyant</i> - MS ^{m1x}	<i>sīv</i> ‘sew’	<i>śívyā</i> - ^{ti/(te)} RV+
<i>nah</i> ‘tie’	<i>nāhya</i> - ^{ti/te} RV _X +		

The largest group of the active -ya-presents (A1) consists of intransitives denoting non-controllable situations, including both states and spontaneous processes.

Subtype A1.1, called for short ‘states’, includes both emotional (‘be glad’, ‘be angry’ etc.) and physical states (‘be lean’, ‘be hungry’, etc.) and has repeatedly been noticed as the semantic core of the active -ya-presents in Sanskrit and comparative Indo-European studies.²¹⁷⁰ Strictly speaking, the verbs of this subclass should be referred to as ‘statives/inchoatives’, since they can denote either being in state Q (‘be Q’) or entering into Q, i.e. the process of transition from NON-Q to Q (‘become Q’); see Chapter A.II.5.

Another subtype includes verbs which can only denote processes, not states, mostly of spontaneous and fatal character: damage, decay, death, destruction; cf. *-jasya*-^{ti} ‘disappear, get lost’, *jūrya*-^{ti} ‘grow old, decay’, *duṣya*-^{ti} ‘spoil’, *-dhvasya*-^{ti} ‘be ruined’, *náśya*-^{ti/(te)} ‘perish’, *pūya*-^{ti} ‘stink, rot’. The position of some -ya-presents with regard to the opposition ‘state’/‘process’ is not quite clear; cf. e.g. *mlāya*-^{ti}, which might belong either with statives/inchoatives (‘be/become relaxed’) or with processes ‘wither, relax’.²¹⁷¹

The meaning of entropy increase (decay, spontaneous destruction) is thus common both for many middle -ya-presents (class F1 of ‘-yá-presents; some ‘-ya-presents of change of state, class R1; cf. *-līya*-^{te} (α), *mriyá*-^{te}) and for

²¹⁷⁰ Cf. WHITNEY (1889 [SktGr]: 273, §761a): “state of feeling, or a condition of mind or body”; DELBRÜCK (1897 [VglSynt II]: 34f.): “Gemütsvorgang oder körperliche Empfindungen des Schmerzes oder der Annehmlichkeit”; RENOU (1930 [GrS]: 435): “la [IV^e] classe tend à s’approprier les verbes susceptibles de noter un mouvement de l’âme, une impression”; SCHMID (1963: 44): “... Verben, die einen physischen oder psychischen Zustand oder Vorgang am Subjekt bezeichnen”; see also GONDA 1951: 91; ELIZARENKOVA 1961: 122ff.

²¹⁷¹ Cf. DELBRÜCK 1897 [VglSynt II]: 34f. on *ślīya*-^{ti}.

active *-ya*-presents, thus being, in a sense, one of the ‘semantic cores’ of the Indian class IV as a whole.

A1 is the only productive subclass of the active *-ya*-presents: all presents which first occur in Vedic prose, belong here, while all intransitive activities and transitives (A2-3) are old formations, attested already in early Vedic (RV, AV); see Chapter VII.1; some of them are probably inherited from Proto-Indo-Iranian, as their Avestan cognates show.

II.6. The type *syāti*

The type *syāti* and its position within the synchronic system of present formations are discussed in detail in KULIKOV 2000b; the main conclusions can be summarized as follows. The class IV analysis of this type, adopted both by Indian grammarians and in a number of modern Sanskrit grammars (thus, *-s-yāti*, *-ch-yāti*, etc.), is unsatisfactory for a number of system-related reasons. By contrast, the class VI analysis (*-sy-āti*, *-chy-āti*, etc.) is supported by several independent features (semantics, syntax, paradigmatic properties). The origin and genesis of the type *syāti* is unclear. In some verbs of this class, *-y-* may originate in the suffix **(e)i-* (perhaps related to the class IV present suffix *-ya-*), secondarily reinterpreted as part of the root. In some others it may have been part of the root from the very beginning. Irrespectively of their origin, the presents of this type could later be assimilated to each other, so as to form a special subclass of class VI.

III. Transitivity alternations and paradigmatic oppositions within the system of -ya-presents

III.1. Transitive counterparts of -ya-passives

-ya-passives can be opposed to any of the main present types attested in Vedic, which include: 1) thematic class I presents (cf. *-bhajya-te* – *bhāja-ti/te*, *ijyá-te* – *yāja-ti/te*, *udyá-te* – *váda-ti/te*, etc.); 2) thematic class VI presents (cf.: *-kīrya-te* – *kirá-ti/te*, *sṛjyá-te* – *sṛjá-ti/te*, etc.); 3) -cha-presents (cf. *yamyá-te* – *yácha-ti/te*); 4) a thematic root presents (class II, cf.: *adyá-te* – *átīti*, *duhyá-te* – *dógdhi*, *dugdhé* etc.); 5) nasal presents (class V, VII, IX) and their thematicizations (*kriyá-te* – *kṛṇóti*, *kṛṇuté*, *gr̥hyá-te* – *gr̥bhñáti*, *yujyá-te* – *yúnakti*, etc.); 6) reduplicated presents (class III, *dhīyá-te* – *-dadhāti* etc.).²¹⁷² I do not mention here passives derived from secondary stems (-áya-presents, causatives, desideratives, discussed in the preceding Chapter. The ratio of different present types opposed to -yá-passives is non-proportional, however. While passives corresponding to nasal and reduplicated presents as well as to a number of class I presents are well-attested from the RV onwards, there are relatively few early Vedic -yá-passives opposed to athematic root presents (class II) and thematic zero grade presents (class VI).²¹⁷³

- for class II, we find in the RV only *duhyá-te* (1×), *mṛjyá-te*, *stūyá-te* (which is secondary as against the old stative *stáve*, see Chapter B.I, s.v.) and *hanyá-te*;

- for class VI presents, only *tujyá-te* (2×) and *sṛjyá-te* are attested in the early RV and *sūyá-te* ($\sqrt{1} sū$) in maṇḍala X.²¹⁷⁴ Note also that none of the

²¹⁷² On the rare -yá-passives corresponding to transitive active -ya-presents, see below, Chapter V.5.

²¹⁷³ -yá-passives opposed to *syāti* presents, which synchronically belong with class VI presents (see above), are also rare and late.

²¹⁷⁴ The class VI present *vṛścá-ti* (which is the transitive counterpart of the passive *vṛścya-te* RV_{X+}) goes back to a fossilized -cha-present.

-yá-passives opposed to class VI transitives has Old Iranian cognates, which may point to their secondary character, too. The scarcity of passive counterparts of the class VI presents is particularly remarkable in view of their prevalent transitivity.

III.2. Transitive-causative counterparts of middle non-passive -ya-presents

(R1-2) Middle -ya-presents with stable accentuation are opposed to the following present types:²¹⁷⁵

– to nasal presents:

<i>ṛjya-te/(ti)</i> RV	<i>ṛñjate</i> etc. (athem.), <i>ṛñjá-ti</i> RV
<i>rādhya-te</i> AV +	<i>rādhnoti</i> etc. YV ^p +
<i>rīya-te</i> RV, VS ^{lx}	<i>riṇāti, riṇīte</i> etc. RV+

– to -áya-presents:

<i>dhriyá-te</i> RV+	<i>dhārāya-ti/te</i> RV+
<i>pādya-te</i> RV+	<i>pādāya-ti/te</i> RV+
<i>būdhyá-te</i> RV+	<i>bodhāya-ti</i> RV+
<i>mriyá-te</i> RV+	<i>mārāya-ti</i> AV+
<i>-līya-te</i> RVKh. +	<i>-lāpāya-ti</i> Br. + ²¹⁷⁶

– to -áya-presents and other present types:

<i>jāya-te</i> RV+	<i>jāna-ti/te</i> RV+	<i>janāya-ti/te</i> RV+
<i>-sriya-te</i> KS ^{plx}	<i>sīsarti</i> etc. RV	<i>sāraya-ti</i> YV+

(F1) Middle -yá-presents of entropy increase are mostly opposed to nasal and -áya-presents:

<i>ṛdhyá-te</i> RV _x +	<i>ṛñāddhi</i> RV+, <i>ṛdhnóti</i> RV _I +	<i>ardháyati</i> AV+
<i>kṣṭyá-te</i> RV+	<i>kṣiṇāti</i> RV+, <i>kṣiṇóti</i> AV+	
<i>chidyá-te</i> RV+	<i>chināti</i> RV+	
<i>jīyá-te</i> RV+	<i>jināti</i> RV+, <i>jinoti</i> JB	
<i>ḍīryá-te</i> YV ^p +	<i>-dṛiṇīyāt</i> ŚB	<i>daráyati</i> RV, <i>dārayati</i> AVP ^{lx} , JB+

²¹⁷⁵ I list only the early formations, attested in the mantra and in the early Vedic prose (in the Saṃhitās).

²¹⁷⁶ For this type, see INSLEY 1987: 57; GOTÖ 279, fn. 648.

<i>púryá-te</i> RV _I +	<i>pṛṇāti</i> RV+, <i>pṛṇá-ti</i> RV+	<i>pūráyati</i> AV+; ²¹⁷⁷ <i>píparti</i> RV ^{1x} , AV ^{2x}
<i>bhajya-te</i> RVKh.+	<i>bhanákti</i> RV+	
<i>bhidya-te</i> RVKh.+	<i>bhinátti</i> RV+	
<i>mīyá-te</i> RV+	<i>mináti</i> RV+	
<i>rícya-te</i> RV+	<i>riṇákti</i> RV+	<i>recáyati</i> Br.+
<i>lipyá-te</i> VS ^m +	<i>límpá-ti</i> AV+	
<i>lúpyá-te</i> TS ^p +	<i>lumpáti</i> AV+	
<i>vlīya-te</i> YV ^p +	<i>vlīnāti</i> YV ^p +	
<i>śíśya-te</i> AV+	<i>śināṣti</i> Br.+; <i>śimṣati</i> Br.+	
<i>śīrya-te</i> RV _I +	<i>śṛṇāti</i> RV+, <i>śṛṇa</i> AV	
<i>śīyá-te</i> AV+		(<i>śātáyati</i> AV+)
<i>hīyá-te</i> RV+		<i>jáhāti</i> RV+

(F2) Middle '-yá-presents of heating:

<i>tápyá-te</i> RV+	<i>tápa-ti/te</i> RV+	<i>tāpáya-ti</i> RV _X +
<i>dáhyá-te</i> RV+	<i>dáha-ti/te</i> RV+	
<i>pácyá-te</i> RV+	<i>páca-ti/te</i> RV+	<i>pācaya-ti/te</i> Br.+

To sum up, the middle -ya-presents with stable (originally, root) accentuation build only a few old transitivity pairs: *ṛíya-te* – *riṇáti*, *pádyá-te* – *pādáyá-ti/te*, *búdhya-te* – *bodháya-ti*, *jáyá-te* – *jána-ti/te*.

By contrast, the '-yá-presents show a remarkable paradigmatic similarity. The majority of the entropy increase verbs (F1) are opposed to transitive-causative presents with nasal affixes; the verbs of heating – to class I presents. Note that only presents with the nasal infix and with the suffix -*nā/-nī-* (classes VII and IX), as well as their thematicizations, are old transitive-causative counterparts of the '-yá-presents of entropy increase.²¹⁷⁸

²¹⁷⁷ For the paradigmatic relationships between *pṛṇāti*/ *pṛṇá-ti*, *púryá-te* and *pūráyati*, see Chapter B.III, s.v.

²¹⁷⁸ The regular paradigmatic opposition between the intransitive middle -ya-presents with root accentuation and transitive-causative nasal presents was repeatedly noticed in Vedic and Indo-European scholarship; see e.g. KURYŁOWICZ 1928: 208; INSLEER 1972: 100ff.; JOACHIM 22. There is no separate pattern “intransitive class IV -ya-present with [...] middle inflection ~ transitive thematic nasal present”, contra TUCKER (2002: 291f.); some of her examples of “Class IV -ya- present[s]”, viz. *sicyáte*, *vidyáte*, and *yujyáte*, instantiate, in fact, -yá-passives.

The class V presents (*ṛdhnóti*, *kṣiṇóti* and *jinoti*) are mostly secondary replacements of other nasal formations (for details of this process, see SCHMID 1955: 11ff.; on *ṛdhnóti*, see JOACHIM 63f.). The reduplicated present *píparti* belongs to another root (*pr̥* ‘pass over’) and occurs only two or three times as a form of *pṛ̥* ‘fill’ (at RV 5.34.2, AV 13.3.4 and, perhaps, AV 20.135.8; see NARTEN 1969b). *-áya*-causatives, if any, are relatively late (see JAMISON 94f., 147, 149 on *daráyati*, *ardháyati* and *pūrayati*).

The lack or rarity of *-yá*-passives opposed to the root presents in the broader sense of the word (= class II + VI) may originate in a very archaic paradigmatic feature. It is generally supposed that root presents could originally be derived only from ‘present roots’, while the ‘aoristic roots’ formed root aorists and characterized (i.e., above all, nasal and reduplicated) presents.²¹⁷⁹ One might assume that, at the beginning, only aoristic roots could form middle *-ya*-presents (LUBOTSKY, p.c.). The prevalence of the nasal presents among transitive counterparts of the intransitive middle *-ya*-presents is still preserved (and, perhaps, further strengthened by paradigmatic attraction) for non-passive *-yá*-presents of entropy increase, which have not become a productive morphological type, as well as for the *-yá*-passives in the early RV, when this formation was not yet fully productive and retained its historical connections with middle *-ya*-presents.

As for the ‘present roots’, they must have had at their disposal some other morphological devices to express the passive meaning, such as, in particular, the stative in *-e/-ire* (cf. *stáve*).

III.3. Transitive-causative counterparts of active intransitive *-ya*-presents

Most active intransitive *-ya*-presents are opposed to *-áya*-presents many of which are old formations, attested already in the early RV. Cf. *tṛpya-ti* – *tarpáya-ti/te* RV +, *náśya-te* – *nāśáya-ti* RV +, *múhya-ti* – *moháya-ti* RV +, etc.; see JAMISON 138ff. on this paradigmatic type.²¹⁸⁰

Two active *-ya*-presents show the labile patterning, i.e. can be employed both intransitively and transitively: *púśya-ti* ‘prosper; make prosper, increase’ and *ríśya-ti/(te)* ‘be hurt, harm’. While the latter could have inherited its labile syntax from Proto-Indo-Iranian (see s.v.), for *púśya-ti* transitive usages are

²¹⁷⁹ See e.g. SCHMID 1955: 63f., with fn. 196 (with bibl.); CARDONA 1967: 764f.

²¹⁸⁰ Here also belong a few hybrid formations: *-áya*-presents with the nasal infix (*dṛṇháya-ti* AV (+), *śundháya-ti* RV^{lx}).

secondary (KULIKOV 1999a). Note that the rare transitive occurrences are limited to the RV, being replaced by productive *-áya*-causatives (*poṣaya-ti* ‘make prosper’ and *reṣáya-ti* ‘harm’; see JAMISON 142, 144) already in early Vedic.

Isolated is the present *jūrya-ti/jīrya-ti*, which is the only intransitive *-ya*-present opposed to a class I present (*jāra-ti/(te)* RV) as well as to a *-áya*-present (*jaráya-ti* RV+); see s.v.

Another peculiarity of the active *-ya*-presents is the lack of competing present formations within the IVS.²¹⁸¹ There are only few exceptions: (1) the pair *iṣya-ti/(te)* ‘send’ RV + // *iṣṇá-ti* RV + ‘id.’ (the latter is very rare in Vedic prose; see s.v.); (2) *rāṇya-ti* is in competition (without essential semantic difference) with *raṇa-ti* and *raṇáya-ti/te* (JAMISON 75; GOTÖ 258); (3) the rare intransitive *-áya*-present *dasaya-te* co-exists with *dásya-ti*; (4) *tṛpya-ti/(te)* appears after the RV as a later replacement of the older nasal presents *tṛpṇóti*, *tṛmpáti*.

There are three more pairs of intransitive class IV and class I presents, which, however, belong to different synchronic layers: (1) the quasi-hapax *śúcya-ti* ‘suffer, feel pain’ appears only in the Brāhmaṇas (ŚB^{1x}, JB^{1x} (?)), *śóca-ti* ‘shine’ is attested from the RV onwards (GOTÖ 307); (2) *sídhya-ti* ‘succeed’ is attested only once in early Vedic (in the late maṇḍala I of the RV), while the parallel *sádha-ti/te* nearly disappears after the RV (GOTÖ 326); (3) likewise, *-hṛṣya-ti* ‘be excited’ occurs only once in the RV (maṇḍala X), while *hárṣa-ti* is exceptional after the RV (GOTÖ 347).

III.4. *-yá*-passives corresponding to transitive *-ya*-presents

Most of the transitive active *-ya*-presents (7 of 10) are well-attested from the RV onwards. One of their remarkable paradigmatic features is the lack of *-yá*-passives in early Vedic and their extreme rarity in the prose, until the very end of the Vedic period.²¹⁸² The attested *-yá*-passives are:

<i>as</i> ‘throw’	<i>áśya-ti/te</i> RV+	<i>asya-te</i> AĀ 2.3.5, ŚrSū.
² <i>iṣ</i> ‘send’	<i>iṣya-ti/(te)</i> RV+	<i>preṣyate</i> AVP 16.54.8
<i>nah</i> ‘tie’	<i>náhya-ti/te</i> RV _X +	<i>nahyá-te</i> AVŚ 12.5.25, AVP 16.120.1, Sū.
<i>nṛt</i> ‘dance’	<i>nṛtya-ti</i> RV _X +	<i>nṛtyate</i> JB 2.69 ^{2x} (pass. of intr. with content acc.)
<i>vyadh</i> ‘pierce’	<i>vídhya-ti</i> RV+	<i>vi-vidhyamāna-</i> JB 2.426:4

²¹⁸¹ This feature was noticed, for instance, by VEKERDI (1961: 254); see also BARTON 1989: 143f. for a possible explanation of this property.

²¹⁸² See GONDA 1951: 94f.

Note that two of the three *-yá*-passives attested in the mantras (all – in the AV) appear in the Paippalāda recension of the AV (*preṣyate* AVP 16.54.8 corresponds to the *-ta*-participle in the Śaunakīya) and the only Śaunakīya form, *apinahyāmāna-*, is attested in the passive-rich hymn 12.5, being probably a nonce formation.

Even rarer and younger (Ep., Cl. Skt.) are passives derived from middle *-ya*-presents of mental activities constructed with the accusative.²¹⁸³

The lack of *-yá*-passives corresponding to transitive *-ya*-presents must be due to the tendency to avoid functionally distinct but morphologically similar formations within the same IVS.

²¹⁸³ E.g. Kathās. 41.14 *indreṇa tad abudhyata* ‘this was perceived by Indra’; see GONDA 1951: 94f.

IV. Remarks on paradigmatic properties of -ya-presents

IV.1. The defective paradigm of -yá-passives in early Vedic

The gaps in the paradigms of the -yá-passives in early mantras (RV, AV) have been noticed since long – for instance, by ARNOLD (1897: 317), JAMISON (1984) and HOCK (1985-86). Beside present forms in the narrow sense of the word (i.e. forms with primary endings only), present participles and rare imperatives,²¹⁸⁴ only exceptional attestations of other grammemes are found:

- forms with **secondary** endings are not attested at all in the family maṇḍalas.²¹⁸⁵ In the late RV we only find *-anīyata* (RV 8.56.4 = Vāl. 8.4) and *sūyata* (√^l*sū*) (RV 10.132.4),²¹⁸⁶ two more forms appear in the AV: *-asicyanta* and *ahanyanta* (AVP).

- the only passive **subjunctive** form attested in the RV is *-bhriyāte* (RV 5.31.12),²¹⁸⁷ cf. RENOU 1937a: 7. No passive subjunctives occur in the AV.

- **optatives** of -yá-passives do not appear in the RV and AV at all. The earliest occurrences of this grammeme are *vr̥jyeta*, *prá bhriyeta* in the young mantra RVKh. 5.7.3.a, repeated also in the Black YV.

The defective inventory of the -yá-passives in early Vedic can hardly be explained on semantic grounds.²¹⁸⁸ Rather, it suggests that their paradigm was

²¹⁸⁴ We find, in particular, in the family maṇḍalas: *badhyantām* (√*bandh*), *-vacyasva*, *vacyántām* (√*vañc*); in the late RV: *yujyadhvam*, *-vr̥ścyantām*; in younger mantras (AV, RVKh.): *-idhyásva*, *-tāyatām*, *-dhīyasva*, *bhriyantām* (RVKh.), *yujyátām*, *hanyátām*, *hanyantām*.

²¹⁸⁵ Cf. AVERY 1885: 356, 361. *sám acyanta* (RV 5.54.12) is likely to belong with non-passive -ya-presents.

²¹⁸⁶ *-ap̥cyanta* (RV 1.110.4) may have originally belonged with non-passive -ya-presents; see s.v. *p̥rc*.

²¹⁸⁷ *ūhyāte* (RV 1.120.11) is, most likely, an intensive; see s.v. *vah*.

²¹⁸⁸ *A priori*, one might suppose the rarity of passive imperatives – which is indeed the

not yet well-established until Vedic prose. The oldest layer of the passive paradigm consisted of the forms of the present tense properly speaking, together with the present participles. As for the forms of the past (imperfect) tense and injunctive, in the earliest periods their function could be taken over by the passive aorist in *-i/-ran(-ram)* and its injunctive.

On the other hand, the development of the passive paradigm could be suppressed by some constraints and tendencies of purely formal (phonological and prosodic) nature – in particular, by the tendency to avoid sequences of two long syllables. This tendency is responsible, for instance, as INSLER (1997) has shown, for the length of the presuffixal vowel *a* in *-yá*-denominatives made from thematic *a*-stems, which is determined by the length of the root and suffix (= penult) syllables, cf. *devayá-* vs. *aghāyá-*; part. *ṛtāyaté* vs. 3pl. *ṛtayanta*. As I argued elsewhere (KULIKOV 2005a), the same tendency may account for the secondary vowel shortening in a number of nominal and verbal formations, in particular, in the nominal derivatives of the root ²*pī* (*pīy*) ‘blame, scorn’ (cf. *pīyú-*, *pīyaka-*, *pīyatnú-*, *pīyāru-*; see Chapter B.V, s.v.) and in the *-ya*-stems built on *CRi* roots (*-śriye°*, *-vliye°* instead of the regular *-śrīye°*, *-vlīye°*; see s.vv.). Since most of the passive *-ya*-stems have long root syllables (the only exception being passives derived from the *Cṛ* roots, such as *kriyá-*, *bhriyá-*), the aforementioned phonological tendency could have retarded the derivation of the optative and subjunctive forms, which have long suffix vowels (*e*, *ā*). Note, incidentally, that two of the three earliest examples of the passive subjunctives and optatives, mentioned at the beginning of this Chapter, are derived from a stem with the short root syllable (*bhriyá-*).

The late character of the subjunctive and optative forms, which, in fact have been added to the passive paradigm as late as in Vedic prose, accounts for the usage of **indicative instead of subjunctive** in the present passive paradigm. One such example is noticed by RENOUE (1937a: 35):

(TS 5.2.10.3 ≈ ^AKS 20.9:28.9-10 ≈ KpS 31.11:158.21-22)

ádad ít sá bráhmanā́nnaṃ, yásyaitā́ [TS, KS in v.l.] *upadhīyántai* /
[KS, ²¹⁸⁹ KpS] *upadhīyanta ítī*

case – on the assumption that one cannot “o r d e r someone to do something that is by nature automatic, neither requiring nor allowing intentions or effort”, as JAMISON (1989: 62) points out when commenting on GOTÓ’s (1987) analysis of the present *vacyá-^{te}*. This constraint does not hold, however, for other non-indicative moods and imperfects/injunctives.

²¹⁸⁹ V.l. *°yantā* in the KS.

‘The one for whom these [bricks] shall be put down shall eat brahmaṇa-food.’²¹⁹⁰

The ungrammatical form °yantā (sandhi form for °yantai), attested as a variant reading in the KS [Brl], probably represents a compromise formation, i.e. subjunctive with the secondarily shortened suffix vowel.

Two forms with the secondary short suffix vowels occur in yet another KS-KpS passage, to which SCHROEDER (1896: 6) has drawn attention:

(KS 27.3:141.20-142.1, 4-5 = KpS 42.3:250.5-6, 10-11 ≈ TS 6.4.7.1-2)

vāryaṃ vṛṇai madagrā eva grahā $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{[TS] } gṛhyāntā \\ \text{[KS] } gṛhāntā \\ \text{[KpS] } gṛhyantā \end{array} \right\} iti.$
 tasmād vāyvagrā grahā gṛhyante [...]

vāryaṃ vṛṇai maddevatyāny eva pātrāṇy $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{[TS] } ucyāntā \\ \text{[KS] } ucyantā \\ \text{[KpS] } ucyantā \end{array} \right\} iti$

“‘I will choose the wealth; verily, [your] cups will be drawn starting with mine“. Therefore the cups are drawn starting with those for Vāyu. [...] “I will choose the wealth; verily, [your] cups will be called having me as their deity“.”

Four forms attested in the KS–KpS (shown in the bold case) are ungrammatical; SCHROEDER emends to ⁺*gṛhyāntā iti* and ⁺*ucyāntā iti*. Most instructive is the case of subj. ⁺*gṛhyāntā*. Apparently, the KS and KpS followed two distinct (and, in a sense, symmetrical) ways to solve the prosodic conflict between the long (closed) root syllable and long suffix vowel: the Kāṭhaka “lightens” the root syllable by dropping the y, the KpS shortens the suffix vowel.²¹⁹¹

Coordinated subjunctive and indicative forms occur in ŚB 14.9.1.2 = BĀUM 6.1.2 *véttha yáthemāḥ prajāḥ prayátyo vipratipádyantā3y iti* [...] *véttha yáthāsáu loká evāṃ bahúbhiḥ púnah-punaḥ prayádbhir ná saṃpūryátā3y iti*²¹⁹² “‘Do you know how these beings on passing away separate in different directions?“ [...] “Do you know how yonder world does not overfill with many [beings] who continually pass away?“.”

²¹⁹⁰ Cf. also KEITH (1914: 415, fn. 1) [TS, transl., ad loc.]: “the subj. in TS. is obviously better than the indic. of KS.”

²¹⁹¹ See also RENO 1933: (90).

²¹⁹² Ed. BÖHTLINGK ⁺*saṃpūryátai*; see Chapter B.III, s.v. *pṛ*.

Furthermore, the late character of the passive subjunctive and optatives may explain the **retention of the root accentuation in ‘-yá-presents**. As I argued in Chapter II.3.2, several non-passive middle ‘-yá-presents, which originally had the accent on the root, have been later transferred to the “passive” class in the AV, MS–KS and ŚB. Among exceptions to this regularity we find a number of subjunctive, optative and imperative forms; cf. group (1) in Chapter II.3.2.2 (*vy-ava-chídyai* ŚBK 2.8.3.18, *múcyātai* AV 8.8.6, *kṣ́yeta* ŚB 14.4.3.7, *prati-púryeta* MS 3.2.2:17.11, etc.). Most likely, the transfer to the passive class was blocked, above all, for optatives and subjunctives, and forms like AV *múcyātai*, ²¹⁹³*uc-chíśyātai* have preserved their original root accentuation.²¹⁹³ Although in Vedic prose the paradigm of *-yá*-passives was well-established and the above constraint was no longer operative, forms like *vy-ava-chídyai* ŚBK and *prati-púryeta* MS may betray the same tendency.

IV.2. Non-passive *-ya*-presents: paradigm and nominal derivatives

Unlike *-yá*-passives, the non-passive *-ya*-presents form full present paradigm (present, imperfect and injunctive, imperative, subjunctive, optative, present participle) already in early Vedic. An interesting paradigmatic disproportion is the prevalence of participles among the forms attested for a number of **active** *-ya*-presents of states (class A1.1). Some active *-ya*-presents occur in the RV only in the participial form: *kṣ́údhyaṅt-* ‘hungry’, *gṛ́dhyant-* ‘eager’, *tṛ́ṣyaṅt-* ‘thirsty’, *-dṛ́pyant-* ‘confused, ignorant’ (in *ádṛpyant-* ‘unconfused’).

Besides the finite forms and present participles, a few *-ya*-stems are attested in nominal derivatives of rare and non-productive types. Some of these derivatives allow an alternative (“non-deverbative”) analysis (for instance, *manyá-* might be taken as derived either from the stem of the *-ya*-present *mánya-^{te}* or directly from the root, with the nominal suffix *-yá-*). Nevertheless, at least their secondary paradigmatic association with the *-ya*-presents (note the participle-like semantics) is probable. Importantly, all these derivatives correspond to active *-ya*-presents (except for *manyá- :: mánya-^{te}*). Below I give a synopsis of such formations, with bibliographical references:

²¹⁹³ The attested form *uc-chíśyātai* probably results from the tendency to lighten the long root syllable before the long suffix vowel; see below.

- a-:** (see WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER AiG II/1: 179f., §76ba; II/2: 81f., §24ba; SOMMER 1977a: 56, note 17)
(a-kṣudhyá- ‘non-hungry’ AV 7.60.4, 6)²¹⁹⁴
-dasyá- (in *a-vidasyá-* ‘inexhaustible’ RV 7.39.6)
-driyá- (in *avidriyá-* ‘non-breaking’ RV 1.46.15)
-pacyá- (in *akṛṣṭa-pacyá-* ‘ripening in an unploughed land’ AV +)
-paśyá- (in *a-paśyá-* RV 1.148.5, *māṇi-paśyá-* AV, etc.)
pūya- ‘pus’ ŚBM (≈ ŚBK *pūyá-*) + (also in *ka-pūya-* ‘stinking’ ChU)
-manyá- ‘considering oneself Q’ (e.g. in *puṇya-manyá-* MS ‘considering oneself good’), ‘respecting’ (in *punar-manyá-* RV 1.117.14)
(-dya-, in *tāmodya-* TĀ^m 1.10.4 ‘destroying darkness’)²¹⁹⁵
- ‘-aka-:** (see WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 147f., §147a,b)
trāyaka- ‘protecting’ VaikhDhS 3.15.13
pīyaka- ‘scornful’ AV 16.6.8
- a-tí-:** (see RENOU 1949: 63; 1951: 4)
tapyatyai KS-Aśvamedha 5.5.6:168.12 (≈ TĀ^m 3.20.1 *tapyatvái*, v.l. *tapatyái*)
snihyati- (in abl.sg. *snihyates* DevatādhB)
- atú-:** (see WACKERNAGEL 1903: 152 [= Kl.Schr. I, 404]; RENOU 1937b: 7; WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 663, §488b; 665ff., §§489a, 490e, 492b)
tanyatú- ‘thunder’ RV, AV 5.13.3
tapyatú- ‘burning, heat’ RV 2.24.9, *tapyatvái* TS^m 1.4.35.1 ≈ TĀ^m 3.20.1
- át:** (= neuter act. part. in adverbial usage; see WACKERNAGEL 1918: 394 [= Kl.Schr. I, 313]; INSLEER 1970: 138, fn. 2; RENOU 1936: 33

²¹⁹⁴ Unless a nonce formation built in analogy with the adjacent *atrīśyá-*; see s.v.

²¹⁹⁵ This formation belongs with the *Cyāti* presents.

and 56f., note 55; WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 164, §70b; RIX 1985: 205f., 217f., notes 47-52; PINAULT 1989: 86f.)

drahyát ‘to become firm’ RV 2.11.15

stāyát ‘secretly’ AV +

-atnú-: (= part. *-at* + *-nú-*; see WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 170, §73; HOFFMANN 1957b: 59 [= Aufs. 2, 411])

pīyatnú- ‘scornful’ RV 8.2.15

-atá-: (see WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 168f., §71a)

tanyatá RV 1.80.12 (unless pres.part.)

paśyata- ‘conspicuous’ AV (all in 13.4, only voc.)

haryatá- ‘enjoyable’ (part.fut.pass.) RV, TB^m (also in *haryata-vant-* ‘[the verse] containing [the word] *haryata-*’ KB^(m))

-āru-: (see WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 288, §177a)

pīyāru- ‘scornful’ RV, AV

-āse-inf.: (see WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 224, §123c, 229, §127bβ; SGALL 1958: 180, 213f.; MANESSY 1961: 198ff., 207f.)

puśyāse ‘in order to prosper, for prosperity’ RV

-ú-: (see WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 845, §681d; WÜST 1931: 193, with fn. 1; M. LEUMANN 1968a: 473f.; LUBOTSKY 1988: 48; MAYRHOFER 2003: 47, 55, 93f.)

īrṣyú- ‘jealous’ AV 6.18.2, JB (+)

tanyú- ‘thundering’ RV 5.63.2, 5

tāyú- ‘thief’ RV

druhyú- (tribe name) RV +

pāyú- ‘protector’ RV +

pīyú- ‘scornful’ RV 1.174.8 = 2.19.7 (also in *deva-pīyú-* AV, VS, ŚB)

(*śimyú-* [tribe name?] RV 7.18.5, *śimyu-* RV 1.100.18)

śundhyú- ‘pure’ RV +

V. -ya-passives and other passive formations

Alongside the productive -yá-passives, finite formations that can be used in passive constructions include: (i) medio-passive aorists, with defective paradigm (3sg. in *-i*, 3pl. in *-ran/-ram*, and participle; see KÜMMEL 1996; KULIKOV 2006b; cf., e.g., *yuj* ‘yoke, join’: 3sg. *áyoji*, 3pl. *áyujran*, part. *yujāná-*); (ii) statives, which supply passive perfects for some verbal roots, and middle perfects,²¹⁹⁶ also with defective paradigm (3sg. in *-e*, 3pl. in *-re*, and participle; cf., e.g., *hi* ‘impel’: 3sg. *hinvé* ‘(it) is impelled’, 3pl. *hinviré* ‘(they) are impelled’; part. *hinvāná-*; see KULIKOV 2006a); and (iii) isolated middle forms of all tense systems: presents (e.g. *gṛ̥* ‘praise’: class IX present *gṛ̥ñtē* ‘is praised’); aorists (e.g. *yuj* ‘yoke, join’: sigmatic aorist (3pl.) *ayukṣata*); futures; as well as intensives.²¹⁹⁷ For the sake of convenience, all formations employed in the passive usage, which I mention in individual lemmata, are synopsisized in Appendix III. As already said, it was not my intention to trace all such forms, therefore this list does not claim to be exhaustive.

V.1. -yá-passives and other presents in the passive usage

Among the tense systems, only the present has a productive passive formation with full paradigm, i.e. -yá-passives, in its disposal.²¹⁹⁸ It is

²¹⁹⁶ Many of them should be taken as statives built on perfect stems, rather than as middle perfects proper, especially in early Vedic; see KULIKOV 2006a.

²¹⁹⁷ Indian grammarians (cf. Pāṇ. 6.4.62) teach special forms built on stems incorporating -y- (obviously, extracted from the present passive suffix -yá-), which are said to be derived from the roots in *-ā* as well as from a few consonantal roots (e.g. from ¹*dā*: aor. *adāyīṣi*, fut. *dāyīṣye*, periphrastic fut. *dāyitā*, opposed to the non-passive middles *adiṣi*, *dāsyate* and *dātā*). Such forms do not occur in Vedic (except for pass. fut. *-khyāyīṣyate* JB, for which see s.v.), obviously being artificial creations made in imitation of -yá-passives. For these formations, see WHITNEY 1884: 289 [= Sel.Wr., 297]; 1889 [SktGr]: 362, §998e-f; RENOU 1930 [GrS]: 466 and esp. KIPARSKY 1979: 138ff.; for Classical Sanskrit (kāvyā) attestations, see RENOU 1959b: 75 [= Choix II, 705], note 57.

²¹⁹⁸ See HOCK 1982: 129. On paradigmatic gaps in early Vedic, see KULIKOV 2006a and

probably for that reason that other present formations are very rare in the passive usage. In particular, GOTŌ (1987: 56) has demonstrated that middle class I presents cannot function as passives (except for *stáva-te*, which is of secondary origin; see s.v.). Passive attestations of forms of other present classes are mostly found in the early Vedic period, when *-yá*-passives could not yet be derived from some verbal roots, and, accordingly, are mainly limited to the roots which did not form *-yá*-passives in early Vedic.²¹⁹⁹ Some of them may be secondary formations based on statives, instantiating a sort of back derivation (Rückbildungen). Thus, we find in the RV the following middle presents attested in the passive usage:

- ¹*gṛ̥* ‘praise’ • *gṛ̥ñtē*²²⁰⁰ (*-yá*-pass. is not attested)
- tud* ‘incite, goad’ • *-tundate* RV 1.58.1²²⁰¹ (*-yá*-pass. is not attested)
- ²*mā* ‘measure’ • *mīmīte* RV 8.12.10 (pass. *mīyá-te* first appears in the Sū.; attestations in the RV, AV and Vedic prose are uncertain)
- śri* ‘lay on’ • *śráyamāṇa-* RV 3.8.2 (?) (pass. *-śrīyá-te* YV +)
- śrī* ‘mix’ • *śrīṇāná-*²²⁰² (*-yá*-pass. is not attested)
- stu* ‘praise’ • *stáva-te* RV²²⁰³
- stṛ̥* ‘strew’ • *-stṛ̥ñtām* RV 7.17.1 (pass. *stīryá-te* YV^m +)

Chapter IV.1 above.

²¹⁹⁹ Cf. also GIPPERT 1984: 36, where the hypothetical pass. **dabhate* (‘(jemand) wird betrogen’) is ruled out on account of the *-yá*-passive *dabhyate*.

²²⁰⁰ See WENZEL 102; EATON 25; DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 264; BURROW 1957: 134; KÜMMEL 1996: 34ff. *gṛ̥ñtē* must be based on the stem of the stative *gṛ̥ñé* ‘is praised’, with which the participle *gṛ̥ñāná-* is likely to belong; see KULIKOV 2006a: 72.

²²⁰¹ *nú cit sahojā amṛto ní tundate* (RV 1.58.1a) ‘The immortal, born by force [Agni] is never goaded on’; see GELDNER’s and RENOU’s (EVP XII, 82) comments ad loc.; cf. also GONDA 1979: 21.

²²⁰² Cf. DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 264.

²²⁰³ Probably based on the stem of the stative *stave*; see NARTEN 1968b; KULIKOV 2006a: 72.

V.2. *-ya*-presents and associated aorists

V.2.1. Middle *-ya*-presents, *-i*-aorists and sigmatic aorists

The main aorist formation employed foremost in the passive usage and thus functioning as the aorist counterpart of *-yá*-passives is the so-called medio-passive *-i*-aorist, represented by three forms only: 3sg. in *-i*, 3pl. in *-ran/-ram*, and participle. For a monographic treatment of Indo-Iranian *-i*-aorists, see KÜMMEL 1996. As is well-known, medio-passive *-i*-aorists are associated with middle *-ya*-presents as a whole, regardless of accentuation and the passive/non-passive distinction (see already DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 267; 1897 [VglSynt II]: 436f.) and never function as the aorist pendants of active *-ya*-presents.²²⁰⁴ This is, incidentally, an important paradigmatic evidence for the common origin of all middle *-ya*-presents, as opposed to active *-ya*-presents, some of which may go back to a different source (see Chapter VII.2).

Less attention was paid to the correlation between middle *-ya*-presents and **sigmatic aorists** that partly fill in the gaps in the paradigm of the *-i*-aorist and even, in a few rare cases, replace 3pl. aorists in *-ran/-ram*, which are limited to early Vedic (RV); for this paradigmatic correlation, see, in particular, NARTEN 1964: 25ff., 215 (on *ayujran* // *ayukṣata*), 223 (on *árādhi* // *rādhiṣṭa*), 227 (*aroci* // *arociṣṭa*), 270f. (on *ásṛgran/m* // *asṛkṣata*); HOFFMANN 1968b: 217f. [= Aufs. 1, 254f.] (on *aroci* RV // *ruciṣṭya* AV, *arociṣṭa* MS); INSLER 1968a; 1969a; 1995.

For convenience, *-i*-aorists (discussed in KÜMMEL 1996 and/or in Part B of the present study), sigmatic aorists which function as aorist pendants of middle *-ya*-presents and the corresponding *-ya*-presents are recapitulated in the table below.²²⁰⁵

²²⁰⁴ The only exception is the pair *śúcya*-*ī* Br. :: *ásoci* RV^{2x}, but, synchronically, these formations do not belong together; see Chapter B.IV, s.v.

²²⁰⁵ I do not include into the table a few anomalous formations, such as *vavarti*, *avavṛtran*, built on the perfect stem (see Chapter B.I, s.v. *vṛt*) and the nonce formation *jārayāyi* RV 6.12.4 (absent from KÜMMEL's corpus).

	middle <i>-ya</i> -presents	<i>-i</i> -aorists	sigmatic aorists
<i>-yá</i> -passives	<i>āpyá</i> ⁻¹ᵉ YVᵐ⁺	<i>āpi</i> ŚB	
	<i>kriyá</i> ⁻¹ᵉ	<i>ākāri</i>	
	<i>gr̥hyá</i> ⁻¹ᵉ AV+	<i>agr̥bhran</i>	
	<i>jñāyá</i> ⁻¹ᵉ	<i>ājñāyi</i>	
	<i>tāyá</i> ⁻¹ᵉ (√¹tan)	<i>-atāyi</i> AĀ	
	<i>-tīrya</i> ⁻¹ᵉ TBᵐ¹ˣ	<i>-tāri</i>	
	<i>dīyá</i> ⁻¹ᵉ AV+	<i>-dāyi</i> (√¹dā ‘give’)	
	<i>-dīyá</i> ⁻¹ᵉ YVᵐ¹ˣ	<i>-dāyi</i> (√²dā ‘bind’)	
	<i>dṛśyá</i> ⁻¹ᵉ	(á)dárśi, ádṛśran/m	<i>dṛkṣata</i>
	<i>dhīyá</i> ⁻¹ᵉ	(á)dhāyi	
	<i>-panyá</i> ⁻¹ᵉ (?)		<i>paniṣṭa</i>
	<i>pīyá</i> ⁻¹ᵉ AV+	<i>ápāyi</i>	
	–	<i>aprāyi</i> RVKh.	
	<i>bhriyá</i> ⁻¹ᵉ	<i>bhāri</i>	
	<i>mīyá</i> ⁻¹ᵉ	<i>-amāyi</i> VādhS	
	<i>yamyá</i> ⁻¹ᵉ	<i>áyāmi</i>	<i>ayaṃsata</i>
	<i>yujyá</i> ⁻¹ᵉ	<i>áyoji, áyujran</i>	<i>ayukṣata</i>
	<i>ucyá</i> ⁻¹ᵉ	<i>ávāci</i>	
	–	<i>vandī</i> (√vand ‘praise’)	
	<i>vidyá</i> ⁻¹ᵉ	(a)védi	
	–	<i>ávāri</i> (√vr̥ ‘cover’)	
	<i>-vr̥hya</i> ⁻¹ᵉ YVᵖ⁺	<i>-varhi</i>	
	<i>śasyá</i> ⁻¹ᵉ	<i>śaṃsi</i>	
	<i>-śrīyá</i> ⁻¹ᵉ Br.+	<i>áśrāyi</i>	
	<i>śrūyá</i> ⁻¹ᵉ	<i>-śrávi</i>	
	<i>sajyá</i> ⁻¹ᵉ TSᵖ⁺	<i>-aṣañji</i> ŚB (√sañj)	
	<i>sicyá</i> ⁻¹ᵉ	<i>-áseci</i> ŚB	<i>-asikṣi</i>
	<i>sūyá</i> ⁻¹ᵉ (√su ‘press’)	<i>ásāvi</i>	(tr.) <i>asoṣṭa</i> ChU
	<i>sr̥jyá</i> ⁻¹ᵉ	(á)sarji, ásr̥gran/m	<i>asṛkṣata</i>
	<i>stūyá</i> ⁻¹ᵉ	<i>ástāvi</i>	<i>astoṣṭa</i>
	<i>stīryá</i> ⁻¹ᵉ	<i>ástāri</i>	
	<i>hūyá</i> ⁻¹ᵉ (√hu)	<i>áhāvi</i>	

-ya-presents	change of state	<i>jāya</i> ^{-te} <i>pyāya</i> ^{-te} <i>būdhya</i> ^{-te} (α) <i>mriyā</i> ^{-te} <i>rajya</i> ^{-te} AV+ <i>rādhya</i> ^{-te} AV+ <i>-līya</i> ^{-te} (α)RVKh.+ <i>sphāya</i> ^{-te} AVP ^{1x}	<i>akṛpran</i> <i>(ā)jāni/jāni</i> <i>ābodhi, ābudhran/m</i> <i>ārādhi</i>	<i>ājaniṣṭa</i> etc. <i>(pyāsiṣīmahi AV+)</i> <i>ābhutsi</i> etc. <i>mṛṣi</i> AVP <i>rādhiṣi</i> etc. AV+
	motion and body posture	<i>īya</i> ^{-te} RV+ <i>ṛjya</i> ^{-te/(ti)} RV <i>(*gamyate ?)</i> <i>dhriyā</i> ^{-te} <i>pādya</i> ^{-te} RV+ <i>rīya</i> ^{-te} RV-VS <i>-līya</i> ^{-te} (β) Br.+ <i>-sriya</i> ^{-te} KS ^p	<i>agāmi</i> <i>(ā)pādi, apadran</i> <i>āmyakṣi</i> <i>aviśran</i> <i>varti, āvṛtran</i> <i>(ā)sādi</i> <i>-āsāri (+prā) ŚB</i> <i>asthiran</i> <i>aspṛdhran</i>	<i>ayāsiṣṭa</i> etc. <i>agasmahi</i> RV, TS <i>(a)patsi</i> AV, ChU, <i>apatsata</i> AB <i>-aleṣṭa</i> etc. ŚB <i>avikṣata</i> etc. <i>avṛtsata</i> etc. <i>(sarṣat AV^{1x})</i> <i>asthiṣata</i> ŚB (+)
	mental activities	<i>-driyā</i> ^{-te} Br.+ <i>būdhya</i> ^{-te} (β)AV+ <i>mānya</i> ^{-te} RV+ <i>mṛṣya</i> ^{-te}	<i>ājuṣran (?)</i>	<i>-dṛḍhvam</i> Br. <i>amaṇsata</i> etc. RV+ <i>(marṣiṣṭhāḥ RV^{1x})</i>
	light and appearance	<i>dīpya</i> ^{-te} AV+	<i>āceti, cēti</i> <i>ābhrāji</i> <i>(a)roci</i> <i>avasran (?)</i> <i>āsoci</i>	 <i>ruciṣīya</i> AV+, <i>arociṣṭa</i> YV ^{m+}

’-yá-presents	entropy increase	<i>ḥdhyá^{-1e}</i> <i>kṣṭyá^{-1e}</i> <i>chídya^{-1e}</i> <i>jṭyá^{-1e}</i> <i>dāryá^{-1e}</i> YV ^P + <i>pūryá^{-1e}</i> <i>bhajya^{-1e}</i> RVKh.+ <i>bhidya^{-1e}</i> RVKh.+ <i>mṛyá^{-1e}</i> <i>mūcyá^{-1e}</i> <i>rīcyá^{-1e}</i> <i>lipyá^{-1e}</i> YV ^m + <i>lupyá^{-1e}</i> TS ^P + <i>vṛīya^{-1e}</i> YV ^P + <i>śīṣyá^{-1e}</i> AV+ <i>śṭyá^{-1e}</i> AV+ <i>śīrya^{-1e}</i> <i>hīyá^{-1e}</i>	<i>-ārdhi/-ardhi</i> YV ^P -ŚB <i>kṣāyi</i> TS ^m <i>(á)chedi</i> <i>apūri</i> Sū. <i>bhedi</i> YV ^m <i>āmāyi</i> YV ^P + <i>(á)móci</i> <i>-reci, areci</i> <i>-lopi</i> ŚrSū. ^m <i>-śeṣi</i> AV+ <i>śāri</i> <i>(á)hāyi</i> AV+	<i>-ārdhiṣṭa</i> MS ^P <i>kṣeṣṭa</i> etc. AV+ <i>chitsi, chitsmahi</i> YV ^P + <i>ajyāsiṣṭām</i> JB <i>(darṣat</i> RV) <i>(āpūriṣṭhāḥ</i> TĀ) <i>bhitthāḥ</i> YV <i>meṣi, meṣṭa</i> etc. AV+ <i>mukṣata</i> etc. <i>āriḥṣi, rikṣata</i> ŚB+ <i>alipsata</i> RV <i>-lopsīya</i> ChU <i>vleṣṭi</i> ŚrSū. <i>hāsmahi, hāsta</i> , etc.			
	heating	<i>tāpyá^{-1e}</i> <i>dāhyá^{-1e}</i> <i>pācyá^{-1e}</i>	<i>ātāpi</i>	<i>átapthāḥ</i> (?) AV <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>(tr. <i>adhākṣiṭ</i> etc.)</td> </tr>			
			(tr. <i>adhākṣiṭ</i> etc.)				

The table clearly shows that middle *-ya*-presents and *-i*-aorists belong together as paradigmatic pendants. Only a few passive *-i*-aorists have no corresponding *-yá*-passives.²²⁰⁶ The opposite is not true: many *-yá*-passives have no corresponding *-i*-aorists. The reason of this asymmetry is simple: *-yá*-passives became productive already in early mantras and could easily be derived analogically from nearly all transitive verbs, while *-i*-aorists never were productive.

Likewise, the lesser percentage of matches between non-passive middle *-ya*-presents and *-i*-aorists is due to the fact that neither of these two morphological types was productive. Importantly, the asymmetries between 3rd and 4th columns are not at random but can be mapped onto the semantic classification of the corresponding verbs.²²⁰⁷ While ‘change of state’ verbs (= R1) and ‘motion and body posture’ verbs (= R2) are well represented for

²²⁰⁶ There are no present counterparts of *aprāyi*, *vandi* and *āvāri* ($\sqrt{\text{vr}}$ ‘cover’), but the function of the non-existent ***prāyá-^{te}* is (partly) taken over by *pūryá-^{te}*.

²²⁰⁷ For semantic classes of *-i*-aorists, see MIGRON 1975: 275ff.

both formations, two other semantic classes show lesser parallelism:

(i) There are no *-i*-aorists corresponding to *-ya*-presents of mental activities (except for *ájuṣran* ‘they enjoyed’);

(ii) There are no middle *-ya*-presents corresponding to *-i*-aorists of the verbs of light and appearance,²²⁰⁸ which typically have class I presents as present pendants: *céta^{-te}* (RVic hapax),²²⁰⁹ *bhrája^{-te/ti}*, *róca^{-te}*, *śóca^{-ti}*. The only *-ya*-present of this semantic class is *dīpya^{-te}*, derived from the secondary root *dīp*, which first appears after the RV (see Chapter B.II, s.v.).

Outside this classification remains the isolated form *áyāvi* VS–TB^m ‘kept away’ (with no corresponding middle *-ya*-presents), which is the only transitive *-i*-aorist (KÜMMEL 87).

V.2.2. Active *-ya*-presents and thematic aorists

A good deal of the active *-ya*-presents have corresponding thematic aorists: *krúdhya^{-ti}* :: *kruḍhaḥ* AV +, *tāmya^{-ti}* :: *tamat* RV, TB, *tṛṣya^{-ti}* :: *tṛṣat* etc. AV +, *dīpya^{-ti}* :: *adr̥pat* Br., *drúhya^{-ti}* :: *adruhaḥ* etc. RV +, *múhya^{-ti}* :: *amuhat* etc. Br., *riṣya^{-ti}* :: *riṣam* etc.; part. *riṣant-* (*riṣant-*) RV +, etc.;²²¹⁰ cf. also *snihya^{-ti}* (post-Vedic) :: *snihat*.²²¹¹ This paradigmatic correlation has been noticed already by HIRT (1898: 272) and RENOU (1930 [GrS]: 442, §320); see also SCHMID 1963: 42, fn. 157; KÜMMEL 2000: 315. A detailed examination of the paradigmatic relationships between active *-ya*-presents and thematic aorists requires a special study of the latter formation and goes beyond the scope of the present monograph.

V.3. Perfects and statives in the passive usage

There is no special passive formation in the perfect system, but forms with middle endings are quite common in the passive usage, particularly, in early Vedic (cf. RENOU 1925: 154ff., 175ff.; GONDA 1979: 83).²²¹² As I argued

²²⁰⁸ MIGRON’s (1975: 275) *verba lucendi*; on this semantic type, see ROESLER 1997.

²²⁰⁹ I follow KÜMMEL’s (1996: 38f., with fn. 47) semantic interpretation of *áceti* ‘has appeared’, *céti* ‘appears’.

²²¹⁰ Note that both pr. *riṣya^{-ti}* and aor. (*a*)*riṣa^{-t}* can be employed both intransitively and transitively (see s.v.), so that their paradigmatic association is supported by the syntactic parallelism.

²²¹¹ See HOFFMANN 1965a: 18 [= Aufs. 2, 447]).

²²¹² In Epic Skt., only middle perfects of verbs of perception (*dadṛśe*, *śuśruve*) can be employed in the passive usage; see HOLTZMANN 1884: 17f.

elsewhere (see KULIKOV 2006a), the early Vedic passive occurrences of 3sg. and 3pl. forms with middle inflection as well as passive occurrences of middle participles derived from perfect stems should be taken as statives built on perfect stems, rather than as middle perfects proper.

The passive usage is quite common for Vedic statives in *-e/-ire*;²²¹³ for a monographic treatment of this formation, see KÜMMEL 1996. In a few cases statives may supply missing *-yá*-passives; cf. *brū* ‘say’ (*bruve* RV 5.61.8,²²¹⁴ with part. *bruvāṇá-*),²²¹⁵ *hi* ‘impel’ (*hinvé*, *hinviré*,²²¹⁶ with part. *hinvāṇá-*). Note also that the stative forms of *śru* ‘hear’ (*śṛṇvé* etc.) are attested already in the early RV, as against the *-yá*-passive *śrūyá-*^{te}, which first appears in the late maṇḍala X (see s.v.).

V.4. Middle futures are quite rare **in the passive usage**. We find, in particular, *-āpsyata* ŚB, *soṣyāmāna-* ($\sqrt{\text{ś}}\text{sū}$) ŚB, *staviṣyase* RV 8.70.14. The only form with a special passive marker (*-y-*), JB 1.321 *ā-khyāyisyante* ‘they will be called’, is a late and artificial formation (see Chapter B.I, s.v.).

²²¹³ See already DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]: 264, fn. 1.

²²¹⁴ See KÜMMEL 76.

²²¹⁵ For the passive interpretation of part. *bruvāṇá-* at RV 3.59.1, see HILLEBRANDT 1913: 73, with fn. 3; THIEME 1957: 39f. [= Op.Mai. I, 233f.].

²²¹⁶ See KÜMMEL 140.

VI. Diathesis fluctuations in -ya-presents

VI.1. Active forms in the paradigm of middle -ya-presents

Middle -ya-presents, including both passive and non-passive (class IV) formations, occur in Vedic with active endings only exceptionally. In contrast to Avestan, where -iia-passives with active inflection are quite common (cf. KELLENS 129f.), the active diathesis is ungrammatical for these two verbal classes in Vedic. Non-passive middle -ya-presents first appear with active inflection at the very end of the Vedic period (in late Brāhmaṇas and, particularly, in some Upaniṣads), but remain very rare until Sūtras. As for -yá-passives with active endings, they are generally said to become more common in late Vedic and post-Vedic texts, especially in Epic Sanskrit (see, e.g., BÖHTLINGK 1887: 220, §774; WHITNEY 1889 [SktGr]: 277, §774; HOLTZMANN 1884: 25f.; MICHELSON 1904: 132; RENOU 1930 [GrS]: 465; VAN DAALEN 1980: 86; SALOMON 1986: 42). In fact, however, such statements are mostly based on misunderstandings.

First, a few late Vedic and post-Vedic forms in -yet, usually treated as passive optatives with the abnormal active inflection (cf. *sicyet* ŚĀ), belong with -yet-optatives, not with -ya-presents (see KULIKOV 2006d).

Second, a good deal of the supposed passives with active endings belong in fact with the non-passive -yá-presents, mistaken by some scholars for (true) passives.

I was able to find only a few -ya-passives with active inflection. One such form is *ud-rudhyati* JB^v 2.383:10 (for which HORSCH (1966: 120) and EHLERS 102 conjecture ⁺*-rudhyate*), attested in a syntactically unclear context (probably, anticausative). The very uniqueness of the form (unless mere mss. error) may point to the fact that in some late texts pass. *-rudhya^{-te}* could be reinterpreted as non-passive (see s.v.). The active diathesis of *ā-dhmāyati* BĀUM 3.2.12 ≈ BĀUK 3.2.11 must be due to the adjacent active form *ūcchūyati/ūcchvayati*.

Other active occurrences belong with non-passive -ya-presents. The

attested forms²²¹⁷ can be divided into two unequal groups:

(1) Forms with **unmotivated diathesis change**, probably due to the late character of texts, where these form appear.

- ṛdh* • *sam-ṛdhyaṅti* ChU 7.14.2
- kṣī* • *apa-kṣīyati*, *ápa-kṣīyati* TA 1.14.2
- tap* • *atapyat* GB^{4x}
tapyā-^{ti} VāsDhS +
- dah* • *dahyaṅti* ŚB 5.9.2
dahya-^{ti} Gr̥Sū.+
dahyet MānGS 2.15.6
ava-dahyaṅti ĀgniGS 3.10.4:174.8
- dīp* • *úd-dīpyati* ŚBK 5.4.1.28^{2x} (≈ ŚBM 4.3.4.33 *dīpyamāna-*)
dīpyati MaitrU 6.35
- pad* • *pra-pádyanti* RVKh. 4.2.7
āpadyati Ār̥ṣB 1.6
āpadyatha (impv., for °-ta) PraśU 2.3
- pī* • *ā-pīryati* TĀ 1.14.1^{2x}
- man* • *abhi-manyanti* MuṇḍU 1.2.9
ava-manyant- BaudhŚS^v 29.8:380.13
- muc* • *pári-mucyaṅti* TĀ^v 10.10.3 (= TĀ-Andhra^v 12.4 = MNU, ed. VARENNE 230) ≈ MuṇḍU^v 3.2.6 (≈ late Up.)
- raj* • *upani-rajyatu* ManB 2.4.10 (← ⁺*upa-rajyatu*?)
- rādh* • *rādhyaṅti* DhSū.
- lī* • *pravi-līyanti* MuṇḍU 3.2.2
- vāś* • *vāśyati*, *vāśyet* APrāyaśc. 2.4
- śī* • *vy-aśīryat* ChU 5.15.2

In some cases we may of course assume the influence of one of the semantic classes of the active -ya-presents; for instance, *sam-ṛdhyaṅti* (ChU) '[his wishes] are fulfilled' may have emerged under the influence of *sídhyā-^{ti/(te)}* 'succeed' and *púṣya-^{ti}* 'prosper'; *-manyanti* (MuṇḍU) and *-manyant-*

²²¹⁷ The list of post-Vedic forms does not claim to be exhaustive.

(BaudhŚS) – under the influence of *dhyāya*-^{ti/(te)} ‘think of’. The influence of the active -ya-presents could not be very strong, however; not infrequent (or even more common) was the opposite diathesis change, i.e. active → middle (see below).

(2) In a few rare cases we can assume a **transitive-causative** opposition between middle and active forms, but examples are few and mostly uncertain:

- tap* • *tāpyate* [dat.sg. part.act.] VS 39.12 (≈ *tāpate* TS^m 1.4.35.1 ≈ TĀ^m 3.20.1)
- pyā* • *ā-pyāyati* ‘makes swell’ VārŚS 1.2.1.7
- bhū* • *abhi-bhūyati* ‘has power over’ MaitrU 3.3^{3x}

None of the above pairs can be regarded as evidence for a morphologically valid paradigmatic opposition. *tāpyate* VS is a nonce formation, replacing the regular transitive *tāpate* (attested in the Taittirīya tradition); *-pyāyati* VārŚS may result from a haplology (← ⁺*ā-pyāyati*); *abhi-bhūyati* is limited to one single passage in the MaitrU. Obviously, in contrast to the opposition within the system of class I presents (cf. *nāma*-^{te} ‘bend (intr.)’ ~ *nāma*-^{ti} ‘bend (tr.)’, *vārdha*-^{te} ‘increase, grow’ ~ *vārdha*-^{ti} ‘make increase, grow’; see GOTÖ 52ff.) and perfects (cf. *jajñé* ‘is born’ ~ *jajāna* ‘has generated’), the diathesis could not serve as the regular marker of transitivity within the system of -ya-presents.

VI.2. Middle forms in the paradigm of active -ya-presents

In contrast to middle -ya-presents, which take active endings only exceptionally, a number of active -ya-presents are not uncommon with middle endings. In a few cases middle inflection even becomes more frequent than (or at least as frequent as) the more archaic active inflection; cf. *dīvyā*-^{ti/te} ‘play’, *yūdhyā*-^{ti/te} ‘fight’, *śudhyā*-^{ti/te} ‘purify’. On the other hand, some texts seem to have generalized the middle diathesis for some active presents, as the GB did for *riṣya*-^{ti} → *riṣya*-^{te}. In general, all middle forms of the primarily active presents can be divided into two main types.

VI.2.1. Middle forms which are in functional opposition to their active pendants, i.e. middle endings have one of the typical functions of this diathesis: self-beneficent (affective) sense (sometimes with some idiomatic meaning changes), passive, reflexive, etc. This class of secondary middle

forms includes:

<i>as</i>	<i>ásya-^{te}</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> self-beneficent [= tr.-aff.] (e.g., with <i>ápi</i>, <i>úpa</i>, <i>ádhi</i>), also auto-directional (with <i>á</i>: ‘take’) indirect reflexive (with <i>pári</i>) pass. AĀ +
² <i>iṣ</i>	<i>iṣye</i> RV <i>preṣyate</i> AVP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> self-beneficent pass.
<i>trp</i>	<i>sam-trpyante</i> KB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> sociative
<i>dīv</i>	<i>dīvyā-^{te}</i> YV ^p +	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> reciprocal. (mostly with <i>vī</i>)
<i>nah</i>	<i>náhya-^{te}</i> <i>nahyá-^{te}</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> self-benef. [= tr.-aff.] refl. (with <i>sám</i>) pass. (with <i>ápi</i>) AV (+)
<i>nṛt</i>	<i>nṛtyate</i> JB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> pass.
<i>paś</i>	<i>pásya-^{te}</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> self-benef. [= tr.-aff.] (‘look for oneself’ etc.)
<i>yudh</i>	<i>yúdhya-^{te}</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> reciprocal (‘fight against each other’)
<i>vyadh</i>	<i>vi-vidhyamāna-</i> JB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> pass.
<i>sīv</i>	<i>sīvyadhvam</i> RV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> self-benef. [= tr.-aff.] (‘sew for oneself’)

VI.2.2. Other middle forms may have emerged under the influence of the main semantic types of the non-passive middle -ya-presents: change of state (R1) and/or entropy increase (F1); motion and body posture (R2); mental activities (R3). In other words, they may have been attracted to the class of middle -ya-presents by virtue of **semantic analogy**. The largest group of such transfers includes -ya-presents of change of state and/or entropy increase, which all belong to semantic class A1.2; other semantic types are represented by a few verbs only.

(1) Change of state / entropy increase

<i>glā</i> ‘be weary’	<i>glāyeran</i> ŚGS 6.3.8
<i>jī</i> ‘grow old’	<i>jīryate</i> AĀ ²²¹⁸
<i>tamⁱ</i> ‘be exhausted’	<i>tāmyante</i> ŚrSū.
<i>das</i> ‘waste’	<i>upādasyata</i> JB

²²¹⁸ On the particular affinity of *jīrya-^{ti}* with middle -ya-presents with fluctuating accentuation, see s.v.

<i>dṛh</i> ‘be firm’	<i>dṛhyasva</i> RV 8.80.7 ([o Indra], become firm’)
<i>naś</i> ‘perish’	<i>vi-naśyate</i> JB
<i>muḥ</i> ‘be confused’	<i>muhya-te</i> (post-Ved.) Up., ŚrSū.
<i>randh</i> ‘be subject’	<i>radhyantām</i> MānŚS ^m
<i>riṣ</i> ‘be hurt’	<i>riṣya-te</i> GB +
² <i>vā</i> ‘wane, fade’	<i>-vāyate</i> GB (+)
<i>śam</i> ‘become appeased’	<i>śāmya-te</i> AB +
<i>śudh</i> ‘purify’	<i>śudhya-te</i> ŚB, TĀ (MNU) +
<i>śuṣ</i> ‘dry’	<i>upa-śuṣyate</i> ChāgU
<i>sādh</i> (¹ <i>sidh</i>) ‘succeed’	<i>sidhyante</i> TĀ 1.31.5 ^{2x}

(2) Motion and body posture

<i>dī</i> ‘fly’	<i>dīyate, pari-dīyase</i> SV
<i>śliṣ</i> ‘adhere, stick’	<i>śliṣya-te</i> ChU +

(3) Mental activities (constructed with the accusative)

<i>dhyā</i> ‘think of’	<i>dhyāya-te</i> KS ^p –KpS ^p +
<i>har</i> ‘enjoy’	<i>hārya-te</i> RV +

In some cases one may also assume the influence of certain middle -ya-presents. For instance, *dīyate, pari-dīyase* SV ‘fly’ could follow the model of the phonologically similar *ṛīya-te* ‘flow’; the middle inflection *śliṣya-te* has probably been triggered by the synonymous and phonologically (partly) similar *lipya-te* ‘stick’.

Of course, there is no clear-cut distinction between the ‘functional’ and ‘analogical’ types. For some -ya-presents both mechanisms could be operative; e.g. *páśya-te* can both express the self-beneficial sense (‘look for oneself’) and follow the pattern of the verbs of mental activities. For verbs denoting inner states the self-beneficial semantics is (almost) inherent to their semantics.

VII. Vedic *-ya*-presents in a diachronic perspective

VII.1. Vedic *-ya*-presents: main developments within the historical period

Already in early Vedic, the *-yá*-passive seems to be a more regular and grammaticalized formation than its Old Iranian cognate. First, the Vedic *-yá*-passives can only be inflected in the middle, while the Avestan *-iia*-passives quite commonly occur with active endings (see KELLENS 129f.). Another feature of the grammaticalization of the passive is the strict correlation between accentuation and the passive/non-passive distinction (which seems to be an Indo-Aryan innovation; see Chapter VII.2.2 below). Thus, the middle diathesis and suffix accentuation have become two (additional) markers of passives, distinguishing them from other *-ya*-formations.

Further development of this morphological category is marked by its increasing productivity: while in early Vedic *-yá*-passives are attested only for some 40 primary roots, the younger mantras double this number, and, from the Vedic prose onwards, *-yá*-passives are derived from secondary stems, such as causatives and desideratives (see WHITNEY 1885a: xxxivf.; ARNOLD 1897: 317; cf. also LEHMANN 1974: 183f.).

By contrast, the majority of non-passive middle *-ya*-presents are old formations, encountered already in early Vedic; nearly 1/3 of them have Old Iranian cognates.

The class of active *-ya*-presents is heterogeneous, which probably betrays its origin from different sources. While the subclass of *-ya*-presents denoting non-controllable situations (A1) shows limited productivity and late Vedic texts attest some new formations of this type, the verbs of two other subclasses (A2-3, i.e. intransitive activities and transitives) are few in number and relatively old: nearly half of them have Old Iranian cognates and only five new presents of this type appear after the RV.

The chronological development of Vedic *-ya*-presents is summarized in

the tables below, according to the main chronological strata: the early and late RV; RVKh. and AV; YVic mantras (VS and mantra parts of the other YVic Saṃhitās), Saṃhitā prose (YV^P); (old) Brāhmaṇas; late Brāhmaṇas (GB, ŚB); and other late Vedic texts (Āraṇyakas, Upaniṣads). Naturally, some *-ya*-presents may only by chance be unattested in earlier texts, sometimes even for some good reasons, such as taboo (cf. on *mriyá-te* s.v.). Yet the ratio of types of *-ya*-presents for various periods as shown in the tables below appears to be a convenient way to visualize general tendencies and changes within the system.

The following notation is used in the tables: *-yá*-passives built on causatives, desideratives and quasi-denominatives are marked with C, D and Q-D, respectively; formations which have Old Iranian (Avestan and/or Old Persian) cognates are in boldface. The presents which do not appear in later periods are marked with the right square bracket.

-ya-passives (Vedic mantras)

RV _{early} ±40 presents	RV _{late} +13 presents	AV, RVKh. +22-25 presents	YV ^m +8 presents
<p>(<i>ajyá-</i> (√<i>aj</i>))] <i>ajyá-</i> (√^{1/2}<i>añj</i>) <i>idhyá-</i> <i>iṣyate</i> (√¹<i>iṣ</i>) <i>īya-</i> (√²<i>yā</i> 'request')] <i>ucyá-</i> (√<i>vac</i>) <i>udyá-</i> (√<i>vad</i>) <i>uhyá-</i> (√<i>vah</i>) <i>ṛcyá-</i> RV-SV] <i>kriyá-</i> <i>gīyá-</i> <i>guhyá-</i> <i>jñāyá-</i> <i>-dadyá-</i> ^{1x} (√<i>dad</i>)] <i>duhyá-</i> <i>dhīyá-</i> <i>nidyá-</i> ^{1x}] <i>nīyá-</i> <i>pīyá-</i> <i>prchyá-</i>] <i>badhyá-</i> <i>bhriyá-</i> <i>-madyá-</i>] <i>mathyá-</i> <i>mīyá-</i> (√<i>mi</i>) <i>mṛjyá-</i> <i>yamyá-</i> <i>yujyá-</i> <i>ribhya-</i> ^{1x}] <i>-rudhyá-</i> <i>vacyá-</i> (√<i>vañc</i>) RV-AV] <i>vidyá-</i> (√¹<i>vid</i>) <i>śasyá-</i> (√<i>śam</i>s) <i>sicyá-</i> <i>sūyá-</i> (√<i>su</i>) <i>srjyá-</i> <i>stūyá-</i> <i>hanyá-</i> <i>hūyá-</i> (√<i>hu</i>) <i>hūyá-</i> (√<i>hū</i>)</p>	<p><i>udya-</i> (√<i>ud</i> 'wet') <i>upyá-</i> (√<i>vap</i>) <i>tāyá-</i> <i>tujyá-</i>] <i>dabhya-</i>] <i>dṛśyá-</i> <i>dhamya-</i> ^{1x}] <i>-panyá-</i> ^{1x} (?)] <i>vṛjyá-</i> <i>vṛśc(y)á-</i> <i>śrūyá-</i> <i>sūyá-</i> (√¹<i>śū</i>) <i>-himsya-</i> ^{1x}]</p>	<p><i>acyá-</i> (√²<i>añc</i>) <i>aśyá-</i> <i>(-iṣyate</i> (√²<i>iṣ</i>) AVP^{1x})] <i>-kṛtyá-</i> <i>krīyá-</i> <i>-gamyá-</i> <i>grhyá-</i> <i>-cṛtyá-</i> <i>tṛhyá-</i> <i>ḍīyá-</i> (√¹<i>dā</i> 'give') <i>ḍīyá-</i> (√^{3/4}<i>dā</i> (<i>di</i>) 'cut') <i>dūya-</i> <i>-dhūyá-</i> <i>namya-</i> ^{1x} <i>-nahyá-</i> ^{1x} <i>pīyá-</i> <i>piśyá-</i> ^{1x}] <i>piśyá-</i> <i>-bhājyá-</i> (√<i>bhaj</i>) (-<i>bhajya-</i> YV^{p+}) D ⁺<i>mūnāmsyámāna-</i> AV^{1x} (?)] (<i>mīyá-^{te}</i> (√²<i>mā</i>)) ⁺<i>yabhyá-</i> RVKh. ^{1x}] <i>-vicyá-</i> <i>vīyá-</i> (√<i>vyā</i> (<i>vī</i>)) <i>hriyá-</i></p>	<p><i>āpyá-</i> <i>cīyá-</i> <i>-ḍīyá-</i> ^{1x} (√²<i>dā</i> 'bind') <i>paṇyá-</i>] C <i>-pyāyyá-</i> (√<i>pyā</i>) <i>bhakṣyá-</i> <i>vīyá-</i> (√<i>vī</i> 'pursue')] C <i>sādyá-</i> (√<i>sad</i>)</p>

***-ya*-passives (Vedic prose)**

YVP + 35 presents	(early) Br. + 34 presents	late Br., Ār., Up. + 15 presents
<i>adyá-</i> <i>-amya-</i> <i>ījyá-</i> (\sqrt{yaj}) <i>-īya-</i> (\sqrt{i} 'go') <i>-uhyā-</i> ($\sqrt{ūh}$) <i>ūya-</i> (\sqrt{u} (<i>vā</i>)) <i>kr̥ṣyá-</i> <i>-kīrya-</i> <i>kramyá-</i> TS C <i>krūdya-</i> KS ^{1x} C <i>-kṣāpyá-</i> MS ^{1x} <i>khāyá-</i> C <i>-ghāryá-</i> (\sqrt{ghr}) <i>caryá-</i> C <i>dhāryá-</i> MS+ <i>-dhāvya-</i> KS ($\sqrt{dhāv}$) <i>dhūpyá-</i> KS ^{1x} <i>pīḍya-</i> TS(+) C <i>māryá-</i> MS ^p (+) <i>-mīvyā-</i> KS ^{1x} <i>mṛdyá-</i> MS+ <i>-mṛśyá-</i> KS+ <i>-rabhya-</i> / <i>labhya-</i> D <i>-rurutsyá-</i> (\sqrt{rudh}) Q-D <i>-varyá-</i> MS+ (<i>-vriya-</i> GB+) (\leftarrow <i>pravará-</i>) C <i>-vartyá-</i> ŚB ^m , MS ^p + C <i>-vāsyá-</i> (\sqrt{vas} 'dwell') <i>-vṛhya-</i> (<i>-bṛhya-</i> KS ^{1x}) C <i>-veṣṭyá-</i> MS+ <i>vlīya-</i> <i>śajyá-</i> ($\sqrt{sañj}$) TS+ Q-D <i>-sadyá-</i> (\leftarrow <i>upasád-</i>) TS <i>skūyá-</i> MS ^{1x} <i>stīryá-</i> <i>-sthīya-</i>	<i>-ukṣya-</i> ^{te} ŚB+ <i>-uṣya-</i> ($\sqrt{uṣ}$ 'burn') PB+ C <i>-kalpya-</i> (\sqrt{klp}) ŚB+ (<i>-klpya-</i> ŚBK) <i>khyāyá-</i> <i>gupyá-</i> <i>-cāyya-</i> TB ^{1x} <i>chādya-</i> (<i>chādaya-</i>) JB+ <i>-jīvyá-</i> ŚB ^{1x} C <i>-jñāpyá-</i> C <i>-jyotyá-</i> ŚB C <i>tārya-</i> ^{te} ($\sqrt{tṛ}$) JB <i>-tīrya-</i> TB ^{1x} D <i>-ditsya-</i> ($\sqrt{dā}$ 'give') JB ^{1x} <i>diśya-</i> C <i>dohya-</i> ^{te} ŚB+ <i>dhmāyá-</i> ^{te} <i>nṛtya-</i> JB C <i>-pādyā-</i> <i>prīya-</i> JB+ <i>bhujyá-</i> ŚB+ <i>-mantryá-</i> (<i>mantrāya-</i>) <i>-mūryá-</i> ŚB C <i>-yātya-</i> KB+ D <i>-līpsyá-</i> ŚB ^{1x} C <i>vādyá-</i> <i>-vich[y]á-</i> ŚBK ^{1x} <i>-vidhya-</i> JB ^{1x} <i>-viśya-</i> PB+ <i>-śasyá-</i> ($\sqrt{śas}$ 'cut') ŚB ^{1x} C <i>śrapyá-</i> ŚB+ <i>-śrīyá-</i> <i>-sidhya-</i> (\sqrt{sidh}) JB ^{1x} C <i>-sārya-</i> JB+ C <i>sthāpya-</i>	<i>asya-</i> AĀ+ C <i>-kramya-</i> GB+ C <i>-jvālyā-</i> GB <i>dīhya-</i> TĀ ^m + C <i>dūṣya-</i> ^{te} Kāth-Saṃk. ^{1x} <i>nudyá-</i> TĀ ^m + <i>bhṛj(j)ya-</i> GB+ <i>muṣyate</i> "Lost-Br." <i>-mṛtya-</i> GB ^{1x} C <i>-rocya-</i> KāthĀ+ C <i>-ropyá-</i> KāthĀ+ C <i>śāmya-</i> GB+ <i>ślāghya-</i> GB ^{1x} <i>sūya-</i> ($\sqrt{sū}$ 'generate') ŚB <i>smaryá-</i> TĀ+

Non-passive middle -ya-presents (including type *mriyáte*)

RV ^{early} 23 presents	RV ^{late} + 5 presents	AV, RVKh., YV ^m + 15 presents	Vedic prose + 7-9 presents
<i>-acya-te</i> ($\sqrt{1} a\tilde{n}c$) <i>īya-</i> ($\sqrt{1} y\tilde{a}$) <i>ījya-</i>] <i>kāya-</i> ^{1x}] <i>kṣīya-</i> <i>chidyá-</i> <i>jāya-</i> <i>jīya-</i> <i>trāya-</i> <i>dhriyá-</i> <i>pácyá-</i> <i>(pátya-)</i> RV-YV ^m <i>pádya-</i> <i>pṛcyá-</i> RV-Br. ^m <i>pyāya-</i> <i>búdhya-</i> <i>mānya-</i> <i>mīyá-</i> <i>múcyá-</i> <i>mṛṣya-</i> <i>ricyá-</i> <i>rīya-</i> RV, VS <i>hīyá-</i>	<i>īdhya-</i> <i>tápyá-</i> <i>pūryá-</i> <i>mriyá-</i> <i>śīrya-</i>	<i>ghriya-</i> YV ^m <i>dáhyá-</i> <i>dīpya-</i> <i>bhajya-</i> ($\sqrt{bhañj}$) <i>bhidya-</i> <i>rajya-</i> <i>rādhya-</i> <i>lipyá-</i> VS+ <i>-līya-</i> <i>lúpyá-</i> <i>vásya-</i> <i>śíśyá-</i> <i>śītyá-</i> <i>-styāya-</i> AVP-VS <i>sphāya-</i> AVP ^{1x}	<i>(-arcya-te</i> ŚĀ ^{1x}) <i>-iṅya-</i> (<i>-āṅgya-</i>) ŚB <i>-īrya-</i> <i>-īya-te</i> (\sqrt{i}) GB+ <i>-driyá-</i> <i>dīryá-</i> <i>(bhāṣya-</i> ŚĀ ^{1x}) <i>bhra(m)śya-</i> TĀ ^m + <i>-sriya-</i> KS ^{1x}

Active *-ya*-presents

RV ^{early}	RV ^{late}	AV, RVKh., YV ^m	YV ^p	Br.
(A1) non-controllable situations (states + processes)				
15 presents	+ 6 presents	+ 19 presents	+ 4 presents	+ 10 presents
<i>ucya-</i> <i>gṛdhya-</i> <i>jūrya-</i> (jūrya- AV+) <i>tṛṣya-</i> <i>dāsyā-</i> <i>dṛḥya-</i>] <i>nāśya-</i> <i>pūsyā-</i> <i>mēdya-</i> <i>rāṇya-</i> RV, AVP] <i>rīṣya-</i> ^{ti/(te)} <i>vāya-</i> (√ ² vā ‘wane’) <i>śrāmya-</i> <i>śrāya-</i> <i>harya-</i> RV-TB ^m	<i>kṣúdhya-</i> <i>-jasya-</i> RV-Sū. ^m <i>dṛpya-</i> <i>mūhya-</i> <i>sídhya-</i> (√ ² sidh) <i>-hṛṣya-</i>	<i>-kūpya-</i> AV ^{1x} (+) <i>krúdhya-</i> <i>kṣāya-</i> <i>glāya-</i> <i>tuṣya-</i> (AVP?) (+) <i>tṛpya-</i> <i>dāmya-</i> <i>drūhya-</i> <i>pūya-</i> (√ ² pū) <i>mādyā-</i> <i>mlāya-</i> <i>yāsyā-</i> AV] <i>rādhyā-</i> <i>rūpya-</i> <i>lūbhya-</i> <i>śāmya-</i> <i>śudhya-</i> <i>śūsyā-</i> <i>srīvyā-</i> (/śr ^o) MS ^m +	<i>īrṣya-</i> <i>tāmya-</i> <i>śyāya-</i> <i>ślīsyā-</i>	<i>kṛṣya-</i> <i>duṣya-</i> AB+ <i>-dhvasya-</i> GB ^{1x} <i>pīsyā-</i> ŚB <i>-prījyā-</i> TB <i>-pruṣya-</i> ŚB ^{1x} <i>-mṛcyā-</i> JB ^{1x} <i>śūcyā-</i> <i>śūya-</i> (√śvā) BĀUM ^{1x} <i>svidyā-</i> ŚB ^{1x} +

A2-3: intransitive activities and transitives				
12 presents	+ 3 presents	+ 4 presents	–	+ 1 present
ásya- <i>ārya-</i> ^{2x]} ísya- ($\sqrt[2]{i\acute{s}}$) <i>tanya-</i> ^{1x} ($\sqrt{(s)tan}$) <i>tūrya-</i> ^{1x]} <i>dīya-</i> pásya- <i>pīya-</i> RV, TB ^m yúdhya- rāya- vidhya- <i>śivya-</i>	dīvyā- <i>nāhya-</i> <i>nītya-</i>	<i>-áśya-</i> ($\sqrt[2]{naś}$ (² <i>aś</i>)) MS ^{m1x} <i>dhyāya-</i> <i>śVmya-</i> ⁱⁱ YV ^m <i>stāya-</i>		<i>vāya-</i> ($\sqrt[1]{vā}$ ‘blow’) ŠB+

VII.2. Remarks on the origin and genesis of *-ya*-presents

VII.2.1. Possible sources of the present suffix *-ya*-

As is well-known, the present suffix *-ya*- goes back to PIE **-ĵe/o-*, reflexes of which are found in all Indo-European languages.²²¹⁹ Most of the early suggestions on the origin of *-ya*- (resp. PIE **-ĵe/o-*) from other morphemes²²²⁰ were abandoned by the end of the 19th century. To mention a few of them:

(i) According to the earliest hypothesis, first advanced by HAUGHTON (1825: I, 331) and adopted by most Indo-Europeanists in the middle of the 19th century, the passive suffix *-yá-* (as well as *-ya-* in class IV presents) goes back to the verbal root *i* ‘go’, so that, for instance, the passive usage of *tudyé* is explained as going back to ‘ich gehe mich im Schlagen’ (→ ‘ich werde geschlagen’); see BENFEY 1847: 510 [= Kl.Schr. II, 79]; 1852: 404, fn. 1; BOPP 1871: III, 86f.; GABELENTZ 1861: 529; F.M. MÜLLER 1864: 582; POTT 1867: 289; for a criticism, see esp. BRUGMANN 1878: 187f.

(ii) BRUGMANN’s (1878) and KURYŁOWICZ’s (1964: 84f.) account of *-yá*-passives as denominatives derived from gerunds (participia futuri passivi), such as *guhýá-*, is also implausible.

(iii) More likely is a genetic relationship between *-yá*-denominatives and some of class IV presents (especially, with active inflection). The denominative suffix *-yá-*, in turn, may be related to the nominal suffix *-i-* (**-eĵ-*); cf. pairs like *śocí-* – *śúcyati*, Gr. *χάρις* – Ved. *háryati*.²²²¹ On the denominative origin of (some) *-ya*-presents, see BRUGMANN 1904: 523f.; 1916

²²¹⁹ See, for instance, BOPP 1868: I, 210ff.; BRUGMANN 1902: 523ff.; LORENTZ 1898; HIRT 1928 [IdgG IV]: 216ff.; BIRWÉ 1956: 17. On the genetic relationship of the Vedic *-ya*-presents with *-ē*-statives in some other branches of Indo-European (~ Baltic *-i*-presents etc.), see esp. MEILLET 1900: 305ff.; HIRT, op.cit., 218ff.; SCHMID 1963: 79ff.; CHRISTOL 1990: 117ff.; RASMUSSEN 1993: 480ff.; HARDARSON 1998: 333, with fn. 33; for criticism, see MEILLET 1905-1906: 371f.; PERSSON 721ff.

²²²⁰ I do not discuss here possible genetic relationships of *-ya*- with other verbal morphemes in Vedic. Suffice it to mention that it was repeatedly related to ‘deverbative’ suffixes *-āyá-* and *-anyá-* (cf. OETTINGER 1992); often also to the intensive *-yá-*, future *-syá-* (cf. SCHMID 1963: 79ff.; KURYŁOWICZ 1964: 111f.) and even causative *-āya-*; cf. SCHLEICHER 1876: 127f.; GABELENTZ 1861: 529; BRUGMANN 1902: 523ff., 528ff.; MEILLET 1900: 297f., 305ff.; THUMB/HAUSCHILD 233ff. (with bibl.); for recent surveys, see BEEKES 1995: 229f.; SIHLER 1995: 502ff. “The historical development of all these forms is still unclear” (BEEKES).

²²²¹ But cf. also PERSSON 728f. on forms without *-i-*.

[Grundr.²]: 181f.; MEILLET 1900: 307ff.; E. LEUMANN 1902; REICHELT 1902: 66 et passim;²²²² HIRT 1900: 189; 1913: 281; 1921 [IdgG II]: 153; 1939: 97; SZEMERÉNYI 1964: 378f.; and, more recently, LUBOTSKY 1985 (who demonstrated that the PIE source of Ved. *śuṣ*, i.e. **H₂śus*, must be an adjective, not a verbal root); BARTON 1986: 143, fn. 27 (“many of the **ḷ^o*-intransitives are doubtless denominal in origin”).

(iv) Very attractive is also KORTLANDT’s (1981: 127f.) hypothesis on the genetic relationship between Vedic *-i*-aorists, *-áya*-causatives and *-yá*-passives: the former may go back to “a deverbative noun of the type **k^wori* [> Ved. (*á*)*kāri* – LK], which could itself be used predicatively”, whereas causatives and *-yá*-passives are supposed to be derivatives from this noun.

VII.2.2. The original accentuation of (middle) *-ya*-presents

It is commonplace in Vedic studies to assume that all *-ya*-presents, irrespectively of accentuation and diathesis (i.e. both *-yá*-passives and class IV presents), go back to one source, and the correlation between accentuation and the passive/non-passive distinction is an Indo-Aryan innovation. See, for instance, F.M. MÜLLER 1864: 582; DELBRÜCK 1874 [AiV]: 168; J. SCHMIDT 1875: 256f.; HILLEBRANDT 1880: 342f. [= Kl.Schr., 606f.]; SPEIJER 1896 [VSS]: 49, §168; BRUGMANN 1902: 527f.; 1916 [Grundr.²]: 185; REICHELT 1902: 80; M. LEUMANN 1940: 231ff. [= Kl.Schr., 321ff.]; GONDA 1951: 7²²²³ et passim; 1971: 90f.; THUMB/HAUSCHILD 333ff.; STRUNK 1967: 78. This assumption is based, above all, on the syntactic similarity (intransitivity) of the great majority of *-ya*-presents. It immediately raises the question on the original place of accent: did the corresponding present formation of the proto-language have the accent on the suffix or on the root? Evidence is controversial: the zero grade of the root may betray the original suffix accentuation, while the increasing productivity of the *-yá*-passives and the archaic non-productive character of the class IV presents rather point to the root accentuation.

Most scholars considered the root accentuation in the class IV presents secondary as against the suffix accentuation in *-yá*-passives; see already BENFEY 1865a: 1783 [= Kl.Schr. II, 141]; 1866a: 196; SAUSSURE 1877;

²²²² REICHELT assumed that *-áya*- in *-áya*-presents and *-i*- in *-i*-aorists belong here as well (op.cit., 82ff., 86ff.).

²²²³ “... everybody knows the intimate connection between the *-yá*- class and the 4th present-class”.

FROEHDE 1881: 172; DIELS 1913: 4.²²²⁴ Very plausible is KURYLOWICZ's (1952: 114f.) assumption that accent retraction to the root in class IV presents was due to the influence of class I presents with phonologically regular full grade root, i.e.: **asy-á-* → *ásy-*, **paśy-á-* → *páśy-*, etc. on the model of **gacháti* → *gáchati*, where *a* < **ñ* has been reanalysed as full grade (SAUSSURE 1879: 174 [= Rec., 163]);²²²⁵ cf. also GONDA 1951: 92 ("the accentual differentiation of the *-ya*-verbs was attended by a partial leaning towards other thematic root-accented presents"); 1971: 91.

By contrast, DELBRÜCK (1897 [VglSynt II]: 435f.) argued for the opposite development (*'-ya-* → *-yá-*); cf. also KÜMMEL in LIV 637, note 2 [ad got. *þaursjan** 'dürsten'] s.v. **ters-*.²²²⁶ No doubt, the system of *-ya*-presents was subject to a number of analogical accent shifts of both kinds (*'-ya-* ↔ *-yá-*), even within the historical period; see Chapters II.3 on *-ya*-presents with fluctuating accentuation and C.II.2.2 on the supposedly passive origin of *-in̥gya^{te}* (*-án̥gya^{te}*) and *ír̥ya^{te}*.

In any case, the difference in accentuation between (middle) class IV presents and *-yá*-passives is clearly secondary. We can only speculate why the passive subclass has generalized the suffix accentuation (which probably was original), while non-passives have retracted the accent to the root. This accent shift may have started in a few old non-passive *-ya*-presents in which zero and full grade could not be distinguished (cf. *mányate*). Another starting point of this process might be the group of *-ya*-presents where the full grade was introduced instead of the phonetically impossible zero grade (as in *padyate* ← **pdyáte*) or in order to avoid morphological opacity (*nahyati/-te* ← **ahyáti/-te* < **ñhíáti/-tai* (?) or *asyati/-te* ← **sṛáti/-tai*).²²²⁷ The root accentuation could be introduced for such presents in accordance with SAUSSURE's rule (reformulated by KURYLOWICZ for *-ya*-presents, see above) and subsequently generalized for all non-passives.

²²²⁴ SAUSSURE (1879: 234 [= Rec., 219], with fn. 1) even assumed that the active *-ya*-present *rañyáti* (with the irregular suffix accentuation) might be a trace of the original accent placement in this present type.

²²²⁵ Essentially the same hypothesis was already proposed by FROEHDE (1881: 172), albeit in a less explicit form.

²²²⁶ "Offenbar **tṛs-je-* mit verschobenem Akzent wie im Ved. (oder deutet dieser Fall auf grundsprachliches Alter des Wurzelakzents bei primären *je*-Präsentien?)".

²²²⁷ Cf. LIV 227, note 2 s.v. **Hned^h* - and LIV 242f., note 4 s.v. **h₁es-*.

VII.2.3. Evidence for heterogeneous origin of *-ya*-presents

Apart from the much debated issue of the original accent placement, there are a number of features betraying the heterogeneous origin of *-ya*-presents. While middle *-ya*-presents with suffix and root accentuation (i.e. *-yá*-passives and middle class IV presents) share a number of properties and can probably be traced to one source,²²²⁸ the difference between middle and active presents with root accentuation (both reckoned to class IV, according to the tradition) seems more fundamental. The main differences can be summarized as follows:

(i) Some root types follow distinct morphophonological patterns in the middle vs. active *-ya*-presents; see Chapter C.I.3 on *Cā* (*CRā*) roots.

(ii) Most likely, at the beginning, middle and active *-ya*-presents were derived from roots of different paradigmatic classes. The core of the middle *-ya*-presents consists of formations built on the ‘aoristic’ verbal roots, which formed transitive nasal presents. By contrast, a number of active *-ya*-presents were derived from roots that had no other old present formations.

(iii) Another feature which distinguishes all middle *-ya*-presents, regardless of the accentuation, from active *-ya*-presents is their paradigmatic association with ‘medio-passive’ *-i*-aorists. As I emphasized in Chapter V.2, this archaic and non-productive formation clearly belongs with middle *-ya*-presents and has no links with active *-ya*-presents.

(iv) Apart from intransitivity, which unites the majority of *-ya*-presents regardless of the diathesis, there are some semantic features, which break the supposed unity of the class IV presents. Most importantly, all middle *-ya*-presents denote situations which are not controlled by the subject (semantically, Patient or Experiencer). This semantic type is not impossible for many active *-ya*-presents either; however, a number of active *-ya*-presents (mostly old formations that probably belong to the earliest layer of this morphological type) are intransitive activities and transitives (= A2-3). Even more problematic is the reconstruction of an aspectual meaning (Aktionsart), common for all *-ya*-presents; the durative (‘kursiv’) semantics, which, according to DELBRÜCK (1897 [VglSynt]: 26ff.), can be ascribed to the suffix *-je/o-* in the proto-language,²²²⁹ is indeed quite common for many intransitive

²²²⁸ See already DELBRÜCK 1874 [AiV]: 166ff.

²²²⁹ Cf. also ELIZARENKOVA 1961: 122ff. More sceptically KURYLOWICZ (1928: 208): “Il est possible, mais indémontrable (au moins provisoirement) que le présent en *-yá*-aussi a servi originellement à exprimer un mode d’action”.

-ya-presents, but barely for transitives such as *ásya*-^{ti/te} ‘throw’ or *vídhya*-^{ti} ‘pierce’.

Note: M. KLAIMAN on the original value of the suffix -ya-

It may be in order to briefly discuss here the hypothesis formulated by M. KLAIMAN in her monograph on voice (1991: 282, note 29; cf. also p.93ff.): “The passive function of *ya-* may originate in its earlier function as a marker of telic neuter intransitive verb”. By ‘neuter’ KLAIMAN means what I label ‘anticausatives’ (although the term is not well-defined); ‘telic’ refers to verbs “encoding action that presuppose an endpoint or definite point of termination” (ibid., p. 94). KLAIMAN believes that Sanskrit atelic transitives mark intransitivity solely by the middle inflection (examples: *dṛṇhati* ‘makes firm’ – *dṛṇhate* ‘becomes firm’, *vardhati* ‘increases, makes bigger’ – *vardhate* ‘increases, becomes bigger’, *vahati* ‘(draught animal) carries (man)’²²³⁰ – *vahate* ‘(man) rides (in a chariot)’), while telic transitives need an additional formant, the suffix -*ya-* (examples: *inddhe* – *idhyate* ‘kindle’, *prṇāti* – *pūryate* ‘fill’, *vivakti* ‘call’ – *ucyate*). KLAIMAN’s hypothesis does not stand to any serious criticism. It suffices to point out that (i) some Vedic transitives form both middle anticausatives without suffix -*ya-* and -*yá-*passives (cf. *váhati* ‘[a draught animal] carries [smb.sth.]’ – *váhate* ‘rides’ – *uhyáte* ‘is carried’ (cf. GOTÖ 295ff.), *bhárati* ‘brings’ – *bhárate* ‘moves’ – *bhriyáte* ‘is brought’, etc.); and (ii) many Vedic active -*ya-*presents, particularly those referring to states (cf. Chapter III.1 above), are typical atelics. KLAIMAN’s collection of examples abounds in inaccuracies, misprints, mistakes and forms invented by herself. For instance, *dṛṇhate* occurs in the RV only once in the intransitive usage (‘becomes firm’); instead, we find in intransitive constructions the -*ya-*present *dṛṇhya*-^{ti/te} (cf. JOACHIM 96), so that one of the pieces of evidence given by KLAIMAN is, in fact, a counter-example; pass. *paśyate* ‘is seen’, quoted by KLAIMAN on p. 282, note 29, does not exist at all, etc. etc. For the most comprehensive survey and criticism of this book see P.K. ANDERSEN 1994, Chapter 2. It is to be regretted that such “findings” (her own expression, p.103) of KLAIMAN’s monograph, published in the prestigious series *Cambridge Studies in Linguistics* and thus supposed to serve as a handbook (which, incidentally, has received positive feed-back among general linguists and typologists; see CROFT 1994²²³¹), for many years will be a source of errors

²²³⁰ This is the correct rendering; KLAIMAN’s translation ‘(chariot) carries (man)’ is inexact.

²²³¹ “This is the sort of research that our field needs more – theorizing based on careful

and inadequate generalisations in typological studies on voice and passive.

VII.2.4. Remarks on possible sources of the Vedic -ya-presents

The features summarized in Chapter VII.2.3 are hard to reconcile with the assumption on the origin of all -ya-presents from one single source. Most probably, we have to posit at least two distinct formations, partly fallen together in Vedic -ya-presents. Thus we return to an old idea of the multiple origin of -ya-presents, expressed, for instance, with minor modifications, by SAUSSURE (1877), BRUGMANN (1916 [Grundr.²]: 178ff.), and, see especially SCHMID 1963: 79ff.²²³²

One of these proto-formations has probably given rise to the core of the **middle** -ya-presents, irrespectively of the accentuation attested in Vedic. As argued in Chapter C.II.2-3, the three semantic classes of the middle non-passive -ya-presents with root accentuation (R1-3) as well as the -ya-presents with fluctuating accentuation (F1-2) correspond to the main semantic types of *media tantum* (regardless of their present suffix) in other Indo-European languages: a number of *media tantum* in Greek and Hittite, *verba deponentia* in Latin, etc.²²³³ That is, from the functional point of view, these classes are isomorphic across various branches of Indo-European, although formal cognates, such as Ved. *mányate* – Gr. μαίνο-(μαι), Av. *mainiieite*, Ved. *mriyáte* – Lat. *moriōr*, are rather few in number. Bearing in mind that passive was probably one of the functions of the PIE middle,²²³⁴ one may assume that passives formed one of the subclasses of this hypothetical proto-formation,²²³⁵ alongside with the verbs corresponding to the Vedic classes R1-3 and F1-2. Originally, this subgroup could include quite a limited number of passives; here probably belonged the formations reflected both in

examination of empirical data of a wide range of languages” (CROFT 1994: 561).

²²³² SCHMID’s reconstruction of the hysterodynamic IE present type (3sg.act.) **kup-/ēi-ti* / (3pl.act.) **kup-ǝǝ-énti* (→ Ved. *kup-ya-ti* / *kup-ya-nti*, with the loss of -ǝ- before -ya-), is dubious in many respects, however; see, in particular, K.H. SCHMIDT 1964 for criticism.

²²³³ For Greek evidence, see, for instance, ALLAN 2003; for Hittite evidence, see NEU 1968: 52 and LURAGHI (forthc.); on Latin deponent verbs, see FLOBERT 1975a; 1975b.

²²³⁴ For Greek evidence, see, for instance, DELBRÜCK 1897 [VglSynt II]: 432ff.; JANKUHN 1969: 39f. et passim, with bibl.

²²³⁵ Thus already DELBRÜCK (1874 [AiV]: 166ff.); SAUSSURE (1877: 280 [= Rec., 354]) (“le passif n’est en effet qu’une extension du moyen de la 4^e classe”).

(early) Vedic and Avestan, such as Ved. *bhriyá-te* // (G)Av. *bairiia-*, Ved. *vacyá-te* // GAv. *vaśiia-*, Ved. *hanyá-te* // Av. *janiia-*. Thus, in some ways, the Indo-Iranian suffix **-já-* served merely for **additional characterization of some middle presents** (above all, *media tantum*) without rendering any particular semantics.²²³⁶ This is not to say that Ilr. **-já-* / Ved. *-ya-te* had no function at all. To say it more exactly, this suffix has not contributed any new meanings in addition to those already expressed by the middle diathesis. Rather, its value can be determined as a selection operating on the range of meanings of the (Indo-European) middle, foregrounding some of them (intransitivization, passivization) and backgrounding some others (reflexive, self-beneficent). Thus, the intransitivity of middle *-ya*-presents, as opposed to transitive usages of presents with other suffixes, can be explained as inherited from the PIE middle.

The class of the **active** *-ya*-presents seems more heterogeneous by origin. While some of these may go back to the same morphological type as the middle *-ya*-presents (see above), some others can be genetically related to denominative verbs. The paradigmatic association of (some) active *-ya*-presents with the archaic nouns in *-ú-*, such as *tanyú-* or *druhyú-*, may also point to their denominal origin.²²³⁷

* * * * *

I confine myself to the above outline of the functional aspects of the possible sources of the Vedic *-ya*-presents, abstaining from speculations on how these functional types ('middle', 'nominal/adjectival') might map onto the PIE verbal suffixes. Reconstructing the PIE sources of the suffix *-ya* requires a thorough examination of related formations in other branches of Indo-European, based on detailed studies of the related verbal formations in individual languages – which still remains a desideratum.

²²³⁶ Cf. MEILLET (1900: 307): "Le suffixe **-ye-* n'est donc pas un élément significatif, comme par exemple l'infixe **-ne-* ou le suffixe **-ǵ-*, c'est un simple élément de formation ..."

²²³⁷ See also TUCKER (1988: 97ff.) on the paradigmatic association between participles in *-yánt-* and adjectives in *-ú-*.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

Post-Vedic -*ya*-presents: a selection

A number of post-Vedic formations are already mentioned in Part B, in connection with other derivatives of the same roots attested in the Vedic period. Below I will briefly discuss some more -*ya*-presents first attested in the texts which are traditionally included into the Vedic tradition, but do not belong to the Vedic period properly speaking. Foremost, this selection contains several formations encountered in the post-Vedic Brāhmaṇas (Anubrāhmaṇas of the Sāmaveda: SVB, SUB, etc.), the oldest Śrauta-Sūtras and the ‘principal’ Upaniṣads (KāṭhU, ŚvetU, MaitrU, etc.), in particular, those which are included into WHITNEY’s lists (1885b [Roots]: 218f., 230f., 238) under the heading “Earlier [and Later] language” with the mark “S[ūtras].”

īkṣ ‘perceive, look’: *īkṣya*^{-te}

Gr̥Sū. (+);

• pass.

pass. of caus.: *-īkṣya*^{-te}

+ *sam* KātyŚS [ed. WEBER, ed. THITE] 7.6.26 [= other eds. 7.6.24]

Since the root *īkṣ* lacks ablaut, its passive and causative passive stems are formally undistinguishable. The passive participle with the preverb *sam* is attested at KātyŚS 7.6.26 [= 7.6.24 in some eds.] *somakṛaṇyā ca samīkṣyamāṇāṃ*²²³⁸ *samakhya iti*, in the same usage as the causative passive *saṃkṣāpyāmāna*- MS, discussed at length in Chapter B.I, s.v. *khyā* (*kṣā*), and in KULIKOV 2008, and thus belongs with the causative *sam-īkṣāya*^{-ti/te} ‘make

²²³⁸ Ed. VIDYĀDHARA ŚARMĀ °*īkṣa*°.

perceive; make appear’ (for which see JAMISON 123f.), rather than with the non-causative *īkṣa-te*. The arguments contra the traditional interpretation of the causative *sam-khyāpāya-ti* as ‘make look (at smb.)’ hold true for caus. *īkṣāya-ti/te* and its passive as well. In my view, both causatives are to be rendered as ‘make appear together, make associated’, i.e., for the passage quoted above: ‘and [he should address the wife], which is being caused to appear together (~ be considered / become associated) with the soma-cow [with the mantra] “I have appeared together / have been considered together / (~ I have become associated) [with the heavenly insight...]” [VS 4.23].’

Passives of the non-causative *īkṣ* ‘perceive, look’ first appear in Gṛhya-Sūtras (VaikhGS, BaudhGS).

***kal* ‘drive’**

pass. of -āya-pres.: -kālya-te

+ *upa* SVB 3.3.1;

+ *pra* SVB 3.3.1, GobhGS 3.6.1

The causative passive *-kālya-te* ‘be driven’, attested from the post-Vedic SVB onwards,²²³⁹ is derived from the *-āya*-present *kālaya-ti*, which is the only present formation of the verb *kal*. On this verb, see also EINO 2004: 39f. (“these verbal forms of *pra-kāl* can [...] be considered to be peculiar usages of folk-language of cattle-breeders”).

***kṣal* ‘wash’**

pass. of -āya-pres. (caus.): -kṣālyamāna-

+ *pra* VaitS 10.3, KauśS 76.27^{2x}

Like the preceding present *-kālya-te*, pass. *-kṣālyamāna-te* ‘wash’, attested in the two AVic Sūtras, is derived from the *-āya*-present *kṣālaya-ti*, which is the only present formation in the IVS and, synchronically, should not be considered a causative.²²⁴⁰

²²³⁹ The corresponding SVB passage is quoted in Chapter B.IV, s.v. *sphā*.

²²⁴⁰ Cf., in particular, the hypercharacterized caus. *kṣālāpaya-ti* (Sū.+), which is one of

kṣip ‘throw’: *kṣipyā*^{-te}

Simplex ViṣṇuSmṛ. 43.42 (*kṣipyanti*, VWC-Sū. II, 953, fn. 1
⁺*kṣipyante*), Ep. +;²²⁴¹
 + *vi* ‘disperse, scatter’ Ep. +;²²⁴²
 + *sam* ‘compress, diminish’ ManuSmṛ. 7.34 +
 • pass.
 (ChU 8.6.5 *kṣipyet* – *-yet*-optative)

The late passive of the root *kṣip* appears from the Smṛtis onwards, e.g. in ViṣṇuSmṛ. 43.42 (with the abnormal active inflection; see BHARADWAJ 1982: 113; VWC-Sū. II, 953, fn. 1 conjectures ⁺*kṣipyante*).²²⁴³

(ViṣṇuSmṛ. 43.42cd)

kvacit kṣipyanti vāṇaughair ' utkr̥tyante tathā kvacit

‘In some place they are shot with many arrows; in some place they are cut in pieces.’ (from a description of hell)

The active ending *-nti* (instead of ⁺*-nte*) must be due to metrical reasons. Notice that, although the verb *kṣip* is normally constructed with the accusative of the object being thrown, the example quoted above shows that in later texts it could also occur with the accusative of target (corresponding to the subject of the passive construction in our example), thus becoming a ‘two pattern’ verb.

The form *kṣipyet* (ChU 8.6.5) belongs with *-yet*-optatives, not with the (active) *-ya*-presents; see KULIKOV 2006d: 31f.

the earliest *-āpaya*-formations.

²²⁴¹ *úpākṣipyata*, *kṣipyate* (TB 1.1.3.5, ed. MITRA [B.Ind.]) are erroneous readings for *úpākṣīyata*, *kṣīyate*; see Chapter B.III, s.v. *kṣī*.

²²⁴² E.g. at GauḍĀgŚ 3.46ab *yadā na līyate cittam ' na ca vikṣipyate punaḥ* ‘when the mind does not dissolve, and does not disperse anymore’; see BOUY 2000: 195f.

²²⁴³ Cf. also Epic Skt. act.part. *ākṣipyant-* ‘being pulled, thrown’ (MBh. 1.16.15); for Epic forms, see, in particular, KULKARNI 1942-43: 239; SIL 1958: 206; OBERLIES 2003: 265, 411.

cint (\Leftarrow *cintaya-*) ‘think, consider’: *cintya-^{te}*

KaṭhU 2.8 +²²⁴⁴

- pass.

The passive *cintya-^{te}* is built on the present *cintaya-^{ti}*, first attested in the late Brāhmaṇas (GB, Up. +). This present is the denominative of *cintā-* ‘thought’ (cf. the content accusative construction at GB 1.1.30:22.8 *cintāṃ cintayet*), which could have been secondarily grouped with the infixed nasal -āya-causatives of the type *dṛṇhayati*, *śundhayati* (see KELLER 1906: 152f., with fn. 1, on this class). The earliest attestation of this passive occurs in the KaṭhU:

(KaṭhU 2.8ab)

na nareṇāvareṇa prokta eṣa 'suvijñeyo bahudhā cintyamānaḥ

‘It is not easy to understand, when proclaimed by an inferior man, [even though] being manifoldly meditated on.’²²⁴⁵

cud ‘impel’

pass. of caus.: *codya-^{te}* ‘be prescribed, enjoined’

ŚrSū.+

The causative passive *codya-^{te}* first appears in Śrauta-Sūtras (ŚŚS, ĀpŚS, LāṭyŚS) in the technical sense ‘be prescribed, enjoined’; see also RENO 1941-42: 127 [= Choix I, 333] on the technical usage of this passive in the grammatical literature.

jī ‘defeat, win, overpower’: *-jīya-^{te}*

+ *parā* SVB 3.6.6-9 +²²⁴⁶

²²⁴⁴ On the compound *vi-cintaya-^{ti}* and its pass. *vi-cintya-^{te}* in the late Skt. text Bodhicaryāvatāra, see KAJIHARA 1992: 1062ff. [(25)ff.], with note 6.

²²⁴⁵ For this passage, see WELLER 1953: 86f., fn.1, with bibl.

²²⁴⁶ The form *jīyate* in JB 1.313:2 (ed. RAGHU VIRA/LOKESH CHANDRA) is an

- pass.

All Vedic attestations of the present *jīya-^{te}* belong to the root *jī* (*jyā*) ‘deprive of property’, see Chapter III, s.v. One of the earliest attestations of the passive of *jī* (‘be defeated, overpowered’) appears in the post-Vedic SVB:²²⁴⁷

(SVB 3.6.6-9)

jayati na parājīyate

‘[This king] is victorious [and] is not overpowered.’

Although *-jīyate* might equally belong to *jī* ‘[the king] is not deprived of property’, this verb does not occur with the preverb *parā* (in contrast to *jī* ‘win’, which is very common with this preverb), and the interpretation ‘is not overpowered’ is supported by the active form in the same clause.

dhṛṣ* ‘dare’: -*dhṛṣyamāṇa-

+ *pra* ‘overpower’ ĀśŚS 2.11.18

- pass.

The fundamentally intransitive verb *dhṛṣ* forms a passive in the compound with *pra*, meaning ‘overpower’, attested at ĀśŚS 2.11.18 *aindrābārhaspatyāṇ pradhṛṣyamāṇāḥ* ‘those who are overpowered [by enemies should sacrifice] to Indra and Bṛhaspati.’

(*bhī* ‘fear’: *bhīya-^{te}*)

The passive *bhīya-^{te}* is not attested in Sanskrit. JB 1.288:10 *bhīyamāna-*,

erroneous reading for *jayate*, attested as a variant reading (see FRENZ 16; BODEWITZ 1990: 178 and 309, note 10):

(JB 1.313:2-3)

tad yad vai kiṃ ca prāñī jayate, tasmin sarvasminn apitvī bhavati ya evaṃ veda

‘Therefore, whatever a living being wins, he who knows thus, gets a share in it.’

(BODEWITZ)

²²⁴⁷ For Epic attestations of this passive, see OBERLIES 2003: 432.

quoted in VWC-Br. II, 1093a s.v. *bhī*, is the sandhi form of *hīyamāna-* after -*b* (*atha triṣṭubh bhīyamānāmanyata* ‘... but then the Triṣṭubh felt slighted’ (BODEWITZ)).

bhū ‘become’: *-bhūya-^{te}*, *-bhūya-^{ti}*

+ *abhi* ‘overcome’

[[Med.]: [pass.] MaitrU–MaitrāyaṇyU, Smṛ. +

[[Act.]: [tr.] MaitrU 3.3^{3x}

The fundamentally intransitive verb *bhū* ‘become’ cannot be passivized as simplex, but passives are derived from some compounds. The post-Vedic passive *abhi-bhūya-^{te}*, derived from the transitive compound *abhi-bhū* ‘overcome’ (see S. SEN 1927: 370), appears in the MaitrU (6x, only in the participle *abhi-bhūyamāna-*).²²⁴⁸ An example is:

(MaitrU 3.2 = MaitrāyaṇyU 3.2)

*asti khalv anyo ’paro bhūtātmākhyo, yo ’yaṃ sitāsitaīḥ karmaphalair
abhibhūyamānaḥ sadasadyonim āpadyate*

‘Indeed, there is another (ātman) called the *bhūtātman*, which, being overcome by good and evil results of acts, enters upon higher and lower forms of existence...’ (VAN BUITENEN 129)

The active *-ya-present abhi-bhūya-^{ti}*, attested in the adjacent passage, is a very rare instance of a secondary transitive derivation from a *-ya-passive* marked by diathesis change (middle → active) only:

(MaitrU 3.3)

*atha yathāyaḥpiṇḍe hanyamāne nāgnir abhibhūyaty, evaṃ nābhibhūyaty
asau puruṣo; ’bhibhūyaty ayaṃ bhūtātmopasaṃśliṣṭatvāt*

‘And just as when a lump of iron has been forged into same shape fire no longer can overpower [it], so the puruṣa no longer has power [over the *bhūtātman*]; [on the contrary], this *bhūtātman* overpowers [the puruṣa], because of keeping him completely enveloped.’²²⁴⁹

²²⁴⁸ Also quite frequently in later texts, e.g. in ManuSmṛ. 7.179 *śātrubhir nābhibhūyate* ‘[this king] is not overcome by enemies’ (see STERNBACH 1959: 248).

²²⁴⁹ I follow VAN BUITENEN’s (1962: 129f.) interpretation of the passage. COWELL’s translation of *abhibhūyati* as ‘becomes manifold’ is untenable. A passive

bhram ‘wander, move (chaotically), err’: *bhrāmya*^{te/(ti)}*bhrāmya*^{te}: ŚvetU 1.6, 6.1, MaitrU 4.2 +*bhrāmya*^{ti}: MaitrU^v 7.8 +

- anticaus. (← pass.?)

The position of the early post-Vedic present *bhrāmya*^{te/(ti)},²²⁵⁰ first attested in two ‘principal’ Upaniṣads (ŚvetU, MaitrU), is unclear. Two of the four upaniṣadic occurrences (ŚvetU 6.1 and MaitrU 4.2) may belong to the passive type, but the two other occurrences should rather be translated non-passively:

(ŚvetU 1.6b)

tasmin haṃso bhrāmyate brahmacakre

‘In this Brahma-wheel a goose (= an individual soul) flutters about.’

(ŚvetU 6.1cd)

devasyaiṣa mahimā tu loke 'yenādaṃ bhrāmyate brahmacakram

‘This is the greatness of the god, by which this Brahma-wheel moves (i.e. turns) / is put into motion.’

(MaitrU 4.2)

pāpmanā gṛhīta iva bhrāmyamānam

‘Like one seized by evil, [the body] [is] chaotically moving / being put into chaotic motion.’

(MaitrU 7.8)

*nairātmyavādakuhakair 'mithyādṛṣṭāntahetubhiḥ**bhrāmyan loko na jānāti ' vedavidyāntaraṃ tu yat*

interpretation of these three passive occurrences, given in PW V, 321, and, subsequently, in WHITNEY 1889 [SktGr]: 277, §774 (where these MaitrU forms are mentioned as rare examples of passives with active inflection); 1885b [Roots]: 113, was adopted by a number of scholars. WELLER in his review of ESNOL’s ed. and transl. of the MaitrU (1955: 544 [= Kl.Schr. 1, 103]) emends all the three active forms to the corresponding passives (*abhibhūyate*, without translation); likewise TSUI 1955: 100 (“passive with act. ending”, also without translation). A passive translation of these forms (‘fire cannot be overpowered’ (?) etc.) is hardly possible for semantic reasons, however.

²²⁵⁰ Taught also by Pāṇ. 3.1.70 (with active inflection) alongside the less recommendable class I present *bhrama*^{ti} (see KIPARSKY 1979: 102).

‘Erring because of the deceptions of the doctrines denying the Ātman and the tricks of the false appearances, the world does not know what the essence of the Vedic knowledge is.’

For ŚvetU 1.6 and MaitrU 7.8 non-passive interpretations seem very likely (thus e.g. PW V, 401 for ŚvetU and MaitrU 4.2 [sub caus.]; F.M. MÜLLER (1884: 234), DEUSSEN (1897: 293), HILLEBRANDT (1921: 126 = 1977: 171) and HAUSCHILD for ŚvetU; VAN BUITENEN for MaitrU): the verb refers to a spontaneous chaotic motion, erring of a soul, body, etc. The passive interpretations suggested for ŚvetU by SCHRADER (1931: 886) (contra HAUER 1931: 12²²⁵¹) and OBERLIES (1995: 83f., with fn. 98, with bibl.) (‘in diesem hohen Brahman-Rad ... wird ein Ganter veranlaßt zu kreisen’) seem forced. Accordingly, *bhrāmya-te* is registered as a primary (class IV) non-passive (‘fientiv’) present in GOTŌ 59, 232; MAYRHOFER, EWAia II, 279; and LIV 94.

By contrast, the construction in MaitrU 4.2 and ŚvetU 6.1 (with the instrumentals *yena* and *pāpmanā*, which can be taken as passive agents) may point to a passive analysis (i.e. *bhrāmya-te* should be taken as a passive derived from caus. *bhrāmaya-ti*);²²⁵² but cf. also HAUSCHILD’s non-passive translation of ŚvetU 6.1: ‘... wodurch sich dieses Brahmanrad bewegt’.

The causative-passive interpretation of *bhrāmya-te* is preferable for two reasons:

(i) on formal grounds: given the anīṭ analysis of the root *bhram* (which is more likely than the seṭ analysis; cf., in particular, prec. *bhramyāt* Sū.²²⁵³ and caus. *bhrāmaya-ti*; see MAYRHOFER, *ibid.*), the long root vowel can be best explained as taken from the causative stem *bhrāmaya*;²²⁵⁴

²²⁵¹ ‘In diesem ... Machtgeheimnis-Rade **irrt** ein Schwan **umher**.’

²²⁵² Cf. COWELL (‘driven hither and thither by sin’) and VAN BUITENEN 130 (‘... it is driven out to wander’) for MaitrU 4.2; F.M. MÜLLER 1884: 260 (‘... this Brahma-wheel is made to turn’), HILLEBRANDT 1921: 131 = 1977: 176 (‘es ist aber die Macht Gottes in der Welt, durch die das Brahmarad bewegt wird’) and OBERLIES 1998: 109, with fn. 199 (‘die Größe Gottes ist es doch, durch die dieses Brahman-Rad veranlaßt wird, sich in [dieser] Welt zu drehen’), for ŚvetU 6.1.

²²⁵³ See NARTEN 1982: 129 [= Kl.Schr. 1, 256].

²²⁵⁴ Thus PW, *ibid.* The long root vowel might, however, be secondarily introduced under the influence of the active -ya-presents built on *amⁱ* roots (*śāmya-ti*, *śrāmya-ti*, etc.).

(ii) for chronological reasons: most of the class IV middle presents are old formations (see Chapter C.II.2).

In my view, *bhrāmya-te* is likely to originate in the causative passive (i.e. ‘be made to move, wander’), but at a later stage this present could be attracted to the class of non-passive middle -ya-presents of (spontaneous) motion of the type *pādya-te*, thus following the same scenario as the original causative passives *-iṅgya-te* (*-āṅgya-te*) and *īrya-te* (both belonging to the class of verbs of motion); see Chapter B.II, s.vv. Thus, **synchronically**, *bhrāmya-te* should be grouped with class IV presents, at least in most of its usages. Note also that, under the non-passive analysis, it is easier to explain the active form at MaitrU 7.8: non-passive middle -ya-presents do occur in the Upaniṣads with the secondary active inflection (albeit rarely), while passives do not.

mnā* ‘mention’: -*mnāya-te

+ *ā* BhārŚS 1.1.9 +
• pass.

For this -ya-passive *-mnāya-te* built on the secondary root *mnā*, see GOTÖ 1987: 239; 1997a: 1025.

rakṣ* ‘protect’: *rakṣya-te

(AV 18.4.70 mss., eds. *rākṣamāṇā-*, PW ⁺*rakṣyamāṇa-* ?), (ŚvetU 5.10, ed. ĀnSS, ed. HAUSCHILD *rakṣyate*, read with ed. OBERLIES and others *yujyate*), Smṛ., Ep. +

The late passive *rakṣya-te* does not appear before the Smṛti period (YājñSmṛ. 1.336) and Epic Skt.²²⁵⁵ WHITNEY’s (1885b [Roots]: 134) reference “U.+”²²⁵⁶ relates to ŚvetU 5.10cd, which PW VI, 214, ed. ĀnSS and ed. HAUSCHILD read as *yad-yac charīram ādatte* ‘*tena-tena sa rakṣyate*

²²⁵⁵ For Epic attestations of this passive (with active inflection!), see OBERLIES 2003: 265 and 492.

²²⁵⁶ “B.+” in WHITNEY’s lists on p. 231 is probably a misprint.

(‘... in dem [Körper] ist sie verwahrt’). The correct reading is probably *yujyate* (thus mss., OBERLIES 1998: 105 and other eds.): ‘Welchen Körper auch immer er annimmt, mit dem wird er verbunden’ (OBERLIES).

(Other passives)

Passive interpretations are suggested by most interpreters for the class I present middle participle *rākṣamāṇā-* at AV 18.4.70:

(AV 18.4.70)

prāsmāt pāśān varuṇa muñca sārvaṇ ' yáih samāmé badhyáte yáir vṛyāmé ádhā jīvema śarādāṃ śatāni ' tváyā rājan gupitā rākṣamāṇāḥ

‘Release all fetters from us, o Varuṇa, with which one is bound in oath, with which in abjuration;²²⁵⁷ so may we live hundreds of autumns [...]

A passive analysis, adopted for *rākṣamāṇāḥ* already in PW VI, 214, has been followed by LUDWIG (1878: 492) (‘... von dir o könig behütet und beschirmt’) and WHITNEY (‘by thee, O king, guarded, defended’).²²⁵⁸ This interpretation is unlikely for system-related reasons, however: class I middle presents cannot be employed in the passive usage (GOTŌ 56). BÖHTLINGK/ROTH’s conjecture ⁺*rakṣyamāṇa-*, hesitantly suggested in PW VI, 214, requires the emendation of both the stem (-ṣy- for -kṣy- is indeed quite common in mss.) and accent and, furthermore, is doubtful for chronological reasons, in view of the recent age of the passive *rakṣya-*^{1e} (see above). Note also that the passive analysis of *rākṣamāṇāḥ* leaves unexplained the coordination of the present and perfect participles in pāda d. I therefore follow the transitive interpretation by WEBER (1896: 293), with minor syntactic modifications:²²⁵⁹ ‘... may we live hundreds of autumns, **preserving** [the oaths] guarded by you, o king.’

²²⁵⁷ On the correct interpretation of *samāmé ... vṛyāmé*, see HOFFMANN 1969b: 202f. [= Aufs. 1, 297f.] (‘... alle Fesseln, mit denen man beim Vertragseid, mit denen man bei der Abschwörung gebunden wird’).

²²⁵⁸ Likewise ELIZARENKOVA (1976: 256): ‘тобою, о царь, защищенные и охраняемые’. GOTŌ does not mention this problematic occurrence s.v.

²²⁵⁹ WEBER: ‘Dann wollen wir leben hundert Herbste, durch dich, o König, die verborgenen Dinge behütend.’

ram ‘come to peace, stop; be satisfied’: *ramya*^{te}

+ *abhi* KauṣGS^m 3.14.16 ≈ ŚGS^m 4.2.6 ≈ GautPS^m 2.6.13 (?) (*abhi-ramyatām*, GautPS v.l. °*ramate*) (≈ Smṛ.^m)

- anticaus. [change of state?]

(BaudhŚS 24.7:190.15 *vi-ramyet* – -yet-optative)

The present *-ramya*^{te} is attested only in the form *abhi-ramyatām*, which appears in a mantra quoted in some Gṛhya- and Piṭṛmedha-Sūtras (KauṣGS 3.14.16 ≈ ŚGS 4.2.6 ≈ GautPS 2.6.13 (?))²²⁶⁰ as well as in the Smṛtis (YājñSmṛ. 1.251, ManuSmṛ. 3.251²²⁶¹). The meaning is probably ‘may you be satisfied’,²²⁶² rather than ‘may you repose, rest’²²⁶³ (A.A. VIGASIN, p.c.).²²⁶⁴ This is an instance of the ‘courteous’ 3rd person imperative (for 2nd person),²²⁶⁵ and thus exemplifies a very late usage.²²⁶⁶

The form *vi-ramyet* at BaudhŚS 24.7:190.15 belongs with -yet-optatives, not with -ya-presents; see KULIKOV 2006d: 39.

riph ‘snarl’: *riphya*^{te}

ĀśŚS 1.5.10

- pass. / (anticaus. [change of state] ?)

The -ya-present *riphyate* (first attested in ĀśŚS 1.5.10), derived from

²²⁶⁰ See CALAND 1895: 108, 112 [= Kl.Schr., 18, 22]; but HULTSCH’s ms. reads °*ramate*; see Appendix to CALAND’s ed. of GautPS, p. 132.

²²⁶¹ ManuSmṛ. has *abhito ramyatām* ‘repose wherever you wish’, with v.l. *abhi bho ramyatām*.

²²⁶² Thus e.g. STENZLER (p. 33) for YājñSmṛ. (‘möget ihr befriedigt sein’); OLDENBERG for ŚGS (‘sei befriedigt’); JOLLY (1880: 237) (‘may you be satisfied!’) and KORNEEVA (2007: 175, 257, 340) (‘Да будете вы довольны!’) for ViṣṇuSmṛ.^m 73.26, on which see also fn. 2266 below.

²²⁶³ Thus BÜHLER (1886: 121) for ManuSmṛ. (‘rest either (here or at home)’).

²²⁶⁴ On the development of this secondary meaning of *ram*, see RENOU, EVP IX, 102f.

²²⁶⁵ See e.g. SPEIJER 1886 [SktS]: 271f., §349.

²²⁶⁶ Cf. also ViṣṇuSmṛ.^m 73.26 *abhiramantu bhavantaḥ* ‘may you be satisfied’.

the root *riph* ‘snarl’, is employed as a technical term denoting the change of visarga before vowels.²²⁶⁷ Both passive (‘is changed to *r*’) and non-passive (‘becomes *r*’)²²⁶⁸ interpretations are possible. Since most of the middle non-passive *-ya*-presents are old formations, the latter analysis seems less likely only for system-related reasons.

***ruj* ‘hurt’: *-rujya*^{-te}**

+ *vi* ĀpŚS 7.12.2
• pass. (?)

The *-ya*-present *vi-rujya*^{-te} is attested in ĀpŚS 7.12.2 *yady aṅgahīṇaḥ syād, aṅgato vā virujyeta* ‘if [the animal] would be without some limb, or with defective limb(s) ...’²²⁶⁹ The adjacent participle *°hīṇa-* (which belongs with the non-passive *°yá*-present *hīyá*^{-te}; see Chapter III, s.v.) may plead for a non-passive interpretation. That is, there are some (weak) reasons to group *-rujya*^{-te} with the *°yá*-presents of destruction and damage (cf. *hīyá*^{-te} ‘fall off, be missing’; see Chapter C.II.3). However, evidence is too scant, and the paradigmatic features of *ruj* (the lack of a transitive nasal present, in contrast to most *°yá*-presents of destruction) does not support this analysis.

***lakṣ* ‘mark, indicate, designate’**

pass. of *-áya*-pres.: *lakṣya*^{-te}
+ *upa* ŚrSū. +

The passive *-lakṣya*^{-te}, first attested in Śrauta-Sūtras, belongs with the non-causative *-aya*-present *-lakṣaya*^{-ti}. An example is:

(ŚŚS 1.16.9)

nigamasthāneṣu ca sā devatopalakṣyate

‘And at those places [in the recitations] where insertions are made this

²²⁶⁷ On the onomatopoetic origin of this term (perhaps based on the meaning ‘be torn’, said of a tissue, attested in younger texts), see RENOU 1941-42: 149 [= Choix I, 355].

²²⁶⁸ Thus MYLIUS: ‘[Ein visarga] wird ... zu *r*.’

²²⁶⁹ For this passage, see, in particular, WEZLER 1998: 272f.

deity is indicated.²²⁷⁰

For Epic attestations of this passive, see OBERLIES 2003: 499.

likh ‘scratch, scrape’: -*likhya*-^{te}

+ *nir* ĀpŚS 9.17.4 = HirŚS 15.7.24;

+ *pari* VaitS 28.8

• pass.

The passive -*likhya*-^{te} first appears in Śrauta-Sūtras, cf. ĀpŚS 9.17.4 = HirŚS 15.7.24 *nir likhyate* ‘*tra pātram* ‘here the vessel is being scraped out, [not washed]’.

vadh (badh) ‘slay, kill’: *vadhya*-^{te}

(GB 2.3.9:194.15, ed. MITRA *vadhyate*, ed. GAASTRA *badhyate* [*bandh*]; VārŚS 3.3.1.33 *vadhyeta*, TSUJI ‘*yajeta* (?)’), Smṛ., AVPariś. +

• pass.

GB 2.3.9:194.15 *badhyate* (ed. MITRA *vadhyate*), reckoned in VWC-Br. II, 1285a to the verb *vadh (badh)* ‘slay, kill’, appears in a difficult passage:

(GB 2.3.9:194.15-195.2)

tāḥ prajā āśvam āraṃs. tad badhyate vā. etad yajño, yad dhavīṃṣi pacyante, yat somaḥ sūyate, yat paśur ālabhyate

The passage is syntactically unclear and probably corrupt. The form *badhyate* may belong to the verb *bandh* ‘bind’; I essentially follow PATYAL’s (1969: 269 and 271, note 3) interpretation:

‘These creatures injured the horse. Thus, verily, it (?) is bound. This is a sacrifice, when oblations are cooked, when soma is pressed out, when cattle is offered.’

The only attestation of the alleged passive *vadhyate* in the Sūtras

²²⁷⁰ Rather than ‘is made manifest’, as CALAND translated this form (with a question mark); cf. ĀpŚS 24.3.21, MānŚS 1.5.5.3, etc.

(VārŚS 3.3.1.33 *yo jyogāmayāvi vadhyeta*) is uncertain, too. The passage is based on MS 4.3.7:46.18 *yó jyógāmayāvī syát, tám eténa yājayet* ‘who would be sick for a long time, one should cause him to perform a sacrifice’; TSUJI (1964: 14) hesitantly conjectures ⁺*yajeta* for *vadhyeta*.

The earliest reliable occurrences of the passive *vadhya-te* ‘be killed’ appear in post-Vedic texts, in particular, in Smṛtis (e.g. YājñSmṛ. 1.323), AVParīś., and Epics (also with active inflection; see OBERLIES 2003: 241 and 507).

***viś* ‘enter’**

pass. of caus.: *-veśya-te*

+ *pra* ‘make enter, bring inside’ DrāhyŚS–LāṭyŚS

Causative passives of the root *viś* are first attested in the closely related DrāhyŚS and LāṭyŚS, e.g. at LāṭyŚS 5.6.1 = DrāhyŚS 14.1.17 *praveśyamānam rājānam anu praviśet* ‘he should enter following the King [Soma] being brought inside’.

vr̥ṣ* ‘rain’: *-vr̥ṣya-te

+ *abhi* ‘rain upon’ ŚrSū.

• pass.

The fundamentally intransitive verb *vr̥ṣ* ‘rain’ can be passivized only in compounds with *abhi* (cf. the similar case of pass. *abhi-bhūya-te* discussed above). The passive *abhi-vr̥ṣya-te* is first attested in the Śrauta-Sūtras of the Taittirīya school, e.g. at BaudhŚS 14.1:152.15 (≈ BhārŚS 10.8.6 etc.) so *’bhivṛṣyamāṇo japati* ‘being under rain, he murmurs [the formula]: ...’

śak* ‘be able to (do)’: *śakya-te

SUB 3.16, MaitrU [ed. VAN BUITENEN] 4.0/4.3 [= ed. COWELL 6.34 = MaitrāyaṇyU 4.[2].9 (ed. “108 Up.”, p. 243, l.10-11)], ŚrSū. +

• pass.

In post-Vedic texts, the verb *śak* is common with the infinitive (‘X is able to V_{INF}’), which can function as the subject of the corresponding passive constructions (see SPEIJER 1886 [SktS]: 303f., §387; 1896 [VSS]: 67, §219; RENOU 1930 [GrS]: 135; GIPPERT 1995: 272). Examples are:

(SUB 3.15-16)

tasmai brahma na prabrūyāt ||15|| śakyamānam akurvate

‘Brahma will not answer to him, who does not do what can be [done].’

(MaitrU, ed. VAN BUITENEN 4.0/4.3 [= ed. COWELL 6.34] = MaitrāyaṇyU 4.[2].9)

na śakyate varṇayitum girā tadā ' svayaṃ tad antaḥkaraṇena gr̥hyate

‘[The bliss] cannot then be described by speech; it has to be captured itself, by inner organ.’

śap ‘curse’: *śapya*^{-te}

KauśS 48.7, 52.8

• pass.

Both attestations of the present *śapya*^{-te} in the KauśS (48.7 *śapyamānam*, 52.8 *śapyamānāya*) are translated as passives by CALAND (1900: 167, with fn. 5 and 179, with fn. 6).²²⁷¹ BLOOMFIELD (1902: 513) considered CALAND’s translation “very improbable” and opted for a non-passive (middle) interpretation (‘cursing, conjuring [enemy]’), thus, apparently, taking *śapya*^{-te} as a transitive class IV present. This analysis is doubtful, foremost, for system-related reasons: all class IV middle presents are old formations, attested from the early Vedic period onwards.

śās ‘order’: *śāsya*^{-te}, *śiṣya*^{-te}

śāsya^{-te} (+ *anu* JB 1.199:5 ≈ 1.199:7 *anuśāsyaṇte*, read ⁺*anuśasyante*; see s.v. *śams*), Ep. +;

śiṣya^{-te} Cl. +

²²⁷¹ For 48.7: ‘den verflucht werdenden’; for 52.8: ‘demjenigen, der einem Ordal unterzogen wird’.

The passives of the verb *śās* ‘order’ (*śāsyā-te*, *śiṣyā-te*) first appear in post-Vedic texts (Ep.,²²⁷² Cl.); for the erroneous analysis of JB 1.199:5 ≈ 1.199:7 (mss.) *anuśāsyante* as pass. of *śās* (FRENZ 39) and the confusion of some derivatives of the roots *śams* and *śās*, see Chapter B.I, s.v. *śams*.

snā ‘bathe’: *snāya-te*

MānŚS^m 8.20.8 (*snāyasva*), AVPariś., Ep.

(GB 1.5.2:114.4ff. *pra-snāyeyuḥ* – *-yet*-optative)

The imperative form *snāyasva* attested in the mantra MānŚS 8.20.8 *atra piba snāyasva* ‘drink now [and] bathe’ is isolated; the complete middle paradigm probably did not exist before Ep. Skt.²²⁷³ For Epic attestations of this *-ya*-present, see OBERLIES 2003: 538. According to OBERLIES (2003: 194), this late formation could result from the reinterpretation of the original passive as a reflexive: ‘is bathed’ → ‘bathes (oneself)’.²²⁷⁴

The plural optative form *-snāyeyuḥ*, encountered a few times in a GB passage, is likely to represent a *-yet*-optative; see KULIKOV 2006d: 42f.

snih ‘stick, be sticky’: *snihya-ti/(te)*

DevatādhB 3.4 (+)

- intr. proc.

The stem *snihya-* ‘stick, be sticky’²²⁷⁵ is first attested in the form

²²⁷² For Epic attestations of this passive, see OBERLIES 2003: 523.

²²⁷³ For AVPariś. 40.4.2, BISSCHOP & GRIFFITHS (2003: 335, with fn. 104) read an active form of this *-ya*-present in pāda a: *bhasmanā snāyati rudro* ‘Rudra is bathed in ash’, against the emendation **snāyate* in ed. BOLLING & NEGELEIN (discarded in their Corrigenda), although the middle form appears to be metrically better.

²²⁷⁴ In OBERLIES’ formulation, “[t]he class IV present of *snā* (only *ātm.* [!]) is presumably the passive (*snāyate*) used as active (‘[the child] bathes’ ← ‘[the child] is bathed’) ”.

²²⁷⁵ On the Indo-European cognates of this root and present, the original meaning and its development in post-Vedic Sanskrit, see HOFFMANN 1965a: 18ff. [= Aufs. 2,

snihyates (DevatādhB), the ablative singular of an extremely rare formation – a -ti-derivative built on a present stem;²²⁷⁶ see WERBA [VIA I] 261. In Epics, we only find middle forms of this -ya-present; active inflection is unattested, pace WHITNEY (1885b [Roots]: 195) and KÜMMEL (LIV 573); see OBERLIES 2003: 538f.

The present *snihya*-^{ti/(te)} could be built on the model of the synonymous *śliṣya*-^{ti} (see Chapter B.V, s.v.); note also the parallelism of *śleṣmán*- ‘slim’ and *snīhán*- ‘snot’ (HOFFMANN 1965a: 21ff. [= Aufs. 2, 451ff.]).

srāṃs ‘fall asunder, break down’: -*srasya*-^{te}

- + vi BaudhŚS 14.14:178.5-6 +
• anticaus.

The present -*srasya*-^{te}, first attested in BaudhŚS 14.14:178.5-6 (*ulbād garbhaṃ visrasyamānam anumantrayate* ‘he should address [the formula] to the embryo falling down out of the membrane...’), belongs with the middle -ya-presents of destruction (cf. Chapter C.II.3). This formation co-exists in the IVS with the older class I present *srāṃsa*-^{te} ‘id.’ and could be built in analogy with the both phonologically and semantically similar *bhra(ṃ)śya*-^{te} ‘fall’, also attested in the Taittirīya tradition (in the TĀ; see Chapter B.IV, s.v.), probably on the paradigmatic model *bhraṃśa*-^{te} YV^p + // *bhra(ṃ)śya*-^{te} TĀ + (cf. GORŌ 59, 337, with fn. 831). Note also the transitive pendant of -*srasya*-^{te}, the nasal present (impv.) *srasnīṣva* ‘untie’, which occurs in the same Śrauta-Sūtra (BaudhŚS^m 6.31:197.1) and may point to the secondary affinity of -*srasya*-^{te} with some ‘-yá-presents, such as *múcyá*-^{te} (see Chapter C.II.3).

447ff.], with fn. 23. In spite of the late attestation of this -ya-present in Vedic, it is reconstructed for PIE in LIV 573.

²²⁷⁶ Probably, created in imitation of *snéhiti*- RV 8.96.13 (on which see HOFFMANN 1965a: 19 [= Aufs. 2, 448]).

APPENDIX II

Vedic quasi-denominatives and their passives²²⁷⁷

In the texts describing Vedic ritual, i.e., above all, in the Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras, we find a number of technical terms referring to certain ritual activities, in particular, to recitations and chants. These include, for instance, *prastāva*- [introductory part of a sāman], *pratihāra*- [next part of a sāman, usually functioning as a response to *prastāva*], *udgītha*- [a part of a sāman (usually the principal one)], *upadrava*- [fourth portion of the sāman chanted by the udgātar], *praiśá*- [invitation to a recitation addressed to the hotar], *vaṣaṭkārá*- [exclamation *vaṣat*], *hīmkāra*- [introductory formula of a litany], *pravara*- [invocation of Agni accompanied by enumeration of the ṛṣi-ancestors], *upasád*- [ceremony preceding Sutyā (Soma pressing)], *pravargyā*- [the ritual which includes, among others, putting the ritual vessel, also called *pravargya*, on the fire],²²⁷⁸ etc. (see RENOU 1954; 1955a: 430 [on *hīmkāra*-]; MYLIUS 1995, s.vv.). The meaning ‘X performs A’ (where A stands for a ritual activity), e.g. ‘the priest chants *prastāva*, performs *udgītha*’, etc., is expressed by means of a verb built on the same root and with the same preverb (or with the same prefixal part, as in the case of *vaṣat-kārá*-, *hīmkāra*-) and thus might be called ‘cognate verb’: *prá-stauti*, *práti-harati*, *hīm-karoti*, etc. From the point of view of their meaning, such verbs behave very much like denominatives – in spite of the lack of the denominative suffix -(a)yá-. Consider the main syntactic patterns attested (A stands for the ritual term, e.g. *prastāva*-, *pratihāra*-, etc.; V^A for the cognate verb; N for other nouns, with which V^o is constructed; X for the subject, typically referring to a priest):

²²⁷⁷ This is a preliminary outline of a class of verbs which I hope to discuss in detail elsewhere. Some of the ideas presented below have been coined under the influence of a talk with Marcos ALBINO in Erlangen, in October 1997, to whom I would like to express my sincerest thanks. Of course, all responsibility for possible misinterpretations is mine.

²²⁷⁸ For a description of the rite, see HOUBEN 3ff.

[i] $X_{NOM} + A_{ACC} + V^A$:

(TS 6.2.3.3)

yā́h [...] upasáda upāsīdan

‘... the upasads which [the gods] performed ...’

(AB 7.25.4)

purohitasyārṣeṣeṇa pravaram pravṛṇīran

‘With [Agni as] the ancestral [priest] of Purohita,²²⁷⁹ they should perform pravara.’

(TĀ 5.6.1)

purástād upasádām pravargyām prá vṛṇakti

‘Before the upasad-performance he performs pravargya.’

(JB 1.130:5-6)

bṛhati prastute ā ity uktvādim ādadīta

‘After having chanted bṛhati as *prastāva*, having said *ā*, he should perform ādi’.

(JB 1.178:8-9)

girā ca dakṣase iti ṣaḍbhir akṣarair ādim ādatte

‘With the six syllables *girā ca dakṣase* he performs the ādi.’

More common is pattern [ii] $X_{NOM} + V^A$, without an overtly expressed cognate object A:

(TB 2.2.6.2 = AB 5.23.4)

mānasā prá stauti, mānasód gāyati, mānasā prāti harati

‘With his mind he performs *prastāva*, with his mind he chants *udgītha*, with his mind he performs *pratihāra*.’

(AĀ 2.3.4)

pañcakṛtvah prastauti, pañcakṛtvā udgāyati, pañcakṛtvah pratiharati,

pañcakṛtvā upadravati

‘Five times he performs *prastāva*, five times he chants *udgītha*, five times he performs *pratihāra*, five times he performs *upadrāva*.’

(JB 1.178:8)

yajñā vo agnaye iti ṣaḍbhir akṣaraiḥ prastauti

‘He performs *prastāva* by means of six syllables *yajñā vo agnaye* [“your

²²⁷⁹ Cf. RENO 1954: 110.

sacrifices – to Agni”].’

(KB 28.2.5-7 [ed. LINDNER 28.1])

tasmān maitrāvaruṇa eva sarvebhyaḥ preṣyati

‘Therefore only the Maitrāvaruṇa-priest performs the praiṣas [addressed] to all.’

(PB 2.1.1^{bis})

tiṣṛbhyo hiṃkāroti

‘For three [verses] he makes hiṃkāra.’

(PB 7.1.2)

dvir avanarded, dhiṃkuryāt tṛtīyam

‘Twice he should stretch the tone, the third (time) he should make *him*.’

(CALAND)

[iii] $\mathbf{X}_{\text{NOM}} + \mathbf{N}_{\text{GEN}} + \mathbf{V}^{\text{A}}$

Besides the nominative subject, pattern [iii] includes a genitive argument, which, at first glance, ‘hangs’ unconnected within the syntactic structure. Examples are:

(JB 1.75:1)

kusurbindo hauddālakis somānām ujjagau

‘Kusurbinda, the son of Uddālaka, acted as Udgātṛ at Soma sacrifices.’

(BODEWITZ 1990: 42)

(JB 1.84:3)

devakṣetraṃ vā eṣo ’dhyavasyati, yas somasyodgāyati

‘Those who act as an Udgātṛ for a Soma sacrifice, take up their abode in the domain of the gods.’ (BODEWITZ 1990: 48)

The genitives *somānām*, *somasya* cannot be governed directly by the verb; BODEWITZ (op.cit.), 218, note 14 ad JB 1.75 mentions this syntactic oddity but leaves it without explanation. Below I will return to this issue.

[iv] $\mathbf{X}_{\text{NOM}} + \mathbf{N}_{\text{ACC}} + \mathbf{V}^{\text{A}}$

Constructions with accusatives of nouns other than A are illustrated by the following examples:

(JB 1.173:2)

*tad gāyatram iva ⁺prastūyāt*²²⁸⁰

²²⁸⁰ Ed. RAGHU VIRA/LOKESH CHANDRA °stuy°.

‘Therefore he should use the Gāyatra as it were when he sings the Prastāva...’ (BODEWITZ 1990: 97)

(ŚB 1.4.2.3)

*āthārṣeyām prā vr̥ṇīte ṛṣibhyaś caivānam etād devébhyaś ca ní vedayaty,
ayām mahāvīryo yó yajñām prāpad iti. tasmād ārṣeyām prā vr̥ṇīte*

In the latter passage, *ārṣeyām* might be taken either as an adjective ‘related to ṛṣi’ (which then requires a head noun; cf. ‘free’ genitive in pattern [iii]) or as a substantive. Cf. EGGELING’s remark ad loc.: “*Ā r s h e y a m p r a v r i n ī t e*, literally ‘he chooses the ancestral’ (*rishi*). I take ‘*ārṣeyam*’ as a masculine adjective qualifying a supplied ‘(A g n i m) h o t ā r a m.’ In this way the formula is explained by Sāyana on 1,5,1,9 (*rishîṇām sambandhinam adhvaryur hotāram vrinīte*), and this seems to me the most natural interpretation. It is true, however, that, as the formula (‘he chooses the ancestral’) became stereotyped, its exact import became forgotten, and *ā r s h e y a* was generally taken as a neuter, either adjective (viz. ‘*nāmadheyam*,’ ‘*apatyam*’) or noun (ancestral lineage).” The correct semantic analysis of the constructions with *prā-vr̥* was given by BROUGH (1950; 1953: 10ff.), who translated the above passage as follows (1953: 15):

‘Next he recites the pravara of *ṛṣi*-names; he thus makes him known in this matter to the *ṛṣis* and to the gods, with the thought, “Of great power is he who obtained the sacrifice”. It is for this reason that he recites the pravara of *ṛṣi*-names.’

Below I will return to the syntactic analysis of this pattern.

All the syntactic patterns listed above can be passivized, particularly often in the locative absolute constructions, i.e. with the verb in the form of a *-ta*-participle or present participle of the corresponding *-yā*-passive:²²⁸¹

[i_{pass.}] A_{NOM} (⇒ LOC) + V^A_{PASS}. Examples are:

(TS 6.2.3.3-4)

yāt sāyām-prātar upasāda upasadyānte...

‘By the fact both morning and evening upasads are being performed ...’

(TĀ 5.10.2)

yāsyaivām vidūṣaḥ pravargyāḥ pravṛjyāte

‘... for whom knowing thus the pravargya is being performed.’

²²⁸¹ See a rich collection of examples and discussion in OERTEL 1926: 156ff.

(JB 1.140:2-3)

*pratihāra eva +pratihriyamāṇe*²²⁸² *vāk ity udgātā brūyāt*

‘While the pratihāra is being sung, the Udgātar should speak the word *vāc.*’ (cf. OERTEL 1926: 292)

(MS 1.4.11:60.6)

*tāt pravare pravaryāmāṇe*²²⁸³ *brūyāt ...*

‘Then, when the pravara is performed, he should say ...’

[ii_{pass.}] V^A_{PASS}. Examples are:

(PB 7.7.15)

prastūyamāṇe sam mīlet

‘When the prastāva is being chanted, [the Udgātar] should close his eyes.’
(cf. OERTEL, op.cit., 291)

(ĀpŚS 10.22.12-23.1 = VaikhŚS 12.16:146.19)

nikramyamāṇeṣu yajamāno [...] japati

‘While the nikramaṇas (ritual footsteps) are being made, the sacrificer ... whispers [the formulae].’

Cf. also passive participles, corresponding to the technical terms *udgīthā-* and *hiṃkāra-* in the following BĀU passage:

(ŚB 14.9.3.9 (= BĀUM 6.3.9 = BĀUK 6.3.4))

āthainam abhī mṛṣati [...] hiṃkṛtām asi, hiṃkriyamāṇām asy, udgīthām asy, udgīyamāṇām asi

‘Then he touches that [sacrificial mixture, saying]: [...] “You are hiṃ-kāra which is pronounced, you are hiṃ-kāra which is being pronounced, you are [a sung] udgītha, you are [udgītha] which is being sung.”²²⁸⁴

²²⁸² Thus emended in CALAND’s transcript, apud BODEWITZ 1990: 251, note 25; ed. RAGHU VIRA/LOKESH CHANDRA reads *pratihriyamāṇaḥ*.

²²⁸³ For other variants of this passive stem (GB *pra-vriya-* etc.), see Chapter B.I, s.v.

²²⁸⁴ The semantic difference between *hiṃkṛtā-* and *hiṃkriyamāṇā-*, *udgīthā-* and *udgīyamāṇā-* in this context is rather subtle and, most likely, should be interpreted as the distinction between an accomplished action vs. an action which is being performed but not yet accomplished; thus BÖHTLINGK (‘du bist das Hin, das ausgesprochen worden ist, und das Hin, welches ausgesprochen wird, du bist das Udgītha und das Sāman, **das man zu singen anfängt**’) and MINARD 1956: 144, [§]342 (‘après/pendant le Hing’). Differently SENART (‘tu es le **hiṃ** et tu es **la production du hiṃ**, tu es l’udgītha et tu es **la production de l’udgītha**’) (emphasis

The abnormal final accent of *hiṃkriyamāṇām* may be due to the final accent of the adjacent *udgīthām*.

[iii_{pass.}] N_{GEN} + V^A_{PASS}

(JB 1.325:1-3)

sāmno hiṃkriyamāṇa, etāṃ diśaṃ yaṇi dviṣyāt, taṃ manasā nirbādheta; tata eva sa parābhavati. pratihriyamāṇa etām u eva diśaṃ yaṇi dviṣyāt, taṃ manasāpastabhnūyāt; tata u eva sa parābhavati

‘When the Hiṃkāra is applied in the Sāman²²⁸⁵ one should remove in thought him whom one hates to that direction; and from the same moment he becomes lost. When the Pratihāra is applied, one should push back in thought him whom one hates to that same direction; and also from that same moment he becomes lost’. (BODEWITZ 1990: 185)

[iv_{pass.}] N_{NOM} (⇒ LOC) + V^A_{PASS}

The noun *sāman* as well as technical terms for metres and stotras are particularly common as N. In my view, the most exact rendering of the collocations of the type *sāma prastūyate* is ‘sāman (stotra, gāyatri, etc.) is performed (chanted, sung) as *prastāva* (*pratihāra*, etc.)’, or ‘*prastāva* (*pratihāra*, etc.) is performed (chanted, sung) by means of sāman (stotra, gāyatri, etc.)’.²²⁸⁶ Examples are:

(JB 1.104:1)

gāyatriyāṃ prastutāyāṃ gāyatram eva gāyan pṛthivīm manasā gacchet

‘After the Gāyatri has been chanted as *prastāva*, he should, singing the Gāyatri, fix his mind on (lit.: go with his mind to) the earth.’ (cf. OERTEL, op.cit., 261)

(KS 34.18:48.13)

bahiṣpavamāne prastute brūyāt ...

everywhere mine – LK).

²²⁸⁵ For the syntax of this absolute locative construction, see KEYDANA 1997: 126 (with a more exact translation: ‘Während der Hiṃ-Laut eines Sāmans gemacht wird ...’).

²²⁸⁶ Cf. also OERTEL’s (1926: 297) remark: “In the phrases *rathantare* and *bṛhati prastute* [...] and *rathantare prastūyamāne* [...], ‘When the *prastāva* of the Rathantara [of the Bṛhat] Sāman has been sung’ and ‘is being sung’, the pregnant construction of √*stu* + *pra* ‘to sing the *prastāva*’ with the name of the Sāman whose *prastāva* is sung is noteworthy.”

‘After the Bahiṣpavamāna has been chanted as *prastāva*, he should say ...’²²⁸⁷

(JB 1.322:7 = 1.336:6)

pratihriyamāṇaṃ sāmāvasīdati

‘The Sāman chanted as *pratihāra* sinks down.’²²⁸⁸

(JB 1.323:1-2)

prastūyamāṇaṃ sāma prajākāmo ’bhyudgāyēd. [...] pratihriyamāṇaṃ eva paśukāmo ’bhyudgāyēt

‘Someone who is desirous of progeny should start the Udgītha in addition to the Sāman still being chanted as *prastāva*. [...] Someone who is longing for cattle should sing the Udgītha in addition to the *pratihāra* being performed.’

(JB 1.112:7-8)

etad dha vai sāmno ’ntar araṇyam, yat prastutam anabhisvaritam ādīyate

‘What is performed as *ādi* [after] the *prastāva* has been performed, without a special tone (*svara*), that is a [retirement into] the forest (= retirement from something undertaken) in the middle of the *sāman*.’²²⁸⁹

The verbal forms employed in the constructions under discussion lack any specific morphological marking and might appear to be regular compounds (*prā-stu*, *prāti-hṛ*, etc.). Probably for that reason their position within the verbal system has never been the subject of a special study. At first glance, pattern [i] (*pravarām pravṛṇīte* etc.) can be taken as a content accusative construction of the type *póṣam puṣyati* ‘he prospers (lit. prospers prosperity)’, *svápnam suptvá* (AV 10.3.6) ‘having slept’, with the ‘cognate object’ (*figura etymologica*; see Chapter A.II.3) *pravarām*, and such cases are indeed grouped together by GONDA (1959: 276ff.). In my view, however, the similarity is only superficial. While in the content accusative constructions the accusative object is semantically “empty” (*póṣam puṣyati* = *puṣyati*), constructions of the type *pravaram pravṛṇīte*, *prastāvam prastauti* reveal, in a sense, an opposite relationship between the verbal form and the

²²⁸⁷ For further examples of similar locative absolute constructions with the participle *prastuta-*, see OERTEL, op.cit., 260ff.

²²⁸⁸ BODEWITZ (1990: 183): ‘The Sāman in which a *Pratihāra* is applied...’

²²⁸⁹ Cf. also BODEWITZ’s note ad loc. (1990: 238, note 17): “Does *ādīyate* refer to the *Ādi*, the part of the Sāman coming after the *Prastāva*?”

accusative object. *pravṛṇṇīte*, *prastauti* etc. are semantically (almost) empty, functioning as ‘support verbs’,²²⁹⁰ meaning ‘do, perform, bring about’.²²⁹¹ In other words, in the case of *póṣam puṣyati* the base of syntactic derivation is the verb (*puṣyati* → *póṣam puṣyati*), whilst in the case of *prastāvam prastauti* the noun is the base of syntactic derivation (*prastāvam* → *prastāvam prastauti*). Thus, *pravṛṇṇīte*, *prastauti* etc. might be labelled ‘cognate verbs’ (in analogy with ‘cognate accusatives’).

While the affinity with content accusative constructions (limited to pattern [i]) is purely superficial, the **semantic** parallelism with denominatives is quite significant. Like the denominatives of the type *kṣemayá-ⁱⁱ* ‘give rest, abode’ (← *kṣéma-* ‘rest, abode’), verbs *pravṛṇṇīte*, *prastauti*, etc., when employed in pattern [ii], “compress” two meanings in one word: ‘perform’ + ‘pravara’; ‘perform/sing’ + ‘prastāva’; etc.

Thus, we are confronted with a descriptive dilemma: to take *pravaram pravṛṇṇīte* etc. (α) as a content accusative construction (GONDA), and the verb in such constructions as a regular compound; or (β) as a denominative without denominative morphology. Let us consider *pro et contra* of each of these solutions.

Semantics. In contrast to content accusative constructions, the meaning of verbs such as *pravṛṇṇīte* etc. reveal idiomatic semantic changes and can hardly be deduced from the meaning of the verb: *úpa-sad* ‘perform upasad’ ← *sad* ‘sit’, *prá-vṝ* ‘perform pravara’ ← *vṝ* ‘choose’, etc. Most instructive is the case of *ā-dā* ‘perform ādi’, the meaning of which has nothing in common with ¹*dā* ‘give’, nor with *ā-¹dā* ‘take’.²²⁹²

²²⁹⁰ Other terms are: ‘light verb’ (JESPERSEN’s terminology, also adopted in modern syntactic theories), ‘function verb’, ‘lexical function’ (MEL’ČUK and ŽOLKOVSKIĬ), Fr. ‘verbe opérateur’. Cf. JESPERSEN’s (1942: 117f.) description of such constructions as consisting of “an insignificant verb” “placed before the really important idea”.

²²⁹¹ Cf. BROUGH’s (1950: 129 [= Coll.Pap., 77]) description of such constructions: “a verb is used absolutely instead of the cognate noun with a verb of doing, saying, etc.”.

²²⁹² This peculiar usage of *ā-dā* in late Vedic did not escape the attention of Sanskritists; cf. WHITNEY 1883: cxlviii; 1886: 11ff.; WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER AiG I, 17; II/2, 25, 299; III 130f.; OERTEL 1926: 260. The construction *ādim ādatte* ‘he performs the ādi’ is considered as evidence for the etymological relationship between *ādi-* and ¹*dā* ‘give’; cf. especially WHITNEY, op.cit., and MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 165 (with other explanations). However, from the semantic point of view, *ādi-* and ¹*dā* hardly belong together; note that some Indian grammarians even reckoned it to the root *ad* ‘eat’; see WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II/2]: 299.

On the contrary, the denominative analysis of *úpa-sad*, *prá-vṛ̥* etc. conforms to the common patterns of the denominative derivation. Albeit rare for Vedic *-(a)yá*-denominatives,²²⁹³ the type ‘perform P’ is quite common for denominal verbs in world languages.²²⁹⁴

Syntax. In contrast to the content accusative constructions and denominatives, the pattern (*pravaram*) *pravṛ̥ṇīte* can easily be passivized. Particularly instructive are syntactic differences between the ‘cognate verbs’ such as *úpa-sad*, *prá-vṛ̥* and the corresponding simplex verbs (i.e. *sad* ‘sit’, *vṛ̥* ‘choose’, etc.). Unlike *úpa-sad* and *prá-vṛ̥*, passives are not derived from *sad* and *vṛ̥* (for *sad*, only a causative passive can be derived: *sādyá-^{te}*). Note, furthermore, that the passive of the compound *ā-¹dā* ‘take’, attested a few times in the *Samhitā* prose, does not occur in the *Brāhmaṇas* properly speaking (see Chapter B.I, s.v.). Finally, the ‘cognate verbs’ sometimes show remarkable syntactic peculiarities both in transitive and passive constructions. Thus, the verb *stu* is constructed with the accusative of the recipient of praise, not with the accusative of the praise. However, from the *Brāhmaṇas* onwards, we find constructions such as *tām ná stūyāmāne* ‘*va nayet*’ (ŚB 4.2.4.6) ‘he should not pour it [into the cup] while the stotra is being sung’ or *bahiṣpavamāne stūyamāne* (JUB 1.1.5.6 [ed. OERTEL 1.5.6]) ‘when the *bahiṣpavamāna* is being sung as stotra...’, clearly instantiating passives of cognate verbs (see Chapter B.I, s.v. *stu*).

Morphology. In spite of the fact that most verbs in question are undistinguishable from regular compound verbs, some of them exhibit certain peculiarities that are at odds with regular morphological patterns. Thus, passives derived from the verb *prá-vṛ̥* do not follow the regular pattern, which would yield, for the *seṭ* variant of the root (*vṛ̥*), the stem ***ūryá-* (i.e. in compound – ***proryá-*).²²⁹⁵ This form could be avoided because of its morphological opacity with regard to the noun *pravará-*.

The present *ādim ādatte* illustrates nothing but the secondary derivation *ādi-* \approx *ādi-* + *ā-dā*, on which see below.

²²⁹³ To this semantic type belongs, for instance, *namasyá-^{ti}* ‘perform *námas-*’; see TUCKER 1988: 98.

²²⁹⁴ For a typology of denominatives (denominal verbs), see KALIUSČENKO 1988 (cf. esp. p. 48, 100 on the type ‘perform A’ = KALIUSČENKO’s type 16).

²²⁹⁵ The correct passive stem built on the *aniṭ* variant, i.e. *-vriya-*, is attested in the GB and some *Sūtras*. Yet the variant readings *pravṛ̥ṇīya-* and *pravṛ̥ṇīya-* (see Chapter B.I, s.v. *vṛ̥*) show that the *seṭ* variant was not totally abandoned.

To sum up, the verbs of the type *prá-vṝ*, *úpa-sad*, etc. can hardly be grouped with normal compound verbs attested in content accusative constructions. Rather, these display several structural affinities with denominatives. For the lack of better term I will label such verbs ‘**quasi-denominatives**’. The derivational scenario which gives rise to these formations can be summarized as follows. Quasi-denominative verbs based on the term A, meaning ‘perform A’, borrow their morphology from A, i.e. they are built on the root of A (R_A) ($v\bar{r}$, *sad* etc.), attaching the same preverb/prefixal part as in A (Pv_A), if any. These formations behave as the corresponding compound verbs (i.e. $Pv_A + R_A$; these compound verbs can be called ‘morphological **prototypes**’) as far as most of their morphological properties are concerned; in particular, they copy the paradigmatic properties of the prototype and its diathesis. Cf. the middle inflection of *prá-vṝ* and *ā-dā*, which is clearly taken from the *media tantum* verbs *vṝ* ‘choose’ and *ā¹-dā* ‘take’ and does not render any ‘middle semantics’. In the cases where the etymology and/or morphological analysis of A is not obvious (cf. *ādi-*), the choice of a prototype may be purely formal, and its proper semantics plays little (if any) role in this choice. In particular, the prototype of *ā-dā* ‘perform ādi’ is *ā¹-dā*, not any of the verbs based on other (partly) homonymous roots (*²dā* ‘bind’, *^{3/4}dā* ‘cut’, etc.) simply because only *¹dā* is well-attested with the preverb *ā*.²²⁹⁶

While the morphological and paradigmatic properties of quasi-denominatives are largely borrowed from the morphological prototype, their syntactic properties are quite different. The syntactic pattern that can be regarded as basic, from the derivational point of view, is the transitive construction [i] $X_{\text{NOM}} + A_{\text{ACC}} + V^A$ (where $V^A = (Pv_A) + R_A$): *sa pravaram pravṝṇīte*; *sa ādim ādatte*; etc. The more common pattern [ii] $X_{\text{NOM}} + V^A$ (*sa pravṝṇīte* etc.) results from [i] by the operation that can be called ‘cognate object deletion’. The resulting syntactic structure retains, however, a trace of the deleted object (‘hidden cognate object’, \emptyset^A), which surfaces in several syntactic processes, so that the verb in patterns [ii-iii] can be shown to behave transitively. In particular, the passivizability of [ii] (cf. *prastūyate* ‘the *prastāva* is being chanted’) can only be explained on the assumption that [iii] is transitive ($X_{\text{NOM}} + \emptyset^A_{\text{ACC}} + V^A$), even though an overtly expressed direct object is lacking.²²⁹⁷ Likewise, the genitive in patterns [iii] and [iii_{pass.}]

²²⁹⁶ *^{3/4}dā* ‘cut’ (*²dā* ‘bind’?) (pr. *-d(i)yá^{-ti}*) occurs with the preverb *ā* only in the RV (1×) and AV; see Chapter B.VI, s.vv.

²²⁹⁷ As OERTEL (1926: 297) explains, in such cases “the subject is implied in the

and the adjective in [iv] (e.g. at ŚB 1.4.2.3 *ārṣeyám prā vr̥ṇīte*, under the adjective analysis of *ārṣeyám*) can readily be accounted for as syntactically connected with the hidden object or passive subject, cf. *yas somasyodgāyati* (= *somasyodgātham udgāyati*) ‘The one who performs udgātha of a Soma sacrifice...’

Besides clear instances of quasi-denominatives, there are some transitional cases between quasi-denominative compounds of the type Pv+*kṛ* (e.g. *hūṃ-kṛ* ‘pronounce hūṃ-kāra’, with the prefixal part *hūṃ-* which is used as a bound form) and constructions ‘accusative + *kṛ*’ (i.e. constructions with a free accusative noun). For instance, *pāryagni-kṛ* behaves as a quasi-denominative compound at AB 2.5.1 *paryagni-kriyamāṇe* ‘while the paryagnikaraṇa (= ceremony of carrying round the fire)²²⁹⁸ is performed’, but as a construction with free accusative (which becomes the nominative subject in the corresponding passive construction) at TS 3.4.3.5 *pāryagnau kriyamāṇe* (with the same meaning).²²⁹⁹ The quasi-denominative type was probably not yet well-established in the early Vedic prose (i.e. in the Saṃhitās), before the period of the Brāhmaṇas properly speaking.

To conclude this short discussion of quasi-denominatives, one should mention another class of usages which, at first glance, appear very similar to the quasi-denominative type. Consider the following examples:

(TB 3.10.9.1)

yád vy ádyat, tásmād vidyút

‘By virtue of the fact that he untied (*vyadyát*) [the gods], [it is called] **lightning** (*vidyút*).’

(ŚB 4.3.2.3)

tád yád enác chyāti, tásmāc chastraṃ nāma

‘[By virtue of the fact] that [the Hotar] sharpens it (*śyāti*), therefore it is called recitation (*śastra*).’

(GB 1.5.12:129.3-4)

tad yat saṃśyāyati, tasmāc chyenas. tac chyenasya śyenatvam

‘Thus, [by virtue of the fact] that he coagulates (*saṃśyāyati*), [he is called] a falcon (*śyena*). This is the falcon’s falcon-ness (i.e. that is why

verb”.

²²⁹⁸ On paryagnikaraṇa, see HILLEBRANDT 1911: 421 [= Kl.Schr., 188].

²²⁹⁹ Cf. also the distinction between the absolutives *paryagni-kṛtya* VaikhŚS ≈ *paryagni kṛtvā* JB.

falcon is called falcon).’

(ŚĀ 6.15)

*yamo rājeti vā aham etam upāsa iti. sa yo haitam evam upāste, sarvaṃ
hāsmā idaṃ śreṣṭhyāya yamyate*

‘“He is king Yama”, thus I reverence him. For the one who reverences him (sc. Yama) thus, everything here is indeed subdued (*yamyate*) to his supremacy.’

(VādhAnv [ed. IKARI] 4.47 = VādhS [ed. CALAND] 4.13:2)

ahar vā iṣṭir, ahnā hi sarve kāmā iṣyante

‘Die Iṣṭi ist der Tag, denn am Tage werden alle Wünsche gewünscht (*iṣyante*).’ (CALAND 1928: 109f. [= Kl.Schr., 409f.])

This type might be called ‘pseudo-etymological’. As in the case of quasi-denominatives, the choice of the ‘etymon’ is based on purely formal similarity, and the pseudo-etymological verb often reveals some (syntactic) properties, which its prototype lacks. In particular, the passive of ¹*iṣ* ‘wish’ is exceptional in Vedic (see Chapter B.IV, s.v.), and the passive of *yam* ‘hold’ does not occur as simplex elsewhere. One need not argue that there is hardly any semantic affinity between *vī*-²*dā* ‘untie’ (*vī*-^{3/4}*dā* ‘destroy’?) and *vidyút*-‘lightning’, *sām*-*śyā* ‘coagulate’ and *śyená*- ‘falcon’ – as is the case with *ā*-¹*dā* ‘take’ and *ādi*.

However, in contrast to quasi-denominatives, pseudo-etymological verbs do not mean ‘perform A’, and derivation has little or nothing in common with the meaning of the base noun, often even being at odds with their etymology; for instance, the noun *iṣṭi*- ‘sacrifice’ is derived from the root *yaj*, not ¹*iṣ* ‘wish’, so that the corresponding passive verb should be, in fact, *ijyante*, not *iṣyante*.

APPENDIX III

-yá-passives and other formations attested in the passive usage: a synopsis

The table below does not claim to be an exhaustive synopsis of all Vedic middle forms attested in the passive usage, being rather a representative selection of such forms. Only verbs which attest passive usage for forms other than grammaticalized passives (i.e. -yá-presents and -i-aorists) are included. Since passive usages of middle forms are mostly limited to the RV, I only give explicit references to texts other than the RV.

	-yá-passive	aorists	perfects / statives	other formations (pres., fut., intens.)
<i>añj</i>	<i>ajyá-^{te}</i> RV+		<i>ānájé, ānájāná-</i>	(pres. <i>añkte, añjāná-</i> etc.)
<i>ad</i>	<i>adyá-^{te}</i> YS ^p +	<i>adāná-</i> RV ^{1x}		
<i>āp</i>	<i>āpyá-^{te}</i> YS ^m +	<i>-āpi</i> ŚB, TĀ (?)		cond. <i>-āpsyata</i> ŚB
<i>idh</i>	<i>idhyá-^{te}</i> RV+	<i>idhāná-</i>	<i>édhe</i> ; stat. <i>indhé, indhāna-</i>	
<i>ṛc</i>	<i>ṛcyá-^{te}</i> RV		<i>āṛce</i>	
<i>kṛ</i>	<i>kriyá-^{te}</i> RV+	<i>ākāri, krāṇá-</i>	<i>cakre</i>	
<i>khyā</i>	<i>khyāyá-^{te}</i> Br.+	<i>akhyata</i> etc. RV+		fut. <i>-khyāyīṣyante</i> JB
<i>jñā</i>	<i>jñāyá-^{te}</i> RV+	<i>ājñāyi</i>		pres. <i>-jānāna-</i> JB
¹ <i>dā</i>	<i>dīyá-^{te}</i> AV+	<i>dāyi</i> RV	<i>dadé, dadriré</i> RV	
² <i>dā</i>	<i>-dīyá-^{te}</i> YS ^m	<i>-dāyi</i> RV	<i>-dadé</i> RV	
<i>duh</i>	<i>duhyá-^{te}</i> RV+		<i>duduhāná-</i> , stat. <i>-duhe</i>	

	-yá-passive	aorists	perfects / statives	other formations (pres., fut., intens.)
<i>drś</i>	<i>drśyá-^{te}</i> RV _x +	<i>ádarśi, ádrśran/m,</i> <i>drśāna-, drśāná-;</i> <i>dr̥kṣata</i>	<i>dádṛśe, dádṛśre,</i> <i>dádṛśāna-</i>	
<i>dhā</i>	<i>dhāyá-^{te}</i> RV+	<i>ádhāyi, dhāyi,</i> <i>dhīmahi; ádhita</i> ŚB	<i>dadhé, dadhire,</i> <i>dádḥāna-</i>	pres. <i>dadhīta</i>
<i>nid</i>	<i>nidyá-^{te}</i> RV	<i>nidāná-</i>		
<i>panⁱ</i>	<i>-panyá-^{te}</i> RV	<i>paniṣṭa</i>	<i>papné</i>	
<i>pā</i>	<i>pāyá-^{te}</i> AV+	<i>ápāyi</i> RV	<i>pape, papāná-</i> RV	
<i>piś</i>	<i>piśyá-^{te}</i> AV		<i>pipiśé</i> RV	
<i>piṣ</i>	<i>piṣyá-^{te}</i> AVP+		<i>-pipiṣe</i> RV	
<i>pīḍ</i>	<i>pīḍya-^{te}</i> TS		<i>pipīḷé</i> RV	
¹ <i>pū</i>	<i>pūyá-^{te}</i> RV+		<i>punāná-;</i> <i>pupuvāná-</i> MS ^p , <i>pupuve</i> PB	
<i>bandh</i>	<i>badhyá-^{te}</i> RV+		<i>bedhiṣe</i> AV	
<i>bhaj</i>	<i>-bhāḥjyá-^{te}</i> AV+		<i>-bhejire</i> AV	
<i>bhṛ</i>	<i>bhriyá-^{te}</i> RV+	<i>bhāri</i>	<i>babhrāná-</i>	(pres. <i>bhára-^{te},</i> <i>bíbḥramāṇa-</i>)
² <i>mā</i>	<i>mīyá-^{te}</i> (AV, ŚB ?), Sū.+			pres. <i>mīmīte</i>
<i>mṛj</i>	<i>mṛjyá-^{te}</i> RV+	<i>mṛjāná-</i>	<i>māmṛjé;</i> stat. <i>marmṛjāná-</i>	int. <i>marmṛjyámāna-</i>
<i>yabh</i>	<i>yabhya-^{te}</i> Kh.			fut. ⁺ <i>yapsyámāna-</i> (?) AV
<i>yam</i>	<i>yamyá-^{te}</i> RV, Br.	<i>áyāmi; ayaṃsata</i>	<i>yemire, yemāná-</i>	
² <i>yā</i> 'im- plore'	<i>īya-^{te}</i> RV	<i>iyāná-</i>		
<i>yuj</i>	<i>yujyá-^{te}</i> RV+	<i>áyoji, áyujran,</i> <i>yujāná-; ayukṣata</i>	<i>yuyujé, yuyujré,</i> <i>yuyujāná-</i>	

	-yá-passive	aorists	perfects / statives	other formations (pres., fut., intens.)
<i>vañc</i>	<i>vacyá</i> ^{-te} RV-AV		<i>vāvakre</i>	
¹ <i>vid</i>	<i>vidyá</i> ^{-te} RV+	<i>avedi, védi</i>	<i>vividé</i>	
<i>vṛj</i>	<i>vṛjyá</i> ^{-te} RV+		<i>vāvṛje</i>	
<i>vṛ̥</i> (¹ <i>vṛ̥</i>)	(-varyá ^{-te} MS ^p +, -vriya ^{-te} GB+)	<i>urāṇá</i> - RV		
<i>vraśc</i>	<i>vṛ̥śc[y]á</i> ^{-te} RV+	-vṛ̥kṣi RVKh., TS+		
<i>śams</i>	<i>śasyá</i> ^{-te} RV+	<i>śaṁsi</i>		(-śaṁsamāna-)
<i>śri</i>	-śr̥yá ^{-te} YS+	<i>áśr̥āyi</i> RV	<i>śiśriyāná</i> - RV	pres. <i>śráyamāṇa</i> - RV
<i>śru</i>	<i>śrūyá</i> ^{-te} RV _x +	-śr̥āvi	<i>śuśruve</i> ; stat. <i>śṛṇvé</i> , <i>śṛṇviré</i> , <i>śṛṇviṣé</i>	
<i>sic</i>	<i>sicyá</i> ^{-te} RV+	-áseci ŚB; -asikṣi MS ^m	-ṣiṣice ŚB, -ṣiṣicāná- MS ^p	
<i>su</i>	<i>sūyá</i> ^{-te} RV+	<i>ásāvi</i> , <i>s^uvāná</i> - RV, TS ^m	<i>suṣvāná</i> -; stat. <i>sunvé</i> , <i>sunviré</i> , <i>sunvāná</i> - (?)	
¹ <i>sū</i>	<i>sūyá</i> ^{-te} RV _x +		<i>suṣ(u)vāná</i> - YV ^p +, Br.	fut. <i>soṣyāmāna</i> - ŚB
<i>sṛj</i>	<i>sṛjyá</i> ^{-te} RV+	(<i>á</i>) <i>sarji</i> , <i>ásṛgram/n</i> , <i>sṛjāná</i> -; <i>asṛkṣata</i>	<i>sasṛjire</i> , <i>sasṛjāná</i> -	
<i>stu</i>	<i>stūyá</i> ^{-te} RV+	<i>ástāvi</i> , <i>stuvāná</i> -; <i>astoṣṭa</i> etc.	<i>tuṣṭuvāná</i> -; stat. <i>stāve</i> , <i>stavāná</i> , <i>stāvāna</i> -, <i>stavān</i> ; (stat.?) <i>stuṣé</i>	pres. <i>stāvase</i> etc.; fut. <i>staviṣyase</i> RV, <i>stoṣyāmahe</i> ŚB
<i>stṛ̥</i>	<i>stīryá</i> ^{-te} YV ^m +	<i>ástāri</i> RV	<i>tistiré</i> RV	-stṛ̥ṇītam RV
<i>hu</i>	<i>hūyá</i> ^{-te} RV+	<i>áhāvi</i>	-juhure, <i>júhvāna</i> -	
<i>hū</i>	<i>hūyá</i> ^{-te} RV+	<i>huvāná</i> -		

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. TEXTS

Samhitās

- RV Ed. AUFRECHT, Theodor: *Die Hymnen des Rigveda*. 2 Bde. 2. Auflage. Bonn, 1877.
 → Bibl. II: VAN NOOTEN & HOLLAND 1994
 Translations:
complete: LUDWIG 1876, 1881, 1883; GRASSMANN 1876-77; GELDNER 1951; ELIZARENKOVA 1989, 1995, 1999; WITZEL et al. 2007 [books I-II].
selections: BENFEY 1862, 1864, 1866, 1883; BERGAIGNE 1894; MÜLLER 1891; OLDENBERG 1897; HILLEBRANDT 1913; RENOU 1938 [HP], 1947 [AS], 1956 [HS], 1955-1969 [EVP]; LOMMEL 1955; THIEME 1964; VELANKAR 1963 [book VII]; 2003 [book V]; AMBROSINI 1981 [book X]; SANI 2000.
- AVŚ Ed. ¹ROTH, R./WHITNEY, W.D.: *Atharva Veda Sanhita*. Erster Band. Text. Berlin, 1856.
 Ed. ²ROTH/WHITNEY/LINDENAU: *Atharva Veda Sanhita*. Herausgegeben von R. ROTH und W.D. WHITNEY. Zweite, verbesserte Auflage besorgt von Max LINDENAU. Berlin, 1924. [books I-XIX].

Ed. VISHVA BANDHU (et al.): *Atharvaveda (Śaunaka) with the Pada-pāṭha and Sāyaṇācārya's commentary*. I-IV. Hoshiarpur, 1960-64. (VIS 13-17).

Translations:

complete: WHITNEY/LANMAN 1905; ELIZARENKOVA 2005, 2007, 2010, KULIKOV (in preparation).

selections: AUFRECHT 1850 [book XV]; LUDWIG 1878; WEBER 1858a [book I], 1862: 178-217 [book XIV], 1873b [book II], 1885 [book III], 1898a [book IV], b [book V], 1895-1896 [XVIII]; HENRY 1891a [XIII], 1892 [VII], 1894 [VIII-IX], 1896a [X-XII]; BLOOMFIELD 1897; ELIZARENKOVA 1976.

AVP-Kashm. Ed. BARRET, LeRoy Carr: *The Kashmirian Atharva Veda*.

Book one. *JAOS* 26 (1906), 197-205.

Book two. *JAOS* 30 (1910), 187-256.

Book three. *JAOS* 32 (1912), 343-390.

Book four. *JAOS* 35 (1915), 42-101.

Book five. *JAOS* 37 (1917), 257-308.

Book six. → Ed. EDGERTON

Book seven. *JAOS* 40 (1920), 145-169.

Book eight. *JAOS* 41 (1921), 264-289.

Book nine. *JAOS* 42 (1922), 105-146.

Book ten. *JAOS* 43 (1923), 96-115.

Book eleven. *JAOS* 44 (1924), 258-269.

Book twelve. *JAOS* 46 (1926), 34-48.

Book thirteen. *JAOS* 48 (1928), 34-65.

Book fourteen. *JAOS* 47 (1927), 238-249.

Book fifteen. *JAOS* 50 (1930), 43-73.

Book sixteen and seventeen. *AOS* 9 (1936).

Book eighteen. *JAOS* 58 (1938), 571-614.

Book nineteen and twenty. *AOS* 18 (1940).

Ed. EDGERTON, Franklin: *The Kashmirian Atharva Veda*. Book six. *JAOS* 34 (1915), 374-411.

Ed. RAGHU VIRA: *Atharva Veda of the Paippalādas*. 3 parts. Lahore, 1936, 1940, 1941.

AVP-Or. Ed. DURGAMOHAN BHATTACHARYYA: *Paippalāda Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda*. First Kāṇḍa. Calcutta, 1964 (CSCRS 26);

- Volume two [books II-IV]. Calcutta, 1970 (CSCRS 62).
- Ed. DIPAK BHATTACHARYA: *The Paippalāda Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda*. Volume One: Consisting of the first fifteen Kāṇḍas [books I-XV]. Calcutta, 1997. (B.Ind. 318); Volume Two: Consisting of the sixteenth Kāṇḍa [book XVI]. Calcutta, 2008. (B.Ind. 319)
- [book 2] → Bibl. II: ZEHNDER 1999 [with translation]
- [book 5] → Bibl. II: LUBOTSKY 2002 [with translation]
- [books 6-7] → Bibl. II: GRIFFITHS 2004a/2009 [with translation]
- [book 19] → Bibl. II: GRIFFITHS 1997 [with translation]
- SV Ed. BENFEY, Theodor: *Die Hymnen des Sāma-Veda*. 2 Bde. Leipzig, 1848.
- SVJ Ed. RAGHU VIRA: *Sāma Veda of the Jaiminīyas*. Lahore, 1938. (Sarasvati Vihara Series; 3).
- Ed. CALAND, Willem: *Die Jaiminīya-Saṃhitā mit einer Einleitung über die Sāmavedaliteratur*. Breslau, 1907. (Indische Forschungen; 2).
- RVKh. Ed. SCHEFTELOWITZ, Isidor: *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda*. Breslau, 1906. (Indische Forschungen; 1).
- Ed. SĀTAVALEKAR: *Ṛgveda-Saṃhitā*. Pāraḍī, 1957 (“ṛṣṭīya vāra”), p. 769-791.
- Ed. AUFRECHT, Theodor: → in RV, ed. AUFRECHT (Khailikāni Sūktāni), p. 672-688.
- [5.7 (Praiṣādhyāya)] → Bibl. II: MINKOWSKI 1991 [with translation]
- VS Ed. WEBER, Albrecht: *The Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā in the Mādhyandina- and the Kāṇva-Çākhā with the Commentary of Mahīdhara*. Berlin-London, 1852. (Repr.: ChSS 103 (1972)).
- Ed. SĀTAVALEKAR: *Vājasaneyi-Mādhyandina-Śukla Yajurveda-Saṃhitā*. Aundh, 1946.
- VSK Ed. SĀTAVALEKAR: *Śuklayajurvedīya Kāṇvasaṃhitā*. Pāraḍī, 1983. (“caturtham saṃskaraṇam”).
- MS Ed. SCHROEDER, Leopold von: *Mâitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā*. 4 Bde.

- Leipzig, 1881, 1883, 1885, 1886.
 Transl.: → Bibl. II: AMANO 2009 [books 1-2, prose parts]
- KS Ed. SCHROEDER, Leopold von: *Kâṭhakam. Die Saṃhitâ der Kaṭha-Çâkhâ*. 3 Bde. Leipzig, 1900, 1909, 1910.
 Ed. NAVATHE: → Bibl. II: NAVATHE 1980
- KpS Ed. RAGHU VIRA: *Kapiṣṭhala-Kaṭha-Saṃhitâ. A text of the Black Yajurveda*. 1st ed. Lahore: Mehar Chand Lachhman Das, 1932. (*Mehar Chand Lachhman Das Sanskrit and Prakrit Series*; 1). (2nd ed. Delhi, 1968) [with a different pagination; the present book uses 1st ed.]
- TS Ed. WEBER, Albrecht: *Die Taittirîya-Saṃhitâ*. 2 Bde. Berlin, 1871, 1872. (*IndSt* 11-12).
 Ed. B.Ind.: *The Sanhitâ of the Black Yajur Veda: with the commentary of Mâdhava Âchârya*. Ed. by E. Roer and E.B. Cowell (vol. I); E.B. Cowell (vol. II); Maheśachandra Nyâyaratna (vol. III-V); Paṇḍit Satyavrata Sâmaśramî (vol. VI: Kaṇḍa VI & VII). Calcutta, 1860-1899. (*B.Ind.* 26).
 Ed. ĀnSS: *Padapāṭhayutā Kṛṣṇayajurvedīyataittirīyasamhitā* ... Poona, 1900-1908. (*ĀnSS* 42).
 Ed. N.S. SONTAKKE / T.N. DHARMADHIKARI: *Taittirīya Saṃhitâ: with the Padapāṭha and the commentaries of Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara Miśra and Sāyaṇācārya*. Ed. by N.S. Sontakke & T.N. Dharmadhikari. Vol. I/1-2 (1970, 1972) [book 1]; II/1 (1981) [book 2]; II/2 (1985) [book 3]; III/1 (1990) [book 4]. Poona, 1970-.

Brāhmaṇas

- AB Ed. AUFRECHT, Theodor: *Das Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. Mit Auszügen aus dem Commentare von Sāyaṇācārya und anderen Beilagen* hrsg. von Theodor Aufrecht. Bonn, 1879.
 Ed. HAUG, Martin: *The Aitareya Brahmanam of the Rigveda* [...] Edited, translated and explained by Martin Haug. 2 vols. Bombay-London, 1863.
 Ed. SUDHAKAR MALAVIYA: *The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa of the Ṛgveda: with the commentary [...] of Sāyaṇācārya and*

- ‘Sarala’ Hindi translation. Ed. and translated by Sudhakar Malaviya. 2 vols. Varanasi, 1980-1983. (*Prāchyabhārati Series*; 14-15).
- Ed. ĀnSS: *Aitareyabrāhmaṇam, Śrīmatasāyaṇācāryaviracita-bhāṣyasametam*. 2 vols. 2nd ed. Poona, 1930, 1931. (*ĀnSS* 32).
- Transl.: → Bibl. II: KEITH 1920
- KB Ed. ĀnSS: Poona, 1911. (*ĀnSS* 65).
- Ed. LINDNER, B.: *Das Kaushītaki Brāhmaṇa*. Herausgegeben und übersetzt von B. Lindner. I. Text. Jena, 1887.
- Ed. SARMA, E.R. Sreekrishna: *Kauṣītaki-Brāhmaṇa*. 1. Text. Wiesbaden, 1968. (*Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland*; Supplementband 9, 1).
- Transl.: → Bibl. II: KEITH 1920
- PB Ed. Chinnaśwami ŚASTRI, A.: *The Tāṇḍyamahābrāhmaṇa* belonging to the Sāma Veda with the commentary of Sāyaṇāchārya. 2 vols. Benares, 1935, 1936. (*KashiSS, Haridās Sanskrit Granthamālā*; 105).
- Transl.: → Bibl. II: CALAND 1931a
- JB Ed. RAGHU VIRA/LOKESH CHANDRA: *Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa of the Sāmaveda. Complete Text critically edited for the first time* by Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra. Nagpur, 1954. (*Sarasvati-Vihara-Series*; 31). [2nd revised ed.: *Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa of the Sāmaveda*. Critically edited by Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra. Delhi, 1986]
- Ed. CALAND, W.: *Das Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa in Auswahl. Text, Übersetzung, Indices*. Amsterdam, 1919. (VKNAWL 19.4).
- Ed. OERTEL: → Bibl. II: OERTEL 1897, 1898, 1899, 1902, 1905, 1907, 1909.
- Ed. LOKESH CHANDRA: *The Jaiminiya Brahmana of the Samaveda II.1-80 (Gavāmayana)*. Nagpur, 1950. (*Sarasvati Vihara Series* 21).
- Ed. TSUCHIDA, Ryutaro: *Das sattra-Kapitel des Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa (2,334-370) nach den Handschriften herausgegeben, ins Deutsche übersetzt und erklärt*.

- Dissertation. Marburg, 1979.
 Transl.: in ed. CALAND; → Bibl. II: SCHRAPEL 1970;
 BODEWITZ 1973, 1990; TSUCHIDA 1979
- ŞB Ed. EELSINGH, Herman Frederik: *Şaḍviṃśabrāhmaṇam Vijñāpanabhāṣyasahitam*. Proefschrift Utrecht. Leiden: Brill, 1908.
- Ed. Bellikoth Ramachandra SHARMA: *Şaḍviṃśa Brāhmaṇa with Vedārthaprakāśa of Sāyaṇa*. Tirupati, 1967. (KSVS 9).
 Transl.: BOLLÉE 1956; WEBER 1858b
- TB Ed. ĀnSS: *Kṛṣṇayajurvedīyaṃ Taittirīyabrāhmaṇam, Śrīmat-sāyaṇācāryaviracitabhāṣyasametam*. 3 vols. 3rd ed. Poona, 1979. (ĀnSS 37).
- Ed. DUMONT, Paul-Émile [with transl.]:
 1.4.3-4: *Mélanges Renou* (1968), 243-253.
 2.1: *PrAPS* 108/4 (1964), 337-353.
 2.6: *PrAPS* 109/6 (1965), 309-341.
 2.8: *PrAPS* 113/1 (1969), 34-66.
 3.1: *PrAPS* 98/3 (1954), 204-223.
 3.2: *PrAPS* 101/2 (1957), 216-243.
 3.3: *PrAPS* 103/4 (1959), 584-608.
 3.4: *PrAPS* 107/2 (1963), 117-182.
 3.5: *PrAPS* 104/1 (1960), 1-10.
 3.6: *PrAPS* 106/3 (1962), 246-263.
 3.7.1-6; 11: *PrAPS* 105/1 (1961), 11-36.
 3.7.7-10; 12-14: *PrAPS* 107/5 (1963), 446-460.
 3.8-9: *PrAPS* 92/6 (1948), 447-503.
 3.10-12: *PrAPS* 95/6 (1951), 628-675.
- Ed. A. Mahadeva SASTRI (et al.): *The Taittirīya Brahmana with the Commentary of Bhattabhaskaramistra*. Ed. by A. Mahadeva Sastri, R. Shama Sastri and L. Shrinivasacharya. 4 vols. Mysore 1908-1921. (≈ Delhi 1985).
- Ed. Rājendralāla MITRA: *The Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa of the Black Yajur Veda, with the commentary of Sāyaṇāchārya*. Calcutta, 1859-1870. (B.Ind. 31).
- VādhAnv (Vādhūla-Anvākhyāna = Vādhūla-Brāhmaṇa) → Sūtras: VādhS

- ŚB Ed. WEBER, Albrecht: *The Çatapatha-Brâhmaṇa in the Mādhyandina-Çâkha with extracts from the commentaries of Sâyaṇa, Harisvâmin and Dvivedaganga*. Berlin – London, 1885. (Repr.: ChSS 96 (1964)).
- Ed. Satyavrata SĀMAŚRAMĪ: *The Çatapatha Brâhmaṇa of the White Yajurveda with the commentary of Sâyaṇa Ācārya*. Calcutta, 1903-... (B.Ind. 145).
- Ed. Kalyan-Bombay: *Shrimad-Vajsaneyi-Madhyandin-Shatpath-Brâhmanam with Vedarthaprakash commentary by Shrimat-Trayibhashyakar Sayanacharya, and Sarvavidyanidhana Kavindracharya Saraswati Shri Hari Swami*. Edited by several learned persons. 5 vols. Kalyan – Bombay, 1940.
- Ed. Chinnaswāmi ŚĀSTRĪ et al.: *Śatapatha Brâhmaṇa of the White Yajurveda in the Mādhyandina Recension*. 2 parts. [books I-VII] Benares, 1937-1950. (KashiSS 127); 2nd ed. (Complete Volume). Varanasi, 1984.
- Ed. Kāśī: *Śatapathabrâhmaṇa* [...] Kāśī, saṃv. 1994-1997. (Acyutagranthamālā 11-13).
- Transl.: → Bibl. II: EGGELING 1882-1900; ROMANOV 2009 [Book I]; 2010 [Book X]
- ŚBK Ed. CALAND, Willem: *The Śatapatha Brâhmaṇa in the Kāṇvīya recension*. 2 vols. Lahore, 1926-1939 (Punjab Sanskrit Series; 10). (Repr.: Delhi, 1983)
- Ed. SWAMINATHAN, C.R.: *Kāṇvaśatapathabrâhmaṇam*. Vol. I-V. Delhi, 1994-. (KMŚ 12, 22, 30, 31, 39). [with translation]
- GB Ed. GAASTRA, Dieuke: *Das Gopatha Brâhmaṇa*. Leiden, 1919.
- Ed. Rājendralāla MITRA / Harachandra Vidyābhushaṇa: *The Gopatha Brâhmaṇa of the Atharva Veda: in the original Sankrit*. Calcutta, 1872. (B.Ind. 69).
- Transl.: → Bibl. II: PATYAL 1969
- “Lost-Br.” Ed. Batakrishna GHOSH: *Collection of the fragments of lost Brâhmaṇas*. Calcutta, 1947. (Bhāratī Mahāvidyālaya Publications. Vedic Series; 1).
- Kāṭh-Saṃk. [including Sūtra portions]

Ed. SŪRYAKĀNTA: *Kāṭhaka-Saṃkalana. Extracts from the lost Kāṭhaka-Brāhmaṇa, Kāṭhaka-Śrautasūtra & Kāṭhaka-Gṛhyasūtras*. Lahore, 1943. (Meharchand Lachhmandas Sanskrit and Prakrit Series; 12). (Repr.: New Delhi, 1981).

Ed. CALAND: → Bibl. II: CALAND 1920

Āraṇyakas

- AA Ed. KEITH, Arthur Berriedale: *The Aitareya Āraṇyaka. Edited from the manuscripts [...] with introduction, translation, notes, indexes and an appendix containing the portion hitherto unpublished of the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka* by A.B. Keith. Oxford, 1909. (AOAS 1, pt 9).
- Ed. ĀnSS: *Aitareyāraṇyakam Śrīmat-sāyaṇācārya viracita-bhāṣya sametam*. 3rd ed. Poona, 1959. (ĀnSS 38).
- ŚĀ Ed. BHIM DEV: *Śāṅkhāyanāraṇyakam*. Critically ed. by Bhim Dev. Hoshiarpur, 1980. (VIS 70).
- Ed. ĀnSS: *Ṛgvedāntargataṃ Śāṅkhāyanāraṇyakam*. Poona, 1922. (ĀnSS 90).
- Ed. KEITH: → in AA, ed. Keith, p. 305-328. [books VII-XV]
- Transl.: → Bibl. II: KEITH 1908
- KaṭhĀ Ed. WITZEL, Michael: *Das Kaṭha Āraṇyaka*. Textkritische Edition mit Übersetzung und Kommentar (Teildruck). Dissertation Erlangen, 1972. Kathmandu, 1974. (Diplomatic reprint: *Kaṭha Āraṇyaka*. Critical edition with a translation into German and an introduction. Cambridge, 2004. (HOS 65))
- TĀ Ed. ĀnSS: *Kṛṣṇayajurvedīyaṃ Taittirīyāraṇyakam Śrīmat-sāyaṇācāryaviracitabhāṣyasametam*, ed. H.N. Āpte. 3rd ed. Poona, 1937, 1939. (≈ 1st ed., 1898). (ĀnSS 36).
- Ed. Rājendralāla MITRA: *The Taittirīya Āraṇyaka of the Black Yajur Veda, with the commentary of Sāyaṇācārya*. Calcutta, 1872. (B.Ind. 52).
- Ed. SASTRI/RANGACARYA: *The Taittirīya Āraṇyaka: with the commentary of Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara Miśra*. Delhi, 1984.
- [Book 2] → Bibl. II: MALAMOUUD 1977

[Book 5] → Bibl. II: HOUBEN 1991

[Books 7-9] → TaiU

[Book 10] → MNU

TĀ-Āndhra = *Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka*, Āndhra-Rezension X (Anuvāka-
Pariśiṣṭa)

→ TĀ, ed. ĀnSS, vol. II, p. 397ff.; ed. MITRA, p. 913ff.

Upaniṣads

Anthologies: Ed. “18 Up.”: *Eighteen principal Upaniṣads*. Vol. I. *Upaniṣadic texts with parallels from extant Vedic literature, exegetical and grammatical notes*. Ed. by V.P. LIMAYE / R.D. VADEKAR. Poona: Vaidika Saṃśodhana Maṇḍala, 1958. [ĪśU, KenaU, KaṭhU, PraśU, MuṇḍU, MāṇḍU, TaiU, AitU, ChU, BĀU, ŚvetU, KauṣU, MaitrU, BāṣkalamantraU, ChāgU, ĀrṣU, ŚaunakaU, JUB].

Ed. RÖER, E.: *The Taittirīya and Aitarēya Upanishads, with the commentary of Śankara Āchārya, and the gloss of Ānanda Giri, and the Swétāswatara Upanishad, with the commentary of Śankara Āchārya*. Calcutta, 1850. (*B.Ind.* 17, Nos. 22, 33, 34).

Ed. “108 Up.”: *Hundred & eight Upaniṣads (Iṣa [sic!] etc.)*. [*A book of Indian philosophy*]. Thoroughly revised. Published by SHIVPRASAD RAGHORAM [et al.]. Benares, 1938.

Ed. “32 Up.”: *Upaniṣadāṃ Samuccayaḥ*, publ. by H.N. ĀPTĒ. Poona, 1817/1895. (*ĀnSS* 29).

Ed. WEBER, A.: Analyse der in Anquetil du Perron’s Uebersetzung enthaltenen Upanishad. *IndSt* 2 (1853), 1-111, 170-236; *IndSt* 9 (1865), 1-173.

Ed. SCHRADER, F. Otto: *The minor Upanisads, critically ed. for the Adyar Library (Theosophical Society)* by F. O. Schrader. Vol. I. Saṃnyāsa-Upaniṣads. Madras, 1912. (*The Adyar Library*; 3). [translation: → Bibl. II: OLIVELLE 1992]

Ed. Adyar Libr.: *The Yoga Upanishads* (Adyar, 1920); *Unpublished Upanishads* (Adyar, 1933); etc.

→ Bibl. II: BÖHTLINGK 1890 [KaṭhU, PrU, AitU]

-
- Bibl. II: OLIVELLE 1998 [BĀU, ChU, TaiU, AitU, KauṣU, KenaU, KaṭhU, ĪśU, ŚvetU, MuṇḍU, PraśU, MāṇḍU]
- Translations:
- Bibl. II: DEUSSEN 1897; HILLEBRANDT 1921/1977; HUME 1931; DELLA CASA 1976; OLIVELLE 1992
- ChU Ed. ĀnSS: *Chandogyopaniṣat. Ānandagirikṛtāṭikāsaṃvalita-śāṃkarabhāṣyasametā* [...] Poona, 1902. (ĀnSS 14).
- Ed. MORGENROTH, Wolfgang: *Chāndogya-Upaniṣad. Versuch einer kritischen Ausgabe mit einer Übersicht über ihre Lehren*. Diss. Jena, 1958.
- Ed. BÖHTLINGK, Otto: *Khāndogjopanishad*. Kritisch herausgegeben und übersetzt von O. Böhtlingk. Leipzig, 1889.
- Ed. SENART, Émile: *Chāndogya-Upaniṣad*. Traduite et annotée par Émile Senart. Paris: "Les Belles Lettres", 1930.
- Transl.: → Bibl. II: HAYOT 1996
- JUB Ed. OERTEL, Hanns: The Jāiminīya or Talavakāra Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa: text, translation, and notes. *JAOS* 16 ([1893] 1896), 79-260.
- Ed. SHARMA, Bellikoth Ramachandra: *Jaiminīyārṣeya-Jaiminīyopaniṣad-Brāhmaṇas*. Tirupati, 1967. (KSVS 5-6).
- BĀUK Ed. MAUE, Dieter: *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad I. Versuch einer kritischen Ausgabe nach akzentuierten Handschriften der Kāṇva-Rezension mit einer Einleitung und Anmerkungen*. Diss. Gießen, 1976.
- Ed. PEREZ COFFIE: *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad II: Crit. ed. of the second chapter of the Kāṇva recension according to accented mss. with a critical-exegetical commentary*. Diss. Harvard University. Cambridge, Mass., 1994.
- Ed. SENART: *Bṛhad-Āraṇyaka-Upaniṣad*. Traduite et annotée par Émile SENART. Paris: "Les Belles Lettres", 1934.
- BĀUM → in ŚB [14.4-9]
- Ed. BÖHTLINGK, Otto: *Bṛhadāraṇjakopanishad in der Mādhyamīdina-Recension*. Hrsg. und übers. von

-
- O. Böhtlingk. St. Petersburg, 1889.
- AiU → in AĀ (2.4-6)
→ Bibl. II: JEŽIĆ 1999
- KaṭhU → in anthologies
→ Bibl. II: BÖHTLINGK 1890 [ed., transl.]; REGNAUD 1898: 57-167 [ed., transl.]; WHITNEY 1890b [transl.]; GELDNER 1928: 155-169 [transl.]; etc.
- KauṣU Ed. COWELL, E. B.: *The Kaushītaki-brāhmaṇa-Upanishad: with the commentary of Śāṅkarānanda*. Ed. with an English transl. by E. B. Cowell. Calcutta, 1861. (*B.Ind.* 39).
Ed. FRENZ, Albrecht: *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad. IJ 11* (1968-69), 79-129. [ed., transl.]
→ in ŚĀ (3-6)
→ Bibl. II: JEŽIĆ 1999; BODEWITZ 2002b
- KenaU → in JUB (4.18-21)
Ed. RENOU: → Bibl. II: RENOU 1943
- TaiU → in TĀ (books 7-9)
Ed. ANGOT, Michel: *Taittirīya-Upaniṣad avec le commentaire de Śaṅkara*. Vol. 1-2. Paris, 2007. (*PICI* 75/1-2).
- MNU → in TĀ (book 10), TĀ-Āndhra
Ed. VARENNE, Jean: *La Mahā Nārāyaṇa Upaniṣad. Édition critique, avec une traduction française, une étude, des notes et, en annexe, la Prāṇāgnihotra Upaniṣad*. 2 tomes. Paris, 1969. (*PICI* 11, 13).
- ŚvetU Ed. HAUSCHILD, Richard: *Die Śvetāśvatara-Upaniṣad. Eine kritische Ausgabe mit einer Übersetzung und eine Übersicht über ihre Lehren*. Hrsg. von R. Hauschild. Leipzig, 1927. (*AbhKM* 17/2).
Ed. OBERLIES: → Bibl. II: OBERLIES 1995, 1996, 1998
- ĪśU(M) → in VS(M) (book 40)
- ĪśUK → in VSK (book 40)
- MaitrU = Maitri (Maitrī), Maitrāyaṇa, Maitrāyaṇīya Up.

- Ed. COWELL, E.B.: *The Maitri or Maitrāyaṇīya Upanishad, with the commentary of Rāmatīrtha*. Ed., with an English translation by E. B. Cowell. London, 1870. (*B.Ind.* 42).
- Ed. van BUITENEN, J.A.B.: → Bibl. II: VAN BUITENEN 1962
- MaitrāyaṇyU (= VAN BUITENEN's "Southern Maitrāyaṇī" (SM))
 → in ed. "108 Up.", p. 237-247.
 → in ed. "120 Up.", p. 176-194.
- MuṇḍU Ed. HERTEL: *Muṇḍaka-Upaniṣad. Kritische Ausgabe*. Hrsg. von Johannes HERTEL. Leipzig: H. Haessel, 1924. (*Indo-Iranische Quellen und Forschungen*; 3).
- PraśU → in anthologies
 → Bibl. II: BÖHTLINGK 1890 [ed., transl.]
- KaṭhŚiU → Bibl. II: WITZEL 1979-1980
- AvyaktaU → Bibl. II: DUMONT 1940
- ChāgU → Bibl. II: BELVALKAR 1924; RENOU 1959a
- GauḍĀgŚ → Bibl. II: BOUY 2000
- GTU → Bibl. II: BERGMANN 1965
- KubjU Ed. GOUDRIAAN, Teun & SCHOTERMAN, Jan A.: *The Kubjikā Upaniṣad*. Ed. with a translation, introduction, notes and appendices by T. Goudriaan and J. A. Schoterman. Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1994. (*GOS* 10).
- Tejobindūpaniṣad → in ed. "108 Up."

Sūtras

Śrauta-Sūtras

- ĀśŚS Ed. B.Ind.: *The Śrauta Sūtra of Āśvalāyana with the commentary of Gārgya Nārāyaṇa*. Ed. by Rāmanārāyaṇa VIDYARATNA. Calcutta, 1864-1874. (*B.Ind.* 49).
- Ed. ĀnSS: *Nārāyaṇakṛtavṛttisametam Āśvalāyanaśrauta-sūtram*. Ed. by G. Ś. GOKHALE. Poona, 1917. (*ĀnSS* 81).
- Ed. Hoshiarpur: *The Āśvalāyana Śrautasūtra, with the comm.*

- of Devatrāta*. 3 vols. Ed. by R. S. BAWA, B. B. CHAUBEY, G. Ch. OJHA et al. Hoshiarpur, 1986-1996. (*Panjab University indological series*; 31, 35, 36).
- ŚŚS Ed. HILLEBRANDT, Alfred: *The Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra together with the commentary of Varadattasuta Ānartīya*. Vol. I. *Text of the Sūtra, critical notes, indices*. Calcutta, 1888. (*B.Ind.* 99).
Transl.: → Bibl. II: CALAND 1953
- LatyŚS Ed. Ānandachandra VEDĀNTAVĀGĪŚA: *Srauta Sūtra of Lātyāyana with the commentary of Agniswāmī*. Calcutta, 1870-1872. (*B.Ind.* 63). (2nd ed.: *With new appendix containing corrections and emendations to the text* by C. G. KASHIKAR. New Delhi, 1982).
Ed. H. G. RANADE: *Latyāyana-Śrauta-Sūtra*, critically edited and translated by H.G. Ranade. Vols. I-III. Delhi, 1998. (*KMŚ* 27-29).
- DrāhyŚS Ed. REUTER, J.N.: *The Śrauta-sūtra of Drāhyāyana, with the commentary of Dhanvin*. London, 1904. [until 11.1.4]
Ed. RAGHU VIRA: *JVS* 1 (1934), 13-80. [books 11-15]
Ed. B. R. SHARMA: *Drāhyāyana Śrauta Sūtram (With the Commentary of Dhanvin)*. Allahabad, 1983. (*Ganganatha Jha Kendrija Sanskrit Vidyapeetha Text Series*; 6).
- JŚS Ed. GAASTRA, Dieuke: *Bijdrage tot de kennis van het vedische ritueel. Jaiminīyaśrautasūtra*. Proefschrift Utrecht. Leiden, 1906. [book 1].
Ed. Premnidhi SHASTRI: *Jaiminīya-śrauta-sūtra-vṛtti of Bhavatrāta*. Ed. by P. Shastri. New Delhi, 1966. (*Śatapīṭaka Series*; 40).
[for a division of the text, see PARPOLA 1967: 196ff.]
- MānŚS Ed. VAN GELDER, Jeannette M.: *The Mānava Śrautasūtra belonging to the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā*. 2 vols. New Delhi, 1961, 1963. (*Śatapīṭaka Series*; 17, 27). [with translation]
Ed. KNAUER, Friedrich: *Das Mānava-Çrauta-Sūtra*. St.-Petersbourg, 1900 (Buch I); 1901 (Buch II); 1903 (Buch III-V).

-
- VārŚS Ed. CALAND, Willem / RAGHU VIRA: *Vārāha-Śrauta-Sūtra: Being the main ritualistic Sūtra of the Maitrāyaṇī Śākhā*. Lahore, 1933. (*Meharchand Lachhmandas Sanskrit and Prakrit Series*; 2).
- BaudhŚS Ed. CALAND, Willem: *The Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra belonging to the Taittirīya Saṃhitā*. 3 vols. Calcutta, 1904-1924. (*B.Ind.* 163). (2nd ed.: With new appendix containing many text improvements [by Radhe Shyam Shastri], New Delhi, 1982).
- Ed. KASHIKAR, C.G.: *The Baudhāyana Śrautasūtra*. Critically edited and translated by C.G. Kashikar. 4 vols. Delhi, 2003. (*KMŚ* 35-38).
- VādhS [including VādhAnv, VādhŚS]
- Ed. CALAND, W.: → Bibl. II: CALAND 1923, 1924, 1926, 1928
- Ed. Braj Bihari CHAUBEY: *Vādhūla-śrautasūtram*: crit. ed. with introd. and indices by B.B. Chaubey. Hoshiarpur, 1993.
- Ed. SPARREBOOM/HEESTERMAN: → Bibl. II: SPARREBOOM/HEESTERMAN 1989 [VādhŚS 1.1-1.4]
- Ed. IKARI, Yasuke: *Vādhūla Śrautasūtra 1.1-1.4 (Agnyādheya, Punarādheya): a new critical edition of the Vādhūla Śrautasūtra, I. Zinbun: Annals of the Institute for Research in Humanities (Kyoto University)*, 30 (1995).
- VādhAnv Ed. IKARI, Yasuke: *Vādhūla-Anvākyāna (= Vādhūla-Brāhmaṇa)* (in preparation).
- VādhŚS Ed. IKARI, Yasuke: *Vādhūla-Śrauta-Sūtra* (in preparation).
- VādhPrāyaśc. Ed. IKARI, Yasuke: *Vādhūla-Prāyaścittāni* (in preparation).
- BhārŚS Ed. RAGHU VIRA: *Bhāradvāja-Śrautasūtra*. *JVS* 1 (1934), 2 (1935).
- Ed. KASHIKAR, C.G.: *The Śrauta, Paitṛmedhika and Pariśeṣa Sūtras of Bharadvāja*. Critically edited and translated by C. G. Kashikar. 2 parts. Poona, 1964.
- ĀpŚS Ed. GARBE, Richard: *The Śrauta Sūtra of Āpastamba belonging to the Taittirīya Saṃhitā with the commentary of*

- Rudradatta*. 3 vols. Calcutta, 1882, 1885, 1902. (*B.Ind.* 92).
- Ed. ŚĀSTRĪ: *Āpastambaśrautasūtra Dhūrtasvāmibhāṣya*. Vol. I: ed. by A. Chīnnaswāmī Śāstrī (1955); Vol. II: ed. by A. Ch. Śāstrī and P.N. Paṭṭābhirāma Śāstrī (1963). Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1955-1963. (*Gaekwad's Oriental series*; 121, 142).
- Transl.: → Bibl. II: CALAND 1921, 1924a, 1928a
- HirŚS Ed. ĀnSS: *Satyāṣādhaviracitaṃ Śrautasūtram*. [Ed. by Kāśīnāthaśāstrī Āgāṣe and Śaṅkaraśāstrī Mārūlakara]. 10 vols. 1907-1932. (*ĀnSS* 53).
- VaikhŚS Ed. CALAND, Willem: *Vaikhānasa-Śrautasūtram*. Calcutta, 1941. (*B.Ind.* 265).
- KātyŚS Ed. WEBER, Albrecht: *The Çrautasūtra of Kātyāyana with extracts from the commentaries of Karka and Yājñikadeva...* Berlin – London, 1859. (*The white Yajurveda*, Part III). (Repr.: *ChSS* 104 (1972)).
- Ed. NITYĀNANDA et al.: Chowkhambā Sanskrit Series: *The Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra with the Karka Bhāṣya of Śrī Karkāchārya*. Part I (= I-XI). Ed. by Pandit Nityānanda Panta Parvatiya. Benares, 1928; Part II (= XII-XXVI). Ed. by Gopāl Śāstri and Dogrā Anantarām Śāstri. Benares, 1939.
- Ed. VIDYĀDHARA ŚARMĀ: *Katyayan Srauta Sutra with Devayājñika Paddhati*. Edited by Pandit Śrī Vidyādhara Śarmā. Benares City, 1933-1937. (?)
- Ed. RANADE, H.G.: *Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra [Rules for the Vedic sacrifices]* (ed. [up to book XV], transl. by H.G. Ranade. Poona, 1978.
- Ed. THITE, Ganesh Umakant: *Kātyāyana-Śrautasūtra: text with English translation and notes*. Delhi: New Bharatiya Book Corporation, 2006.
- VaitS Ed. VISHVA BANDHU: *Vaitāna-Śrauta-Sūtra with the commentary called Ākṣepānuvidhi by Somāditya*. Edited, critically, ... by Vishva Bandhu in collaboration with Bhim Dev & Pitambar Datt. Hoshiarpur, 1967. (*Woolner*

Indological Series; 13).

Ed. GARBE, Richard: *Vaitāna Sūtra. The ritual of the Atharvaveda*. Ed. with critical notes and indices by Richard Garbe. London, 1878. (*Sanskrit Text Society*).

Transl.: → Bibl. II: CALAND 1910

Gṛhya-Sūtras

- ĀśGS Ed. STENZLER, Adolf Friedrich: *Indische Hausregeln, I. Āṣvalāyana*. Erstes Heft. Text. Leipzig, 1864. (*AbhKM* 3/4).
- Ed. VIDYĀRATNA/VEDĀNTĀVĀGĪSA: *The Grihya sūtra of Āśvalāyana, with the commentary of Gārgya Nārāyana*. Ed. by Rāmanārāyana Vidyāratna and Ānandachandra Vedāntāvāgīsa. Calcutta, 1869. (*B.Ind.* 57).
- Ed. T. G. SASTRI: *The Asvalayanagrihyasutra with the commentary Anavila of Haradattacharya*. Ed. by ... T. Ganapati Sastri. Trivandrum, 1923. (*TrivSS* 78). (Repr.: Delhi, 1985 (*Sri Garib Das Oriental series*; 29)).
- Ed. ĀnSS: *Nārāyaṇakṛtavṛttigṛhyaparīṣiṣṭabhaṭṭakumārila-kārikāśahitam Āśvalāyanagṛhyasūtram ...* [Poona], 1936. (*ĀnSS* 105).
- Ed. N.N. SHARMA: *Āśvalāyana Gṛhyasūtram with Sanskrit commentary of Nārāyaṇa*, English translation ... Ed. by Dr. Narendra Nath Sharma. Delhi, 1976.
- Ed. K.P. AITHAL: *Āśvalāyanagṛhyasūtra-bhāṣyam of Devasvāmin*. Critically ed. ... by Pandit K.P. Aithal... Madras: Adyar Library, 1980.
- Transl.: → Bibl. II: OLDENBERG 1886
- ŚGS Ed. OLDENBERG, Hermann: *Das Çāṅkhāyanagṛhiyam*. *IndSt* 15 (1878), 1-166. [with translation]
- Transl.: → Bibl. II: OLDENBERG 1886
- KauśGS Ed. T.R. CHINTAMANI: *The Kauṣītaka Gṛhyasūtras with the commentary of Bhavatrāta*. University of Madras, 1944.
- GobhGS Ed. KNAUER, Friedrich: *Das Gobhilaḡṛhyasūtra*, hrsg. und übers. von Friedrich Knauer. 2 Bde. Dorpat – Leipzig,

- 1884, 1886.
- Ed. Chintamani BHATTACHARYA: *Gobhilagr̥hyasūtam with Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa's commentary*. Critically edited... Calcutta, 1936. (Calcutta Sanskrit Series; 17).
- Transl.: → Bibl. II: OLDENBERG 1892
- DrāhyGS Ed. ĀnSS: *Rudraskandapraṇītā Drāhyāyaṇagr̥hyasūtra-vṛttiḥ*. Poona, 1914. (*ĀnSS* 74). (= KhādiraGS)
- KhādiraGS Ed. MAHADEVA SASTRI / SRINIVASACHARYA: *The Khadira Grihyasutra. With the commentary of Rudraskanda*, edited by A. Mahadeva Sastri and L. Srinivasacharya. Mysore, 1913. (*Government Oriental Library Series; Bibliotheca Sanskrita*; 41). (= DrāhyGS)
- Transl.: → Bibl. II: OLDENBERG 1886
- JGS Ed. CALAND, Willem: *De literatuur van den Sāmaveda en het Jaiminigr̥hyasūtra*. Amsterdam, 1905. (VKNAWL, dl. 6, No. 2).
- Ed. CALAND, Willem: *The Jaiminigr̥hyasūtra belonging to the Sāmaveda with extracts from the commentary edited with an introduction and translated for the first time into English* by W. Caland. Lahore, 1922. (*Punjab Sanskrit Series*; 2).
- MānGS Ed. KNAUER, Friedrich: *Das Mānava-gr̥hya-sūtra nebst Commentar in kurzer Fassung*. St. Petersburg, 1897.
- Ed. SASTRI, R.H.: *Mānava-gr̥hya-sūtra of the Maitrāyaṇīya Śākhā, with the commentary of Aṣṭāvakra*. Baroda (?), 1926. (repr.: New Delhi, 1982 (*Panini Vaidika Granthamala*; 6)).
- Transl.: → Bibl. II: DRESDEN 1941
- VārGS Ed. RAGHU VIRA: *Vārāha-Gr̥hyasūtra with short extracts from the Paddhatis of Gaṅgādhara & Vasiṣṭha*. Critically ed. by Raghu Vira. Proefschrift Utrecht, 1929. Lahore, 1932. (Panjab University Oriental Publications; 17).
- Bibl. II: ROLLAND 1971 [with translation]
- KāṭhGS Ed. CALAND, Willem: *The Kāṭhagr̥hyasūtra with extracts*

- from three commentaries, an appendix and indexes. Lahore, 1925. (= LaugGS)*
- LaugGS Ed. MADHUSUDAN KAUL SHĀSTRĪ: *The Laugākshi-Gr̥hya-Sūtras with the bhāṣhyam of Devapāla*. 2 vols. Bombay, 1928, 1934 (*Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies*; 49, 55). (= KāthGS)
- BaudhGS Ed. R. Shama SASTRI: *The Bodhāyana Gr̥hyasūtra*. [2nd ed.] Mysore, 1920. (*Oriental Library Publications. Sanskrit Series*; 32/55).
- BaudhGPariś. Ed. HARTING, Pieter N. U.: *Selections from the Baudhāyana-Gr̥hyapariśiṣṭasūtra*. Proefschrift Utrecht. Amersfoort, 1922.
- BhārGS Ed. SALOMONS, Henriette J.W.: *The domestic ritual according to the school of Bhāradvāja*. Proefschrift Utrecht. Leiden, 1913.
- ĀpGS Ed. WINTERNITZ, M.: *The Āpastambīya Gr̥hyasūtra with extracts from the commentaries of Haradatta and Sudarśanārya*. Vienna, 1887.
Transl.: → Bibl. II: OLDENBERG 1892
- HirGS Ed. KIRSTE, J.: *The Gr̥hyasūtra of Hiranyakeśin with extracts from the commentary of Māṭṛidata*. Vienna, 1889.
Transl.: → Bibl. II: OLDENBERG 1892
- VaikhGS Ed. CALAND, Willem: *Vaikhānasasmārtasūtram: the domestic rules of the Vaikhānasa school belonging to the Black Yajurveda*. Calcutta, 1927. (*B.Ind.* 242).
Transl.: → Bibl. II: CALAND 1929
- ĀgnivGS Ed. RAVI VARMA, L.A.: *Āgniveśyagr̥hyasūtra*. Trivandrum, 1940. (*TrivSS* 144; *Sri Chitrodayamanjari* 33; *University Series* 2).
- PārGS Ed. STENZLER, Adolf Friedrich: *Indische Hausregeln. II. Pāraskara*. Erstes Heft. Text. Leipzig, 1876. (*AbhKM* 6/2).
Transl.: → Bibl. II: OLDENBERG 1886
- KauśS Ed. BLOOMFIELD, Maurice: *The Kāuṣika-sūtra of the Atharva-*

veda, with extracts from the commentaries of Dārila and Keçava. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1890. (JAOS 14).

Transl.: → Bibl. II: WEBER 1858b; CALAND 1900; GONDA 1965

- ĀpM Ed. WINTERNITZ, M.: *The Mantrapāṭha, or The prayer book of the Āpastambins. Edited together with the commentary of Haradatta and translated by M. Winternitz.* First Part: *Introduction, Sanskrit text, varietas lectionis, and appendices.* Oxford, 1897. (AOAS 1, Pt 8).
- ManB Ed. DURGAMOHAN BHATTACHARYA: *Chāndogyabrāhmaṇa with the commentaries of Guṇaviṣṇu and Sāyaṇa.* Calcutta, 1958. (CSCRS 1). (= ChB)
- Ed. JÖRGENSEN, Hans: *Das Mantrabrāhmaṇa.* 2. Prapāṭhaka. Dissertation Kiel. Darmstadt, 1911.
- Ed. STÖNNER, Heinrich: *Das Mantrabrāhmaṇa:* 1. Prapāṭhaka. Halle a. S., 1901.

Pitṛmedha-Sūtras

- BaudhPS Ed. CALAND, Willem: *The Pitṛmedhasūtras of Baudhāyana, Hiraṇyakeśin, Gautama.* Leipzig, 1896. (AbhKM 10/3).
- Ed. RAABE, Christine Henriëtte: *Bijdrage tot de kennis van het hindoesche doodenritueel. Tweede en derde Hoofdstuk van het Baudhāyanapitṛmedhasūtra. Tekst met aantekeningen.* Proefschrift Utrecht. Leiden, 1911.
- HirPS → BaudhPS, ed. CALAND, also in HirŚS, Pt 10, p.227-318 (books XXVIII-XXIX).
- GautPS → BaudhPS, ed. CALAND

Śulba-Sūtras

- Ed. SEN & BAG: *The Śulbasūtras of Baudhāyana, Āpastamba, Kātyāyana and Mānava,* with text, English transl. and comment. by S.N. Sen and A.K. Bag. New Delhi, 1983.

- MānŚulbS → MānŚS, Ch. X
- BaudhŚulbS Ed. THIBAUT, G.: Baudhāyanaśulbasūtra. *The Paṇḍit*, Old series 9 (1874), 10 (1875); New series 1 (1876-77).
- ĀpŚulbS Ed. BÜRK, Albert: Das Āpastamba-Śulba-Sūtra. hrsg., übersetzt und mit einer Einleitung versehen. *ZDMG* 55 (1901), 543-549.
- KātyŚulbS Ed. S. D. KHADILKAR: *Kātyāyana Śulba Sūtra, with English transl., explanatory notes, figures and articles* ed. by S. D. Khadilkar. Poona, 1974.

Dharma-Sūtras and Dharma-Śāstras / Smṛtis

- Anthologies: → Bibl. II: OLIVELLE 2000 [ĀpDhS, GautDhS, BaudhDhS, VāsDhS], with transl.
- VāsDhS Ed. FÜHRER, Alois Anton: *Śrīvāsiṣṭhadharmaśāstram. Aphorisms on the sacred law of the Āryas, as taught in the school of Vasiṣṭha, ed. with critical notes, an Anukramaṇikā, indices of words and Vedic mantras, and an appendix of quotations as found in some Dharmanibandhas* by A. A. Führer. Bombay, 1883. (*Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series*; 23). (3rd ed.: Poona, 1930).
- Transl.: → Bibl. II: BÜHLER 1882
- GautDhS Ed. STENZLER, Adolf Friedrich: *The Institutes of Gautama*. London, 1876.
- Transl.: → Bibl. II: BÜHLER 1879
- BaudhDhS Ed. HULTZSCH, E.: *Das Baudhāyana-Dharmasūtra*. Zweite, verbesserte Auflage. Leipzig, 1922. (*AbhKM* 16/2).
- Ed. ŚASTRI, A. Ch.: *The Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra with the Vivaraṇa commentary by Śrī Govinda Swami*. Ed. ... by A. Chinnaswami Sastri. Benares, 1934. (*KaśhīSS* 104; *Karmakāṇḍa* Section 11).
- Transl.: → Bibl. II: BÜHLER 1882
- ĀpDhS Ed. BÜHLER, George: *Āpastambīyadharmasūtram. Āpastamba's Aphorisms on the sacred law of the Hindus*. Ed. ... with crit. notes, variant readings from Hiranyakeśi-

- Dharmasūtras,... 3rd ed. ... Bombay, 1932. (*Bombay Sanskrit Series*; 44, 50).
Transl.: → Bibl. II: BÜHLER 1879
- HirDhS → in HirŚS (Pt 10: books 26-27)
- VaikhDhS → in VaikhGS, ed. CALAND (8-10) [with translation]
- ViṣṇuSmṛ. Ed. JOLLY, Julius: *Viṣṇusmṛtiḥ. The Institutes of Viṣṇu, together with extracts from the Sanskrit commentary of Nanda Paṇḍita called Vaijayantī*. Calcutta, 1881. (*B.Ind.* 91).
Ed. Pandit V. KRISHNAMACHARYA: *Viṣṇusmṛti with the commentary Keśavavaijayantī of Nandapaṇḍita*. 2 vols. Madras, 1964. (*Adyar Library Series*; 93).
Transl.: → Bibl. II: JOLLY 1880; KORNEEVA 2007
- ManuSmṛ. Ed. JOLLY, Julius: *Mānava Dharma-Śāstra, the code of Manu...* text critically edited ... by J. Jolly. London, 1887. (*Trübner's Oriental Studies*).
Ed. HAUGHTON, Graves C.: *Mānava-Dharma-Śāstra*. Vol. I: *Sanskrit text [with notes]*; Vol. II: *English translation*. London: Cox and Baylis, 1825.
Transl.: → Bibl. II: BÜHLER 1886
- NārSmṛ. Ed. LARIVIERE, Richard W.: *The Nāradasmṛti. Critically ed. with an introduction, annotated translation, and appendices* by R. W. Lariviere. Pt. 1: Text; Pt. 2: Translation. Philadelphia, 1989. (*University of Pennsylvania studies on South Asia*; 4-5).
Ed. JOLLY, Julius: *The institutes of Nārada, together with copious extracts from the Nāradaśāstra of Asahāya and other standard commentaries*. Calcutta, 1885. (*B.Ind.* 102).
Transl.: → Bibl. II: JOLLY 1876, 1889; LARIVIERE (Pt. 2; see above); VIGASIN & SAMOZVANCEV 1998
- YājñSmṛ. Ed. STENZLER, Adolf Friedrich: *Yājñavalkyadharmasāstram. Yājñavalkya's Gesetzbuch*. Sanskrit und Deutsch hrsg. von A. F. Stenzler. Berlin – London, 1848.
Ed. Umesh Chandra PANDEY: *Yājñavalkyasmṛti of Yogīśhwara*

Yājñavalkya: with the Mitākṣarā commentary of Vijñāneshwar. Ed. with the 'Prakash' Hindī commentary. Varanasi, 1967. (KashiSS 178).

Transl.: → Bibl. II: SAMOZVANCEV 1994

ParāśSmṛ. Ed. CHANDRAKĀNTA TARKĀLAṆKĀRA: *Parāśara-Smṛti. Parāśara Madhāva. With the gloss by Madhavāchāryya. Ed. with notes by Chandrakānta Tarkālaṅkāra. Vols. I-III. Calcutta, 1890-1892. (B.Ind. 94).*

Other texts belonging to the Vedic tradition

- SVB Ed. B. R. SHARMA: *Sāmavidhāna Brāhmaṇa with Vedārthaprakāśa of Sāyaṇa and Padārthamātravivṛti of Bharatasvāmin. Tirupati, 1964. (KSVS 1).*
- Ed. BURNELL, A.C.: *The Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa (being the third Brāhmaṇa) of the Sāma Veda. Edited ... by A.C. Burnell. Vol. I. Text and commentary with introduction. London, 1873.*
- ĀrṣB Ed. B.R. SHARMA: *Ārṣeya Brāhmaṇa with Vedārthaprakāśa of Sāyaṇa. Tirupati, 1967. (KSVS 8).*
- JĀrṣB → JUB, ed. SHARMA
- Ed. BURNELL, A.C.: *The Jaiminīya Text of the Ārṣeyabrāhmaṇa of the Sāmaveda. Mangalore, 1878.*
- NidānaS Ed. K.N. BHATNAGAR: *Nidāna-Sūtra of Patañjali. Lahore, 1939.*
- DevatādhB Ed. B.R. SHARMA: *Devatādhyāya-Saṃhitopaniṣad-Vaṃśa-Brāhmaṇas with the commentaries. Tirupati, 1965. (KSVS 2-4).*
- VaṃśaB → in ed. DevatādhB
- Ed. WEBER, A.: *Das Vaṃśabrāhmaṇa des Sāmaveda. IndSt 4 (1858), 371-386.*
- VPrātiś. Ed. WEBER, A.: *Das Vâjasaneyi-Prātiçākhyam. IndSt 4 (1858), 65-171, 177-331.*
- AVParīś. Ed. BOLLING, George Melville & NEGELEIN, Julius von: *The*

- Parīṣiṣṭas of the Atharvaveda*. Vol. 1. *Text and critical apparatus*. Leipzig, 1909-1910.
- Ed., transl. of AVParīś. 40: → Bibl. II: BISSCHOP & GRIFFITHS 2003 [for a convenient overview of existing editions and translations, see *ibid.*, 316f.]
- APrāyaśc. Ed. NEGELEIN, J. von: *Atharvaprāyaścittāni*. Text mit Anmerkungen. *JAOS* 33 (1913) 71-144, 217-253; 34 (1914) 229-277.
- Yā. Ed. ROTH, Rudolf: *Jāśka's Nirukta sammt den Nighaṇṭavas hrsg. und erläutert* von R. Roth. Göttingen, 1852.
- BṛhDev. Ed., transl. MACDONELL, Arthur Anthony: *The Bṛhaddevatā attributed to Śaunaka: a summary of the deities and myths of the Rig-Veda. Critically ed. in the original Sanskrit with an introd. and seven appendices, and transl. into English with critical and illustrative notes* by Arthur Anthony Macdonell. Cambridge, 1904. (*HOS* 5-6).
- Pāṇ. (Aṣṭādhyāyī) Ed. BÖHTLINGK, Otto: *Pāṇini's Grammatik*. Herausg., übersetzt, erläutert und mit verschiedenen Indices versehen von O. Böhtlingk. Leipzig, 1887.
- DhP (Dhātupāṭha) → in Pāṇ., ed. BÖHTLINGK
- Kāśikā Vṛtti → in Pat., ed. KIELHORN
- Pat. (Mahābhāṣya) Ed. KIELHORN, Franz: *The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patanjali*. Ed. by F. Kielhorn. 3 vols. Bombay, 1880-1885. (2nd ed., rev.: 1892-1909)

Other Sanskrit texts

- MBh. (crit. ed.) *The Mahābhārata for the first time critically ed.* by Vishnu S. SUKTHANKAR et al. Poona, 1933-1966.
- Rām. (crit. ed.) *The Vālmiki-Rāmāyaṇa* critically ed. for the first time by G.H. BHATT et al. Baroda, 1960-1975.
- KA Ed. R. P. KANGLE: *The Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra*. Part I. *A critical edition with a glossary*; Part II. *An English translation with critical and explanatory notes*. Bombay, 1960, 1963. (*University of Bombay Studies; Sanskrit, Prakrit and Pali*;

1-2).

Ed. JOLLY/SCHMIDT: *Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya. A new edition* by J. Jolly and R. Schmidt. Lahore, 1923-1924. (*The Punjab Sanskrit series or a collection of rare and unpublished Sanskrit and Prakrit works*; 4).

Transl.: → Bibl. II: MEYER 1926

Kathās. Ed. DURGÂPRASÂD/PARAB: *The Kathasaritsagara* of Somadevabhata. Ed. by pandit Durgâprasâd and Kâśinâth Pâṇḍurang Parab. Bombay, 1889.

BhāgP Ed. BURNOUF, Eugène: *Le Bhāgavata Purāṇa, ou Histoire poétique de Kṛichṇa, traduit et publié* par E. Burnouf [et M. Hauvette-Besnault]. Paris, 1884-1898.

For editions of (Old) Avestan texts, see Bibl. II: HUMBACH 1991; INSLER 1975a; KELLEN & PIRART 1988-1991; WOLFF 1910

II. SECONDARY LITERATURE

ADAMS, James Noel

1982 *The Latin sexual vocabulary*. London: Duckworth.

AIKHENVALD, Alexandra Y.

2004 *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

ARITHAL, K. Parameswara

1986 *Non-Ṛgvedic citations in the Āśvalāyana Śrautasūtra (a study)*. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series. (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Studies; vol. C).

Albino, MARCOS

1999 Vedisch *pūr* 'füllen'. WZKS 43: 5-19.

Album – Kern. Opstellen geschreven ter eere van Dr. H. Kern. Leiden: Brill.

ALSDORF, Ludwig

1961 Gleanings from the Atharvaveda. *ALB* 25: 106-116. [= Kl.Schr., 18-28].

1974 *Kleine Schriften*. Wiesbaden: Steiner. (Glasenapp-Stiftung; 10).

ALLAN, Rutger

2003 *The middle voice in Ancient Greek*. Amsterdam: Gieben. (Amsterdam studies in classical philology; 11).

AMANO, Kyoko

AMANO = AMANO 2009

2009 *Maitrāyaṇī Samhitā I-II: Übersetzung der Prosapartien mit Kommentar zur Lexik und Syntax der älteren vedischen Prosa*. Bremen: Hempen. (MFHS 9).

AMBROSINI, Riccardo

- 1969 Contributi all'interpretazione di RV. X.129. In: *Studia classica et orientalia Antonio Pagliaro oblata* I. Roma: Herder editrice e libreria, 95-136.
- 1981 *Dal X libro del Ṛg-Veda*. Inni tradotti e commentati da Riccardo Ambrosini. Pisa: Giardini. (*Orientamenti linguistici*; 15).

ANDERSEN, Dines

- 1892 *Om brugen og betydningen af Verbets Genera i Sanskrit, oplyst især ved undersøgelser om sprogbrugen i Chāndogya-Upanishad*. Kjøbenhavn: Thaning og Appel.

ANDERSEN, Paul Kent

- 1986 The genitive agent in Rigvedic passive constructions. In: *Collectanea linguistica in honorem Adami Heinz*. (Prace Komisji Językoznawstwa; 53). Wrocław etc.: Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 9-13.
- 1991 *A new look at the passive*. Frankfurt am Main etc.: Peter Lang. (*Duisburger Arbeiten zur Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft*; 11).
- 1994 *Empirical studies in diathesis*. Münster: Nodus Publikationen.

ANDERSON, Stephen R.

- 1988 Objects (direct and not-so-direct) in English and elsewhere. In: Caroline Duncan-Rose & Theo Vennemann (eds), *On language: rhetorica, phonologica, syntactica. A festschrift for Robert P. Stockwell from his friends and colleagues*. London: Routledge, 287-314.

APRESJAN, Jurij Derenikovič

- 1986 Sintaksičeskaja informacija dlja tolkovogo slovarja. *Linguistische Arbeitsberichte* (Leipzig), No. 54-55: 88-116. [Repr. in: APRESJAN, Ju.D. *Izbrannye trudy*. Tom II. Moskva: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury, 114-134].

APTE, Vinayak Mahadev

- 1940-41 Non-Ṛgvedic mantras rubricated in the Āśvalāyana-Gṛhya-Sūtra: sources and interpretation. *New Indian Antiquary* 3: 49-61, 101-110, 144-155, 171-182, 211-222, 235-243.

ARNOLD, Edward V.

- 1897 Sketch of the historical grammar of the Rig and Atharva Vedas. *JAOS* 18 (2): 203-353.
- 1905 *Vedic metre in its historical development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ATKINS, Beryl T., KEGL, Judy & LEVIN, Beth

- 1988 Anatomy of a verb entry: from linguistic theory to lexicographic practice. *International Journal of Lexicography* 1/2: 84-126.

AUFRECHT, Theodor

- 1850 Das XV. Buch des Atharvaveda. *IndSt* 1: 121-140.
- 1906 Bemerkungen zum R̥gveda. *ZDMG* 60: 556-557.

AVERY, John

- 1880 Contributions to the history of verb-inflection in Sanskrit. *JAOS* 10: 219-324.
- 1885 The unaugmented verb-forms of the Rig- and Atharva-Veda. *JAOS* 11: 326-361.

BAILEY, Harold W.

- 1936 Indo-Iranica. *TPS* (1936): 95-101.
- 1957 A problem of the Indo-Iranian vocabulary. *RO* 21 (*Mémorial S. Schayer*): 59-69.
- 1972 Atharva-veda *mākaka*-. In: J. Ensink & P. Gaeffke (eds), *India maior. Congratulatory volume presented to Jan Gonda*. Leiden: Brill, 41-45.

BAKKER, Egbert J.

- 1994 Voice, aspect and aktionsart: Middle and passive in Ancient Greek. In: Fox & Hopper (eds), 23-47.

BANERJI [BANERJEE], Sures Chandra

- 1962 *Dharma-sūtras: a study in their origin and development*. Calcutta: Punthi Pustak.

BARRET, LeRoy Carr

- 1920 Paippalāda and Rigveda. In: *Studies in honor of Maurice Bloomfield*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1-18.

BARTHOLOMAE, Christian

- 1897 Rev. of: WACKERNAGEL 1896 [AiG I]. *IFAnz* 8: 11-17.

-
- 1904 [AirWb] *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Strassburg: Trübner.
- BARTON, Charles R.
 1989 PIE. *mer-, Arm. *meřanim* 'die'. *IF* 94: 135-157.
- BECHTEL, Fritz
 1892 *Die Hauptprobleme der indogermanischen Lautlehre seit Schleicher*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- BEEKES, Robert S.P.
 1969 *The development of the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals in Greek*. The Hague etc.: Mouton.
 1979 GAv. *uzirəidyāi* and *rārəša-*. *MSS* 38: 9-20.
 1982/83 On laryngeals and pronouns. *KZ* 96: 200-232.
 1985 Skt. *uttānā-*. *KZ* 98: 47-48.
 1995 *Comparative Indo-European linguistics: an introduction*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
 1999 Rev. of: HOFFMANN/FORSSMANN 1996 [*Avestische Laut- und Flexionslehre*]. *Kratylos* 44: 62-71.
- BELVALKAR, Sripad Krishna
 1924 [1925] Four unpublished upaniṣadic texts, tentatively edited and translated for the first time. *PAIOC* 3 (Madras, December 1924): 17-40.
- BENEDETTI, Marina
 2006 Mehr als Passiv: über einige Verbalmorpheme in altindogermanischen Sprachen. *International journal of diachronic linguistics and linguistic reconstruction* 3: 91-110.
- BENFEY, Theodor
 1846 Rev. of: BÖHTLINGK 1845 [*Sanskrit-Chrestomathie...*]. [2. Teil] *GGA*, Jg. 1846, St. 76: 725-760.
 1847 Rev. of: CURTIUS, Georg. *Sprachvergleichende Beiträge zur griechischen und lateinischen Grammatik*. Berlin: Wilhelm Besser, 1846. *GGA*, Jg. 1847, St. 50ff.: 497-510. [= *Kl.Schr.* II, 70-79].
 1850 Rev. of: BOLLER, Anton. *Ausführliche Sanskrit-Grammatik*. Berlin, 1847. *GGA*, Jg. 1850, Bd. 2, St. 81-82: 805-816.
 1852 *Handbuch der Sanskritsprache*. 1. Abteilung: *Grammatik*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.

-
- 1862 Uebersetzung des Rig-Veda. [also Rig-W^o] [1.1-73]. *OuO* 1: 9-54, 385-420, 575-605.
- 1864 Uebersetzung des Rig-Veda. [1.74-100]. *OuO* 2: 233-260, 507-519.
- 1865a Rev. of: MIKLOSICH, F. *Die Verba impersonalia im Slavischen*. Wien, 1865. *GGA*, Jg. 1865, St. 45: 1778-1792. [= *Kl.Schr.* II, 137-148].
- 1865b Rev. of: SCHMIDT, J. *Die Wurzel AK im Indogermanischen*. Weimar: Böhlau, 1865. *GGA*, Jg. 1865, St. 35: 1376-1391. [= *Kl.Schr.* II, 148-159].
- 1866a Ueber *ri*, *ṛi* und *li*. *OuO* 3: 1-77, 193-256.
- 1866b Uebersetzung des Rig-Veda. [1.101-118]. *OuO* 3: 128-168.
- 1874 Sanskritisch *sâ* (Verbalwurzel) = griechisch *ᾶ*, *ᾷ*; sanskritisch *sitá* (Ptcp. Pf. von *sâ*) = lateinisch *sāto*, in *sātis*, *sātio* und Verwandten. – Rigveda II. 23, 16. *NGG* (1874), No. 25: 626-643. [= *Kl.Schr.* II, 177-190].
- 1875 Vedisch *ṛidūdāra*, *ṛidûpé*, *ṛidûvridhâ*. *NGG* (1875), No. 8: 189-224. [= *Kl.Schr.* I, 316-341].
- 1883 Uebersetzung des Rig-veda. [1.119-130]. *BB* 7: 286-309.
- 1890-1892 *Kleinere Schriften*. Erster Band, 1. und 2. Abtheilung (1890); Zweiter Band, 3. und 4. Abtheilung (1892). Berlin: Reither. (Repr.: Hildesheim – New York: Olms, 1975).
- BERGAIGNE, Abel
- 1878-1883 *La religion védique d'après les hymnes du Rig-Veda*. I (1878), II (1883), III (1883). Paris: Vieweg. (*Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études*; 36 (53-54, 117)). (Repr.: Paris: Champion, 1963).
- 1881 Quelques observations sur les figures de rhétorique dans le *Ṛig-Veda*. *MSL* 4: 96-137.
- 1883-1884 Études sur le lexique du *Ṛig-Veda*. *JA*, 8^{me} sér., T. 2 (1883): 468-527; T. 3 (1884): 188-252, 518-553; T. 4 (1884): 169-206, 462-517. (Repr.: Paris: E. Leroux).
- 1887 La syntaxe des comparaisons védiques. In: *Mélanges Renier. Recueil des travaux ... en mémoire de ... Léon Renier*. Paris: Vieweg, 75-101.
- 1894 Quarante hymnes du Rig-Véda, traduits et commenté par A.

-
- BERGAIGNE. *MSL* 8: 1-44, 264-276, 348-355, 393-424, 479-485.
- BERGMANN, Ursula
 1965 *Die Ganeśatāpanīya-Upaniṣad. Teil 1. Text und Übersetzung. Teil 2. Anmerkungen.* Inaugural-Diss. Marburg.
- BHARADWAJ, Sudhi Kant
 1982 *Linguistic study of Dharmasūtras.* Rohtak: Manthan publications.
- BHAWE, Shrikrishna S.
 1939 *Die Yajus' des Áśvamedha. Versuch einer Rekonstruktion dieses Abschnittes des Yajurvedas auf Grund der Überlieferung seiner fünf Schulen.* Stuttgart: Kohlhammer. (*Bonner Orientalistische Studien*; 25).
 1962 *The Soma-hymns of the Ṛgveda: A fresh interpretation. Part III (RV. 9.51-70).* Baroda: Oriental Institute. (*University of Baroda Research Series*; 6).
- BICHLMEIER, Harald
 2000 *Zur Syntax der ablativischen Adverbien im Ṛgveda.* *MSS* 60: 7-66.
- BIRWÉ, Robert
 1956 *Griechisch-Arische Sprachbeziehungen im Verbalssystem.* Walldorf: Verlag für Orientkunde. (*Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte des Orients*; 8).
 1966 *Studien zu Adhyāya III der Aṣṭādhyāyī Pāṇinis.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- BISSCHOP, Peter & GRIFFITHS, Arlo
 2003 *The Pāśupata observance (Atharvedapariśiṣṭa 40).* *IJJ* 46: 315-348.
- BISWAS, Ashutosh Sarma
 1968 *Bhāgavata purāṇa: a linguistic study, particularly from the Vedic background.* Dibrugarh.
- BLAIR, Chauncey J.
 1961 *Heat in the Rig Veda and Atharva Veda: A general survey with particular attention to some aspects and problems.* New Haven: American Oriental Society. (*AOS* 45).

BLOOMFIELD, Maurice

- 1890 Contributions to the interpretation of the Veda. Second series. *AJPh* 11 (3) [= No. 43]: 319-356.
- 1893a Contributions to the interpretation of the Veda. [Third series]. *JAOS* 15: 143-188.
- 1893b The myth of Soma and the eagle. In: *Festgruss Roth*, 149-155.
- 1895 On assimilation and adaptation in congeneric classes of words. *AJPh* 16 (4) [= No. 64]: 409-434.
- 1896a Contributions to the interpretation of the Veda. [Fifth series]. *JAOS* 16: 1-42.
- 1896b Contributions to the interpretation of the Veda. Seventh series. *AJPh* 17 (4) [= No. 68]: 399-437.
- 1897 *Hymns of the Atharva-veda together with extracts from the ritual books and commentaries*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. (SBE 42).
- 1899 *The Atharva-veda and the Gopatha-Brahmana*. Strassburg: Trübner. (*Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde*; Bd. II, Heft 1 B).
- 1902 Rev. of: CALAND 1900 [*Altindisches Zauberritual. Probe einer Uebersetzung der wichtigsten Theile der Kauṣika Sūtra*]. *GGA*, Jg. 164, Nr. 7: 489-514.
- 1906 [VC] *A Vedic concordance*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (HOS 10).
- 1912 Rev. of: CALAND 1910 [*Das Vaitānasūtra des Atharvaveda*, übers. von W. Caland]. *GGA*, Jg. 174, Nr. 1: 1-19.
- 1917 Some cruces in Vedic text, grammar, and interpretation. *AJPh* 38 (1) [= No. 149]: 1-18.
- 1928 The home of the Vedic sacrifice. *JAOS* 48: 200-224.

BLOOMFIELD, Maurice & EDGERTON, Franklin

- 1930-1934 [Ved. Var.] *Vedic variants*. Vol. I. *The verb* (1930); Vol. II. *Phonetics* (1932); Vol. III. *Noun and pronoun inflection* (1934). Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America.

BLOOMFIELD, Maurice & SPIEKER, Edward H.

- 1886 Introduction to the study of the Old-Indian sibilants. *PrAOS*, May 1886 [*JAOS* 13 (1889)]: cxvii-cxxii.

BODEWITZ, Hendrik W.

- 1973 *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa I, 1-65. Translation and commentary: with a study. Agnihotra and Prāṇāgnihotra.* Leiden: Brill. (ORT 17).
- 1976 *The daily evening and morning offering (agnihotra) according to the Brāhmaṇas.* Leiden: Brill. (ORT 21).
- 1979 The raising of the central pillar (made of the udumbara wood) of the sadas hut by the Udgātṛ according to the Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa I.70-72. In: J.P. Sinha (ed.), *Ludwik Sternbach felicitation volume*. Part One. Lucknow: Akhila Bharatiya Sanskrit Parishad, 77-87. [cf. BODEWITZ 1990: 39-41, 214-217].
- 1982 The 'marriage' of heaven and earth (JB. 1, 145-146; PB. 7, 10, 1-9; AB. 4, 27, 5-10). WZKS 26: 23-36.
- 1983a The fourth priest (the brahmán) in Vedic ritual. In: Ria Kloppenburg (ed.), *Selected studies on ritual in the Indian religions. Essays to D.J. Hoens*. Leiden: Brill, 33-68. (*Studies in the history of religions*; 45).
- 1983b Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa I, 153-155 on the Kāleya Sāman. In: K. S. Ramamurthi et al (eds), *Surabhi. Sreekrishna Sarma Felicitation volume*. Tiruvanmiyur, Madras: Kalakshetra Publications Press, 179-191 [cf. BODEWITZ 1990: 85-87, 257-262].
- 1985 Yama's second boon in the Kaṭha Upaniṣad. WZKS 29: 5-26.
- 1986 The cosmic, cyclical dying (*parimara*). Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 8,28 and Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad 2,11-12. In: Morgenroth (ed.), *Sanskrit and world culture*, 438-443.
- 1990 *The Jyotiṣṭoma ritual: Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa I, 66-364. Introduction, translation and commentary.* Leiden: Brill. (ORT 34).
- 1997 Rev. of: JAMISON 1991a [*The ravenous hyenas ...*]. *IIJ* 40 (1): 59-98.
- 2001 The *saṃvargavidyā* and its context in two Sāmavedic texts. In: Karttunen & Koskikallio (eds), *Fs. Parpola*, 55-66.
- 2002a The dark and deep underworld in the Veda. *JAOS* 122 (2) (*Fs. Insler*): 213-223.
- 2002b *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad. Translation and commentary. With an*

- appendix *Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka IX-XI*. Groningen: Forsten. (GOS 16).
- 2007 The special meanings of *śrama* and other derivations of the root *śram* in the Veda. *IJJ* 50: 145-160.
- BOETZELAER, Johan Maurits van
- 1971 *Sureśvara's Taittirīyopaniṣad-Bhāṣyavārtikam*. Translated into English with an introduction and notes. Leiden: Brill.
- BÖHTLINGK, Otto
- 1845 *Sanskrit-Chrestomathie, zunächst zum Gebrauch bei Vorlesungen*. St. Petersburg: Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- 1879-89 [pw] *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung*. Bearb. von Otto Böhtlingk. St. Petersburg: Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- 1885a Einige Bemerkungen zu Baudhāyana's Dharmasāstra. *ZDMG* 39: 539-542.
- 1885b Zur indischen lexicographie. [Buchbesprechung von WHITNEY 1885b [Roots]]. *ZDMG* 39: 532-538.
- 1876 Zur Kritik und Erklärung verschiedener indischer Werke. *Bull. de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St.-Petersbourg* XXI: 93-132, 200-242, 370-409. [= *Mélanges asiatiques tirés du Bull. de l'Académie Impériale ...* VII: 448-504, 527-589, 615-672].
- 1887 Bemerkenswerthes aus Rāmājaṇa. *BerVKSGWL* 39: 213-227.
- 1889 Ueber die sogenannten Unregelmässigkeiten in der Sprache des Gṛhjasūtra des Hiraṇyakeçin. *ZDMG* 43: 598-603.
- 1890 Drei kritisch gesichtete und übersetzte Upanishad mit erklärenden Anmerkungen. *BerVKSGWL* 42: 127-197. [KāṭhU, PrU, AitU: ed., transl.]
- 1891 Zu den von mir bearbeiteten Upanishaden. *BerVKSGWL* 43: 70-90.
- 1892 Probe einer rationellen Bearbeitung des Taittirīja-Brāhmaṇa. *BerVKSGWL* 44: 199-226.
- 1896a Bemerkungen zu Manu's Gesetzbuchs. *BerVKSGWL* 48: 245-250.
- 1896b Kritische Bemerkungen zu Pāraskara's Gṛhjasūtra. *BerVKSGWL* 48: 1-11.

-
- 1896c Nachtrag zum Artikel: Ueber *esha lokaḥ*. *BerVKSGWL* 48: 93-98.
- 1896d Probe einer Kritik des Gopathabrāhmaṇa. *BerVKSGWL* 48: 12-18.
- 1897a Bemerkungen zu einigen Upanishaden. *BerVKSGWL* 49: 78-100.
- 1897b Kritische Beiträge. *BerVKSGWL* 49: 127-138.
- 1898 Kritische Bemerkungen zu Hiraṇyakeśins Gṛhyasūtras. *ZDMG* 52: 81-88.
- 1900 Grammaticische Absonderlichkeiten im Aitarejabrāhmaṇa. *BerVKSGWL* 52: 413-421.
- 1909 *Sanskrit-Chrestomathie*. 3. verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. Hrsg. von R. GARBE. Leipzig: H. Haessel.
- BÖHTLINGK, Otto & ROTH, Rudolf
 1855-1875 [PW] *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*. St. Petersburg: Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- BOLLÉE, Willem Boudewijn
 1956 *Śaḍviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa*. Introduction, translation, extracts from the commentary and notes. Proefschrift. Utrecht: A. Storm.
- BOPP, Frenz
 1868/71 *Vergleichende Grammatik des Sanskrit, Send, Armenischen, Griechischen, Lateinischen, Litauischen, Altslavischen, Gothischen und Deutschen*. 3. Ausg. Bd. I (1868), II (1870), III (1871). Berlin: Dümmler.
- BOUY, Christian
 2000 *Gauḍapāda. L'Āgamaśāstra. Un traité vedāntique en quatre chapitres*. Texte, traduction et notes par Chr. Bouy. Paris: Boccard. (*PICI* 69).
- BRADKE, Peter von
 1883-84 Rev. of: MS, ed. SCHROEDER. *LBOP* 1: 165-178.
- 1885 *Dyāus Asura, Ahura Mazdâ und die Asuras. Studien und Versuche auf dem Gebiete alt-indogermanischer Religionsgeschichte*. Halle: Niemeyer.
- 1886 Beiträge zur altindischen Religions- und Sprachgeschichte. *ZDMG* 40: 347-364, 655-698.

BRERETON, Joel Peter

- 1981 *The Ṛgvedic Ādityas*. New Haven, Conn.: American Oriental Society. (AOS 63).
- 1985 Style and purpose in the Ṛgveda II 11. *IJJ* 28: 237-262.
- 1986 “*Tat tvam asi*” in context. *ZDMG* 136 (1): 98-109.
- 1999 Edifying puzzlement: Ṛgveda 10.129 and the uses of enigma. *JAOS* 19 (2): 248-260.

BRERETON, Joel Peter & JAMISON, Stephanie W. (eds)

- 2002 *Indic and Iranian studies in honor of Stanley Insler on his sixty-fifth birthday*. Ann Arbor: American Oriental Society. (JAOS 122 (2)).

BRONKHORST, Johannes

- 1982 The variationist Pāṇini and Vedic: a review [of KIPARSKY 1979]. *IJJ* 24: 273-282.
- 1991 Pāṇini and the Veda reconsidered. In: Madhav M. Deshpande & S. Bhate (eds), *Pāṇinian studies. Professor S.D. Joshi Felicitation volume*. Ann Arbor: Center for South and Southeast Asian studies, the University of Michigan, 75-121. (*Michigan papers on South and Southeast Asia*; 37).

BROUGH, John

- 1950 The meaning of *ni ṛhnu* in the Brāhmaṇas. In: Vishva Bandhu (ed.), *Siddhabhāratī or The rosary of Indology. Presenting 108 original papers on indological subjects in honour of the 60th birthday of Dr. Siddheshwar Varma ...* Part 1. (VIS 1). Hoshiarpur: V.V.R. Institute P. and P. Organisation, 126-130. [= Coll.Pap., 74-78].
- 1953 *The early Brahmanical system of gotra and pravara. A translation of the Gotra-Pravara-Mañjarī of Puruṣottama-Paṇḍita*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1996 [Coll.Pap.] *Collected papers*. Ed. by Minoru Hara and J.C. Wright. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.

BROWN, William Norman

- 1941 The Rigvedic equivalent for hell. *JAOS* 61: 76-80. [Repr. in: BROWN 1978: 14-19].
- 1965 Theories of creation in the Rig Veda. *JAOS* 85 (1): 23-34. [Repr. in: BROWN 1978: 40-52].

-
- 1968 Agni, Sun, Sacrifice, and Vāc: a sacrificial ode by Dīrghatamas. *JAOS* 88: 199-218. [Repr. under the title "Dīrghatamas's vision of creation" in: BROWN 1978: 53-74].
- 1978 *India and indology. Selected articles*. Delhi etc.: Motilal Banarsidas.
- BRUGMANN [also BRUGMAN], Karl
- 1878a Die arische passivbildung mit suffix -ya- und die futurparticipia auf -ya-. *MU* 1: 187-206.
- 1878b Das verbale suffix *â* im indogermanischen und die sogen. aeolische flexion der verba contracta. *MU* 1: 1-91.
- 1879a Die achte conjugationsklasse des altindischen und ihre entsprechung im griechischen. *KZ* 24: 255-286.
- 1879b Die schwache form der nominalstämme auf -n is suffixalen weiterbildungen und zusammensetzungen. *MU* 2: 148-262.
- 1902 *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Strassburg: Trübner.
- 1897-1916 [Grundr.²] *Vergleichende Laut-, Stammbildungs- und Flexionslehre nebst Lehre vom Gebrauch der Wortformen der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Zweite Bearbeitung. Strassburg: Trübner; Berlin und Leipzig: de Gruyter. Bd. I: *Einleitung und Lautlehre* (1897); Bd. II: *Lehre von den Wortformen und ihrem Gebrauch* (1906-16). (= K. BRUGMANN und B. DELBRÜCK. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Bd. I-II).
- BRUNE, Johannes
- 1909 *Zur Textkritik der dem Sāmaveda mit dem achten Maṇḍala des Ṛgveda gemeinsamen Stellen*. Inaugural-Diss. Kiel: Karl Jansen.
- BRUNNHOFER, Hermann
- 1886 Ueber das gegenseitige verhältnis der beiden kâṇḍagruppen des Çatapatha-brāhmaṇa nach massgabe der in ihnen verwendeten infinitivformen. *BB* 10: 234-266.
- BUBENÍK, Vít
- 1987 Passivized causatives in Sanskrit and Prakrits. *Linguistics* 25 (4): 687-704.

BÜHLER, Georg

- 1879, 1882 *The sacred laws of the Âryas as taught in the schools of Âpastamba, Gautama, Vâsishtha, and Baudhâyana*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. (SBE 2, 14).
- 1886 *The laws of Manu*: translated with extracts from seven commentaries by G. Bühler. Oxford: Clarendon Press. (SBE 25).

VAN BUITENEN, Johannes A.B.

- 1962 *The Maitrâyaṇīya Upaniṣad. A critical essay, with text, translation and commentary*. 's-Gravenhage: Mouton. (DRT 6).

BURROW, Thomas

- 1947 Sanskrit *râjas*. *BSOAS* 12 (3-4): 645-651.
- 1956 Skt. *lubh* 'disturb'. *JRAS*: 191-200.
- 1957 Sanskrit *gṛ-/gur-* 'to welcome'. *BSOAS* 20: 133-144.
- 1959 Sanskrit *kṣi* : Greek *φθίω*. *JAOS* 79: 255-262.
- 1970 [1972] Rev. of: MAYRHOFER, KEWA, Lief. 19-22. *Kratylos* 15:51-56.
- 1979 *The problem of shwa in Sanskrit*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 1986 The Vedic verb *pávate* 'goes, moves, (wind) blows, (Soma) flows'. *BSOAS* 49 (2): 292-303.

CAILLAT, Colette (ed.)

- 1989 *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes*. Paris: Collège de France. (PICI 55).

CALAND, Willem

- 1893 *Altindischer Ahnencult. Das Çrâddha nach den verschiedenen Schulen mit Benutzung handschriftlicher Quellen dargestellt*. Leiden: Brill.
- 1895 Der Gautamaçrâddhakalpa. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und Literatur des Sāmavedaschulen. *BTLVNI*, 6e volgreeks, dl. 1: 97-112. [= Kl.Schr., 7-22].
- 1896 *Die altindischen toden- und bestattungsgebräuche mit benutzung handschriftlicher quellen dargestellt*. Amsterdam: J. Müller. (VKAWL 1, No. 6).
- 1900 *Altindisches Zauberritual. Probe einer Uebersetzung der wichtigsten Theile der Kauṣika Sūtra*. Amsterdam: J. Müller. (VKAWL 3/2).

-
- 1902a Rev. of: Das Mānavaçrautasūtra, hrsg. von Dr. F. KNAUER. Buch I und II. *GGA*, Jg. 1902, Nr. 2, 122-127. [= Kl.Schr., 602-607].
- 1902b Zur Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā. *WZKM* 16: 97-100. [= Kl.Schr., 134-137].
- 1902c Zur Exegese und Kritik der rituellen Sūtras. [XXXVIII - XLI]. *ZDMG* 56: 551-558. [= Kl.Schr., 86-93].
- 1903 *Über das rituelle Sūtra des Baudhāyana*. Leipzig: Brockhaus. (*AbhKM* 12/1).
- 1909 Kritische Bemerkungen zu Vedischen Ritualtexten. *WZKM* 23: 52-73. [= Kl.Schr., 173-194].
- 1910 *Das Vaitānasūtra des Atharvaveda*. Übers. von W. Caland. Amsterdam: J. Müller. (*VKAWL* 11/2).
- 1912 Kritisch-exegetische Bemerkungen zu den Brāhmaṇas: 1. Zum Śatapathabrāhmaṇa. 2. Zum Kāṭhaka. *WZKM* 26: 107-126. [= Kl.Schr., 195-214].
- 1916 Zu den Brāhmaṇas. In: L. Scherman & C. Bezold (eds), *Aufsätze zur Kultur- und Sprachgeschichte vornehmlich des Orients: Ernst Kuhn zum 70. Geburtstage am 7. Februar 1916 gewidmet von Freunden und Schülern*. Breslau: Marcus, 69-73. [= Kl.Schr., 232-236].
- 1918 Erklärende und kritische Bemerkungen zu den Brāhmaṇas und Sūtras. *ZDMG* 72: 1-31. [= Kl.Schr., 237-267].
- 1920 Brāhmaṇa- en Sūtra-aanwinsten. *VKAWL*. 5de reeks, dl. 4: 461-498.
- 1923 Über das Vādhūlasūtra. *AO* 1: 3-11. [= Kl.Schr., 268-276].
- 1921, 1924a, 1928a *Das Śrautasūtra des Āpastamba*. 3 Bd. Bd. 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1921; Bd. 2-3. Amsterdam: Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, 1924, 1928. (*VKNAWL* 24/2, 26/4).
- 1924 Eine zweite Mitteilung über das Vādhūlasūtra. *AO* 2: 142-167. [= Kl.Schr., 277-302].
- 1926 Eine dritte Mitteilung über das Vādhūlasūtra. *AO* 4: 1-41, 161-213. [= Kl.Schr., 303-396].
- 1928 Eine vierte Mitteilung über das Vādhūlasūtra. *AO* 6: 97-241. [= Kl.Schr., 397-541].

-
- 1929 *Vaikhānasmārtasūtram. The domestic rules and sacred laws of the Vaikhānasa school belonging to the Black Yajurveda.* Translated by W. Caland. Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1927.
- 1931a *Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa. The Brāhmaṇa of Twenty Five Chapters.* Calcutta. (B.Ind. 255).
- 1931b Rev. of: *Chāndogya-upaniṣad* traduite et annoté par E. Senart. *Museum* 38 (6): 153-154.
- 1953 *Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra. Being a major yājñika text of the Ṛgveda.* Nagpur: International Academy of Indian culture: 1953.
- 1990 *Kleine Schriften.* Stuttgart: Steiner. (Glasenapp-Stiftung; 27).
- CALAND, Willem & HENRY, Victor
- 1906 *L'agniṣṭoma. Description complète de la forme normale du sacrifice de soma dans le culte védique.* T. 1. Paris: Leroux.
- CARDONA, George
- 1961 Rigvedic *śṛṇviṣé*. *Language* 37: 338-341.
- 1967 Rev. of: SZEMERÉNYI 1964 [*Syncope in Greek and Indo-European ...*]. *Language* 43: 757-773.
- 1976 Subject in Sanskrit. In: Manindra K. Verma (ed.), *The notion of subject in South Asian languages.* (South Asian studies. University of Wisconsin - Madison. Publication series; 2). Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1-38.
- 1978 [1979] Rev. of: HAUDRY 1977 [*L'emploi des cas en védique*]. *Kratylos* 23: 71-81.
- 1993 The bhāṣika accentuation system. *StII* 18: 1-40.
- DELLA CASA, Carlo
- 1976 *Upaniṣad.* A cura di Carlo della Casa. Torino: Unione tipografico-editrice Torinese.
- CASARETTO, Antje
- 2002 Defektivität und Suppletion im vedischen Verbalsystem: ved. *paś* : *dars*, *drav* : *drā* und *dhāv* : *sar*. *HS* 115:37-56.
- 2006 Zur Suppletion von idg. **mleu_h₂-* und **uek^h-* 'sprechen' im Indoiranischen. *HS* 119: 133-152.

CHAMBADAL, Paul

- 1963 *Évolution et applications du concept d'entropie*. Paris: Dunod.

CHARPENTIER, Jarl

- 1906 Zur indischen Wortforschung. Etymologische und exegetische beiträge. *MO* 1: 17-42.
- 1911 Bemerkungen ueber die vrātya's. *WZKM* 25: 355-388.
- 1912a *Die Desiderativbildungen der indoiranischen Sprachen*. Uppsala: Appelbergs Boktryckeri. (*Archives d'études orientales*; 6).
- 1912b Zur altindischen etymologie. *MO* 6: 118-160.
- 1917/18 Zur altindischen Wortkunde. *WZKM* 30: 91-108.
- 1919 Zur alt- und mittelindischen Wortkunde. *MO* 13: 1-54.
- 1928-29 Kāthaka Upaniṣad. Translated with an introduction and notes. *IA* 57 (1928): 201-207, 221-229; 58 (1929): 1-5.
- 1932-33 Beiträge zur indischen Wortkunde. *MO* 26-27: 91-169.

CHRISTOL, Alain

- 1990 Les laryngales entre phonétique et phonologie. In: *La reconstruction des laryngales*. (*Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège*; 253). Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres", 101-127.

COLINET, Philemon

- 1890 Les principes de l'exégèse védique d'après MM. R. Pischel et K. Geldner. [Rev. of PISCHEL & GELDNER 1889 [VSt I]]. *Muséon* 9: 372-388.

COMRIE, Bernard

- 1981 *Language universals and linguistic typology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- 1985 Causative verb-formation and other verb-deriving morphology. In: Th. Shopen (ed.), 301-348.

COMRIE, Bernard & POLINSKY, Maria (eds)

- 1993 *Causatives and transitivity*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. (*SLCS* 23).

CROFT, William

- 1995 Rev. of: KLAIMAN 1991 [*Grammatical voice*]. *Studies in*

Language 19 (2): 553-562.

VAN DAALEN, L.A.

1980 *Vālmīki's Sanskrit*. Leiden: Brill. (ORT 25).

DANGE, Sadashiv Ambadas

1974 Godāna – the hair-ritual. In: Gajendragadkar, S.N. (ed.), *P.V. Kane commemoration monograph*. Bombay: Bombay University Press, 26-35.

1976 The Vedic *mithuna* (concept and practice). *JOIB* 25 (3-4): 197-212.

DAS GUPTA, Tapan Kumar

1975 *Der Vajra: Eine vedische Waffe*. Wiesbaden: Steiner. (ANIS 16).

DASH, Achyutananda

1991 The syntactic role of *adhi-* in the Pāṇinian *kāraka*-system. In: Madhav M. Deshpande & S. Bhate (eds), *Pāṇinian studies. Professor S.D. Joshi felicitation volume. (Michigan papers on South and Southeast Asia; 37)*. Ann Arbor: Center for South and Southeast Asian studies, the University of Michigan, 135-160.

DE VRIES, Larry

1979 *vaiśvānarā-*. *KZ* 93: 8-24.

DEBRUNNER, Albert

1907 Zu den konsonantischen *-jo*-Präsentien im Griechischen. *IF* 21: 13-98, 201-276.

1935-37 Der Typus *tudā-* im Altindischen. *BSOS* 8: 487-500.

1954 [AiG II/2] → WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER.

1956a Rev. of: RENOU 1952b [GrV]. *Kratylos* 1: 38-45.

1956b Rev. of: SŪRYA KĀNTA ŚĀSTRĪ 1953. [A *grammatical dictionary of Sanskrit (Vedic). I. Phonetics*]. *Kratylos* 1: 147-150.

1957 [AiG I, Nachtr.] → WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER.

DELBRÜCK, Berthold

1869 Ueber den indogermanischen, speciell den vedischen dativ. *KZ* 18: 81-106.

1874 [AiV] *Das altindische Verbum aus den Hymnen des Ṛgveda*

-
- seinem Baue nach dargestellt. Halle a.S.: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- 1888 [AiS] *Altindische Syntax*. Halle a.S.: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses. (B. DELBRÜCK. *Syntaktische Forschungen*. V).
- 1893, 1897 [VglSynt] *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. 3 Theile. Strassburg: Trübner. (= K. BRUGMANN und B. DELBRÜCK. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Band IV).
- DESCLES, Jean-Pierre & GUENTCHEVA, Zlatka
- 1993 Le passif dans le système des voix du français. In: Gaston Gross (ed.), *Sur le passif*. Paris: Larousse, 73-102. (*Langages* 109).
- DESHPANDE, Madhav M.
- 1991 Ditransitive passive in Pāṇini. *IIJ* 34 (1): 19-35.
- 1992 Justification for verb-root suppletion in Sanskrit. *HS* 105: 18-49.
- DEUSSEN, Paul
- 1894 *Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie*. I. Bd. 1. Abteilung. *Allgemeine Einleitung und Philosophie des Veda bis auf die Upanishad's*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- 1897 *Sechzig Upanishad's des Veda, aus dem Sanskrit übers. und mit Einleitungen und Anmerkungen versehen* von P. Deussen. Leipzig: Brockhaus. (3. Ausg.: 1921).
- DHARMADHIKARI
- 1966 Some conjectured emendations in the text of Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā. In: Surya Kanta (ed.), *All India Oriental Conference*. XXIII Session, Aligarh. Summ. of papers, 9-10.
- DIELS, Paul
- 1913 Über das indogermanische Passivum. *Jahresberichte der Schlesischen Gesellschaft für Vaterländische Cultur* 91 (IV. Abt. *Orientalisch-Sprachwissenschaftliche Sektion*): 1-8.
- DIK, Simon C.
- 1981 *Functional grammar*. 3rd rev. ed. Dordrecht: Foris. (*Publications in language sciences*; 7).

DIVER, William

- 1959 Palatal quality and vocalic length in Indo-European. *Word* 15: 110-122.

DOSSI, Beatrice

- 1998 *Samen, Seele, Blut: die Zeugungstheorien des alten Indiens*. München: Akademischer Verlag. (*Ganesha*; 11).

DRESDEN, Mark Jan

- 1941 *Mānavagṛhyasūtra. A Vedic manual of domestic rites*. Translation, commentary and preface. Proefschrift Utrecht. Groningen: Wolters.

DUMONT, Paul-Émile

- 1927 *L'Āśvamedha. Description du sacrifice solennel du cheval dans le culte védique d'après les textes du Yajurveda blanc (Vājasaneyisaṃhitā, Śatapathabrāhmaṇa, Kātyāyanaśrautasūtra)*. Paris: Paul Geuthner.
- 1939 *L'agnihotra. Description de l'agnihotra dans le rituel védique d'après les Śrautasūtras de Kātyāyana (Yajurveda blanc), Āpastamba, Hiraṇyakeśin, Baudhāyana, Manu (Yajurveda noir); Āśvalāyana, Śāṅkhāyana (Ṛgveda); et le Vaitāna-Sūtra (Atharvaveda)*. Baltimore: John Hopkins.
- 1940 The Avyakta Upaniṣad. *JAOS* 60: 338-355.
- 1957 A note on Taittirīya-Saṃhitā 5.2.8.5. and Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa 7.5.1.1. In: Radhakrishnan et al. (eds), *Belvalkar Felicitation volume*, 16-18.
- 1962 The manuscript of the Ṛgveda of the M.A. Stein collection. In: E. Bender (ed.), *Indological studies in honor of W. Norman Brown*. New Haven, Conn.: American Oriental Society. (*AOS* 47).

DUNKEL, George

- 1979 Preverb repetition. *MSS* 38: 41-82.
- 1981 Āmreḍita and iteration of preverbs in Vedic and Hittite. *KZ* 95: 214-226.

EATON, Adoniram J.

- 1884 *The Ātmanepada in Ṛigveda. A Dissertation ...* Leipzig: Kreysing.

EDGERTON, Franklin

- 1911 The K-Suffixes of Indo-Iranian. Part I: The K-Suffixes in the Veda and Avesta. *JAOS* 31/2: 93-150; 31/3: 296-342.
- 1915 Studies in the Veda. *JAOS* 35: 240-246.
- 1947 Rev. of: RODHE 1946 [*Deliver us from evil*]. *JAOS* 67: 219-220.
- 1965 *The beginnings of Indian philosophy*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

EGGELING, Julius

- 1882 1885, 1894, 1897, 1900 *The Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa. According to the text of the Mādhyandina school*. Part I-V. Oxford: Clarendon Press. (*SBE* 12, 26, 41, 43, 44).

EHLERS, Gerhard

- 1988 *Emendationen zum Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa (Zweites Buch)*. Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag. (*Indica et Tibetica*; 14).
- (forthc.) *JB III*. Unpublished Habilschrift.

EHNI, J.

- 1890 *Der vedische Mythos des Yama, verglichen mit den analogen Typen der persischen, griechischen und germanischen Mythologie*. Strassburg: Trübner.

EICHNER, Heiner & LUSCHÜTZKY, Hans Christian (eds)

- 1999 *Compositiones Indogermanicae. In memoriam Jochem Schindler*. Praha: Enigma corporation.

EINOO, Shingo

- 1984 Rev. of: GONDA 1980 [*The Mantras of the Agnyupasthāna and the Sautrāmaṇi*]. *OLZ*, Jg. 79, Nr. 6: 589-594.
- 1985 Studien zum Śrautaritual II. 6. *Nigada*. *IJJ* 28: 263-273.
- 1988 *Die Cāturmāsya oder die altindischen Tertialopfer dargestellt nach den Vorschriften der Brāhmaṇas und der Śrautasūtras*. Tokyo: Institute for the study of languages and cultures of Asia and Africa. (*Monumenta Serindica*; 18).
- 2004 Notes on the *vṛṣotsarga*. In: Griffiths & Houben (eds), 35-48.

ELIZARENKOVA, Tat'jana Ja.

- 1961 Značenie osnov prezensa v Rigvede [The meaning of present stems in the Ṛgveda]. In: M. G. Aslanov et al. (eds), *Jazyki Indii*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo vostočnoj literatury, 91-165.

-
- 1976 *Atxarvaveda: izbrannoe*. [transl., comm.] Moskva: Nauka.
- 1982 *Grammatika vedijskogo jazyka* [A grammar of the Vedic language]. Moskva: Nauka.
- 1989 *Rigveda. Mandaly I-IV*. [Perevod i kommentarii T.Ja. Elizarenkovoj]. Moskva: Nauka.
- 1995 *Rigveda. Mandaly V-VIII*. [Perevod i kommentarii T. Ja. Elizarenkovoj]. Moskva: Nauka.
- 1999a *Rigveda. Mandaly IX-X*. [Perevod i kommentarii T. Ja. Elizarenkovoj]. Moskva: Nauka.
- 1999b *Slova i veščī v Rigvede*. Moskva: Vostočnaja literatura.
- 2005 *Atharvaveda (Šaunaka). Perevod s vedijskogo jazyka, vstupitel'naja stat'ja, kommentarij i priloženija* T. Ja. Elizarenkovoj. T. 1: Knigi I-VII. Moskva: Vostočnaja literatura. (PPV 135, 1).
- 2007 *Atharvaveda (Šaunaka). Perevod s vedijskogo jazyka, kommentarij i priloženija* T. Ja. Elizarenkovoj. T. 2: Knigi VIII-XII. Moskva: Vostočnaja literatura. (PPV 135, 2).
- 2010 *Atharvaveda (Šaunaka). Perevod s vedijskogo jazyka, kommentarij i priloženija* T. Ja. Elizarenkovoj. T. 3: Knigi XIII-XIX[.42]. Moskva: Vostočnaja literatura. (PPV 135, 3).
- EMMERICK, Ronald E.
- 1968 *Saka grammatical studies*. London: Oxford University Press. (London Oriental Series 20).
- ESSERS, Bénard
- 1952 *Een oudindische symboliek van het geluid*. Assen: Van Gorum. (*Philosophia religionis*; 4).
- ETTER, Annemarie
- 1985 *Die Fragesätze im Ṛgveda*. Berlin – New York: de Gruyter. (UIgSK 1).
- FALK, Harry
- 1984 *Legende von Śunaḥśepa vor ihrem rituellen Hintergrund*. ZDMG 134: 115-135.
- 1986 *Bruderschaft und Würfelspiel. Untersuchungen zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des vedischen Opfers*. Freiburg: Falk.
- 1994a *Die Kosmogonie von RV X 72*. In: Mesquita & Werba (eds), *Orbis Indicus. Fs. Oberhammer* (WZKS 38), 1-22.

-
- 1994b Von Götterfiguren und menschlichen Göttern. In: Nalini Balbir & Joachim K. Bautze (eds), *Festschrift Klaus Bruhn zur Vollendung des 65. Lebensjahres dargebracht von Schülern, Freunden und Kollegen*. Reinbek: Wezler, 313-331.
- 2001 Suicidal self-scorching in Ancient India. In: Karttunen & Koskikallio (eds), *Fs. Parpola*, 131-146.
- FAY, Edwin Whitfield
- 1920 Irradiation and blending. In: *Studies in honor of Maurice Bloomfield*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 137-158.
- FENART, Pierre & MANESSY-GUITTON, Jacqueline
- 1974 "Ονειδος chez Homère et skr. *nid-*. In: *Hommage à Pierre Fargues*. Paris: Les belles lettres, 121-130. (Annales de la faculté des lettres et sciences humaines de Nice; 21).
- Festgabe zum fünfzigjährigen Doktorjubiläum Albrecht Weber*. [Hrsg. von O. BÖHTLINGK]. Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1896.
- Festgruss an Rudolf von Roth ...* Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1893.
- Fs. Insler* → BRERETON & JAMISON 2002.
- FILLMORE, Charles
- 1970 The grammar of *hitting* and *breaking*. In: Roderick A. Jacobs & Peter S. Rosenbaum (eds), *Readings in English Transformational grammar*. Waltham, Mass., etc.: Ginn and Company, 120-133.
- FLOBERT, Pierre
- 1970 Rev. of: JANKUHN 1969 [*Die passive Bedeutung medialer Formen untersucht an der Sprache Homers*]. *Kratylos* 15: 153-155.
- 1975a *Recherches sur les verbes déponents latins*. T. 1-2. Lille: Service de reproduction des thèses.
- 1975b *Les verbes déponents latins des origines à Charlemagne*. Paris: "Les belles lettres". (Publications de la Sorbonne; Série "NS Recherches"; 17).
- FORSSMAN, Bernhard
- 1968 Apaoša, der Gegner des Tištriia. *KZ* 82: 37-61.
- 1986 Vedisch *sākām*. *Sprache* 32 (1) (*Festgabe für M. Mayrhofer*): 22-28.

-
- 1996 Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa III 352 und eine homerische Parallele. *MSS* 56: 45-60.
- FORSSMAN, Bernhard & PLATH, Robert (eds)
 2000 *Indoarisch, Iranisch und die Indogermanistik. Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 2. bis 5. Oktober in Erlangen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- FOX, Barbara, & HOPPER, Paul J. (eds)
 1994 *Voice: form and function*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. (TSL 27).
- FOY, W.
 1897 Vedische Beiträge. *KZ* 34: 224-283.
- FRANCESCHINI, Marco
 2008 *An updated Vedic concordance: Maurice Bloomfield's A Vedic concordance enhanced with new material taken from Vedic texts*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. (HOS 66).
- FRANKE, Rudolf Otto
 1897 Rev. of: WACKERNAGEL 1896 [AiG I]. *BB* 23: 162-184.
- FRENZ, Albrecht
 1966 *Über die Verben im Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa*. Marburg – Lahn.
- FRITZ, Matthias
 2000 Die indoiranische Bezeichnung für ‘heiraten’: Rekonstruktion auf der Basis indirekter Evidenz. In: Forssman & Plath (eds), 111-118.
- FROEHDE, F.
 1881 Der lateinische ablaut. II. *BB* 6: 161-195.
 1885 Zur griechischen und lateinischen conjugation. *BB* 9: 107-126.
- FÜRST, Alfons
 1916 Der Sprachgebrauch der älteren Upaniṣads verglichen mit dem der früheren vedischen Perioden und dem des klassischen Sanskrit. *KZ* 47: 1-82.
- GABELENTZ, H.C. von der
 1861 Über das Passivum. Eine sprachvergleichende Abhandlung. *Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen Classe der königlichen Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* 3: 449-546.

GAEDICKE, Carl

1880 *Der Accusativ im Veda*. Breslau: Koebner.

GARBE, Richard

1882 Rev. of: MS, ed. SCHRÖDER. 1. Buch. *GGA*, Jg. 1882 (1): 110-128.

1896 Bemerkungen zum Āpastamba Śrautasūtra. In: *Festgabe Weber*, 33-37.

GARCÍA(-)RAMÓN, José Luis

1990 Mykenisch *e-qi-ti-wo-e* / ^(h)*ek^{wh}t^hiwo^he(s)* / ‘umgekommen, tot’, homerisch ἔφθιται, ἔφθιεν, (°)ἔφθιτο und das Perfekt von idg. **d^hg^{wh}ei-* im Griechischen. *MSS* 51: 7-20.

1993a Griego ζατέω (: hom.-jon. διζημαι), véd. *yā* 2 ‘pedir’ e IE **ǵeh₂-* ‘pedir, desear, buscar ansiosamente’. In: Lambert Isebaert (ed.), *Miscellanea linguistica graeco-latina*. (Collection d’études classiques; 7). Namur: Société des études classiques, 71-84.

1993b Lat. *cēnsēre*, got. *hazjan* und das idg. Präsens **kēns-e-ti* (und **k̑ns-éǵe-ti*?) ‘verkündigt, schätzt’, Stativ **k̑ns-eh₁-* ‘verkündigt, geschätzt sein/werden’. In: Meiser (ed.), *Fs. H. Rix*, 106-130.

1994-95 The word family of Mycenaean *a-ja-me-no* /*aiāi(s)meno-* ‘inlaid, overlaid’ and IE **seh₂i-* ‘bind, attach’. *Minos* 29-30: 335-346.

1995 Zur Konkurrenz von Dativ und Akkusativ von Nomina actionis und Abstrakta im Indogermanischen. In: Smoczyński (ed.), *Kuryłowicz Memorial Volume I*, 101-113.

1996 Sobre la tablilla PY Tn 316 Y el pretendido presente radical *i-je-to*. In: Ernesto De Miro, Louis Godart & Anna Sacconi (eds), *Atti e memorie del secondo congresso internazionale de micenologia*. Roma: Gruppo Editoriale Internazionale, 261-268.

GARNIER, Katharine von, geb. Moewes

1909 *com* als perfektivierendes Präfix bei Plautus, *sam-* im Rigveda, *cuv-* bei Homer. *IF* 25 (*Fs. Brugmann*): 86-109.

GEHMAN, Henry S.

1917 *Adhi*√*brū* and *adhi*√*vac* in the Veda. *JAOS* 36: 213-225.

GEIB, Ruprecht

- 1975 Die Formel *áyus prá tṛ* im Ṛg-Veda. *IJJ* 16: 269-283.

GELDNER, Karl Friedrich

- 1889, 1897, 1901 [VSt I-III] → PISCHEL & GELDNER.
 1907 *Der Rigveda in Auswahl*. 1. Teil. Glossar. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
 1898 Vedisch *vidátha*. *ZDMG* 52: 730-761.
 1917 Zur Erklärung des Rigveda. *ZDMG* 71: 315-346.
 1928 *Vedismus und Brahmanismus*. Tübingen: Mohr (Paul Siebeck). (*Religionsgeschichtliches Lesebuch*; 9).
 1951 *Der Rig-Veda* aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt... Bd. 1-3. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (*HOS* 33-35).

GENIUŠIENĖ, Emma

- 1987 *The typology of reflexives*. Berlin etc.: Mouton. (*Empirical approaches to language typology*; 2).

GEROW, Edwin

- 1973 'Frost' in the Ṛgveda. *JIES* 1 (3): 224-231.

GHATAGE, A.M.; JOSHI, S.D.; RANADE, H.G.; BHATTA V.P. et al. (eds)

- 1976– [EDS] *An encyclopaedic dictionary of Sanskrit on historical principles*. Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute.

GIOVINE, Paolo di

- 1990 *Studio sul perfetto indoeuropeo*. Roma: Dipartimento di Studi Glottoantropologici, Università di Roma "La Sapienza". (*Biblioteca di ricerche linguistiche e filologiche*; 26).

GIPPERT, Jost

- 1984 Ein indo-iran. Infinitiv des Mediopassivs? *MSS* 43: 25-53.
 1995 Zur Syntax des Infinitivs auf *-tum* im Altindischen. In: Smoczyński (ed.), *Kuryłowicz Memorial Volume I*, 255-277.

GIVÓN, Talmy

- 1984 *Syntax: a functional-typological introduction*. Vol. I. Amsterdam: Benjamins. [2nd ed.: *Syntax: an introduction*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2001]

GÖHLER, Lars

- 2005 Was verstand die frühe Mīmāṃsā unter einer vedischen Weisung (*codanā*)? In: Göhler (ed.), *Fs. Mylius*, 221-228.

GÖHLER, Lars (ed.)

- 2005 *Indische Kultur im Kontext: Rituale, Texte und Ideen aus Indien und der Welt. Festschrift für Klaus Mylius*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. (*Beiträge zur Indologie*; 40).

GONDA, Jan

- 1929 ΔEIKNYMI: *Semantische studie over den Indo-Germaanschen wortel DEIK-*. Amsterdam: H.J. Paris.
- 1936 Zur Homonymie im Altindischen. *AO* 14: 161-202. [= *Sel.St.* III, 1-42].
- 1937 Altind. *pratisara-*, *sraja-* und Verwandtes. *AO* 15: 311-328. [= *Sel.St.* II, 375-392].
- 1938 *Stilistische studie over Atharvaveda I-VII*. Wageningen: H. Veenman & zonen.
- 1948 Quelques observation sur l'emploi du verbe simple 'au lieu d'un composé' etc. dans la langue sanskrite. *AO* 20: 167-205. [= *Sel.St.*, III, 180-218].
- 1951 *Remarks on the Sanskrit passive*. Leiden: Brill. (*ORT* 4).
- 1954 *Pratiṣṭhā. Saṃjñāvyākaraṇam. Studia Indologica Internationalia*. I. Poona/Paris: Centre for International Indological Research, 1-37. [= *Sel.St.* II, 338-374].
- 1956 Semantisches zu idg. *rēḡ-* „König“ und zur Wurzel *rēḡ-* („sich aus)strecken“. *KZ* 73: 151-167. [= *Sel.St.* I, 415-431].
- 1957a The character of the Sanskrit accusative. In: Diego Catalán (ed.), *Miscelánea homenaje a André Martinet: Estructuralismo e historia*. La Laguna: Biblioteca Filológica Universidad de la Laguna. T. I, 47-65. [= *Sel.St.* I, 44-62].
- 1957b A note on the function of the accusative as described in the handbooks. In: Radhakrishnan et al. (eds), *Belvalkar Felicitation volume*, 72-80. [= *Sel.St.* I, 63-71].
- 1957c 'Attraction' and co-ordination in the Veda. *BSOAS* 20: 279-289. [= *Sel.St.* III, 227-237].
- 1959 *Stylistic repetition in the Veda*. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgeversmaatschappij. (*VKNAWL* 65/3).

-
- 1963 *The vision of the Vedic poets*. The Hague: Mouton. (DRT 8).
- 1964 Notes on *Atharvaveda-Saṃhitā* book 14. *IJJ* 8: 1-24. [= Sel.St. III, 475-498].
- 1964-65 Rev. of: BLAIR 1961 [*Heat in the Rig Veda ...*]. *IJJ* 8: 60-64.
- 1965 *The Savayajñas. (Kauśikasūtra 60-68. Translation, introduction, commentary)*. Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers maatschappij. (VKNAWL 71/2).
- 1966a De kosmogonie van Ṛgveda 10, 129. *Tijdschrift voor filosofie* 28: 670-696. [= Sel.St. III, 407-433].
- 1966b *Loka. World and heaven in the Veda*. Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers maatschappij. (VKNAWL 73/1).
- 1967a *The meaning of the Sanskrit term dhāman-*. Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers maatschappij. (VKNAWL 73/2).
- 1967b On the use of the absolute in Sanskrit. In: Baburam Saksena et al. (eds), *Kavirāja-abhinadhana-grantha*. Lakhnau: Akhila Bharatīya Samskr̥ta Parisad, 262-265. [= Sel.St. III, 91-94].
- 1967-68 The anuṣṭubh stanzas of the Ṛgveda. *ALB* 31-32 (*Dr. V. Raghavan Felicitation volume*): 14-51. [= Sel.St. III, 323-360].
- 1968a Atharvaveda 11, 7. In: *Mélanges Renou*, 301-336. [= Sel.St. III, 439-474].
- 1968b The Sanskrit particle *api*. *Lingua* 21: 183-196. [= Sel.St. II, 157-170].
- 1969 *Eye and gaze in the Veda*. Amsterdam: North-Holland. (VKNAWL 75/1).
- 1970 *Notes on names and the name of god in ancient India*. Amsterdam: North-Holland. (VKNAWL 75/4).
- 1971 *Old Indian*. Leiden: Brill. (*Handbuch der Orientalistik*. 2. Abt. 1. Band. 1. Abschnitt).
- 1972 *The Vedic god Mitra*. Leiden: Brill. (ORT 13).
- 1974a *The dual deities in the religion of the Veda*. Amsterdam: North-Holland. (VKNAWL 81).
- 1974b Notes on Atharvaveda 12,1. In: Jan Reychman et al. (eds),

- Anantapāraṇi kila śabdaśāstram ... Księga pamiątkowa ku czci Eugeniusza Śluszkiewicza.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 79-88.
- 1975-91 [Sel.St.] *Selected studies*. Vol. I-VI. Leiden: Brill.
- 1976 *Triads in the Veda*. Amsterdam: North-Holland. (VKNAWL 91).
- 1977 *The ritual sūtras*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. (*A history of Indian literature*; vol. I, fasc. 2).
- 1979 *The medium in the Ṛgveda*. Leiden: Brill. (ORT 24).
- 1980a *The mantras of the Agnyupasthāna and the Sautrāmaṇī*. Amsterdam: North-Holland. (VKNAWL 104).
- 1980b *Vedic ritual: the non-solemn rites*. Leiden: Brill. (*Handbuch der Orientalistik*. 2. Abt. 4. Band. 1. Abschnitt).
- 1982a "In the beginning". *ABORI* 63: 43-62. [= Sel.St. VI, 2, 117-136].
- 1982b Some notes on optional rites. In: Dharmendra K. Gupta (ed.), *Recent studies in Sanskrit and Indology. Jagannath Agrawal felicitation volume*, 23-41. Delhi: Ajanta publications. [= Sel.St. VI, 2, 77-95].
- 1982c *The Haviryajñāḥ Somāḥ: the interrelations of the Vedic solemn sacrifices Śāṅkhāyana Śrautasūtra 14, 1 – 13. Translation and notes*. Amsterdam: North-Holland. (VKNAWL 113).
- 1983a The creator and his spirit (Manas and Prajāpati). *WZKS* 27: 5-42. [= Sel.St., VI, 2, 271-308].
- 1983b The redundant and the deficient in Vedic ritual. *VIJ* 21: 1-34. [= Sel.St., VI/2, 309-342].
- 1983c *Soma's metamorphoses (the identifications in the oblatory rites of Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 12, 6, 1)*. Amsterdam: North-Holland. (MKNAWL 46/2: 29-54).
- 1983d *On the structure of multipartite formulae in Vedic rites and ceremonies*. Torino. (*Pubblicazioni di IndT*; 14).
- 1984 *Prajāpati and the year*. Amsterdam: North-Holland. (VKNAWL 123).
- 1985a *Pūṣan and Sarasvatī*. Amsterdam: North-Holland. (VKNAWL 127).

- 1985b *The ritual functions and significance of grasses in the religion of the Veda*. Amsterdam: North-Holland. (VKNAWL 132).
- 1986 *Prajāpati's rise to higher rank*. Leiden: Brill. (ORT 29).
- 1987 *Rice and barley offerings in the Veda*. Leiden: Brill. (ORT 31).
- 1989a *The Indra hymns of the Ṛgveda*. Leiden: Brill. (ORT 36).
- 1989b *Prayer and blessing: ancient Indian ritual terminology*. Leiden: Brill. (ORT 33).
- 1989c *Prajāpati's relations with Brahman, Bṛhaspati and Brahmā*. Amsterdam: North-Holland. (VKNAWL 138).
- 1991 *The functions and significance of gold in the Veda*. Leiden: Brill. (ORT 37).
- 1991-92 The triadic hymns of the Ṛgveda-Saṃhitā IX. *ABORI* 72-73 (= *Amṛtamahotsava (1917-1992) volume*): 1-10.

GOTŌ, Toshifumi

GOTŌ = GOTŌ 1987

- 1976 *rabh- : labh- + ā in der vedischen Literatur*. *JIBS* 24 (2): 1015-1007 = (23)-(31).
- 1980 Ai. *utsaṅgá-* und Verwandtes. *MSS* 39: 11-36.
- 1985 Altindisch *rándhra-* und uridg. **lend^h*, *MSS* 44: 77-91.
- 1987 *Die "I. Präsensklasse" im Vedischen: Untersuchung der vollstufigen thematischen Wurzelpräsentia*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (*SbÖAW* 489; *VKSKS* 18). (2., überarbeitete und ergänzte Aufl. 1996).
- 1988 Rev. of JAMISON 1983 [-āya-formations ...]. *IIJ* 31: 303-321.
- 1989 Ṛgvedisch *vipanyā-*, *vipanyú* und *vipanyāmahe*. *IIJ* 32 (4): 281-284.
- 1990 Materialien zu einer Liste altindischer Verbalformen: 1. *amⁱ*, 2. *ay/i*, 3. *as/s*. *BNMEO* 15 (4): 987-1012.
- 1991 Materialien zu einer Liste altindischer Verbalformen: 4. *dogh/dugh/doh/ duh*, 5. *savśu*, 6. *¹savⁱśū*, 7. *²(savⁱ/)sū*. *BNMEO* 16 (3): 681-707.
- 1993 Materialien zu einer Liste altindischer Verbalformen: 8. *ard/rd*, 9. *īṣ*, 10. *ukṣ*, 11. *eṣ/iṣ*, 12. *eṣⁱ/iṣⁱ*, 13. *ok/oc/uc*, 14. *kaṇ*, 15. *vakṣ/ukṣ*. *BNMEO* 18 (1): 119-141.

-
- 1996a *Verbesserungen und Nachträge zu: Die "I. Präsensklasse" im Vedischen.* 2. Aufl. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- 1996b Zur Geschichte vom König Jānaśruti Pautrāyaṇa (Chāndogya-Upaniṣad IV 1-3). *StII* 20: 89-115.
- 1997a Materialien zu einer Liste altindischer Verbalformen: 16. *chad*, 17. *chand/chad*, 18. *chard/chrd*, 19. *dagh/dhag*, 20. *dveṣ/dviṣ*, 21. *bandh/badh*, 22. ¹*man*, 23. ²*man*, 24. *mnā*, 25. ¹*yav/yu*, 26. ²*yav/yu*, 27. *sanⁱ*, 28. *star/stṛ*, 29. *starⁱ/stṛ*. *BNMEO* 22 (4): 1001-1059.
- 1997b Überlegungen zum urindogermanischen «Stativ». In: Emilio Crespo & José Luis García Ramón (eds), *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy. Actas del Coloquio de la Indogermanische Gesellschaft.* Madrid: Uam; Wiesbaden: Reichert, 165-192.
- 1999 Notizen zur altindischen und avestischen Syntax. In: Eichner et al. (eds), *Gs. Schindler*, 127-142.
- 2000 "Purūravas und Urvaśi" aus dem neuentdeckten Vādhūla-Anvākyāna (Ed. IKARI). In: Hintze & Tichy (eds), *Fs. Narten*, 79-110.
- 2001 Rev. of: WERBA 1997 [VIA I]. *Kratylos* 46: 62-73.
- 2002 Funktionen des Akkusativs und Rektionsarten des Verbums – anhand des Altindischen. In: Heinrich Hettrich & Jeong-Soo Kim (eds), *Indogermanische Syntax: Fragen und Perspektiven.* Wiesbaden: Reichert, 21-42.
- 2009 Der Optativ *bhṛjéyur* in den Yajurveda-Saṁhitās. In: Xavier Tremblay & Eric Pirart (eds), *Zarathushtra entre l'Inde et l'Iran. Études indo-iraniennes et indo-européennes offertes à Jean Kellens à l'occasion de son 65^e anniversaire.* (Beiträge zur Iranistik; 30). Wiesbaden: Reichert, 107-113.
- GOUDRIAAN, Teun
- 1986 Vedic *kṛtyā* and the terminology of magic. In: Morgenroth (ed.), *Sanskrit and world culture*, 450-456.
- GRASSMANN, Hermann
- 1873 [Wb. zum RV] *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda.* Leipzig: Brockhaus.

- 1876, 1877 [RV übers.] *Rig-Veda übersetzt und mit kritischen und erläuternden Anmerkungen versehen* von Hermann Grassmann. In zwei Theilen. Leipzig: Brockhaus.

GRIFFITHS, Arlo

- 1999 *Atharvaveda (Paippalāda): An edition of the first ten hymns of its nineteenth book (ṛcākāṇḍa)*, with introduction, translation and commentary. MA Thesis, Leiden University.
- 2004a *The Paippalādasamhitā of the Atharvaveda. Kāṇḍas 6 and 7: A new edition with translation and commentary*. PhD diss., Leiden University.
- 2004b Paippalāda Mantras in the Kauśikasūtra. In: Griffiths & Houben (eds), 49-99.
- 2009 *The Paippalādasamhitā of the Atharvaveda. Kāṇḍas 6 and 7: A new edition with translation and commentary*. Groningen: Forsten. (GOS 22). [based on GRIFFITHS 2004a]

GRIFFITHS, Arlo & HOUBEN, Jan E.M. (eds)

- 2004 *The Vedas: Texts, language & ritual. Proceedings of the Third International Vedic Workshop, Leiden 2002*. Groningen: Forsten. (GOS 20).

GRIFFITHS, Arlo & SCHMIEDCHEN, Annette (eds)

- 2007 *The Atharvaveda and its Paippalādaśākhā: Historical and philological papers on a Vedic tradition*. Aachen: Shaker Verlag. (Geisteskultur Indiens: Texte und Studien; 11; Indologica Halensis).

GÜNTERT, Herman

- 1914 *Über Reimwortbildungen im Arischen und Griechischen. Eine sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchung*. Heidelberg: Winter. (Indogermanische Bibliothek. III. Abt.: Untersuchungen; Bd. 1).

HACKSTEIN, Olav

- 1995 *Untersuchungen zu den sigmatischen Präsensbildungen des Tocharischen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. (HS; Ergänzungsheft 38).

HAMM, Frank-Richard

- 1968/69 Chāndogyopaniṣad VI. Ein erneuter Versuch. WZKS 12-13 (Festschrift für Erich Frauwallner. Ed. by Gerhard

Oberhammer): 149-159.

HANEFELD, Erhardt

- 1976 *Philosophische Haupttexte der älteren Upaniṣaden*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. (FBI 9).

HARDARSON, Jón Axel

- 1993 *Studien zum urindogermanischen Wurzelaoist und dessen Vertretung im Indoiranischen und Griechischen*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. (IBS 74).
- 1998 Mit dem Suffix **-eh₁-* bzw. **-(e)h₁-je/o-* gebildete Verbalstämme im Indogermanischen. In: Meid (ed.), *Sprache und Kultur der Indogermanen*, 323-339.

HARTMANN, Hans

- 1954 *Das Passiv. Eine Studie zur Geistesgeschichte der Kelten, Italiker und Arier*. Heidelberg: Winter.

HASPELMATH, Martin

- 1987 *Transitivity alternations of the anticausative type*. Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft. (Arbeitspapier 5 (N.F.)).
- 1993 More on the typology of inchoative/causative verb alternation. In: Comrie & Polinsky (eds), 87-120.

HAUDRY, Jean

- 1977 *L'emploi des cas en védique. Introduction à l'étude des cas en indo-européen*. Lyon: Édition l'Hermès. (Collection "Les hommes et les lettres"; 5).

HAUER, Jakob Wilhelm

- 1931 *Ein monotheistischer Traktat Altindiens*. Gotha: Leopold Klotz. (Marburger theologische Studien; 6).

HAUGHTON, Graves C.

- 1825 → Bibl I: ManuSmṛ.

HAUSCHILD, Richard

- 1954 Rev. of: RENOU 1952b [GrV]. *OLZ*, Jg. 49, Nr. 9/10: 442-446.
- 1965 Rev. of: MAYRHOFER 1965b [*Sanskrit-Grammatik*]. *IF* 70: 215-216.

HAYOT, Fernand

- 1996 *Chândogya Upaniṣad. Texte, traduction et notes* par F. Hayot. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve. (*Les Upanishad*; 22).

HEDEMANN, Harro

- 1964 *Die Arzneipflanzen und Drogen für die Zahn-, Mund- und Kieferkrankheiten in den drei altindischen medizinischen Sammelwerken Susruta-Samhita, Charaka-Samhita und Vagbhata's Astangahridayasamhita*. Diss. zur Erlangen eines Grades eines Doktors der Zahnmedizin ... Düsseldorf.

HEENEN, François

- 2006 *Le désidératif en védique*. Amsterdam: Rodopi. (*LSIE* 13).

HEESTERMAN, Johannes C.

- 1957 *The ancient Indian royal consecration. The rājasūya described according to the Yajus texts and annotated*. 's-Gravenhage: Mouton. (*DRT* 2).

HENRY, Victor

- 1891a *Les hymnes Rohitas. Livre XIII de l'Atharva-Véda. Traduit et commenté* par V. Henry. Paris: Maisonneuve.
- 1891b Rev. of: BLOOMFIELD 1890 [Contributions to the interpretation of the Veda. Second series]. *Revue critique* 31 (1): 323-325.
- 1892 *Le livre VII de l'Atharva-Véda. Traduit et commenté* par V. Henry. Paris: Maisonneuve.
- 1894 *Les livres VIII et IX de l'Atharva-Véda. Traduits et commentés* par V. Henry. Paris: Maisonneuve.
- 1896a *Les livres X, XI et XII de l'Atharva-Véda. Traduits et commentés* par V. Henry. Paris: Maisonneuve.
- 1896b Rev. of: WACKERNAGEL 1896 [AiG I]. *Revue critique* 38 (1): 121-125.
- 1898 *Vedica*. (3^e série.). *MSL* 10: 84-109.

HERTEL, Johannes

- 1921 *Die Weisheit der Upanishaden: eine Auswahl aus den ältesten Texten*. Aus dem Sanskrit übers. und erläut. von Johannes Hertel. München: Beck.

HETRICH, Heinrich

- 1989 Rev. of: GOTÖ 1987. *HS* 102: 302-306.

-
- 1990a *Der Agens in passivischen Sätzen altindogermanischen Sprachen.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. (*Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. I. Philologisch-historische Klasse*; Jg. 1990; Nr. 2).
- 1990b Rektionaler und autonomer Kasusgebrauch. In: H. Eichner & H. Rix (eds), *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie. Jacob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute. Kolloquium der indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 13. bis 15. Oktober in Basel.* Wiesbaden: Reichert, 82-99.
- 1991 Syntax und Wortarten der Lokalpartikeln des Ṛgveda. I: *ādhi.* *MSS* 52: 27-76.
- 1995 Zur funktionalen Variationsbreite altindogermanischer Kasus: Der Ablativ im Ṛgveda, In: H. Hettrich et al. (eds), *Fs. Strunk*, 53-72.
- 2005 Zu Konstruktion und Bedeutung der Wurzel ¹man im Rgveda. In: Th. Krischet al. (eds), *Analecta homini universali dicata. Festschrift für Oswald Panagl zum 65. Geburtstag.* Band I. Stuttgart: Akademischer Verlag, 75-83.
- 2007 *Materialien zu einer Kasussyntax des Rgveda.* Würzburg: Institut für Altertumswissenschaften der Universität. (Publication on Internet, work in progress; see <http://www.vergl-sprachwissenschaft.phil.uni-wuerzburg.de/publikationen-hettrich.html>)
- HETTRICH, Heinrich et al. (eds)
- 1995 *Verbae et structurae: Festschrift für Klaus Strunk zum 65. Geburtstag.* Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. (*IBS* 83).
- HILL, Eugen
- 2007 *Die Aorist-Präsentien des Indoiranischen. Untersuchungen zur Morphologie und Semantik einer Präsensklasse.* Bremen: Hempen. (*MFHS* 7).
- HILLEBRANDT, Alfred
- 1880 Rev. of: WHITNEY 1879 [*SktGr*]. *BB* 5: 338-345. [= *Kl.Schr.*, 602-609].
- 1885a *uktham madaś ca śasyate.* *BB* 9: 192-194. [= *Kl.Schr.*, 57-59].

-
- 1885b *Vedachrestomatie für den ersten Gebrauch bei Vedavorlesungen*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- 1889 *Vedica*. WZKM 3: 188-194, 259-273. [= Kl.Schr., 116-137].
- 1891-1902 [VMyth] *Vediche Mythologie*. 3 Bände. 2. Aufl. Breslau: Koebner (1891); Marcus (1899, 1902).
- 1911 The practice of circumambulation. *The Expository Times* 22 (Oct. 1910 - Sept. 1911): 420-422. [= Kl.Schr., 187-189].
- 1913 *Lieder des Ṛgveda*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Leipzig: Hinrichs. (*Quellen der Religions-Geschichte*; 5).
- 1915 Weitere Bemerkungen zu den Upaniṣads. *ZDMG* 69: 104-106. [= Kl.Schr., 194-196].
- 1916 Die Paṇi's im Ṛgveda. *ZDMG* 70: 512-520. [= Kl.Schr., 197-205].
- 1921 *Aus Brahmanas und Upaniṣaden. Gedanken altindischer Philosophen*. Jena: Diederichs Verlag. (*Religiöse Stimmen der Völker*; 1. *Die Religion des alten Indien*; I). (Neuausg.: *Upanishaden. Die Geheimlehre der Inder*. Köln: Diederichs, 1977 (*Diederichs Gelbe Reihe*; 15)).
- 1924 Rev. of: *Der Ṛgveda*, übersetzt und erläutert von Karl F. GELDNER. Göttingen, 1923. *IFAnz* 42: 23-27. [= Kl.Schr., 497-501].
- 1924/25 Der Nachtweg der Sonne. *Zeitschrift für Buddhismus und verwandte Gebiete* 6: 114-117. [= Kl.Schr., 250-253].
- 1987 *Kleine Schriften*. Stuttgart: Steiner. (*Glaserapp-Stiftung*; 28).
- HINTZE, Almut
- 1994 *Der Zamyād-Yašt: Edition, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Wiesbaden: Reichert. (Beiträge zur Iranistik; 15).
- HINTZE, Almut & TICHY, Eva (eds)
- 2000 *Anusantatyai. Festschrift für Johanna Narten zum 70. Geburtstag*. Dettelbach: Röhl. (*MSS*; Beiheft 19).
- HINÜBER, Oskar von
- 1979 A Vedic verb in Pāli: *udājita*. In: J. P. Sinha (ed.), *Ludwik Sternbach felicitation volume*. Part Two. Lucknow: Akhila Bharatiya Sanskrit Parishad, 819-822.
- HIRT, Herman
- 1898 Akzentstudien. [7. Die thematischen Präsentien.] *IF* 8: 267-

-
- 278.
- 1900 *Der indogermanische Ablaut, vornehmlich in seinem Verhältnis zur Betonung.* Strassburg: Trübner.
- 1913 Fragen des Vokalismus und der Stammbildung im Indogermanischen. *IF* 32: 209-318.
- 1921 [IdgG II] *Indogermanische Grammatik.* Teil II. *Der indogermanische Vokalismus.* Heidelberg: Winter.
- 1928 [IdgG IV] *Indogermanische Grammatik.* Teil IV. *Doppelung – Zusammensetzung – Verbum.* Heidelberg: Winter.
- 1939 *Die Hauptprobleme der indogermanischen Sprachwissenschaft.* Hrsg. und bearbeitet von Helmut Arntz. Halle/Saale: Niemeyer.
- HIRZEL, Arnold
- 1890 *Gleichnisse und Metaphern im Ṛgveda in kulturhistorischer Hinsicht zusammengestellt und verglichen mit den Bildern bei Homer, Hesiod, Aeschylus, Sophokles und Euripides.* Diss. Leipzig: Friedrich.
- HOCK, Hans Henrich
- 1981 Sanskrit causative syntax: a diachronic study. *Studies in the linguistic sciences* 11 (2): 9-33.
- 1982 The Sanskrit passive: synchronic behavior and diachronic development. *South Asian Review* 6: 127-137.
- 1985-86 Voice, mood, and the gerundive (*kṛtya*) in Sanskrit. *IndT* 13 (*Proc. of the 6th World Sanskrit Conference* (Philadelphia, October 13-20 1984)): 81-102.
- 1991 Causees, passive agents, or instruments? Instrumental NPs with causatives in early and later Vedic Prose. In: Hock, H.H. (ed.), *Studies in Sanskrit syntax: A volume in honor of the centennial of Speijer's Sanskrit Syntax (1886-1986)*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 71-93.
- 2002 The Yājñavalkya cycle in the Bṛhad Āraṇyaka Upaniṣad. *JAOS* 122 (2) (*Fs. Insler*): 278-286.
- HOENS, Dirk J.
- 1951 *Śānti. A contribution to Ancient Indian religious terminology.* 's-Gravenhage: Smits.

HOFFMANN, Karl

- 1940 Vedische Namen. *Wörter und Sachen* 21: 139–161. [= Aufs. 1, 6-28].
- 1951 Die angebliche Wurzel *bhreṣ*. In: Paul Thieme (ed.), *Beiträge zur indischen Philologie und Altertumskunde. Walther Schubring zum 70. Geburtstag dargebracht von der deutschen Indologie (ANIS 7)*. Hamburg: Cram, de Gruyter, 19-24. [= Aufs. 1, 29-34].
- 1952 [1956] / 1976 Zum prädikativen Adverb. *MSS* 1: 42-53. [= Aufs. 2, 339-348]; Nachtrag. In: Aufs. 2, 348-349.
- 1952 [1957] Zur vedischen Verbalflexion. *MSS* 2: 121-137. [= Aufs. 2, 358-372].
- 1955 Altpers. *afuvāyā*. In: Hans Krahe (ed.), *Corolla linguistica. Fs. Sommer*, 80-85. [= Aufs. 1, 52-57].
- 1956 Notizen zu WACKERNAGEL-DEBRUNNER, Altindische Grammatik II, 2. *MSS* 8: 5-24 [= Aufs. 2, 387-402].
- 1957a Mārtāṇḍa und Gayōmart. *MSS* 11: 85-103. [= Aufs. 2, 422-438].
- 1957b Zwei vedische Wortsippen. *MSS* 10: 59-71. [= Aufs. 2, 411-421].
- 1959 Vedisch *gr̥h* 'klagen'. *MSS* 14: 35-37. [= Aufs. 2, 439-441].
- 1960a Textkritisches zum Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa. *IIJ* 4: 1-36 [= Aufs. 1, 77-112].
- 1960b Rev. of: WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER [AiG: Introduction générale ...; Nachtr. zu I; Nachtr. zu II/1; II/2]. *ZDMG* 110: 175-182. [= Aufs. 1, 130-137].
- 1960c Der vedische Typus *menāmenam*. *KZ* 76: 242-248. [= Aufs. 1, 113-119].
- 1965a Idg. **sneigʰ*. *MSS* 18: 13-28. [= Aufs. 2, 442-454].
- 1965b Materialien zum altindischen Verbum [: 1. *añc* 'schöpfen' etc.]. *KZ* 79: 171-191. [= Aufs. 1, 162-182].
- 1966 Vedisch *vichāyāti* und *govyachá-*. *MSS* 19: 61-72. [= Aufs. 2, 455-464].
- 1967a [Inj] *Der Injunktiv im Veda. Eine synchronische Funktionsuntersuchung*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- 1967b Der vedische Prekativtyp *yeṣam, jeṣma*. *MSS* 20: 25-37.

-
- [= Aufs. 2, 465-474].
- 1967c Avestisch *haoma yō gauma*. *MSS* 21: 11-20. [= Aufs. 2, 475-482].
- 1968a Avest. *uruuīnaitīš* Yt. 13,33. *MSS* 24: 39-42. [= Aufs. 2, 506-508].
- 1968b Hethitisch *luk(k)-*, *lukki-*. *KZ* 82: 214-220. [= Aufs. 1, 251-257].
- 1968c Die Komposition eines Brāhmaṇa-Abschnittes (MS. I 10, 14-16). In: *Mélanges Renou*, 367-380. [= Aufs. 1, 207-220].
- 1968d Remarks on the new edition of the *Paippalāda-Saṃhitā*. *IJ* 11: 1-10. [= Aufs. 1, 228-237].
- 1969a Der Mantra *yán nāvam aít* TS. II 3,10,1. *MSS* 25: 59-63. [= Aufs. 2, 509-512].
- 1969b Materialien zum altindischen Verbum [: 11. *amⁱ*, 12. *jakṣ*]. *KZ* 83: 193-215. [= Aufs. 1, 288-310].
- 1970 Die Weltentstehung nach dem Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa. *MSS* 27: 59-67. [= Aufs. 2, 516-522].
- 1974 Ved. *dhānuṣ-* und *pāruṣ-*. *Sprache* 20: 15-25. [= Aufs. 1, 327-337].
- 1975 Pāṇini V 4,61 *ativyathane*. *MSS* 33: 45-50. [= Aufs. 2, 547-551].
- 1975, 1976, 1992 [Aufs.] *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik*. 3 Bände. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- 1976a Ved. *yabh*. In: Aufs. 2, 570-574.
- 1976b Nachtrag zu Hoffmann 1952a [1956]. In: Aufs. 2, 348-349.
- 1976c Zu ved. *tan* 'donnern'. In: Aufs. 2, 562-569.
- 1976d Die Aoristbildungen von ved. *vr̥t*. In: Aufs. 2, 589-592.
- 1982 Vedica. *MSS* 41: 61-94. [= Aufs. 3, 767-800].
- 1985 Vedisch *kṣaṇ*. In: Hermann M. Ölberg et al. (eds), *Sprachwissenschaftliche Forschungen: Festschrift für Johann Knobloch zum 65. Geburtstag am 5. Januar 1984 dargebracht von Freunden und Kollegen (IBS 23)*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 171-177. [= Aufs. 3, 812-818].
- 1986 Textkritisches zur *Paippalāda-Saṃhitā*. In: W. Morgenroth (ed.), *Sanskrit and world culture*, 457-461. [= Aufs. 3, 819-

823].

HOFFMANN, Karl / FORSSMANN, Bernhard

1996 *Avestische Laut- und Flexionslehre*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. (IBS 84).

HOFFMANN, Karl & NARTEN, Johanna

1989 *Der Sasanidische Archetypus: Untersuchungen zur Schreibung und Lautgestalt des Avestischen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

HOLTZMANN, Adolf

1884 *Grammatisches aus dem Mahabharata. Ein Anhang zu William Dwight Whitney's Indischer Grammatik*. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel. (Bibliothek indogermanischer Grammatiken. Bd. II, Anhang I).

HOPPER, Paul J. & THOMPSON, Sandra A.

1980 Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56 (2): 251-299.

HORSCH, Paul

1966 *Die vedische Gāthā- und Śloka-Literatur*. Bern: Francke.

HOUBEN, Jan E.M.

HOUBEN = HOUBEN 1991

1991 *The Pravargya Brāhmaṇa of the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka: an ancient commentary on the Pravargya ritual: introduction, translation, and notes*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

2001 The Vedic horse-sacrifice and the changing use of the term *ahiṃsā*: an early insertion in TB 3.9.8? In: Karttunen & Koskikallio (eds), *Fs. Parpola*, 279-290.

2010 The *Sviṣṭakṛt*: formal structure and self-reference in Vedic ritual. In: Julieta Rotaru [et al.] (eds), *Lucrările Simpozionului International: Cartea, România, Europa* : Ed. a II-a – 20-24 septembrie 2009; 550 de ani de la prima atestare documentară a oraşului Bucureşti. Bucureşti: Editura Biblioteca Bucureştilor, 596-621.

HÜBSCHMANN, Heinrich

1885 *Das indogermanische Vocalsystem*. Strassburg: Trübner.

HUMBACH, Helmut

- 1956 Rituelle Termini technici in den awestischen Gathas (*daēnā*-, *urvan*-, *yāh*, *yāna*-). *MSS* 8: 74-83.
- 1991 *The Gāthās of Zarathushtra and the other Old Avestan texts. Part I: Introduction – Text and translation; Part II: Commentary.* Heidelberg: Winter.

HUME, Robert Ernest

- 1931 *The thirteen principal Upanishads translated from the Sanskrit with an outline of the philosophy of the Upanishads.* 2nd ed., revised. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

ICKLER, Ingeborg

- 1973 *Untersuchungen zur Wortstellung und Syntax der Chāndogyopaniṣad.* Göppingen: Kümmerle. (*Göppinger Akademische Beiträge*; 75).
- 1976 Bemerkungen zum “Sieverschen Gesetz” unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des RV. [Rev. of: SEEBOLD 1972 (*Das System der indogermanischen Halbvokale...*)]. *OLZ*, Jg. 71, Nr. 2: 117-128.

INSLER, Stanley

- 1967a Avestan *niyṛāire*. *KZ* 81: 259-264.
- 1967b Studies about the Sanskrit root *ar/r*. *IF* 72: 250-258.
- 1968a The origin of the Sanskrit passive aorist. *IF* 73: 312-346.
- 1968b Vedic *āñjasā*, *ṛñjasānā*- and the type *sahasānā*-. *KZ* 82: 1-23.
- 1969a The Sanskrit *sa*-aorist. *MSS* 26: 43-50.
- 1969b Vedic *dambhāyati*. *IF* 74: 11-31.
- 1970 Sanskrit *tāskara*- and text criticism to AV. xix 47-50. *Sprache* 16 (2): 138-148.
- 1971a Some problems of Indo-European **ə* in Avestan. *Language* 47 (3): 573-585.
- 1971b Vedic *mith*. *TPS* 1971 (1973): 163-174.
- 1972a Some irregular Vedic imperatives. *Language* 48 (3): 551-565.
- 1972b Vedic *mamatsi*, *ámamdur* and *īyate*. *KZ* 86: 93-103.
- 1975a [Gāthās] *The Gāthās of Zarathustra*. Leiden: Brill; Téhéran –

-
- Liège: Bibliothèque Pahlavi. (*Acta Iranica*; 8, 3^{me} série, vol. I).
- 1975b The Vedic type *dheyām*. *Sprache* 21 (1): 1-22.
- 1987 The Vedic causative type *jāpáyati*. In: Calvert Watkins (ed.), *Studies in memory of Warren Cowgill*. (UIGSK 4). Berlin etc.: de Gruyter, 54-65.
- 1995 Vedic *ājaniṣṭa* and related problems. In: Hettrich et al. (eds), *Fs. Strunk*, 91-104.
- 1996 Avestan *vāz* and Vedic *vāh*. In: Hanns-Peter Schmidt & Albrecht Wezler (eds), *Veda-Vyākaraṇa-Vyākhyāna. Festschrift Paul Thieme zum 90. Geburtstag*. Reinbek: Wezler, 169-186. (*StII* 20).
- 1997 Vedic denominatives to thematic *a*-stems. In: Alexander Lubotsky (ed.), *Sound law and analogy. Papers in honor of Robert S.P. Beekes on the occasion of his 60th birthday*. (LSIE 9). Amsterdam: Rodopi, 103-110.
- 1999 Vedic *dṛṣád-*. In: Eichner et al. (eds), *Gs. Schindler*, 163-164.
- JACKSON, Peter
- 2002 *Verbis pingendis. Contributions to the study of ritual speech and mythopoeia*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck. (IBS; *Vorträge und kleinere Schriften*; 72).
- JAMISON, Stephanie W.
- JAMISON = JAMISON 1983a
- 1979a The case of the agent in Indo-European. *Sprache* 25 (1): 129-143.
- 1979b Remarks on the expression of agency with the passive in Vedic and Indo-European. *KZ* 93: 196-219.
- 1979c Voice fluctuation in the Rig Veda: medial *-anta* in active paradigms. *IJJ* 21: 149-169.
- 1982 Case disharmony in Ṛgvedic similes. *IJJ* 24: 252-271.
- 1982/83 "Sleep" in Vedic and Indo-European. *KZ* 96: 6-16.
- 1983a *Function and form in the -āya-formations of the Rig Veda and Atharva Veda*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. (*KZ*; *Ergänzungsheft* 31).
- 1983b Two problems in the inflection of the Vedic intensive. *MSS* 42: 41-73.

-
- 1984 The Vedic passive optative and its functional equivalents: a study in the syntax of gerundive. *JAOS* 104 (4): 609-620.
- 1986 Brāhmaṇa syllable counting, Vedic *tvác* 'skin', and the Sanskrit expression for the canonical creature. *IIIJ* 29: 161-181.
- 1987 Mantra glosses in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa: more light on the development of the Vedic verbal system. In: George Cardona & Norman H. Zide (eds), *Fs. for Henry Hoenigswald: on the occasion of his seventieth birthday*. Tübingen: Narr, 169-175.
- 1988 The quantity of the outcome of vocalized laryngeals in Indic. In: Alfred Bammesberger (ed.), *Die Laryngalthorie und die Rekonstruktion des indogermanischen Laut- und Formensystems*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 213-226.
- 1989 Rev. of: Gotō 1987. *Kratylos* 34: 59-65.
- 1991a *The ravenous hyenas and the wounded sun: myth and ritual in ancient India*. Ithaca – London: Cornell University Press.
- 1991b The syntax of direct speech in Vedic. In: Joel P. Brereton & S. W. Jamison (eds), *Sense and syntax in Vedic (Panels of the VIIth World Sanskrit Conference; Vol. IV)*. Leiden: Brill, 40-57, 62-65.
- 1996 *Sacrificed wife / sacrificer's wife: women, ritual, and hospitality in ancient India*. Oxford etc.: Oxford University Press.
- 2000a On translating the *Rig Veda*: Three questions. In: Karlene Jones-Bley et al. (eds), *Proceedings of the eleventh annual UCLA Indo-European conference. Los Angeles, June 4-5 1999. (JIES monograph series; 35)*. Washington: Institute for the Study of Man, 1-20.
- 2000b A Sanskrit maxim and its ritual and legal applications. In: Hintze & Tichy (eds), *Fs. Narten*, 111-125.
- 2007 *The Rig Veda between two worlds. Le Ṛgveda entre deux mondes*. Paris: Boccard. (*PICI*; 74).
- JANERT, Klaus Ludwig
- 1956 *Sinn und Bedeutung des Wortes »dhāsi« und seiner Belegstellen im Rigveda und Avesta*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. (*Göttinger Asiatische Forschungen*; 7).

JANKUHN, Harald

- 1969 *Die passive Bedeutung medialer Formen untersucht an der Sprache Homers*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. (KZ; Ergänzungsheft 21).

JASANOFF, Jay

- 1978 *Stative and middle in Indo-European*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. (IBS 23).

JAYASURIYA, M.H.F.

- 1957 Some Vedic verb-forms and their variants in the Brahmanas. *University of Ceylon Review* 15 (3-4): 151-165.

JESPERSEN, Otto

- 1927 *A modern English grammar on historical principles*. Pt. III. *Syntax*. Second volume. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- 1942 *A modern English grammar on historical principles*. Pt. VI. *Morphology*. Written with the assist. of Paul Christophersen, Niels Haislund and Knud Schibbye. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.

JEŽIĆ, Mislav

- 1999 *Ṛgvedske upanišadi: Aitareya i Kauṣītaki. Sanskrtski izvornik i hrvatski prijevod, uvodi i objašnjenja i izvodi. Dodatak: Bāṣkalamantra-upaniṣad*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.

JOACHIM, Ulrike

- 1978 *Mehrfachpräsentien im Ṛgveda*. Frankfurt am Main etc.: Peter Lang. (*Europäische Hochschulschriften*. Reihe XXI: *Linguistik*; 4).

JOHANSSON, Karl Ferdinand

- 1894 Die bildung des dativus sing. der -a-stämme im Arischen. *BB* 20: 81-102.
- 1917 *Über die altindische göttin Dhiṣāṇā und verwandtes: beiträge zum fruchtbarkeitskultus in Indien*. Uppsala: Akademiska Bokhandeln; Leipzig: Harrassowitz. (*Skrifter utgifna af K. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala*; 20:1).
- 1927 *Etymologisches und wortgeschichtliches*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells boktryckeri. (*Uppsala universitets årsskrift. Filosofi, språkvetenskap och historiska vetenskaper* 1927; 1).

JOLLY, Julius

- 1880 *The institutes of Vishnu*: transl. by J. Jolly. Oxford: Clarendon press. (SBE 7).
- 1889 *The minor law-books*: transl. by J. Jolly. Part I: Nārada; Brihaspati. Oxford: Clarendon Press. (SBE 33).

KAJIHARA, Mieko

- 1992 On the *Pariṇāmanā* Chapter of the Bodhicaryāvatāra. *JIBS* 11 (2): 1062-1059 [(25)-(28)].
- 2002 *The brahmacārīn in the Veda: The evolution of the "Vedic student" and the dynamics of texts, rituals, and society in ancient India*. PhD diss. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University.

KALIUSČENKO, Vladimir D.

- 1988 *Deutsche nominale Verben*. Tübingen: Narr. (*Studien zur deutschen Grammatik*; 30).

KAPANI, Lakshmi

- 1992 *La notion de saṃskāra dans l'Inde brahmanique et bouddhique*. I. Paris: Boccard. (*PICI* 59 (1)).

KARNIK, H.R.

- 1965 Some derivative legends from the II, III and IV Kāṇḍas of the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa. In: S. N. Gajendragadkar & S. A. Upadhyaya (eds), *H. D. Velankar commemoration volume: a volume of Indological studies by his students pres. to Prof. H. D. Velankar on the occasion of his seventy-second birthday on 3rd Oct. 1965*. Bombay: Wilson College, 64-71.

KARTTUNEN, Klaus & KOSKIKALLIO, Petteri (eds)

- 2001 *Vidyārṇavavandanam. Essays in honour of Asko Parpola*. Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society. (*SO* 94).

KASHIKAR, C.G.

- 1961 A critical and exegetical study of the Vāraha Śrauta Sūtra I. 1-3. *ALB* 25: 229-241.
- 1975 Further notes on the Vāraha Śrauta Sūtra I 1-3. In: R.N. Dandekar et al. (eds), *Sanskrit and Indological studies. Dr. V. Raghavan felicitation volume*. Delhi etc.: Motilal Banarsidas, 193-198.

KEITH, Arthur B.

- 1906 The gerund as passive in Sanskrit. *JRAS* (1906): 693-695.
- 1907 The use of the passive gerund in Sanskrit. *JRAS* (1907): 164-166.
- 1908 *The Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka. With an appendix on the Mahāvratā.* London: Royal Asiatic Society. (*Oriental Translation Fund*; N.S., 18).
- 1914 *The Veda of the Black Yajus School entitled Taittiriya Saṁhitā.* 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. (*HOS* 18-19).
- 1920 *Rigveda Brahmanas: The Aitareya and Kaṣṭaki Brāhmaṇas of the Rigveda.* Translated from the original Sanskrit. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. (*HOS* 25).

KELLENS, Jean

- 1984 *Le verbe avestique.* Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- 1995 *Liste du verbe avestique.* Wiesbaden: Reichert.

KELLENS, Jean & PIRART, Eric

- 1988-91 *Les textes vieil-avestiques.* Vol. 1: *Introduction, texte et traduction* (1988); vol. 2: *Repertoires grammaticaux et lexiques* (1988); vol. 3: *Commentaire* (1991). Wiesbaden: Reichert.

KELLER, Otto

- 1906 Die nasalpräsentia der arischen sprachen. *KZ* 39: 137-205.

KEYDANA, Götz

- 1997 *Absolute Konstruktionen in altindogermanischen Sprachen.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. (*HS*; *Ergänzungsheft* 40).

KEMMER, Suzanne

- 1993 *The middle voice.* Amsterdam: Benjamins. (*TSL* 23).
- 1994 Middle voice, transitivity, and the elaboration of events. In: Fox and Hopper (eds), 179-230.

KIEHNLE, Catharina

- 1979 *Vedisch ukṣ und ukṣ/vakṣ. Wortgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchungen.* Wiesbaden: Steiner. (*ANIS* 21).

KIPARSKY, Paul

- 1979 *Pāṇini as a variationist*. Ed. by S. D. Joshi. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press; Poona: Poona University Press. (*Current studies in linguistics*; 7).

KLAIMAN, Miriam H.

- 1991 *Grammatical voice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

KLAUS, Konrad

- 1986 *Die altindische Kosmologie. Nach den Brāhmaṇas dargestellt*. Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag. (*Indica et Tibetica*; 9).
- 1989 *Die Wasserfahrzeuge im vedischen Indien*. Stuttgart: Steiner. (AAWLM; Jg. 1989, Nr. 13).

KLEIN, Jared S.

- 1992 *On verbal accentuation in the Rigveda*. New Haven: American Oriental Society. (AOS; Essay No. 11).
- 2008 Adverbial Repetition in the Rigveda. In: Kulikov & Rusanov (eds), *Gs. Elizarenkova*, 167-182.

KLINGENSCHMITT, Gert

- 1982 *Das altarmenische Verbum*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

KNOBL, Werner

- 2004 The nonce formation: A more-than-momentary look at the *Augenblicksbildung*. In: Griffiths & Houben (eds), 261-283.
- 2007a Mind-reading the poet: Cases of intended metrical irregularity in Vedic poetry. *StII* 24: 105-139.
- 2007b Zwei Studien zum Wortschatz der Paippalāda-Saṃhitā. In: Griffiths & Schmiedchen (eds), 35-69.
- 2008 Conspicuous absence. A new case of intended metrical irregularity: The catalectic line RV 10.129.7b. In: Kulikov & Rusanov (eds), *Gs. Elizarenkova*, 183-195.

KÖHLER, Hans-Werbin

- 1973 *Śrad-dhā- in der vedischen und altbuddhistischen Literatur*. Wiesbaden: Steiner. (*Glasenapp-Stiftung*; 9).

KORNEEVA, Natalija A.

- 2007 *Viṣṇu-smṛiti. Perev. s sanskr., predislovie, komm. i prilozhenija* N.A. Korneevoj. Moskva: Vostočnaja literatura.

(PPV 132).

KORTLANDT, Frederik H. H.

1981 1st sg. middle *-H₂. *IF* 86: 123-136.

KOZIANKA, Maria

2000 Bemerkungen zum altindischen Passiv. In: Forssman & Plath (eds), 243-251.

KOZINSKY, Isaac & POLINSKY, Maria

1993 Causee and patient in the causative of transitive: Coding conflict or doubling of grammatical relations? In: Comrie & Polinsky (eds), 177-240.

KRETSCHMER, Paul

1892 Indogermanische accent- und lautstudien. *KZ* 31: 325-472.

KRICK, Hertha

1982 *Das Rutual der Feuergründung (Agyādheya)*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (*SbÖAW* 399; *VKSKS* 16).

KRISCH, Thomas

1996 *Zur Genese und Funktion der altindischen Perfekta mit langem Reduplikationsvokal*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. (*IBS* 87).

1999 Zur Reziprozität in altindogermanischen Sprachen. In: Eichner et al. (eds), *Gs. Schindler*, 273-297.

2006 *RIVELEX: Rigveda-Lexikon = RIVELEX: a Rigvedic lexicon*. Bd. 1 / Vol. 1. Graz: Leykam. (*Grazer vergleichende Arbeiten*; 20).

KUHN, Adalbert

1864 Indische und germanische segenssprüche. *KZ* 13: 49-74, 113-157.

KÜHN, Ingrid

1970 *Ṛgvedisch anvantitf-*. *MSS* 28: 89-107.

KUIPER, Franciscus B.J.

1934 Zur Geschichte der indoiranischen *s*-Präsentia. *AO* 12: 190-306.

1937 *Die indogermanischen Nasalpräsentia. Ein Versuch zu einer morphologischen Analyse*. Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-

-
- Hollandsche Uitgeversmaatschappij.
- 1939 Indoiranica. 20. Aw. *sā* 'wehren'. *AO* 17: 63-64. [= Sel.Wr., 219-220].
- 1947 Traces of laryngeals in Vedic Sanskrit. In: *India Antiqua. A volume of oriental studies presented ... to J.P. Vogel*. Leyden: Brill, 198-212.
- 1948 Vedic *sádhiṣ-* : *sadhástha-* and the laryngal Umlaut in Sanskrit. *AO* 20: 23-35.
- 1952 The three Sanskrit roots *añc-/añj-*. *Vāk* 2: 36-99. [= Sel.Wr., 221-283].
- 1955 Rigvedic loanwords. In: Otto Spies (ed.), *Studia Indologica. Festschrift für Willibald Kirfel zur Vollendung seines 70. Lebensjahres. (Bonner Orientalische Studien, N.S., 3)*. Bonn: Selbstverlag des Orientalischen Seminars, 137-185.
- 1958 Rigvedic *kīrín-* and *krīlī-*. In: *Turner Jubilee Volume I (IL 19)*. Poona: Linguistic Society of India, 349-362. [= Sel.Wr., 51-64].
- 1960 The ancient Aryan verbal contest. *IIJ* 4: 217-281.
- 1965 Rev. of: BRANDENSTEIN & MAYRHOFFER 1964. *IIJ* 8 (4): 298-308.
- 1974 *ví dayate* and *vidátha-*. *Indologica Taurinensia* 2 (1974 [1975]): 121-132. [= Sel.Wr., 406-417].
- 1979 *Varuṇa and vidūṣaka. On the origin of the Sanskrit drama*. Amsterdam: North-Holland. (VKNAWL 100).
- 1987 *Gopālaketikandrikā. A Kṛṣṇa-play by Rāmakṛṣṇa*. (Sanskrit text with notes). Amsterdam: North-Holland. (VKNAWL 134).
- 1991a *Aryans in the Rigveda*. Amsterdam: Rodopi. (LSIE 1).
- 1991b Rev. of: MITTWEDE 1989 [Textkr. zur KS]. *Kratylos* 36: 191-192.
- 1991c The new 'Mayrhofer'. Rev. of: MAYRHOFFER, EWAia I, Lfg. 1-4 (pp. 1-316). *IIJ* 34 (2): 105-120.
- 1997 [Sel.Wr.] *Selected writings*. Ed. by A. Lubotsky, M.S. Oort and M. Witzel. Amsterdam: Rodopi. (LSIE 8).
- KULIKOV, Leonid I.
- 1995 Vedijskie kauzativnye prezenty s nosovymi affiksami i ix tematičeskie varianty [Vedic causative presents with nasal

- affixes and their thematic variants]. In: Nikita V. Gurov & Yaroslav V. Vasil'kov (eds), *Sthāpakaśrāddham. Professor G.A. Zograph commemorative volume*. St. Petersburg: Peterburgskoe vostokovedenie, 94-115.
- 1997 Vedic *mriyāte* and other pseudo-passives: notes on an accent shift. In: Irén Hegedűs et al. (eds), *Indo-European, Nostratic, and Beyond: Festschrift for V. V. Shevoroshkin. (JIES monograph series; 22)*. Washington: Institute for the Study of Man, 198-205.
- 1998a Passive, anticausative and classification of verbs: The case of Vedic. In: Leonid Kulikov & Heinz Vater (eds), *Typology of verbal categories: Papers presented to Vladimir Nédjalkov on the occasion of his 70th birthday. (Linguistische Arbeiten; 382)*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 139-153.
- 1998b Vedic *-ya*-presents: semantics and the place of stress. In: Meid (ed.), *Sprache und Kultur der Indogermanen*, 341-350.
- 1999a May he prosper in offspring and wealth (A few jubilee remarks on the typology of labile verbs and Sanskrit *púṣyati* 'prosper; makes prosper'). In: Ekaterina V. Rakhilina & Yakov G. Testeleťs (eds), *Tipologija i teorija jazyka: Ot opisanija k ob"jasneniju. K 60-letiju A.E. Kibrika* [Typology and linguistic theory: From description to explanation. For the 60th birthday of Aleksandr E. Kibrik]. Moskva: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury, 224-244.
- 1999b Split causativity: remarks on correlations between transitivity, aspect, and tense. In: Werner Abraham & Leonid Kulikov (eds), *Tense-aspect, transitivity and causativity. Essays in honour of Vladimir Nédjalkov. (SLCS 50)*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1999, 21-42.
- 2000a Vedic causative nasal presents and their thematization: a functional approach. In: John Ch. Smith & Delia Bentley (eds), *Historical linguistics 1995. Selected papers from the 12th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Manchester, August 1995*. Vol. 1: *General issues and non-Germanic languages. (CILT 161)*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 191-209.
- 2000b The Vedic type *syāti* revisited. In: Forssman & Plath (eds), 267-283.

-
- 2000c RV 1.120.11: a note on the Vedic reflexive. In: Michaela Ofitsch & Christian Zinko (eds), *125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz. Festband anlässlich des 125jährigen Bestehens der Forschungsrichtung "Indogermanistik" an der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz. (Arbeiten aus der Abteilung 'Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft' Graz; 15)*. Graz: Leykam, 231-238.
- 2001 Between passive and reflexive: The Vedic presents with the suffix *-ya-*. In: Geart van der Meer & Alice G.B. ter Meulen (eds), *Making sense: from lexeme to discourse. In honor of Werner Abraham at the occasion of his retirement. (Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik (GAGL); 44)*. Groningen: Center for Language and Cognition, 13-20.
- 2002 Tipologičeskie zametki o morfoložičeskom reciproke v vedijskom sanskrite [Typological remarks on the reciprocal verbs in Vedic Sanskrit]. In: V. A. Plungian & A. Ju. Urmančieva (eds), *Jazyki mira. Tipologija. Uralistika. Pamjati T. Ždanovoj. Stat'i i vospominanija. [Languages of the world. Typology. Uralic studies. Memorial volume for T. Ždanova]*. Moscow: Indrik, 276-299.
- 2005a Length vacillation *-īy-/-iy-* and related phenomena in Vedic. In: Gerhard Meiser and Olav Hackstein (eds), *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel. Akten der XI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft. 17.-23. September 2000, Halle an der Saale*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 295-317.
- 2005b Rev. of: KUPFER 2002. *Kratylos* 50: 83-89.
- 2006a Passive and middle in Indo-European: Reconstructing the early Vedic passive paradigm. In: Werner Abraham & Larisa Leisiö (eds), *Passivization and typology: form and function. (TSL 68)*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 62-81.
- 2006b The Vedic medio-passive aorists, statives and their participles: Reconsidering the paradigm. In: Bertil Tikkannen and Heinrich Hettrich (eds), *Themes and Tasks in Old and Middle Indo-Aryan Linguistics. Papers of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference. Vol. 5*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 45-63.
- 2006c Skt. *vr̥dh₂* 'hurt, damage, cut'. *IndT* 32: 203-210.

-
- 2006d The Sanskrit -yet-optative: A formation not yet recorded in Sanskrit grammars. *WZKS* 50: 27-68.
- 2007a Reciprocal constructions in Vedic. In: Vladimir Nedjalkov et al. (eds), *Reciprocal constructions*. (TSL 71). Amsterdam: Benjamins, 709-738.
- 2007b The reflexive pronouns in Vedic: A diachronic and typological perspective. *Lingua* 117/8: 1412-1433.
- 2008 The Vedic causative *saṃkhyāpáyati* / *saṃkṣāpáyati* reconsidered. In: Kulikov & Rusanov (eds), *Gs. Elizarenkova*, 245-261.
- 2008 [2009] Rev. of: Griffiths & Schmiedchen (eds) 2007. *Acta Orientalia Vilnensia* 9 (1): 137-140.
- 2011a Voice typology. In: Jae Jung Song (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 368-398.
- 2011b Passive to anticausative through impersonalization: The case of Vedic and Indo-European verbs of perception and speech. In: Anna Siewierska & Andrej Malchukov (eds), *Impersonal constructions: a cross-linguistic perspective*. (SLCS 124). Amsterdam: Benjamins, 229-254.
- 2011c Rev. of: S. JAMISON 2007 [*The Rig Veda between two worlds*]. *IJJ* 54 (1): 79-98.
- in preparation *Atharvaveda* (Śaunaka). *Perevod s vedijskogo jazyka i kommentarii* L. I. Kulikova. T. 4: Knigi XIX.43-73 i XX (kuntāpa). Moskva: Vostočnaja literatura.
- KULIKOV, Leonid & RUSANOV, Maxim (eds)
- 2008 *Indologica. T. Ya. Elizarenkova Memorial Volume*. Pt I. Moscow: Izd-vo RGGU. (*Orientalia et Classica*; 20).
- KULKARNI, Ekanath Dattatreya
- 1942-43 Unpāṇinian forms and usages in the critical edition of the Mahābhārata. *BDCRI* 4: 227-245.
- KULONEN, Ulla-Maija
- 1989 *The passive in Ob-Ugrian*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- KÜMMEL, Martin
- 1996 *Stativ und Passivaorist im Indoiranischen*. Göttingen:

-
- Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. (*HS*; *Ergänzungsheft* 39).
- 2000 *Das Perfekt im Indoiranischen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- KUPFER, Katharina
- 2002 *Die Demonstrativpronomina im Rigveda*. Frankfurt am Main etc.: Peter Lang. (*Europäische Hochschulschriften*. Reihe XXI: *Linguistik*; 244).
- KURKE, Leslie
- 1989 Pouring prayers: a formula of IE sacral poetry? *JIES* 17 (1-2): 113-125.
- KURYLOWICZ, Jerzy
- 1927 Les effets du *a* en indo-iranien. *Prace Filologiczne* 11: 201-244.
- 1928 Le genre verbal en indo-iranien. *RO* 6: 199-209.
- 1931-32 Un archaïsme de la conjugaison indo-iranienne. *RO* 8: 94-101.
- 1935 *Études indoeuropéennes*. I. Kraków: Nakładem Polskiej Akademii umiejętności. (*Polska Akademia Umiejętności. Prace komisji językowej*, 21).
- 1949 Les racines *seṭ* et la loi rythmique *ī/ī*. *RO* 15: 1-24.
- ¹1952, ²1958 *L'accentuation des langues indo-européennes*. Kraków: Nakład Polskiej Akademii umiejętności. (*Polska Akademia Umiejętności. Prace komisji językowej*; 37).
- 1956 *L'apophonie en indo-européen*. Wrocław: Zakład Imienia Osolińskich – Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk. (*Polska Akademia Nauk. Prace Językoznawczy*; 9).
- 1964 *The inflectional categories of Indo-European*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- LANMAN, Charles R.
- 1920 The Sanskrit passive-stem. *JAOS* 40: 199.
- LEHMANN, Winfred P.
- 1974 *Proto-Indo-European syntax*. Austin – London: University of Texas Press.
- LESIMPLE, Emile
- 1948 *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*. Publiée et traduite par E. Lesimple. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve. (*Les Upanishad*; 9).

LEUMANN, Ernst

- 1892 Die accentuation des Çatapatha-Brähmaṇa. *KZ* 31: 22-51.
- 1902 Zur Geschichte der vierten Präsensklasse des Sanskrit. In: M. Erdmann (ed.), *Verhandlungen der sechsundvierzigsten Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner in Strassburg (Elsass), vom 1. bis 4. Oktober 1901*. Leipzig, 159-160. [= Kl.Schr., 453].
- 1998 *Kleine Schriften*. Stuttgart: Steiner. (Glasenapp-Stiftung; 37).

LEUMANN, Manu

- 1940 Zur Stammbildung der Verben im Indischen. *IF* 57: 205-238. [= Kl.Schr., 303-328].
- 1942 Idg. *sk* im Altindischen und Litauischen. *IF* 58: 1-26, 113-130. [= Kl.Schr., 328-359].
- 1959 *Kleine Schriften*. Zürich: Artemis.
- 1968a *u-* und *yu-*Adjektive des Altindischen. In: *Mélanges Renou*, 467-478.
- 1968b Zu den lautlichen Fernwirkungen im Altindischen. In: J.C. Heesterman et al. (eds), *Pratidānam: Indian, Iranian, and Indo-European studies presented to F.B.J. Kuiper on his sixtieth birthday*. (Janua linguarum: Series maior; 34). The Hague: Mouton, 53-59.

LEVIN, Beth

- 1993 *English verb classes and alternations*. Chicago etc.: University of Chicago Press.

LEVIN, Beth & RAPOPORT, Milka

- 1995 *Unaccusativity: at the syntax-lexical semantics interface*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

LIEBERT, Gösta

- 1949 *Das Nominalsuffix -ti- im Altindischen: ein Beitrag zur altindischen und vergleichenden Wortbildungslehre*. Lund: Håkan Ohlssons Boktryckeri.
- 1957 *Die indoeuropäischen Personalpronomina und die Laryngaltheorie. Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der Pronominalbildung*. Lund: Gleerup. (Lunds universitets årsskrift. N.F., Avd. 1, Bd. 52, Nr. 7).

LIEBICH, Bruno

- 1886 Die casuslehre der indischen grammatiker verglichen mit dem gebrauch der casus im Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa. (Ein beitrage zur syntax der sanskrit-sprache). *BB* 10: 205-234; 11: 273-315.
- 1891 *Panini. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntniss der indischen Literatur und Grammatik*. Leipzig: Haessel.

LINDEMAN, Fredrik Otto

- 1968 Bemerkungen zu den indogermanischen Langdiphthongen. *NTS* 22: 99-114.
- 1987 *Introduction to the 'Laryngeal Theory'*. Oslo: Norwegian University Press, The Institute for the Comparative research in Human Culture.

LINDENAU, Max

- 1925 Die Skambha-Hymnen des Atharvaveda. *ZII* 3: 235-279.
- 1926 Ein vedischer Lobgesang auf die Mutter Erde als die große Allgottheit (Atharvaveda XII, 1). In: Willibald Kirfel (ed.), *Beiträge zur Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte Indiens: Festgabe Hermann Jacobi zum 75. Geburtstag ...* Bonn: Klopp, 248-258.

LIV = *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*

- ²2001 *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*. Unter Leitung von Helmut RIX und der Mitarbeit vieler anderen bearbeitet von Martin KÜMMEL, Thomas ZEHNDER, Reiner LIPP, Brigitte SCHIRMER. 2., erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage, bearbeitet von Martin KÜMMEL und Helmut RIX. Wiesbaden: Reichert. [1st ed.: 1998]

LOMMEL, Herman

- 1955 *Gedichte des Rig-Veda*. Auswahl und Übersetzung von H. Lommel. München-Planegg: Otto Wilhelm Barth.

LORENTZ, Friedrich

- 1898 Zu den idg. *jo*-Präsentien. *IF* 8: 68-122.

LOWE, Ramesh Kumar

- 1987 *Language of the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*. Ghaziabad: Indo-Vision.

LUBOTSKY, Alexander M.

- 1983 On the external sandhis of the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā. *IJJ* 25: 167-179.
- 1985 The PIE word for 'dry'. *KZ* 98: 1-10.
- 1988 *The system of nominal accentuation in Sanskrit and Proto-Indo-European*. Leiden: Brill. (*Memoirs of the Kern Institute*; 4).
- 1989 The Vedic -āya-formations [Rev. of JAMISON 1983]. *IJJ* 32 (2): 89-113.
- 1995a Reflexes of intervocalic laryngeals in Sanskrit. In: Smoczyński (ed.), *Kuryłowicz Memorial Volume I*, 213-233.
- 1995b Sanskrit *h* < **dh*, *bh*. In: Nikita V. Gurov & Yaroslav V. Vasiľkov (eds), *Sthāpakaśrāddham. Professor G.A. Zograph commemorative volume*. St.Petersburg: Peterburgskoe vostokovedenie, 124-144.
- 1995c Vedic *samaha* 'verily'. *IJJ* 38 (3): 257-260.
- 1997a [RVWC] *A R̥gvedic word concordance*. 2 parts. New Haven: American Oriental Society. (AOS; 82).
- 1997b The Indo-Iranian reflexes of PIE **CRHUV*. In: A. Lubotsky (ed.), *Sound law and analogy. Papers in honor of Robert S.P. Beekes on the occasion of his 60th birthday*. (LSIE 9). Amsterdam: Rodopi, 139-154.
- 1997c Remarks on the Vedic intensive. [Review of: SCHAEFER 1994]. *JAOS* 117 (3): 558-564.
- 1997d Rev. of: VOLKART, Marianne. *Zu Brugmanns Gesetz im Altindischen*. Bern: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Bern, 1994. *Kratylos* 42: 55-59.
- 2000 The Vedic root *vr̥* 'to cover' and its present. In: Forssman & Plath (eds), 315-325.
- 2001 Reflexes of Proto-Indo-European **sk* in Indo-Iranian. *Incontri Linguistici* 24: 25-57.
- 2002 *Atharvaveda-Paippalāda. Kāṇḍa five. Text, translation, commentary*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. (HOS; *Opera Minora* 4).
- 2004 Avestan *siazd-*, Sanskrit *sedh-*, Latin *cedere*. In: A. Hyllested et al. (eds), *Per aspera ad asteriscos: Studia*

-
- Indogermanica in honorem Jens Elmegård Rasmussen sexagenarii Idibus Martiis anno MMIV (IBS 112).*
Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 322-332.
- 2007 PS 8.15. Offense against a Brahmin. In: Griffiths & Schmiedchen (eds), 23-33.
- 2011 The origin of Sanskrit roots of the type *sīv-* 'to sew', *dīv-* 'to play dice', with an appendix on Vedic *i*-perfects. In: Stephanie W. Jamison, H. Craig Melchert, and Brent Vine (eds), *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*. Bremen: Hempen, 105-126.
- LÜDERS, Heinrich
- 1929 Vedisch *śáma-*. KZ 56: 282-287. [= Phil.Ind., 591-595].
- 1935 Vedisch *heṣant*, *heṣa*, *heṣas*. AO 13: 81-127. [= Phil.Ind., 751-784].
- 1940 [Phil.Ind.] *Philologica Indica. Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. Ludwig Alsdorf ... Bd. I, II.
- 1945-49 Das Vidhurapaṇḍitajātaka. ZDMG 99: 103-130. [= Kl.Schr., 36-63].
- 1951 *Varuṇa*. Aus dem Nachlaß hrsg. von Ludwig Alsdorf. I. *Varuṇa und die Wasser*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- 1959 *Varuṇa*. Aus dem Nachlaß hrsg. von Ludwig Alsdorf. II. *Varuṇa und das Ṛta*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- 1973 *Kleine Schriften*. Wiesbaden: Steiner. (Glasenapp-Stiftung; 7).
- LUDWIG, Alfred
- 1876 *Der Rigveda oder die heiligen hymnen der Brâhmana*. Zum ersten male vollständig ins Deutsche übersetzt mit commentar und einleitung von A. Ludwig. Bd. I-II. Prag: F. Tempsky.
- 1878 *Der Rigveda oder die heiligen hymnen der Brâhmana*. Bd. III. *Die mantraliteratur und das alte Indien als einleitung zur uebersetzung des Rigveda*. Prag: F. Tempsky.
- 1881, 1883 *Der Rigveda oder die heiligen hymnen der Brâhmana*. Bd. IV-V. *Commentar zur Rigveda-übersetzung*. Prag: F.

-
- Tempisky (Bd. IV); Leipzig: G.Freytag (Bd. V).
- 1893 Ueber die neuesten arbeiten auf dem gebiete der Ṛgveda-forschung. *SBGW*, Jg. 1893, St. VI: 1-176.
- 1895 Der Nāsadaśīya-hymnus Rigveda X. 129. *SBGW*, Jg. 1895, St. XIV: 1-8.
- LÜHR, Rosemarie
- 1994 Zur Interdependenz der Methoden 'Funktionsbestimmung' und 'Rekonstruktion' – das Infinitivmorphem indoiran. *-d^hiāi. *MSS* 55: 69-97.
- LURAGHI, Silvia
- forthc. Basic valency orientation and the middle voice in Hittite. *Studies in language*.
- LYONS, John
- 1968 *Introduction to theoretical linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1979 Knowledge and truth: a localistic approach. In: D. J. Allerton et al. (eds), *Function and context in linguistic analysis: A festschrift for William Haas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 111-141.
- MACDONELL, Arthur Anthony
- MACDONELL = MACDONELL 1910
- 1910 *Vedic grammar*. Strassburg: Trübner. (*Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde*; Bd. I, Heft 4).
- 1917 *A Vedic reader for students*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- MALAMOUD, Charles
- 1972 Observations sur la notion de "reste" dans le brāhmanisme. *WZKS* 16: 5-26.
- 1977 *Le Svādhyāya. Récitation personnelle du Veda. Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka. Livre II. Texte traduit et commenté*. Paris: Boccard. (*PICI* 42).
- MANESSY, Jacqueline
- 1961 *Les substantifs en -as- dans la Ṛk-Saṃhitā. Contribution à l'étude de la morphologie védique*. Dakar: Université de Dakar, Faculté des lettres et sciences humaines. (*Publications de la section de langues et littératures*; 8).

MASICA, Colin P.

- 1976 *Defining a linguistic area: South Asia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

MATTHEWS, Peter H.

- 1997 *The concise Oxford dictionary of linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

MAURER, Walter H.

- 1995 Foreshadowings of transmigration in the Ṛgveda. In: Mirja Juntunen et al. (eds), *Sauhr̥dyamaṅgalam. Studies in honour of Siegfried Lienhard on his 70th birthday*. Stockholm: The Association of Oriental Studies, 207-213.

MAURY, Jacqueline

- 1943 *Mundaka Upanishad*. Publié et traduit par J. Maury. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve. (*Les Upanishad*; 4).

MAYRHOFER, Manfred

- 1956-80 [KEWA] *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. Bd. I-IV. Heidelberg: Winter.
- 1965a Hethitisches und arisches Lexikon. *IF* 70 (3): 245-257.
- 1965b *Sanskrit-Grammatik mir sprachvergleichenden Erläuterungen*. 2. Aufl. Berlin: de Gruyter. (*Sammlung Götschen*; 1158/1158a).
- 1966 Indoarisch *lubh-*: Homonymie oder semantische Vielfalt? *AO* 30 (*Iranian Studies presented to Kaj Barr*): 159-165. [= *Kl.Schr.*, 100-106].
- 1979 *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- 1986-1996 [EWAia] *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. Bd. I-II. Heidelberg: Winter.
- 2003 *Die Personennamen in der Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā. Sicheres und Zweifelhafes*. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (*SbBAW*; Jg. 2002, Heft 3).

MEHENDALE, Madhukar Anant

- 1955 About *viścakadrākarṣaṇ* in the Nirukta II. 3. *IL* 16 (*Suniti Kumar Chatterji jubilee volume*): 128-143.

MEID, Wolfgang (ed.)

- 1998 *Sprache und Kultur der Indogermanen. Akten der X.*

Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft. Innsbruck, 22.-28. September 1996. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. (IBS 93).

MEIER, Frz. Jos.

- 1931 Der Archaismus in der Sprache des Bhāgavata-Purāṇa mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Verbalflexion. *ZII* 8: 33-79.

MEILLET, Antoine

- 1898 Letto-slavica. *MSL* 10, 135-142.
 1900 Sur les suffixes verbaux secondaires en indo-européen. *MSL* 11: 297-323.
 1905-06 Observations sur le verbe latin. *MSL* 13: 350-375.
 1906-08 Les alternances vocaliques en vieux slave. *MSL* 14: 193-209, 332-390.
 1908-09 De l'accentuation de certains verbes en germanique commun. *MSL* 15: 349-352.
 1910-11 Traitement de \tilde{N} en indo-iranien. *MSL* 16: 67-68.
 1916 De quelques présents athématiques à vocalisme radical *o*. *MSL* 19: 181-192.
 1918 A propos du présent avestique *nāismī*. *MSL* 20: 210-212.
 1920 Sur le rythme quantitatif de la langue védique. *MSL* 21: 193-207.

MEISER, Gerhard

- 1993 Zur Funktion des Nasalpräsens im Urindogermanischen. In: Meiser (ed.), *Fs. H. Rix*, 280-313.

MEISER, Gerhard (ed.)

- 1993 *Indogermanica et Italica. Festschrift für Helmut Rix zum 65. Geburtstag*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. (IBS 72).

Mélanges d'Indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou ... Paris: Boccard. (PICI 28).

MEL'ČUK, Igor A.

- 1988 Semantic description of lexical units in an Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionary: basic principles and heuristic criteria. *International Journal of Lexicography* 1 (3): 165-188.

-
- 1993 The inflectional category of voice: towards a more rigorous definition. In: Comrie & Polinsky (eds), 1-46.
- 1994 *Cours de morphologie générale (théorique et descriptive)*. Vol. II/2: *Significations morphologiques*. Montréal: Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal.
- MESQUITA, Roque & WERBA, Chlodwig H. (eds)
- 1994 *Orbis Indicus. Gerhardo Oberhammer lustrum XIII. exigenti ab amicis discipulisque oblatus*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (WZKS 38).
- MEYER, Johann Jakob
- 1926 *Das altindische Buch vom Welt- und Staatsleben: das Arthaśāstra des Kauṭilya*. Aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt und mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen versehen von J.J. Meyer. Leipzig: Harrassowitz.
- 1939 Zusätze zur „Trilogie altindischer Mächte und Feste der Vegetation“. *WZKM* 46: 47-140.
- MICHAELS, Axel
- 1978 *Beweisverfahren in der vedischen Sakralgeometrie: ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte von Wissenschaft*. Wiesbaden: Steiner. (ANIS 20).
- 1983 *A comprehensive Śulvasūtra word index*. Wiesbaden: Steiner. (ANIS 24).
- MICHELSON, Truman
- 1904 Linguistic archaisms of the Rāmāyaṇa. *JAOS* 25 (1): 89-145.
- MIGRON, Saul
- 1975 The Rgvedic passive aorist in -i: a functional study. *Folia Linguistica* 8: 271-310.
- MILLER, D. Gary
- 1993 *Complex verb formation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. (CILT 95).
- MINARD, Armand
- 1949, 1956 *Trois énigmes sur les cent chemins. Recherches sur le Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa*. T. I, II. Paris: Boccard.
- 1963 Rev. of.: RENOU, EVP VIII-IX. *BSL* 58 (2): 57-65.
- 1964 Rev. of.: RENOU, EVP X-XI. *BSL* 59 (2): 48-56.
- 1965 Rev. of.: RENOU, EVP XII. *BSL* 60 (2): 22-27.

MINKOWSKI, Christopher Z.

- 1991 *Priesthood in Ancient India: A study of the Maitrāvaruṇa priest*. Vienna: Sammlung de Nobili. (Publications of the De Nobili Research Library; 18).

MITTWEDE, Martin

- 1986 [Textkr. zur MS] *Textkritische Bemerkungen zur Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā*. Stuttgart: Steiner. (ANIS 31).
 1989 [Textkr. zur KS] *Textkritische Bemerkungen zur Kāṭhaka-Saṃhitā*. Stuttgart: Steiner. (ANIS 37).

MODAK, B.R.

- 1993 *The ancillary literature of the Atharva-Veda: a study with special reference to the Pariśiṣṭas*. New Delhi: Rashtriya Veda Vidya Pratishthan.

MONIER-WILLIAMS, Monier

- 1899 *A Sanskrit-English dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

MORAVCSIK, Edith A.

- 1978 On the case marking of objects. In: Joseph H. Greenberg (ed.), *Universals of human language*. Vol. 4: *Syntax*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 249-289.

MORGENROTH, Wolfgang

- 1958 *Chāndogya-Upaniṣad...* → Bibl I: Texts
 1963 Die Sprache der Chāndogya-Upaniṣad. In: *History and culture of Ancient India* [Istorija i kul'tura drevnej Indii]. Moscow: Nauka, 223-234.
 1970 Die Lehre des Uddālaka Āruṇi. Ch.-Up. VI. Bemerkungen zur Textkritik und Interpretation. *ArOr* 38: 33-44.
 1980-81 Glossen in der Chāndogya-Upanishad. *IndT* 8-9 (*Dr. Ludwik Sternbach Commemoration volume*): 283-291.
 1984 Principles of text-construction and interpretation: some remarks on a new edition of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad under preparation. In: S. D. Joshi (ed.), *Amṛtadhārā. Professor R.N. Dandekar felicitation volume*. Delhi: Ajanta Publications, 493-499.
 1986 (ed.) *Sanskrit and world culture. Proceedings of the fourth World Sanskrit conference ...* Weimar, May 23-30, 1979. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag. (*Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des*

alten Orients; 18).

MÜLLER, Friedrich Max

- 1864 Einiges über das Passivum. *OuO* 2: 581-582.
 1879, 1884 *The Upanishads*, translated by F. M. Müller. Part 1-2.
 Oxford: Clarendon Press. (*SBE* 1, 15).
 1891 *Vedic hymns*, translated by F. M. Müller. Part I. *Hymns to the*
 Maruts, Rudra, Vāyu, and Vâta. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 (*SBE* 32).

MÜLLER, Reinhold F.G.

- 1952 *Manas und der Geist altindischer Medizin*. Leipzig: Johann
 Ambrosius Barth. (*Nova Acta Leopoldina. Abh. der*
 deutschen Akademie der Naturforscher (Leopoldina) zu
 Halle/Saale; 15, Nr. 108).

MURAKAWA, Akiko

- 2000 The *vyūḍha/avyūḍha/samūḍha* Daśarātra. *JIBS* 48 (2): 1152-
 1150 = (1)-(3).

MUUSSES, Martha Adriana

- 1920 *Koecultus bij de Hindoes*. Proefschrift. Purmerend:
 J. Muusses.

MYLIUS, Klaus

- 1968 Der *saṃsava*. *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-*
 Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg (Gesellschafts- und
 Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe). 17 (6): 117-137. [= Aufs.,
 38-70].
 1982 Acchāvākīya und Potra. Vergleich zweier vedischer
 Opferpriesterämter. *AoF* 9: 115-131. [= Aufs., 355-377].
 1994a *Āśvalāyana-Śrautasūtra. Erstmalig vollständig übersetzt,*
 erläutert und mit Indices versehen von K. Mylius. Wichtrach:
 Institut für Indologie. (*Texte und Übersetzungen*; 3).
 1994b The *janyabhayāpanodana*: a Vedic sacrificial rite. In: S. S.
 Bahulkar & Sucheta Paranjpe (eds), *Śruti-cintāmaṇi. Prof.*
 C. G. Kashikar felicitation volume. (Shri Balmukunda
 Sanskrit Mahavidyalaya Research Series; 9). Pune: Tilak
 Maharashtra Vidyapeeth, 90-98. [= Aufs., 436-444].
 1995 *Wörterbuch des altindischen Rituals. Mit einem Übersicht*
 über das altindische Opferritual und einem Plan der

- Opferstätte. Wichtrach: Institut für Indologie.
 2000 [Aufs.] *Das altindische Opfer: ausgewählte Aufsätze und Rezensionen; mit einem Nachtrag zum "Wörterbuch des altindischen Rituals"*. Wichtrach: Institut für Indologie.

NARTEN, Johanna

NARTEN = NARTEN 1964

- 1959 Formüberschneidungen bei ved. *vr̥śc*, *vr̥j*, *vr̥h* (*bṛh*). *MSS* 14 (= *Geburtstagsgabe für W. Wissmann*): 39-52. [= *Kl.Schr.* 1, 1-10].
- 1964 *Die sigmatischen Aoriste im Veda*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- 1965 Über die vedischen Belege von *m̐v*. *MSS* 18 (= *W. Wissmann zum 65. Geburtstag*): 53-60. [= *Kl.Schr.* 1, 44-49].
- 1968a Das altindische Verb in der Sprachwissenschaft. *Sprache* 14: 113-134. [= *Kl.Schr.* 1, 75-96].
- 1968b Zum 'proterodynamischen' Wurzelpräsens. In: J. C. Heesterman et al. (eds.) *Pratidānam: Indian, Iranian, and Indo-European studies presented to F. B. J. Kuiper on his sixtieth birthday*. The Hague: Mouton, 9-19. [= *Kl.Schr.* 1, 97-107].
- 1969a Ai. *sr̥* in synchronischer und diachronischer Sicht. *MSS* 26: 77-103. [= *Kl.Schr.* 1, 125-143].
- 1969b Griech. *πίμπλημι* und RV. *ápiprata*. In: *Studia classica et orientalia Antonio Pagliaro oblata III*. Roma: Herder editrice e libreria, 139-155. [= *Kl.Schr.* 1, 108-124].
- 1971 Vedisch *aghnyā-* und die Wasser. In: P. W. Pestman (ed.), *Acta Orientalica Neerlandica: Proceedings of the congress of the Dutch Oriental Society ...* Leiden: Brill, 120-134. [= *Kl.Schr.* 1, 175-189].
- 1981 Vedisch *lelāya* 'zittert'. *Sprache* 27: 1-21. [= *Kl.Schr.* 1, 233-253].
- 1982 Zu einem Optativ im *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa*. *MSS* 41: 127-137. [= *Kl.Schr.* 1, 254-262].
- 1985 Avestisch *frauuaš-*. *IJJ* 4: 35-48. [= *Kl.Schr.* 1, 283-296].
- 1986 *Der Yasna Haptaṇhāiti*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- 1987a Vedisch *dīdāya* 'leuchtet' und Zugehöriges. *StII* 13/14 (= *Fs. W. Rau*): 149-161. [= *Kl.Schr.* 1, 367-379].

-
- 1987b Ved. *śrīṇāti*, gr. κρείων, κρέων. *KZ* 100: 270-296. [= *Kl.Schr.* 1, 340-366].
- 1988-90 Die vedischen Verbalwurzeln *dambh* und *dabh*. *Sprache* 34: 142-157. [= *Kl.Schr.* 1, 380-395].
- 1993 Ved. *stanáyati*, gr. στένω etc.: idg. 'donnern' und 'stöhnen'. In: Meiser (ed.), *Festschrift H. Rix*, 314-339. [= *Kl.Schr.* 1, 396-421].
- 1995 *Kleine Schriften*. Bd. 1. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- NAVATHE, P.D.
- 1980 *Agnihotra of the Kaṭha Śākhā [Kāṭhaka Samhitā 6.1-9; 7.1-11]: with introduction, text, translation, and notes*. Pune: University of Poona. (*Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit; Class C*; 13).
- NEDJALKOV, Vladimir P.
- 1987 Načinatel'nost' i sredstva ee vyraženiya v jazykax raznyx tipov [Inchoativity and its expression in languages of different types]. In: A. V. Bondarko et al. (eds), *Teorija funkcional'noj grammatiki. Vvedenie. Aspektual'nost'. Vremennaja lokalizovannost'. Taksis*. Leningrad: Nauka, 180-195.
- 2002 Notes on the typology of principal types of inceptive predicates: three types of phasal inceptives (inchoatives, ingressives, initives); two non-phasal types (iteratives proper and adverbial iteratives). In: Wolfram Bublitz, Manfred von Roncador & Heinz Vater (eds), *Philologie, Typologie und Sprachstruktur: Festschrift für Winfried Boeder zum 65. Geburtstag*. Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang, 137-156.
- 2007 Overview of the research. Definitions of terms, framework, and related issues In: Vladimir P. Nedjalkov et al. (eds), *Reciprocal constructions*. (TSL 71). Amsterdam: Benjamins, 3-114.
- NEDJALKOV, Vladimir P. & SIL'NICKIJ, Georgij G.
- 1969 Tipologija morfoložičeskogo i leksičeskogo kauzativa. In: A. A. Xolodovič (ed.), *Tipologija kauzativnyx konstrukcij: Morfoložičeskij kauzativ*. Leningrad: Nauka, 20-50. [English transl.: The typology of morphological and lexical causatives. In: F. Kiefer (ed.), *Trends in Soviet theoretical linguistics*.

(*Foundations of language. Supplementary series*; 18).
Dordrecht: Reidel, 1-32].

NEGELEIN, Julius von

- 1898 *Zur Sprachgeschichte des Veda. Das Verbalsystem des Atharva-Veda sprachwissenschaftlich geordnet und dargestellt.* Berlin: Mayer & Müller.

NEISSER, Walter

- 1892 *Vedica. vahnī.* *BB* 18: 301-324. [= *Kl.Schr.*, 56-79].
- 1893 *Vedica.* *BB* 19: 120-150, 248-253, 284-292. [= *Kl.Schr.*, 80-125].
- 1894 *Vedica.* *BB* 20: 39-80. [= *Kl.Schr.*, 129-170].
- 1902 Ueber die Herausgabe einer altindischen Wurzelwörterbuches. *Jahresbericht des Schlesischen Gesellschaft für vaterländische Cultur* 80. IV. Abtheilung. *Orientalisch-sprachwissenschaftliche Section*, 3-14. [= *Kl.Schr.*, 171-182].
- 1906 *Indische miszellen.* *BB* 30: 299-325. [= *Kl.Schr.*, 215-241].
- 1924 [Zum Wb. des RV I] *Zum Wörterbuch des Ṛgveda.* Erstes Heft (*a – auśāna*). Leipzig: Brockhaus. (*AbhKM* 16/4).
- 1925 *Altindisch stāuti/stāve.* *ZII* 3: 187-200. [= *Kl.Schr.*, 259-272].
- 1928 Rev. of: OERTEL 1926 [*The syntax of cases ...*]. *ZII* 6: 319-326. [= *Kl.Schr.*, 294-301].
- 1930 [Zum Wb. des RV II] *Zum Wörterbuch des Ṛgveda.* Zweites Heft: A. *Nachträge zum ersten Heft.* B. *Die mit Guttural anlautenden Wörter.* Leipzig: Brockhaus. (*AbhKM* 17/3).
- 1932 Rev. of: THIEME 1929 [*Das Plusquamperfektum im Veda*]. *OLZ*, Jg. 35, Nr. 8/9: 600-605. [= *Kl.Schr.*, 302-305].
- 1980 *Kleine Schriften.* Stuttgart: Steiner. (*Glasenapp-Stiftung*; 21).

NEU, Erich

- 1968 *Das hethitische Mediopassiv und seine indogermanischen Grundlagen.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. (*Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten*; 6).

NOOTEN, Barend A. van & HOLLAND, Gary B.

- 1994 *Rig Veda: a metrically restored text with an introduction and notes.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. (*HOS* 50).

NUSSBAUM, Alan J.

- 1998 *Two studies in Greek and Homeric linguistics*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. (*Hypomnemata*; H. 120).

OBERHAMMER, Gerhard; PRETS, Ernst & PRANDSTETTER, Joachim

- 1996 *Terminologie der frühen philosophischen Scholastik in Indien: ein Begriffswörterbuch zur altindischen Dialektik, Erkenntnislehre und Methodologie*. Bd. 2: *U-Pū*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (*Denkschriften der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philos.-hist. Classe*; Bd. 248; *Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens*; 17).

OBERLIES, Thomas

- 1988 Die Śvetāśvatara-Upaniṣad: Eine Studie ihrer Gotteslehre. (Studien zu den "mittleren" Upaniṣads I). *WZKS* 32: 35-62.
- 1992a Idg. **pen-* 'sich abmühen' im Vedischen. *HS* 105: 16-17.
- 1992b Ved. *niṣkā* 'Brustschmuck': Studien zur Wortkunde des Kāṭhaka II. *HS* 105: 9-12.
- 1992c [1994] Zur Wortkunde des Kāṭhaka III. *MSS* 53: 117-131.
- 1995 Die Śvetāśvatara-Upaniṣad. Einleitung – Edition und Übersetzung von Adhyāya I. (Studien zu den "mittleren" Upaniṣads II – 1. Teil). *WZKS* 39: 61-102.
- 1996 Die Śvetāśvatara-Upaniṣad. Edition und Übersetzung von Adhyāya II-III. (Studien zu den "mittleren" Upaniṣads II – 2. Teil). *WZKS* 40: 123-160.
- 1998 Die Śvetāśvatara-Upaniṣad. Edition und Übersetzung von Adhyāya IV-VI. (Studien zu den "mittleren" Upaniṣads II – 3. Teil). *WZKS* 42: 77-138.
- 1999 *Die Religion des Ṛgveda*. Zweiter Teil: *Kompositionsanalyse der Soma-Hymnen des Ṛgveda*. Wien: Sammlung De Nobili. (*Publications of the De Nobili Research Library*; 27).
- 2000 Rev. of: LUBOTSKY 1997a [RVWC]. *IJJ* 43 (2): 139-154.
- 2003 *A Grammar of Epic Sanskrit*. Berlin – New York: de Gruyter. (*Indian Philology and South Asian Studies*; 5).

OERTEL, Hanns

- 1897 Contributions from the Jāiminīya Brāhmaṇa to the history of the Brāhmaṇa literature. [First series]. *JAOS* 18: 15-48.

- [= Kl.Schr. I, 28-61].
- 1898 Contributions from the Jāiminīya Brāhmaṇa to the history of the Brāhmaṇa literature. Second series. *JAOS* 19: 97-125. [= Kl.Schr. I, 62-90].
- 1899 [3rd ser.:] The Jaiminiya Brahmana version of the Dirghajihvi legend. In: *Actes du Onzième Congrès International des Orientalistes. Paris – 1897. Première Section: Langues et archéologie des pays ariens*. Paris: Leroux, 225-239. [= Kl.Schr. I, 91-105].
- 1902 Contributions from the Jāiminīya Brāhmaṇa to the history of the Brāhmaṇa literature. Fourth series. *JAOS* 23: 325-349. [= Kl.Schr. I, 106-130].
- 1905 Contributions from the Jāiminīya Brāhmaṇa to the history of the Brāhmaṇa literature. Fifth series. *JAOS* 26: 176-196; Additions to the fifth series. *Ibid.*, 306-314. [= Kl.Schr. I, 131-160].
- 1907 Contributions from the Jāiminīya Brāhmaṇa to the history of the Brāhmaṇa literature. Sixth series. *JAOS* 28: 81-98. [= Kl.Schr. I, 161-178].
- 1909 [7th ser.:] Contributions from the Jāiminīya Brāhmaṇa. *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Art and Sciences* 15: 155-216. [= Kl.Schr. I, 179-225].
- 1926 *The syntax of cases in the narrative and descriptive prose of the Brāhmaṇas. I. The disjunct use of cases*. Heidelberg: Winter. (*Indogermanische Bibliothek. I. Reihe: Grammatiken*; Bd. 18).
- 1927 Rev. of: ŚBK, ed. CALAND. *ZII* 5: 98-123. [= Kl.Schr. I, 557-582].
- 1931a Zu Caland's Übersetzung des Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra. [Rev. of: Caland 1921, 1924, 1928]. *ZII* 8: 281-299. [= Kl.Schr. I, 588-606].
- 1931c Rev. of: BLOOMFIELD & EDGERTON 1932 [Ved. Var. I: *The verb*]. *GGA*, Jg. 193, Nr. 6: 236-240. [= Kl.Schr. I, 611-615].
- 1934a *Zur Kapiṣṭhala-Kaṭha-Saṃhitā*. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (*SbBAW*, Jg. 1934, Heft 6). [= Kl.Schr. I, 633-772].
- 1934b Rev. of: BLOOMFIELD & EDGERTON 1932 [Ved. Var. II:

-
- Phonetics*]. *GGA*, Jg. 196, Nr. 5: 186-193. [= *Kl.Schr.* I, 616-623].
- 1934-35 Roots and verb-forms from the unpublished parts of the Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa. *JVS* I, No.2 (1934): 129-169; *JVS* II, No.2 (1935): 121-195. [= *Kl.Schr.* I, 290-404].
- 1937 *Zu den Kasusvariationen in der vedischen Prosa*. [Erster Teil]. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (*SbBAW*, Jg. 1937, Heft 8). [= *Kl.Schr.* II, 863-1012].
- 1938 *Zu den Kasusvariationen in der vedischen Prosa*. Zweiter Teil. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (*SbBAW*, Jg. 1938, Heft 6). [= *Kl.Schr.* II, 1013-1102].
- 1939a On some genitival constructions in Vedic prose. *NIA* 2: 649-657. [= *Kl.Schr.* I, 493-501].
- 1939b *Zu den Kasusvariationen in der vedischen Prosa*. Dritter Teil. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (*SbBAW*, Jg. 1939, Heft 6). [= *Kl.Schr.* II, 1103-1199].
- 1941 *Die Dativi finales abstrakter Nomina und andere Beispiele nominaler Satzfügung in der vedischen Prosa*. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (*SbBAW*, Jg. 1941, Bd. II, Heft 8). [= *Kl.Schr.* II, 1371-1500].
- 1942a *Euphemismen in der vedischen Prosa und euphemistische Varianten in den Mantras*. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (*SbBAW*, Jg. 1942, Heft 8). [= *Kl.Schr.* II, 1501-1548].
- 1942b Zu den ai. Ellipsen. *KZ* 67: 129-153. [= *Kl.Schr.* I, 502-526].
- 1944 Zu den ai. Ellipsen. *KZ* 68: 61-82. [= *Kl.Schr.* I, 530-551].
- 1994 *Kleine Schriften*. 2 Teile. Stuttgart: Steiner. (*Glasenapp-Stiftung*; 32).
- OETTINGER, Norbert
- 1976 Der indogermanische Stativ. *MSS* 34: 109-149.
- 1979 *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums*. Nürnberg: Hans Carl. (*Erlanger Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft*; 64).

- 1992 [1994] Zu den Verben auf vedisch *-anyá-* und hethitisch *-annīe-*. *MSS* 53: 133-154.

OGUIBENINE, Boris

- 1983 *bándhu* et *dákṣiṇā*. Deux termes védiques illustrant le rapport entre le signifiant et le signifié. *JA* 271: 263-275. [≈ Essais, Ch. 4, 121-130].
- 1984a Les correspondants de védique *yuj-* et *yóga* dans le vocabulaire et les thèmes poétiques indo-européens. *BSL* 79 (1): 131-153.
- 1984b Sur le terme *yóga*, le verbe *yuj-* et quelques-uns de leurs dérivés dans les hymnes védiques. *IJJ* 27 (2): 85-101. [≈ Essais, Ch. 6, 153-169].
- 1985 *Essais sur la culture védique et indo-européenne*. Pisa: Giardini editori e stampatori. (*Testi linguistici*; 5).
- 1988 *La déesse Uṣas: Recherches sur le sacrifice de la parole dans le Ṛgveda*. Louvain – Paris: Peeters. (*Bibliothèque de l'École des hautes études. Section des sciences religieuses*; 89).

OLDENBERG, Hermann

- 1886, 1892 *The Grihya-Sutras: rules of Vedic domestic ceremonies*. Translated by H. Oldenberg. Oxford: Clarendon press. (*SBE* 29, 30).
- 1890 Rev. of: PISCHEL & GELDNER 1889 [*VSt* I/2]. *GGA*, Jg. 1890, Nr. 10: 405-427. [= *Kl.Schr.* 3, 1912-1934].
- 1896 Rev. of: HENRY 1984 [*Les livres VIII et IX de l'Atharva-Véda*]. *IFAnz* 6: 178-185. [= *Kl.Schr.* 3, 1937-1944].
- 1897 *Vedic hymns*, translated by H. Oldenberg. Part II. *Hymns to Agni (maṇḍalas I-V)*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. (*SBE* 46).
- 1901 *Ṛgveda* 6,1-20. *ZDMG* 55: 267-330. [= *Kl.Schr.* 1, 726-789].
- 1903 *krāṇá-*, *krāṇā-* im *Ṛgveda*. In: *Album – Kern*, 33-36. [= *Kl.Schr.* 2, 1111-1114].
- 1909, 1912 [Noten] *Ṛgveda. Textkritische und exegetische Noten*. Bd. 1. *Erstes bis sechstes Buch*; Bd. 2. *Siebentes bis zehntes Buch*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. (*AbhGWG*; Bd. 11, Nr. 5; Bd. 13, Nr. 3).
- 1917 Vedische Untersuchungen. [2. Zu *Ṛgveda* 9,2,7]. *NGG* (1917

-
- [1918]): 17-20. [= Kl.Schr. 1, 335-338].
- 1918 Die vedischen Worte für "schön" und "Schönheit" und das vedische Schönheitsgefühl. *NGG* (1918): 35-71. [= Kl.Schr. 2, 830-866].
- 1967 *Kleine Schriften*. Teile 1, 2. Wiesbaden: Steiner. (*Glasenapp-Stiftung*; 1-2).
- 1993 *Kleine Schriften*. Teil 3. Stuttgart: Steiner. (*Glasenapp-Stiftung*; 34).
- OLIPHANT, Samuel G.
- 1912 Sanskrit *dhénā* = Avestan *daēnā* = Lithuanian *dainā*. *JAOS* 32: 393-413.
- OLIVELLE, Patrick
- 1992 *Samnyāsa Upaniṣads: Hindu scriptures on asceticism and renunciation*. Translated with introd. and notes by P. Olivelle. New York etc.: Oxford University Press.
- 1993 *The Āśrama system: the history and hermeneutics of a religious institution*. New York – Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 1998 *The early Upaniṣads*. Annotated text and translation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 2000 *Dharmasūtras: the law codes of Āpastamba, Gautama, Baudhāyana, and Vasiṣṭha*. Annotated text and translation. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- OLSEN, Birgit Anette
- 1993 Vedic and laryngeals. *irajyāti* and *iradhanta* – *badhnāti* and *ubhnāti*. In: Meiser (ed.), *Festschrift H. Rix*, 362-372.
- OORT, Marianne
- 1995 Surā and other spirits in ritual and non-ritual context. In: N. V. Gurov & Y. V. Vasil'kov (eds), *Sthāpakaśrāddham. Professor G. A. Zograph commemorative volume*. St. Petersburg: Peterburgskoe vostokovedenie, 221-231.
- OSTHOFF, Hermann
- 1880 Die tiefstufe im indogermanischen vocalismus. *MU* 4: 1-401.
- 1884 *Zur geschichte des perfects im indogermanischen mit besonderer rücksicht auf griechisch und lateinisch*. Strassburg: Trübner.

-
- 1910 Zur primären Komparativ- und Superlativbildung. *MU* 6: 70-302.
- OSTLER, Nicholas
 1979 *A theory of case and verb diathesis applied to Classical Sanskrit*. PhD diss. MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- PADUČEVA, Elena V.
 1998 Paradigma reguljarnoj mnogoznačnosti glagolov zvuka. *Vorposy jazykoznanija*, No. 5: 3-23.
- PARPOLA, Asko
 1967 On the Jaiminīyaśrautasūtra and its annexes. *Orientalia Suecana* 16: 181-181-214.
 1968-69 *The Śrautasūtras of Lāṭyāyana and Drāhyāyana and their commentaries*. An English translation and study. Vol. I, 1-2. Helsinki. (*Commentationes humanarum litterarum, Societas Scientiarum Fennica*; 43, Nr. 1-2).
 1973 Rev. of: KB, ed. SARMA. *OLZ*, Jg. 68, Nr. 11/12: 607-612.
- PATYAL, Hukam Chand
 1969 *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa. English translation with notes & introduction*. PhD thesis. University of Poona.
 1970a Remarks on the new edition of the Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa. *JOIB* 20 (2): 102-114.
 1970b Text-critical notes on the Vaitāna Śrauta Sūtra I-X. *ABORI* 51: 123-134.
 1973 Some remarkable verbal forms of the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa. *BDCRI* 33: 253-258.
 1994 Linguistic, syntactic and stylistic peculiarities of the Brāhmaṇas. In: S. S. Bahulkar & Sucheta Paranjpe (eds), *Śruti-cintāmaṇiḥ. Prof. C. G. Kashikar felicitation volume. (Shri Balmukunda Sanskrit Mahavidyalaya Research Series; 9)*. Pune: Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapeeth, 112-121.
- PERSSON, Per
 1912 *Beiträge zur indogermanischen Wortforschung*. 2 Teile. Uppsala: Akademiska Bokhandeln; Leipzig: Harrassowitz. (*Skrifter utgifna af K. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala*; 10:1-2).

PILLAI, P.K. Narayana

- 1958 *Non-Ṛgvedic mantras in the marriage ceremonies.*
Trivandrum: The Travancore Devaswom Board.

PINAULT, Georges-Jean

- 1985 Négation et comparaison en védique. *BSL* 80 (1): 103-144.
1987-88 Védique *jírvi-/jívri-*. *IndT* 14: 313-338.
1989 Reflets dialectaux en védiques ancien. In: Caillat (ed.), 35-96.
1992 Rev. of: JAMISON 1991a [*The ravenous hyenas ...*]. *BEI* 10: 317-324.
1995-96 Distribution des particules comparatives dans la Ṛk-Saṃhitā. *BEI* 13-14: 307-367.
2004 On the usages of the particle *iva* in the Ṛgvedic hymns. In: Griffiths & Houben (eds), 285-306.
2010 Pudenda Vedica. In: Klaus Karttunen (ed.), *Anantaṃ śāstram. Indological and Linguistic Studies in Honour of Bertil Tikkanen (SO 108)*. Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society, 133-147.

PISCHEL, Richard

- 1903 Atharvaveda 7, 106. In: *Album – Kern*, 115-117.

PISCHEL, Richard & GELDNER, Karl F.

- 1889, 1897, 1901 [VSt] *Vedische Studien*. Bd. I-III. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.

PLATH, Robert

- 2000 Zur Etymologie der altindoarischen Wurzel *TOJ*. In: Forssman & Plath (eds), 409-423.

POSTAL, Paul M.

- 1974 *On raising: One rule of English grammar and its theoretical implications*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. (*Current studies in linguistics*; 5).

POTT, August F.

- 1867 *Etymologische Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der Indo-Germanischen Sprachen*. Th. II, Abth. 2. *Wurzeln mit vokalischem Ausgange*. Detmold: Meyer.

PRAUST, Karl

- 2000a Altindisch *dr̥-/dṛ̥-*: *seṭ* oder *aniṭ*? In: FORSSMAN & PLATH

- (eds), 425-441.
- 2000b *Studien zum indogermanischen Verbum*. PhD diss. Universität Münster.
- RADHAKRISHNAN, Sarvepalli et al. (eds)
- 1957 *Felicitation volume presented to Professor Sripad Krishna Belvalkar*. Banaras: Motilal Banarasi Dass.
- RAGHU VIRA & Lokesh Chandra
- 1955 Studies in the Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa (Book I). In: Otto Spies (ed.), *Studia Indologica. Festschrift für Willibald Kirfel zur Vollendung seines 70. Lebensjahres. (Bonner Orientalische Studien, N.S., 3)*. Bonn: Selbstverlag des Orientalischen Seminars, 255-276. [= *AO* 22 (1-2), 55-74].
- RANADE, H. G.
- 1981 A propos of the "Relationship of Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra with the Kāṇva tradition". *IIJ* 23: 97-103.
- RASMUSSEN, Jens E.
- 1987 Miscellaneous morphological problems in Indo-European languages IV. *Arbejdspapirer udsendt af Institut for Lingvistik, Københavns Universitet (APILKU)* 6: 145-156. [= RASMUSSEN 1999: 302-311].
- 1989 *Studien zur Morphophonemik der indogermanischen Grundsprache*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. (*IBS* 55).
- 1993 The Slavic *i*-verbs with an excursus of the Indo-European *ē*-verbs. In: Bela Brogyanyi & Reiner Lipp (eds), *Comparative-historical linguistics: Indo-European and Finno-Ugric. Papers in honor of Oswald Szemerényi. III. (CILT 97)*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 475-487.
- 1999 *Selected papers on Indo-European linguistics. With a section on comparative Eskimo linguistics*. Vols. 1-2. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press. (*Copenhagen Studies in Indo-European*; 1-2).
- RAU, Wilhelm
- 1957 *Staat und Gesellschaft im alten Indien nach den Brāhmaṇa-Texten dargestellt*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- 1964 Versuch einer deutschen Übersetzung der Śvetāśvatara-

-
- Upaniṣad. *AsSt* 17 (1-2): 25-46.
- 1965 Versuch einer deutschen Übersetzung der Muṇḍaka-Upaniṣad. *AsSt* 18-19: 216-226.
- 1971a Versuch einer deutschen Übersetzung der Kāṭhaka-Upaniṣad. *AsSt* 25: 158-174.
- 1971b *Weben und Flechten im vedischen Indien*. Wiesbaden: Steiner. (AAWLM; Jg. 1970, Nr. 11).
- 1972 *Töpferei und Tongeschirr im vedischen Indien*. Wiesbaden: Steiner. (AAWLM; Jg. 1972, Nr. 10).
- 1973 [1974] *Metalle und Metallgeräte im vedischen Indien*. Wiesbaden: Steiner. (AAWLM; Jg. 1973, Nr. 8).
- 1976 *The meaning of pur in Vedic literature*. München: Fink. (*Abhandlungen der Marburger Gelehrten Gesellschaft*; Jg. 1973, Nr. 1).
- 1977 Vedische Lebensweisheit. In: Herbert Härtel (ed.), *Beiträge zur Indienforschung. Ernst Waldschmidt zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet. (Veröffentlichungen des Museums für Indische Kunst; 4)*. Berlin: Museum für Indische Kunst, 345-352.
- 1983 *Zur vedischen Altertumskunde*. Wiesbaden: Steiner. (AAWLM; Jg. 1983, Nr. 1).
- 1985 *Die vedischen Zitate im Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya*. Wiesbaden: Steiner. (AAWLM; Jg. 1985, Nr. 4).
- 1993 *Die vedischen Zitate in der Kāśikā Vṛtti*. Wiesbaden: Steiner. (AAWLM; Jg. 1993, Nr. 5).
- REGNAUD, Paul
- 1898 *Études védiques et post-védiques*. Paris: Leroux; Lyon: A.Rey. (*Annales de l'Université de Lyon*; 38).
- REICHELT, Hans
- 1902 Beiträge zur geschichte der indogermanischen konjugation. *BB* 27: 63-105.
- RENOU, Louis
- 1924 Védique *vāvr̥dhé*, *vāvr̥dhūḥ*. *BSL* 24: 185-188.
- 1925 *La valeur du parfait dans les hymnes védiques*. Paris: Champion. (*Collection linguistique*; 18).
- 1930 [GrS] *Grammaire sanscrite*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve. (2^{me} éd. revue, corrigée et augmentée: 1960).

-
- 1933a La séparation du préverbe et du verbe en védique. *BSL* 34: 49-96.
- 1933b Rev. of: KpS, ed. RAGHU VIRA. *JA* 223, Fasc. annexe: (85)-(92).
- 1936 *Études de grammaire sanscrite. I^e série*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- 1937a *Monographies sanscrites. I. La décadence et disparition du subjonctif*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- 1937b *Monographies sanscrites. II. Le suffixe -tu- et la constitution des infinitifs*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- 1938 [HP] *Hymnes et prières du Veda. Textes traduits du sanskrit*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- 1939a L'ambiguïté du vocabulaire du Ṛgveda. *JA* 231: 161-235. [= Choix I, 43-117].
- 1939b Les éléments védiques dans le vocabulaire du sanskrit classique. *JA* 231: 321-404. [= Choix I, 157-240].
- 1941 Rev. of: OERTEL 1938. [*Zu den Kasusvariationen in der vedischen Prosa. 2. Teil*]. *OLZ*, Jg. 44, Nr. 11/12: 484-486.
- 1941-42 Les connexions entre le rituel et la grammaire en sanskrit. *JA* 233: 105-165. [= Choix I, 311-371].
- 1942 [PR] *La poésie religieuse de l'Inde antique*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- 1943 *Kena Upanishad. Publié et traduit par L. Renou*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve. (*Les Upanishad*; 3).
- 1947a [AS] *Anthologie sanscrite. Textes de l'Inde ancienne traduits du sanskrit*. Paris: Payot.
- 1947b *Les écoles védiques et la formation du Veda*. Paris: Imprimerie nationale. (*Cahiers de la Société Asiatique*; 9).
- 1948 *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad. Publiée et traduite par L. Renou*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve. (*Les Upanishad*; 6).
- 1949 Rev. of: LIEBERT 1949 [*Das Nominalsuffix -ti- im Altindischen*]. *BSL* 45 (2): 60-64.
- 1951 Sur quelques formations sanscrites en -ti-. *Vāk* 1: 1-4.
- 1952a Études védiques. 1. Les versets du Sāmaveda d'origine non ṛgvédique. *JA* 240: 233-241.
- 1952b [GrV] *Grammaire de la langue védique*. Lyon: IAC.

-
- 1952c List of word and forms in the Sāmaveda. *Vāk* 2: 100-116.
- 1953 Études védiques. 3. Quelques termes du Ṛgveda. *JA* 241: 167-183.
- 1954a Notes on Ṛgvedic grammar. *JOIB* 3 (4): 380-390.
- 1954b *Vocabulaire du rituel védique*. Paris: Klincksieck. (*Collection de vocabulaires techniques du sanskrit*, I).
- 1954c Word and word-forms particular to the Kāṇvasaṃhitā. *Vāk* 4: 131-136.
- 1955a Études védiques. 5. Atharva-Vēda et rituel. *JA* 243: 417-438.
- 1955b Remarques sur la Chandogya-Upaniṣad. *EVP* 1: 91-102.
- 1955-69 [EVP] *Études védiques et pāṇinéennes*. Vol. 1-17. Paris: Boccard. (*PICI* 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 26, 27, 30).
- 1956 [HS] *Hymnes spéculatifs du Véda traduits du sanskrit et annotés*. Paris: Gallimard/Unesco.
- 1957a Linguistic remarks on the Paippalādā version of the Atharvaveda. In: Radhakrishnan et al. (eds), *Belvalkar Felicitation volume*, 63-71.
- 1957b List of remarkable words from the Kashmirian (Paippalādā) version of the Atharva Veda (according to L. C. Barret's edition). *Vāk* 5: 74-108.
- 1957c On the internal expansion of Ṛgvedic formulae. *Vāk* 5: 118-124. [= Choix II, 756-762].
- 1957d Remarkable words from Bāṣkala, Chāgaleya, Ārṣeya and Śaunaka Upanishads. *Vāk* 5: 125-131.
- 1958 *Études sur le vocabulaire du Rgveda*. Première série. Pondichéry: Institut français d'indologie. (*PIFI*; 5).
- 1959a *Chāgaleya Upaniṣad*. Publiée et traduite par L. Renou. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve. (*Les Upanishad*; 17).
- 1959b Sur la structure du kāvya. *JA* 247: 1-114. [= Choix II, 631-744].
- 1964a Notes sur la version "paippalāda" de l'Atharva-Veda (première série). *JA* 252: 421-450.
- 1964b Védique *sādh-*, *khād* et *śās-*. In: *Indo-Iranica. Mélanges présentés à Georg Morgenstierne à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz,

- 163-167.
- 1965 Notes sur la version "paippalāda" de l'Atharva-Veda (deuxième série). *JA* 253: 15-42.
- 1997 *Choix d'études indiennes*. Réunies par N. Balbir et G.-J. Pinault. T. I-II. Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient. (*Réimpressions*; 9).
- RIFKIN, Jeremy
- 1989 *Entropy: into the greenhouse world*. New York etc.: Bantam books.
- RIX, Helmut
- 1985 Das letzte Wort der Duenos-Inschrift. *MSS* 46 (*Festgabe K. Hoffmann III*): 193-220.
- RODHE, Sten
- 1946 *Deliver us from evil. Studies on the Vedic ideas of salvation*. Lund: Håkan Ohlssons boktryckeri. (*Skrifter utgivna av Svenska sällskapet för missionsforskning*; 2).
- RÖER, E.
- 1853 *The Taittirīya, Aitarēya, Śvétāśvatara, Kēna, Íśa, Kaṭha, Praśna, Muṇḍaka and Maṇḍukya Upanishads. Translated from original Sanscrit by E. Röer*. Calcutta: T.J. Marthus, Bishop's College Press, 1853. (*B.Ind.* 15; Nos. 41 & 50).
- ROESLER, Ulrike
- 1997 *Licht und Leuchten im R̥gveda. Untersuchungen zum Wortfeld des Leuchtens und zur Bedeutung des Lichts*. Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag. (*Indica et Tibetica*; 32).
- ROLLAND, Pierre
- 1971 *Un rituel domestique védique. Le Vārāhagṛhyasūtra*. Aix-en-Provence: Ophrys.
- 1973 *Le Mahāvraata : Contribution à l'étude d'un rituel solennel védique*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. (*Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. I. Philol.-Hist. Klasse*; Jg. 1973, Nr. 3).
- ROMANOV, Vladimir Nikolaevič
- 2009 *Śatapatha-brahmana: kniga I; kniga X (fragment). Perevod, vstupil'naja stat'ja i primechanija* V. N. Romanova

-
- [Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa: Book I; book X (a selection). Translation, introduction and comm. by V. N. Romanov]. Moskva: Vostočnaja literatura.
- 2010 *Śatapatha-brahmana: kniga X. Perevod, vstupitel'naja stat'ja i primečanija* V. N. Romanova [Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa: Book X. Translation, introduction and comm. by V. N. Romanov]. Moskva: Vostočnaja literatura.
- RÖNNOW, Kasten
- 1927 *Trita Āptya: eine vedische Gottheit*. Inauguraldiss. Uppsala: A.-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln. (*Uppsala universitets årsskrift. Filosofi, språkvetenskap och historiska vetenskaper* 1927; 5).
- 1929 Zur Erklärung des Pravargya, des Agnicayana und der Sautrāmaṇī. *MO* 23: 113-173.
- 1932-33 Ved. *kratu-*. Eine wortgeschichtliche Untersuchung. *MO* 26-27: 1-90.
- RONZITTI, Rosa
- 2001 *Campi figurati della "Creazione" nel Ṛgveda*. Alessandria: Ed. dell'Orso. (*Collana del Dipartimento di Scienze Glottoetnologiche dell'Università degli Studi di Genova*; 6).
- ROSEN, Carol G.
- 1984 The interface between semantic roles and initial grammatical relations. In: D. M. Perlmutter & C. G. Rosen (eds), *Studies in Relational Grammar*. Vol. 2. Chicago and London: Chicago University Press, 38-77.
- ROTH, Rudolf
- 1882 Der Adler mit dem Soma. *ZDMG* 36: 353-360. [= Kl.Schr., 555-562].
- 1994 *Kleine Schriften*. Stuttgart: Steiner. (*Glasenapp-Stiftung*; 36).
- SAKAMOTO-GOTŌ, Junko
- 1985 Das Verbaladjektiv von *dhmā* im Mittelindischen. *MSS* 46 (*Festgabe K. Hoffmann I*): 171-189.
- 2000a Das Jenseits und iṣṭā-pūrtā- "die Wirkung des Geopferten- und-Geschenkten" in der vedischen Religion. In: Forssman & Plath (eds), 475-490.
- 2000b *kathām-katham agnihotrām juhutha* – Janakas Trickfrage in

- 2009 ŚB XI 6,2,1. In: Hintze & Tichy (eds), *Fs. Narten*, 231-252.
 Zum präteritalen Optativ im Alt- und Mittelindoarischen. In: Xavier Tremblay & Eric Pirart (eds), *Zarathushtra entre l'Inde et l'Iran. Études indo-iraniennes et indo-européennes offertes à Jean Kellens à l'occasion de son 65^e anniversaire*. (Beiträge zur Iranistik; 30). Wiesbaden: Reichert, 255-273.
- SALOMON, Richard
 1981 A linguistic analysis of the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad. WZKS 25: 91-105.
 1986 The Viṣṇu Purāṇa as a specimen of Vernacular Sanskrit. WZKS 30: 39-56.
 1991 A linguistic analysis of the Praśna Upaniṣad. WZKS 35: 47-74.
- SAMOVANCEV, Andrej M.
 1994 *Kniga mudreca Jadžnavalk'i* [The book of the sage Yājñavalkya]. Moskva: Vostočnaja literatura.
- SANI, Saverio
 2000 *Ṛgveda. Le strofe della sapienza*. Venezia: Marsilio.
- SANTUCCI, James A.
 1982 The relationship of \sqrt{rj} and \sqrt{srj} in the veda. In: T. N. Dharmadhikari (ed.), *Golden Jubilee volume*. Poona: Vaidika Saṃśodhanā maṇḍala, 241-254.
- SATYA VRAT
 1964 *The Rāmāyaṇa – a linguistic study*. Delhi: Munshi Ram Manohar Lal.
- SAUSSURE, Ferdinand de
 1877 Sur une classe de verbes latins en *-eo*. MSL 3: 279-295. [= Rec., 353-369].
 1879 *Mémoire sur le système primitif des voyelles dans les langues indo-européennes*. Leipsick: Teubner. [= Rec., 1-268].
 1922 [= Rec.] *Recueil des publications scientifiques*. Genève: Société Anonyme des Éditions Sonor.
- SCARLATA, Salvatore
 1999 *Die Wurzelkomposita im Ṛg-Veda*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- SCHAEFER, Christiane
 1994 *Das Intensivum im Vedischen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck &

Ruprecht. (*HS*; Ergänzungsheft 37).

SCHEFTELOWITZ, Isidor

- 1907 Zur Textkritik und Lautlehre des Ṛgveda. *WZKM* 21: 85-142.
- 1912 *Das Schlingen und Netzmotiv im Glauben und Brauch der Völker*. Gießen: A. Töpelmann. (*Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten*; 12 (2)).
- 1913/14 Das Schicksal der indogermanischen Lautgruppe *zg*. *IF* 33: 133-169.
- 1919 Die Nividas und Praiṣās, die ältesten vedischen Prosatexte. *ZDMG* 73: 30-50.
- 1925 Ein urindische Liquidengesetz. *KZ* 53: 248-269.

SCHINDLER, Jochem

- 1977 Notizen zum Sieversschen Gesetz [Rev. of: SEEBOLD 1972]. *Sprache* 23 (1): 56-65.

SCHLEICHER, August

- ⁴1876 *Compendium der vergleichenden grammatik der indogermanischen sprachen*. Weimar: Böhlau.

SCHLERATH, Bernfried

- 1975 Vedisch *vájra*- «die Keule des Indra». *Orbis* 24 (2): 493-518. [= Kl.Schr. 2, 528-555].
- 1980 Indo-iranisch **var*- «wählen». *StII* 5/6: 199-208. [= Kl.Schr. 2, 564-574].
- 1997 Metallgegenstände in vedischer Zeit. In: *Χρόνος. Beiträge zur prähistorischen Archäologie zwischen Nord- und Süfosteuroopa. Festschrift für Bernard Hänsel*. Espelkamp: Marie Leidorf, 819-827. [= Kl.Schr. 2, 564-574].
- 2000 *Kleine Schriften*. 2 Bände. Dettelbach: J.H. Röhl.

SCHMID, Wolfgang P.

- 1955 *Untersuchungen zur Stellung der Nasalpraesentia im indo-iranschen Verbalsystem*. Diss. Tübingen.
- 1956 Vedisch *ímahe* und Verwandtes. *IF* 62: 219-239.
- 1959 Die Kuh auf der Weide. *IF* 64: 1-12. [= Ausg.Schr., 3-14].
- 1963 *Studien zum baltischen und indogermanischen Verbum*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- 1994 [Ausg.Schr.] *Linguisticae scientiae collectanea: ausgewählte*

Schriften. Berlin – New York: de Gruyter.

SCHMIDT, Hanns-Peter

- 1958 *Vedisch vrata und awestisch urvata*. Hamburg: Cram, de Gruyter. (ANIS 9).
- 1963a *aghnya-*. KZ 78: 1-46.
- 1963b Die Kobra im R̥gveda. KZ 78: 296-304.
- 1968 *Bṛhaspati und Indra. Untersuchungen zur vedischen Mythologie und Kulturgeschichte*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- 1973 *Vedic pāthas*. IJ 15: 1-39.
- 1996 The Plight of Ghoṣā. In: Hanns-Peter Schmidt & Albrecht Wezler (eds), *Veda-Vyākaraṇa-Vyākhyāna. Festschrift Paul Thieme zum 90. Geburtstag*. (StII 20). Reinbek: Wezler, 169-186.

SCHMIDT, Johannes

- 1871, 1875 *Zur Geschichte des Indogermanischen Vocalismus*. I-II. Weimar: Böhlau.

SCHMIDT, Karl Horst

- 1964 Rev. of: SCHMID 1963 [*Studien zum baltischen und indogermanischen Verbum*]. *Kratylos* 9: 148-151.

SCHMITT, Rüdiger

- 1971 Die Bedeutung des Sakischen für Indogermanistik und Indo-Iranistik. Zu einem neuen Buch von R.E. Emmerick. [Rev. of EMMERICK 1968]. *Sprache* 17: 50-60.

SCHNEIDER, Ulrich

- 1963-64 Die Komposition der Aitareya-Upaniṣad. IJ 7: 58-69.
- 1971 *Der Somaraub des Manu. Mythos und Ritual*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. (FBI 4).

SCHRADER, Otto

- 1931 Rev. of: HAUER 1931 [Übers. ŚvetU]. *OLZ*, Jg. 34, Nr. 9/10: 884-887.

SCHRAPEL, Dieter

- 1970 *Untersuchung der Partikel iva und anderer lexikalisch-syntactischer Probleme der vedischen Prosa nebst zahlreichen Textemendationen und der kritischen Übersetzung von Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa* 2,371-373

(*Gavāmāyana I*). PhD Diss. Marburg an der Lahn.

SCHROEDER, Leopold von

- 1879 Ueber die Mâytrayani Saṃhitā, ihr Alter, ihr Verhältniss zu den verwandten Çâkhâ's, ihre sprachliche und historische Bedeutung. *ZDMG* 33: 177-207.
- 1883-84 Rev. of: ĀpŚS, ed. GARBE. *LBOP* 1: 2-11.
- 1896 Einiges über das Kāṭhakam. In: *Festgabe Weber*, 5-8.
- 1909 Göttertanz und Weltentstehung. *WZKM* 23: 1-17.

SCHULZE, Wilhelm

- 1885 Indogermanische *āi*-wurzeln. *KZ* 27: 420-429. [= Kl.Schr., 49-56].
- 1888 Miscellen. *KZ* 29: 255-271. [= Kl.Schr., 363 etc.].
- 1912 Zwei lautgeschichtliche Fragen. *SbPAW* 33 (1): 581. [= Kl.Schr., 59-60].
- 1966 *Kleine Schriften*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

SEEBOLD, Elmar

- 1972 *Das System der indogermanischen Halbvokale: Untersuchungen zum sogenannten 'Sieversschen Gesetz' und zu den halbvokalhaltigen Suffixen in den indogermanischen Sprachen, besonders im Vedischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.

SEN, Chitrabhanu

- 1978 *A dictionary of the Vedic rituals. Based on the Śrauta and Gṛhya Sūtras*. Delhi: Concept Publishing Company.

SEN, Nilmadhav

- 1949 The secondary conjugations in the Rāmāyaṇa. *Poona Orientalist* 14: 89-106.
- 1951-52 A comparative study in some linguistic aspects of the different recensions of the Rāmāyaṇa. *JOIB* 1: 119-129.
- 1953 Some epic verbal forms in the Rāmāyaṇa. *JOIB* 3: 152-163.
- 1975 Some remarkable words and verb-forms from the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka. *BDCRI* 35 (1-2): 145-153.

SEN, Sukumar

- 1927, 1928, 1929 The use of the cases in Vedic prose. *ABORI* 8: 347-378; 9: 33-48, 91-170; 10: 45-76, 219-234.

-
- SERBAT, Guy
 1975 *Les structures du latin*. Paris: Picard.
- SGALL, Petr
 1958 *Die Infinitive im Ṛgveda*. Praha: Universita Karlova. (*Acta Universitatis Carolinae. Philologica*; II).
- SHARMA, Aryendra
 1959/60 *Beiträge zur vedischen Lexicographie: Neue Wörter in M. Bloomfields Vedic Concordance*. München: J. Kizinger. (*PHMA* 5/6).
- SHEFTS, Betty
 1961 *Grammatical method in Pāṇini: His treatment of Sanskrit present stems*. New Haven: American Oriental Society. (AOS; Essay 1).
- SHOPEN, Timothy (ed.)
 1985 *Language typology and syntactic description*. Vol. III: *Grammatical categories and the lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SHORTT, John
 1876 *A manual of Indian cattle and sheep*. Madras: Higginbotham and Co.
- SIEG, Emil
 1902 *Die Sagenstoffe des Ṛgveda und die indische Itihâsatradition*. I. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.
 1923 Der Nachtweg der Sonne nach der vedischen Anschauung. *NGG* (1923): 1-23. [= Kl.Schr., 324-346].
 1928 Sonnenrennen im Ṛgveda. *NGG* (1928): 195-213. [= Kl.Schr., 394-412].
 1991 *Kleine Schriften*. Stuttgart: Steiner. (*Glasenapp-Stiftung*; 31).
- SIEWIERSKA, Anna
 1984 *The passive: A comparative linguistic analysis*. London: Croom Helm.
- SIHLER, Andrew L.
 1995 *New comparative grammar of Greek and Latin*. New York – Oxford: Oxford University Press.

-
- SIL, S. C.
 1958 A list of the verb forms in the critical edition of the Ādiparvan of the Mahābhārata. *JOIB* 7 (3): 202-213.
- SILBURN, Alette
 1948 *Śvetāśvatara-Upaniṣad*. Publiée et traduite par A. Silburn. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve. (*Les Upanishad*; 7).
- SIMON, Richard
 1912 [Index verborum zu KS] *Index verborum zu Leopold von Schroeder's Kāṭhakam-Ausgabe*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- SIMSON, Georg von
 1971 Zum Ursprung der Götter Mitra und Varuṇa. *IJJ* 40 (1): 1-35.
- SMITH, C. S.
 1978 Jespersen's 'move and change' class and causative verbs in English. In: M. A. Jazayery et al. (eds), *Linguistic and literary studies in honor of Archibald A. Hill*. Vol. II. *Descriptive linguistics*. The Hague etc.: Mouton, 101-109.
- SMOCZYŃSKI, Wojciech (ed.)
 1995 *Kuryłowicz Memorial Volume*. Part One. Cracow: Universitas. (*Analecta Indoeuropea Cracoviensia*; vol. II).
- SOLMSEN, Felix
 1888 Sigma in verbindung mit nasalen und liquiden im griechischen. *KZ* 29: 59-124.
- SOMMER, Ferdinand
 1977a Der gotische Nominativtypus *sunja*. In: F. SOMMER. *Schriften aus dem Nachlaß*. Hrsg. von B. Forssman. München: Kitzinger, 1977, 23-60. (*MSS, Beihefte*, N.F. 1).
 1977b *śatāvayam* RV V 61,5. Ibid., 61-85.
- SPARREBOOM, Max
 1985 *Chariots in the Veda*. Leiden: Brill. (*Memoirs of the Kern Institute*; 3).
- SPARREBOOM, Max & HEESTERMAN, Johannes C.
 1989 *The ritual of setting up the sacrificial fires according to the Vādhūla school (Vādhūlasūtra 1.1-1.4)*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (*SbÖAW* 539; *VKSKS* 22).

SPECHT, Franz

- 1935 Zur geschichte der Verbalklasse auf -ē. (Ein Deutungsversuch der Verwandtschaft des Indogermanischen). *KZ* 62: 29-115.

SPEIJER [SPEYER], Jacob S.

- 1886 [SktS] *Sanskrit syntax*. Leyden: Brill.
 1896 [VSS] *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*. Strassburg: Trübner. (*Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde*; Bd. I, Heft 6).

SPROCKHOFF, Joachim Friedrich

- 1976 *Samnyāsa: Quellenstudien zur Askese im Hinduismus. I. Untersuchungen über die Samnyāsa-Upaniṣads*. Wiesbaden: Steiner. (*AbhKM* 42/1).
 1994 Zur 'Weihe' des Asketen. Eine Skizze. In: Mesquita & Werba (eds), *Orbis Indicus. Fs. Oberhammer* (WZKS 38), 61-83.

STAAL, Frits

- 1977 Ṛgveda 10.71 on the origin of language. In: Harold Coward & Krishna Sivaraman (eds), *Revelation in Indian thought. A Festschrift in honour of Professor T. R. V. Murti*. Emeryville: Dharma Publishing, 3-14.

STERNBACH, Ludwik

- 1959 Mānava-dharmaśāstra verses in Cāṇakya's compendia. *JAOS* 79: 233-254.

STRUNK, Klaus

- 1967 *Nasalpräsentien und Aoriste. Ein Beitrag zur Morphologie des Verbums im Indo-Iranischen und Griechischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.
 1977 Zwei latente Fälle des verbalen Präsensstammtyps *tīṣṭha-(ti)* im Veda. *ZDMG*, Supplement III, 2: 971-983. (XIX. *Deutscher Orientalistentag. Vorträge*).
 1983 *Typische Merkmale von Fragesätzen und die altindische 'Pluti'*. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (*SbBAW*, Jg. 1983, Heft 8).

STÜBER, Karin

- 2000 Zur Herkunft der altindischen Infinitive auf -*sāni*. *MSS* 60: 135-167.

SUKTHANKAR, Vishnu S.

1921 Studies in Bhāsa. II. *JAOS* 41: 107-130.

SZEMERÉNYI, Oswald

1964 *Syncope in Greek and Indo-European and the nature of Indo-European accent*. Naples: Istituto universitario orientale di Napoli. (*Quaderni della sezione linguistica degli annali*; 3).

TALMY, Leonard

1985 Lexicalization patterns: semantic structure in lexical forms. In: Shopen (ed.), 57-149.

TEDESCO, Paul

1944 The supposed Rigvedic present *márate*. *Language* 20: 212-222.

THIEME, Paul

1929 *Das Plusquamperfektum im Veda*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. (KZ; Ergänzungsheft 7).

1936 Rev. of: OERTEL 1934a [*Zur Kapiṣṭhala-Kaṭha-Saṃhitā*]. *OLZ*, Jg. 39, Nr. 11: 698-705.

1938 *Der Fremdling im Ṛgveda. Eine Studie über die Bedeutung der Worte ari, arya, aryaman und ārya*. Leipzig: Brockhaus. (*AbhKM* 23/2). [= Op.Mai. I, 1-184].

1939 Drei altindische Wurzeln mit der Tiefstufe *mṛ̥*. *KZ* 66: 232-237. [= Kl.Schr. [I], 1, 1-6].

1941 Beiträge zur Vedaexegese. *ZDMG* 95 (N.F. Bd. 20): 82-116. [= Kl.Schr. [I], 1, 7-41].

1952 *Studien zur indogermanischen Wortkunde und Religionsgeschichte*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag. (*Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historische Klasse*; Bd. 98, H. 5).

1953 Review of: HOENS 1951 [*Śānti*]. *Oriens* 6: 395-401. [= Kl.Schr. [I], 2, 654-660].

1955 Rev. of WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1954 [*AiG* II/2]. *GGA*, Jg. 209: 182-216. [= Kl.Schr. [I], 2, 661-695].

1957 *Mitra and Aryaman*. New Haven: Yale University Press. (*Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of arts and sciences*; 41). [= Op.Mai. I, 185-285].

-
- 1958 Sanskrit *edhate*. In: *IL* 19 (*Turner Jubilee Volume I*): 149-158. [= Kl.Schr. [I], 1, 160-169].
- 1964 *Gedichte aus dem Rig-Veda*. Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam.
- 1965 Īsopaniṣad [= Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā 40] 1-14. *JAOS* 85: 89-99. [= Kl.Schr. [I], 1, 228-238].
- 1966 *Upanischaden: ausgewählte Stücke* / aus dem Sanskrit übertr. und erl. von Paul Thieme. Stuttgart: Reclam. (*Reclams Universalbibliothek*; 8723).
- 1971 *Kleine Schriften*. [I]. Teile 1, 2. Wiesbaden: Steiner. (*Glasenapp-Stiftung*; 5, Teile 1-2).
- 1973 King Varuṇa. In: *German Scholars on India*. Vol. I. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 339-349. [= Kl.Schr. II, 1084-1099].
- 1986 Zu RV 10.72. In: A. Etter (ed.), *o-o-pe-ro-si. Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 159-175. [= Kl.Schr. II, 939-955].
- 1987 Das Rätsel RV 1.164.15-16. In: Harry Falk (ed.), *Hinduismus und Buddhismus. Festschrift für Ulrich Schneider*. Freiburg: Falk, 329-339. [= Kl.Schr. II, 956-966].
- 1995a *Kleine Schriften*. II. Stuttgart: Steiner. (*Glasenapp-Stiftung*; 5, II).
- 1995b [Op.Mai.] *Opera maiora*. Bd. I. Hrsg. von Werner KNOBL und Nobuhiko KOBAYASHI. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.
- THUMB, Albert
- 1900 Etymologien. *KZ* 36: 179-201.
- THUMB, Albert / Richard HAUSCHILD
- 1959 *Handbuch des Sanskrit*. II. Teil: *Formenlehre*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- TICHY, Eva
- 1995a *Die nomina agentis auf -tar- im Vedischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- 1995b Vedisch *éd*. Funktion, Herkunft und subordinierte Transpositionen. In: Hettrich et al. (eds), *Fs. Strunk*, 319-343.
- TIKKANEN, Bertil
- 1987 *The Sanskrit gerund: A synchronic, diachronic and typological analysis*. Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society. (*SO*

62).

TOURATIER, Christian

- 1984 Il y a un passif en latin: Mais de quoi s'agit-il? *Travaux du Cercle linguistique d'Aix-en-Provence* 2: 75-92.

TSUCHIDA, Ryutaro

- 1979 *Das sattrā-Kapitel des Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa* (2, 334-370) nach den Handschriften herausgegeben, ins Deutsche übersetzt und erklärt. PhD Diss. Marburg: Mauersberger.

TSUCHIYAMA, Yasuhiro

- 1996 Der König im Rājasūya. In: *Indian thought and Buddhist culture. Essays in honour of Professor Junkichi Imanishi on his 60th birthday*. Tokyo: Shunju-sha, 948-934.
- 2007 On the meaning of the word *rāṣṭrā*: PS 10.4. In: Griffiths & Schmiedchen (eds), 71-80.

TSUJI, Naoshirō

- 1955 Some linguistic remarks on the Maitri Upaniṣad. In: *Studies in indology and buddhology presented in honour of Professor Susumu Yamaguchi on the occasion of his 60th birthday*. Kyoto: Hozokan, 92-105.
- 1957 Linguistic features of "Four unpublished upaniṣadic texts". In: Radhakrishnan et al. (eds), *Belvalkar Felicitation volume*, 19-27.
- 1960 The marriage section of the Āgniveśya-Gṛhyasūtra. *Toyo Bunko* 19: 43-77.
- 1964 Notes on the Rājasūya-section (IX.1.) of the Mānava-śrautasūtra. *Toyo Bunko* 23: 1-34.
- 1967 Notes on the Rājasūya-section (IX.1.) of the Mānava-śrautasūtra [continued]. *Toyo Bunko* 25: 121-143.

TUCKER, Elizabeth

- 1988 Some innovations in the system of denominative verbs in early Indic. *TPS* 86 (2): 93-114.
- 2002 RV *ṛgmín-*, *ṛgmīya-* and *ṛñjate*. *HS* 115: 274-300.

TÜRSTIG, Hans-Georg

- 1985 The Indian sorcery called *abhicāra*. *WZKS* 29: 69-117.

DE VAAN, Michiel A.C.

- 2004 'Narten' roots from the Avestan point of view. In: A. Hyllested et al. (eds), *Per aspera ad asteriscos: Studia Indogermanica in honorem Jens Elmegard Rasmussen sexagenarii Idibus Martiis anno MMIV*. Innsbruck: IBS, 591-599.
- 2008 *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*. Leiden etc.: Brill. (*Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionaries*; 7)

VEKERDI, József

- 1961 On polymorphic presents in the Ṛgveda. *AOH* 12: 250-287.

VELANKAR, H.D.

- 1963 *Ṛgveda maṇḍala VII. (Introduction, Devanāgarī text, English translation, critical notes, select glossary and three indices)*. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan. (*Bharatiya Vidya Series* 23).
- 1968 The Ṛgvedic origin of the story of Naciketas (Ṛv. X.135). In: *Mélanges Renou*, 763-772.
- 2003 *The fifth maṇḍala of the Ṛg-Veda* (with English translation and critical notes). Ed. by S. G. Moghe. Delhi: Koshal Book Depot.

VENKATASUBBIAH, A.

- 1965 On Indra's winning of cows and waters. *ZDMG* 115: 120-133.
- 1966 *vr̥jana*. *ALB* 30: 44-104. [Repr. in: A. Venkatasubbiah. *Vedic studies*. Vol. II. Madras: The Adyar library and research centre, 1968, 151-211].

VERHAGEN, Arie

- 1992 Praxis of linguistics: passives in Dutch. *Cognitive linguistics* 3 (3): 301-342.

VERNAY, Henri

- 1980 *Syntaxe et sémantique: les deux plans des relations syntaxiques à l'exemple de la transitivité et de la transformation passive. Étude contrastive français-allemand*. Tübingen: Niemeyer. (*Linguistische Arbeiten*; 90).

VERPOORTEN, Jean Marie

- 2005 Le rite d'*upāṁśuyāja* dans le Śābara-Bhāṣya. In: Göhler (ed.), *Fs. Mylius*, 391-406.

VIGASIN, Aleksej A. & SAMOZVANCEV, Andrej M.

- 1998 *Dharmaśāstra Narady. Perevod s sankrita i komentarij* A. A. Vigasina i A. M. Samozvanceva. *Vstupitel'naja statja* A. A. Vigasina. Moskva: Vostočnaja literatura.

VINE, Brent

- 1990 Vedic *kūlāyati* and "spontaneous cerebralization" in Sanskrit. In: Werner Bahner et al. (eds), *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Congress of Linguists*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2528-2532.

VISHVA BANDHU

- 1950 An Atharvan hymn to lac (*lākṣā*-). In: Vishva Bandhu (ed.), *Siddha-Bhārātī, or the rosary of indology: ... papers ... in honour of the 60th birthday of Dr. Siddheshwar Varma*. Part One. Hoshiarpur: Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute, 201-213. (VIS 1).
- 1951 [1955] The Tr̥ca (R̥.V. I,41,7-9) re-interpreted. *PAIOC* 16 (Lucknow, Oct. 1951), Vol. II: 20-35.

VISHVA BANDHU ŚĀSTRĪ (general ed.)

- 1935-1992 [VWC] *A Vedic Word-Concordance*. I. *Samhitās*. 6 vols.; II. *The Brāhmaṇas and the Āraṇyakas*. 2 vols.; III. *Upaniṣads*. 2 vols.; IV. *Vedāṅga-sūtras*. 4 vols. Lahore / Hoshiarpur: Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute.

WACKERNAGEL, Jacob W.

- 1890 Miszellen zur griechischen Grammatik. [16-21]. *KZ* 30: 293-316 [= Kl.Schr. I, 656-679].
- 1897 Remarques sur la place du sanscrit dans la linguistique moderne. In: *Actes du 10^{ème} Congrès International des Orientalistes. Session de Genève*. Leide, 90-91. [= Kl.Schr. III, 1487-1488].
- 1902 Über Bedeutungsverschiebung der Verbalkomposition. *NGG* (1902): 737-757. [= Kl.Schr. I, 127-147].
- 1903 Prakritismen im Altindischen. In: *Album – Kern*, 149-152. [= Kl.Schr. I, 401-404].

-
- 1906 Wortumfang und Wortform. *NGG* (1906): 147-184. [= Kl.Schr. I, 148-185].
- 1907 Indisches und Italisches. *KZ* 41: 305-319. [= Kl.Schr. I, 494-508].
- 1918 Indoiranisches. *SbPAW*, Jg. 1918 (1): 380-411. [= Kl.Schr. I, 299-330].
- 1926 Kleine Beiträge zur indischen Wortkunde. In: Willibald Kirfel (ed.), *Beiträge zur Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte Indiens. Festgabe Hermann Jacobi zum 75. Geburtstag ...* Bonn: Fritz Klopp, 1-17. [= Kl.Schr. I, 417-433].
- 1928 Indoiranica. [1.-2.], *KZ* 55: 104-112. [= Kl.Schr. I, 331-338].
- 1935-37 Altindische und mittelindische Miszellen. *BSOS* 8: 823-834. [= Kl.Schr. I, 405-416].
- 1942 Indoiranica. [21.-54.], *KZ* 67: 154-182. [= Kl.Schr. I, 370-398].
- 1955 *Kleine Schriften*. Teile I-II. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

WACKERNAGEL, Jacob / DEBRUNNER, Albert

- 1896-1957 [AiG] *Altindische Grammatik*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- (1896) J. WACKERNAGEL. Bd. I. *Lautlehre*.
- (1905) J. WACKERNAGEL. Bd. II/1. *Einleitung zur Wortlehre. Nominalkomposition*.
- (1930) J. WACKERNAGEL. Bd. III. *Nominalflexion – Zahlwort – Pronomen*.
- (1954) A. DEBRUNNER. Bd. II/2. *Die Nominalsuffixe*.
- (1957) *Introduction générale* par L. RENOU.
- (1957) A. DEBRUNNER. *Nachträge zu Bd. I*.
- (1964) R. HAUSCHILD. *Register zur Altindischen Grammatik von J. Wackernagel und A. Debrunner (Bd. I-III)*.

WATKINS, Calvert

- 1969 *Indogermanische Grammatik*. Bd. III: *Formenlehre*. 1. Teil. Heidelberg: Winter.

WEBER, Albrecht

- 1850a/1868 Der erste adhyâya des Çatapatha-Brâhmaṇa. *ZDMG* 4: 289-301. [= Ind.Str. 1 (1868), 31-53 (mit Nachträgen)].
- 1850b Ueber die Literatur des Sâmaveda. *IndSt* 1: 25-67.
- 1855 Eine Legende des Çatapatha-Brâhmaṇa über die strafende Vergeltung nach dem Tode. *ZDMG* 9: 237-243. [= Ind.Str. 1, 20-30].
- 1858a Erstes Buch des Atharvaveda. *IndSt* 4: 393-430.
- 1858b Zwei vedische Texte über Omina und Portenta. *Abhandlungen der Königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Philosophische und historische Klasse* 1858 [1859]: 313-413.
- 1862 Vedische Hochzeitssprüche. *IndSt* 5: 177-266.
- 1863 *Ueber die Metrik der Inder*. Berlin: Ferd. Dümmler's Buchhandlung. (*IndSt* 8).
- 1865a Analyse der in Anquetil du Perron's Uebersetzung enthaltenen Upanishad [Fortsetzung und Schluß]. *IndSt* 9: 1-173.
- 1865b Ueber Haug's Aitareya-Brâhmaṇa. *IndSt* 9: 210-380.
- 1868 Collectanea über die Kastenverhältnisse in den Brâhmaṇa und Sûtra. *IndSt* 10: 1-160.
- 1868, 1869, 1879 [Ind.Str.] *Indische Streifen*. Bd. I-III. Berlin: Nicolaische Verlagsbuchhandlung (Bd. I-II); Leipzig: Brockhaus (Bd. III).
- 1873a Ueber den padapāṭha der Taittirîya-Saṃhitâ. *IndSt* 13: 1-128.
- 1873b Zweites Buch des Atharva-Saṃhitâ. *IndSt* 13: 129-216.
- 1874 The Sâmavidhânabrâhmaṇa (being the third Brâhmaṇa) of the Sâmaveda, ed. ... by A. C. Burnell. Vol. I. London: Trübner, 1873. *L.C.-Bl.* 13: 422-425. [= Ind.Str. 3, 270-275].
- 1875 Rev. of: Martin HAUG. *Über das Wesen und den Werth des wedischen Accents*. München: G. Franz, 1873 [1874]. *Jenaer Literaturzeitung* 18: 313-316. [= Ind.Str. 3, 335-348].
- 1885 Drittes Buch des Atharva-Saṃhitâ. *IndSt* 17: 177-314.
- 1886 *Verzeichniss der Sanskrit- und Prâkrit-Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*. Bd. 2, Abth. 1 (*Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliothek zu*

-
- Berlin*; Bd. 5). Berlin: Schade.
- 1892 Über den vâjapeya. *SbPAW*, Jg. 1892 (2): 765-813.
- 1895 Vedische Beiträge. 4. Das achtzehnte Buch der Atharvasaṃhitâ. *SbPAW*, Jg. 1895 (2): 815-866.
- 1896 Vedische Beiträge. 4. Das achtzehnte Buch der Atharvasaṃhitâ. (Fortsetzung und Schluss.) *SbPAW*, Jg. 1896 (1): 253-294.
- 1898a Viertes Buch des Atharva-Saṃhitâ. *IndSt* 18: 1-153.
- 1898b Fünftes Buch des Atharva-Saṃhitâ. *IndSt* 18: 154-288.
- WEBER-BROSAMER, Bernhard
- 1988 *Annam: Untersuchungen zur Bedeutung des Essens und der Speise im vedischen Ritual*. Rheinfelden: Schäuble. (*Religionswissenschaft und Theologie*; 3).
- WECKER, Otto
- 1906 Der gebrauch der kasus in der älteren Upaniṣad-literatur verglichen mit der kasuslehre der indischen grammatiker. *BB* 30: 1-61, 177-207.
- WELLER, Friedrich
- 1953a *Versuch einer Kritik der Kāthopaniṣad*. (*Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Institut für Orientforschung*, 12). Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- 1953b Rev. of: B. TUBINI. *Atharvaśira Upaniṣad*, publ. et trad.; *Brahmabindūpaniṣad*, publ. et trad.; etc. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1952. (*Les Upanishad*; 11-14). *OLZ*, Jg. 48, Nr. 11/12: 546-353. [= Kl.Schr. 1, 107-111].
- 1955 Rev. of: ESNOL, M^{lle}. *Maytry Upaniṣad*, publ. et trad. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1952. (*Les Upanishad*; 15). *OLZ*, Jg. 50, Nr. 11/12: 543-547. [= Kl.Schr. 1, 103-105].
- 1987 *Kleine Schriften*. 2 Halbbände. Stuttgart: Steiner. (*Glasenapp-Stiftung*; 26).
- WENNERBERG, Claes
- 1981 *Die altindischen Nominalsuffixe -man- und -iman- in historisch-komparativer Beleuchtung*. I : Wortanalytischer Teil -Wörterbuch-. Göteborg: Universitet, Institutionen foer Jaemförande Spraakforskning.

WENZEL, Heinrich

- 1879 *Ueber den Instrumentalis im Rigveda*. Tübingen: Verlag der H. Laupp'schen Buchhandlung.

WERBA, Chlodwig H.

WERBA = WERBA 1997

- 1997 [VIA I] *Verba Indoarica: die primären und sekundären Wurzeln der Sanskrit-Sprache*. Pars I: *Radices Primariae*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- 2006 *mavāred-rā na-bāyad ziyād kard be joz-e ehtiyāj* (Indo-)Iranische Rekonstrukte als textkritisches Korrektiv in der Altiranistik]. In: H. Eichner et al. (eds), *Iranistik in Europa – Gestern, Heute, Morgen*. (Veröffentlichungen zur Iranistik; 34). Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 261-306.

WEZLER, Albrecht

- 1995 Der Tod als Mittel der Entsühnung (gemäß dem Dharmaśāstra). In: Gerhard Oberhammer (ed.), *Im Tod gewinnt der Mensch sein Selbst. Das Phänomen des Todes in asiatischer und abendländischer Religionstradition. Arbeitsdokumentation eines Symposions*. (SbÖAW 624 = Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens; 14). Wien 1995: 97-140.
- 1998 Sanskrit *paṇḍā-* / *pāṇḍaka-*. *ZDMG* 148 (2): 261-276.

WHITNEY, William Dwight

- 1881 *Index verborum to the published text of the Atharva-Veda*. (JAOS 12). New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- 1882 The cosmogonic hymn, Rig-Veda X. 129. *PrAOS*, May, 1882 [JAOS 11 (1885)]: cix-cxi.
- 1883 On the Jāiminīya- or Talavakāra-Brāhmaṇa. *PrAOS*, May 1883 [JAOS 11 (1885)]: cxliv-cxlviii.
- 1884 The study of Hindu grammar and the study of Sanskrit. *AJPh* 5, No. 3 (19): 279-297. [reprinted in: *Whitney on language: Selected writings of William Dwight Whitney*. Cambridge etc.: MIT Press, 1971, 287-305].
- 1885a Numerical results from indexes of Sanskrit tense- and

- conjugation-stems. *PrAOS*, May 1885 [*JAOS* 13 (1889)]: xxxii-xxxv.
- 1885b [Roots] *The roots, verb-forms, and primary derivatives of the Sanskrit language*. Leipzig: Breitkopf and Härtel.
- 1886 The Upanishads and their latest translation. *AJPh* 7, No. 1 (25): 1-26.
- 1887 Notes on Part IV. of Schröder's edition of the Maitrāyaṇī-Saṁhitā. *PrAOS*, Oct. 1887 [*JAOS* 13 (1889)]: ccxxvi-ccxxviii.
- 1889 [SktGr] *Sanskrit grammar*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- 1890a Böhtlingk's Upanishads. *AJPh* 11 (4) [= No. 44]: 407-439.
- 1890b Translation of the Kāṭha-Upanishad. *TAPA* 21: 88-112.
- 1892 On DELBRÜCK's Vedic Syntax. [Rev. of DELBRÜCK 1888 [AiS]]. *AJPh* 13 (3) [= No. 51]: 271-306.
- 1893 The native commentary to the Atharva-Veda. In: *Festgruss Roth*, 89-96.
- WHITNEY, William Dwight / LANMAN, Charles Rockwell
- 1905 *Atharva-Veda Samhitā*. Translated into English with critical notes and exegetical commentary by William Dwight Whitney ... Revised and edited by Charles Rockwell Lanman. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. (*HOS* 7-8).
- WILLMAN-GRABOWSKA, Hélène
- 1927-28 *Les composés nominaux dans le Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa*. 2 parts. Kraków: Nakł. Polskiej Akademji Umiejętności. (*Prace Komisji Orientalistycznej Polskiej Akademji Umiejętności*; 10, 12).
- WINTERNITZ, Moriz
- 1892 *Das altindische Hochzeitsrituell nach dem Āpastambīya-Gr̥hyasūtra und einigen anderen verwandten Werken*. Wien: F. Tempsky. (*Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philos.-hist. Classe*; Bd. 40, Abh. 1).
- 1914 Die Brautwahl nach dem Bhāradvājagṛhyasūtra. *WZKM* 28: 16-20. [= Kl.Schr. I, 144-148]
- 1936 Ethics in Brahmanical literature. *Prabuddha Bharata* 41: 165-170. [= Kl.Schr. I, 220-225].

-
- 1991 *Kleine Schriften*. 2 Teile. Stuttgart: Steiner. (*Glasenapp-Stiftung*; 30).
- WISTRAND, Erik
- 1941 *Über das Passivum*. Göteborg: Elanders boktryckeri aktiebolag. (*Göteborgs Kungl. Vetenskaps- och Vitterhets-Samhälles Handlingar*. Sjätte följden. Ser. A, Bd. 1, N:o. 1).
- WITZEL, Michael
- 1979-80 Kaṭha-Śikṣā-Upaniṣad und ihr Verhältnis zur Śikṣāvallī der Taittirīya-Upaniṣad. *WZKS* 23: 5-28; 24: 21-82.
- 1984 Sur le chemin du ciel. *BEI* 2: 213-279.
- 1986 JB *pulpūlanī*: the structure of a Brāhmaṇa tale. In: N.S. Ramanuja Tatacharya (ed.), *Dr. B.R. Sharma felicitation volume*. (*Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, Tirupati Series*; 46). Tirupati: Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, 189-216.
- 1987 The case of the shattered head. *StII* 13/14 (*Fs. W. Rau*): 363-415.
- 1989 Tracing the Vedic dialects. In: Caillat (ed.), 97-265.
- 1995 Early Indian culture: Linguistic and textual parameters. In: George Erdosy (ed.). *The Indo-Aryans of ancient South Asia: language, material culture an ethnicity*. (*Indian philology and South Asian studies*; 1). Berlin etc.: de Gruyter, 85-125.
- 1999 Early sources for tracing South Asian substrate languages. *Mother tongue*, Special issue (Oct. 1999): [1-71].
- WITZEL, Michael et al.
- 2007 *Rig-Veda: Das heilige Wissen. Erster und zweiter Liederkreis. Aus dem vedischen Sanskrit übersetzt und herausgegeben* von Michael WITZEL und Toshifumi GOTŌ unter Mitarbeit von Ejirō DŌYAMA und Mislav JEŽIĆ. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag der Weltreligionen.
- WOLFF, Fritz
- 1910 *Avesta: die heiligen Bücher der Parsen übersetzt auf der Grundlage von CHR. BARTHOLOMAE's Altiranischem Wörterbuch* von F. Wolff. Strassburg: Trübner.
- WOOD, Francis A.
- 1907/1908 Rime-words and rime-ideas. *IF* 22: 133-171.

WRIGHT, Jack Clifford

- 2008 *Ṛgvedic grāvan, úsri, and kṣíp*. In: Kulikov & Rusanov (eds), *Gs. Elizarenkova*, 501-526.

WÜST, Walther

- 1931 Ein weiterer irano-skythischer Eigennamen im *Ṛgveda*. In: Walther Wüst (ed.), *Studia Indo-Iranica. Ehrengabe für Wilhelm Geiger*. Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 185-212.
- 1958 Exkurs II [zu: Ved. *ádhrigu* usw.]. *ādhra-* “schwach, gering, (be)dürftig”. *PHMA* 4: 45-58.
- 1966 *Altpersische Studien. Sprach- und Kulturgeschichtliche Beiträge zum Glossar der Achemeniden-Inschriften*. München: Kitzinger. (*PHMA* 8-11 (1962-1965)).

ZEHNDER, Thomas

- 1999 *Atharvaveda-Paippalāda: eine Sammlung altindischer Zaubersprüche vom Beginn des 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr. Buch 2. Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Idstein: Schulz-Kirchner Verlag. (*Wissenschaftliche Schriften: Reihe 3. Beiträge zur Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft*; 107).

ZEILFELDER, Susanne

- 1997 Heth. *hapusa(s)*- ‘Schaft; Penis’ und die Frage des dritten Laryngals. *HS* 110 (2): 188-210.

ZIFF, Paul

- 1984 *Epistemic analysis. A coherence theory of knowledge*. Dordrecht etc.: Reidel. (*Synthese library*; 173).

ZIMMER, Heinrich

- 1879a *Altindisches Leben. Die Cultur der vedischen Arier nach den Samhitā dargestellt*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- 1879b Rev. of: W. SCHERER. *Zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*. 2. Ausgabe. Berlin, 1878. *BB* 3: 324-331.

ZIMMER, Stefan

- 1985 Tod und Sterben im *Ṛgveda*. *IIIJ* 28: 191-199.

ZYSK, Kenneth G.

- 1985a *Religious healing in the Veda. With translations and annotations of medical hymns from the Ṛgveda and the Atharvaveda and renderings from the corresponding ritual*

- texts*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
(*Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*; 75/7).
- 1985b Towards the notion of health in the Vedic phase of Indian
medicine. *ZDMG* 135 (2): 312-318.

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AAWLM</i>	<i>Akademie der Wissenschaften und Literatur, Mainz. Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse. Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur; Stuttgart: Steiner.</i>
<i>AbhGWG</i>	<i>Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philol.-hist. Classe. Neue Folge. Berlin.</i>
<i>AbhKM</i>	<i>Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes. Leipzig.</i>
<i>ABORI</i>	<i>Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. Poona.</i>
<i>AJPh</i>	<i>American Journal of Philology. Baltimore.</i>
<i>ALB</i>	<i>Adyar Library Bulletin. Adyar, Madras.</i>
<i>ANIS</i>	<i>Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien. Wiesbaden: Steiner.</i>
<i>ĀnSS</i>	<i>Ānandāśramasaṃskṛtagranthāvaliḥ (Ānandāśrama Saṃskṛta Series). Poona.</i>
<i>AO</i>	<i>Acta Orientalia.</i>
<i>AOAS</i>	<i>Anecdota Oxoniensia, Aryan Series. Oxford.</i>
<i>AoF</i>	<i>Altorientalische Forschungen. Berlin.</i>
<i>AOS</i>	<i>American Oriental Series. New Haven, Connecticut.</i>
<i>AsSt</i>	<i>Asiatische Studien. Bern.</i>
<i>Ausg.Schr.</i>	<i>Ausgewählte Schriften.</i>
<i>BB</i>	<i>Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen, hrsg. von A. Bezzenger. Göttingen.</i>
<i>BDCRI</i>	<i>Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute. Poona.</i>
<i>BEI</i>	<i>Bulletin d'Études Indiennes. Paris.</i>
<i>BerVKSGWL</i>	<i>Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Philologisch-historische Classe. Leipzig.</i>
<i>B.Ind.</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Indica. A collection of oriental works. Calcutta.</i>
<i>BNMEO</i>	<i>Bulletin of the National Museum of Ethnology. Osaka.</i>

-
- BSL *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris.*
- BSO(A)S *Bulletin of the School of Oriental (and African) Studies,*
University of London.
- BTLVNI *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandse*
Indie. 's-Gravenhage.
- ChSS *Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series.* Varanasi.
- CILT *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- CSCRS *Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series.* Calcutta.
- DRT *Disputationes Rheno-Trajectinae.* The Hague: Mouton.
- EDS *An Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Sanskrit...* → GHATAGE et
al.
- FBI *Freiburger Beiträge zur Indologie.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- GGA *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen.*
- GOS *Groningen Oriental Studies.* Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- HOS *Harvard Oriental Series.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard
University Press.
- HS *Historische Sprachforschung (Historical linguistics).*
Göttingen.
- IA *Indian Antiquary.* Bombay.
- IBS *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.* Innsbruck:
Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- IF *Indogermanische Forschungen. Zeitschrift für*
indogermanische Sprach- und Altertumskunde. Strassburg:
Trübner; Berlin: de Gruyter.
- IFAnz *Anzeiger für indogermanische Sprach- und Altertumskunde.*
Beiblatt zu den Indogermanischen Forschungen. Berlin;
Leipzig: de Gruyter; Strassburg: Trübner.
- IJJ *Indo-Iranian Journal.* The Hague.
- IndT *Indologica taurinensia.* Torino.
- IndSt *Indische Studien,* hrsg. von Albrecht WEBER. Leipzig:
Brockhaus.
- Ind.Str. A. WEBER. *Indische Streifen.*
- JA *Journal asiatique.* Paris.
- JAOS *Journal of the American Oriental Society.* New Haven.
- JIBS *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies (Indogaku Bukkyō-*

	<i>gaku Kenkyū</i>). Tokyo.
JIES	<i>Journal of Indo-European studies</i> . Washington.
JRAS	<i>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland</i> . London.
JVS	<i>Journal of Vedic Studies</i> . Lahore.
KashiSS	<i>Kashi Sanskrit Series</i> . Varanasi.
Kl.Schr.	Klein(er)e Schriften.
KMŚ	<i>Kālamūlāsāstra Series</i> . Delhi.
KSVS	<i>Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha Series</i> . Tirupati.
KZ	[Kuhns] <i>Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen</i> . Berlin: Dümmler; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
LBOP	<i>Literatur-Blatt für orientalische Philologie</i> . Leipzig, 1883-1888.
LIV	→ <i>Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben</i> .
LSIE	<i>Leiden Studies in Indo-European</i> . Amsterdam: Rodopi.
MFHS	<i>Münchener Forschungen zur historischen Sprachwissenschaft</i> . Bremen: Hempen.
MKNAWL	<i>Mededelingen der koninklijke Nederlandse akademie van wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde</i> . [Nieuwe Reeks]. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
MO	<i>Le Monde Oriental. Revue des études orientales</i> . Uppsala.
MSL	<i>Mémoires de la Société de linguistique de Paris</i> .
MSS	<i>Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft</i> . München: Kitzinger.
MU	OSTHOFF, Hermann & BRUGMANN, Karl. <i>Morphologische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen</i> . 6 Teile. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1878-1910.
NGG	<i>Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augustus Universität zu Göttingen. Philos.-hist. Klasse</i> . Göttingen: Dieterich.
NIA	<i>New Indian Antiquary</i> . Bombay.
OLZ	<i>Orientalistische Literaturzeitung</i> . Berlin.
Op.Mai.	<i>Opera maiora</i> .
ORT	<i>Orientalia Rheno-Traiectina</i> . Leiden: Brill.

-
- OuO* *Orient und Occident*. Hrsg. von Theodor BENFEY. Bd. 1-3. Göttingen, 1862-66.
- PAIOC* *Proceedings (and Transactions) of the All-India Oriental Conference*.
- PICI* *Publications de l'Institut de civilisation indienne*. Série in-8°. Paris: E. de Boccard.
- PIFI* *Publications de l'Institut français d'indologie*. Pondichéry.
- PPV* *Pamjatniki pis'mennosti Vostoka*. Moskva.
- PrAOS* *Proceedings of the American Oriental Society*. New Haven.
- PrAPS* *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*. Philadelphia.
- PW* → BÖHTLINGK & ROTH 1855-75
- pw* → BÖHTLINGK 1879-89
- Revue critique* *Revue critique d'histoire et de littérature. Recueil hebdomadaire*. [Nouvelle Série]. Paris.
- RO* *Rocznik Orientalistyczny*. Kraków; Warszawa; etc.
- RVWC* → A. LUBOTSKY. *A Ṛgvedic word concordance*.
- SbBAW* *Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philos.-Hist. Abteilung. / Philos.-Hist. Klasse. Sitzungsberichte*. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- SBE* *Sacred books of the East*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- SBGW* *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich böhmischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften in Prag. Phil.-hist.* Prag.
- SbHAW* *Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philos.-Hist. Klasse. Sitzungsberichte*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- SbÖAW* *Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philos.-Hist. Klasse. Sitzungsberichte*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- SbPAW* *Sitzungsberichte der königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. Berlin.
- Sel.St.* Selected studies.
- Sel.Wr.* Selected writings.
- SLCS* *Studies in language companion series*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- SLS* *Studies in the linguistic sciences*. Urbana, University of Illinois.

<i>SO</i>	<i>Studia Orientalia</i> . Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society.
<i>SSL</i>	<i>Studi e saggi linguistici</i> . Pisa.
<i>StII</i>	<i>Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik</i> . Reinbek : Wezler (1975-2003); Bremen: Hempen (2007–).
<i>TAPA</i>	<i>Transactions of the American Philological Association</i> . Boston.
<i>Toyo Bunko</i>	<i>Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko (The Oriental Library)</i> . Tokyo.
<i>TPS</i>	<i>Transactions of the Philological Society</i> . Oxford.
<i>TrivSS</i>	<i>Trivandrum Sanskrit Series</i> . Trivandrum.
<i>TSL</i>	<i>Typological studies in language</i> . Amsterdam: Benjamins.
<i>UIgSK</i>	<i>Untersuchungen zur indogermanischen Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft</i> . Berlin etc.: de Gruyter.
<i>VIS</i>	<i>Vishveshvaranand Indological Series</i> . Hoshiarpur.
<i>VK(N)AWL</i>	<i>Verhandelingen der koninklijke (Nederlandse) akademie van wetenschappen. Afd. Letterkunde</i> . Nieuwe Reeks. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
<i>VKSKS</i>	<i>Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens</i> . (in <i>SbÖAW</i>).
<i>VSt</i>	<i>Vedische Studien</i> . I-III. → PISCHEL & GELDNER 1889-1901.
<i>VWC</i>	<i>A Vedic Word-Concordance</i> , ed. by VISHVA BANDHU (→ <i>Bibl. II</i>).
<i>WZKM</i>	<i>Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes</i> .
<i>WZKS</i>	<i>Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens und Archiv für indische Philosophie</i> ; since 1970: <i>Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens und Archiv für indische Philosophie</i> ; since 2000: <i>Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens</i> . Wien.
<i>ZDMG</i>	<i>Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i> . Leipzig: Brockhaus; Wiesbaden: Steiner; Stuttgart: Steiner.
<i>ZII</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik</i> . Leipzig: Brockhaus.

INDICES

INDEX VERBORUM

Vedic

- akṛṣṭa-pacyá-* ‘ripening on unploughed ground’ 401, 736
aghāyá-^{ti} 9¹⁸
aṅg → *iṅg*
aj ‘drive’ 39, 44-47, 683, 691, 753, *-aja-^{ti}* 47
¹*añc* ‘bend’ 452-457, 683, 705, *-acya-^{te}* 453ff., 683, 705, 722, 732²¹⁸⁵, 755
²*añc* ‘bail’ 39-41, 452, 456, 683, 691, *-acyá-^{te}* 39ff., 683, 691, 753
^{1/2}*añj* ‘anooint; manifest’ 41-50, 204, 683, 691, 797, *ajyá-^{te}* 11, 41ff., 188f., 492, 683, 691, 753, 797, pres. *ánakti*, *añjmaḥ*, *anikte* etc. 41f., 48ff., 797, pf. *ānajé*, *ānajāná-* 23⁴⁸, 49, 797
añjī- ‘ointment’ 42
ad ‘eat’ 10, 50-51, 683, 691, 797, *adyá-^{te}* 10, 50f., 51ff., 683, 691, 754, 797, *adāná-* 51, 797
adhi-i ‘learn’, *adhīyate*, *adhīyāta*, etc. 349, *adhīyant-* 349⁸⁹²
anuvākyā- 211, 217, 693
anūrúdh- 203⁵⁰⁷
abhí 425¹¹⁰⁰, 772, 780
abhicārā- ‘witchcraft’ 90
amⁱ ‘grasp; swear’ 457, 686, 691, *-amya-^{te}* 126f., 457, 686, 691, 754, *amāte* 457
arṣeyá- 788
álpa-, *álpika-* 492f.
áva 678
ava-prajjana- ‘end of the warp of a web’ 592
avidasyá- ‘inexhaustible’ 551, 736
avidriyá- ‘non-breaking’ 398, 736
as^ḡ ‘eat’ 10, 51-53, 360, 683, 691, *ásyá-^{te}* (*asyá-^{te}*) 10, 51ff., 360, 683, 691, 753
as ‘reach’ → ²*nas*
aśvá-, *aśvāyá-^{ti}* ‘desire horses’ 9¹⁸
as ‘throw’ 517-522, 678²¹¹³, 683, 687, 691, 724, 730, *ásya-^{ti}* 11, 517ff., 687, 724, 730, 757, 760, 762, *ásya-^{te}* 492, 517, 519ff., 678²¹¹³, 683, 691, 730, 749,

- 754, -aset, asate, asa-^{ti/te}
517f.¹⁶⁹⁶
- ādi*- 107, 108, 693, 792f., 796
- āp* ‘obtain’ **53-55**, 683, 691,
797, *āpyá-te* 53f., 683, 691,
741, 753, 797, -*āpi* 54f., 741,
797, *āpsyata* 54, 745, 797
- ār* ‘recognize, treat as an ārya’
522-523, 688, 724, *ārya-ti*
522f., 688, 724, 757
- i* ‘go; send’ 348ff., **458**, 494¹⁶⁴³,
685, 693, 704, 706, 754, 758,
-*īya-te* 458, 685, 693, 706, 755,
inóti/invatī ‘sets in motion’ 348
- inṅlaṅg* ‘move, stir’ **313-314**, 683,
705, -*inṅya-te* (-*āṅgya-te*) 313f.,
316, 683, 705, 707, 755, 760,
775, *inṅaya-ti* 313
- idh* ‘kindle’ 5, **55-58**, 683, 691,
797, *idhyá-te* 5, 55ff., 683, 691,
732²¹⁸⁴, 753, 762, 797, *idhāná-*
56f., 797, *indhāna-* 56f., *indhé,*
édhe, indhāna- 58, 797, *inddhe*
58, 762
- ¹*iṣ* ‘seek, wish’ **458-460**, 524¹⁷¹³,
683, 691, 796, *iṣya-te* 458ff.,
524¹⁷¹³, 691, 753
- ²*iṣ* ‘send’ 459, **460, 523-527**, 683,
687, 691, 724, 730, *iṣya-ti* 459,
523ff., 687, 724, 730, 757,
-*iṣya-te* 460, 524, 527, 683,
691, 730f., 749, 753, *iṣṇāti*
526f., 730
- iṣṭi-* 459, 796
- īkṣ* ‘perceive, look’ **767-768**,
-*īkṣya-te* 767f., -*īkṣáya-ti/te*
767f., *īkṣa-te* 768
- īr* ‘move’ **315-316**, 683, 705,
īrya-te 315f., 399¹⁰²⁴, 683,
705ff., 755, 760, 775, *īrte* 315,
iyarti 315⁸⁰⁷, -*īryant-* 315,
īráya-ti 316
- īrṣ* ‘be angry’ **527-528**, 687,
723, *īrṣya-ti* 527f., 687, 723,
756
- īrṣyú-* ‘jealous’ 528, 737
- u* (³*vā*) ‘weave’ 14²⁷, **460**, 685,
691, *ūya-te* 460, 685, 691, 754,
vaya-ti ‘weave’ 14, 460, *utá-*,
vátave, ótave 460
- ukṣ* ‘(be)sprinkle’ **460-462**, 683,
691, 702, -*ukṣya-te* 460ff., 683,
691, 702, *ukṣa-ti* 460
ukṣámāna- 460f.
- uc* ‘take pleasure’ **528-530**, 687,
723, -*ucya-ti* 528ff., 687, 723,
756
- ucchiṣṭá-* ‘remnant’ 432¹¹¹⁶
- uttāná-* 96f.
- ud* ‘moisten, wet’ **462-463**, 683,
691, *udya-te* 462f., 683, 691,
ūduḥ 463
- udgītha-* 82, 693, 785, 789
- udbhijja-* ‘sprouting’ 412¹⁰⁵⁹
- upadrava-* 785
- upasád-* 275f., 694, 701, 785, 792
- urūcī* ‘far-reaching’ 213
- uṣ* (²*vas*) ‘scorch, burn’ **463-464**,
683, 691, -*uṣya-te* 463f., 683,
691, 754
- ūh* ‘shift’ **231f., 236-239**, 683,
691, *ūhyá-te* 226⁵⁸³, 231-232,
236-239, 683, 691, 754
- ṛ* (*ā-ṛ*) ‘harm’ 610¹⁹³⁹
- ṛc* ‘praise, sing’ **58-62**, 683, 692,
702, 706, 797, *ārca-ti* etc. 58,
60f., *ānrce* 61f., 797, *rcyá-te*
58ff., 483, 683, 692, 702, 753,

- 797, *-arcya-te* 58, 60, 706f., 755
ṛj ‘direct, stretch’ **316-319**, 683,
 705, 722, *ṛjya-te* 316ff., 457,
 510, 683, 705, 727, 742, 755,
ṛjīyant- 316ff., *ṛñjānti*, *ṛñjāte*,
ṛñjānt- 317, 727
ṛjugāmin- 318⁸¹⁴
ṛjū- ‘straight’, *ṛjūyāti* ‘is straight’
 9¹⁸
ṛddhi- 363
ṛdh ‘be successful’ **362-369**, 683,
 710, *ṛdhyā-te* 350f., 362ff., 552,
 647f., 683, 710ff., 727, 743,
 755, *-ṛdhyā-ti* 363, 369, 747,
ṛdhnóti 350, 363, 365, 727,
 729, *ṛnádhat*, *ṛndhánt-* 363⁹²⁹,
 727, *ārdhi*, *vyārdhiṣṭa* 369,
 743, *ardháyati* 727, 729
kanī ‘rejoice’ **319-320**, *cākán-*,
akānīṣ- 320
ka-pūya- ‘stinking’ 591
karkándhu-, ⁺*karkandhukā-* 492f.
kal ‘drive’ 694, **768**, *kālaya-ti*,
-kālya-te 694, 768
kavīyamāna- 83
kā ‘long (for), yearn’ **319-320**,
 686, 706, *kāyamāna-* 15, 319f.,
 686, 706, 755
kup (*/kubh?*) ‘be angry’ **530-531**,
 687, 723, *kupya-ti* 530f., 687,
 723, 763²²³², 756, *kopāya-ti*,
-kupita- 531
kṛ ‘make’ 7f., 22, **62-64**, 685,
 692, 797, *kriyā-te* 7f., 62f., 72,
 685, 692, 708f., 741, 753, 797,
ākāri 63, 741, 759, 797, *krāṇā-*
 63f., 797, *kriyāma* 7, *cakre* 64,
 797, *cakriyāḥ* 7
¹*kṛt* ‘cut’ **64-65**, 683, 692, *kṛtyā-te*
 64f., 683, 692, 753
²*kṛt* ‘spin’ 65¹⁴⁵
kṛp ‘shape’, *akṛpran* 742
kṛś ‘be lean’ **531**, 687, 723,
kṛśya-ti 531, 687, 723, 756,
-karśāya-ti 531
kṛṣ ‘drag, plough’ **65-66**, 683, 692,
 703, *kṛṣyā-te* 65f., 683, 692,
 703, 754, *kārṣa-ti/te*, *kṛṣā-ti* 66
kṛ ‘scatter’ **67-69**, 686, 692,
-kīryā-te 67ff., 686, 692, 695f.,
 754
kṛp ‘arrange, fit’ **464-465**, 694,
kalpya-te, *-kṛpya-te* 464f., 694,
 754, *-kalpa-te* 465, *kalpāya-ti/te*
 465, 694
kram ‘stride’ **69-71**, 688, 693,
 694, *kramyā-te* 69ff., 126f.,
 688, 693, 694, 704, 754,
krāma-ti, *krāma-te* 69ff.,
kramayati, *-krāmayati* 70f.,
 694
krī ‘buy’ 6, **71-72**, 686, 692,
krīyā-te 6, 71f., 686, 692, 753
krudh ‘be angry’ **531-532**, 687,
 723, *krúdhya-ti* 28, 531f., 687,
 723, 744, 756, *krudhaḥ* 744,
krodháya-ti 531f., *kruddhá-*
 531, *krudhyet*, *ácukrudhat* 532
krūd ‘burn (of milk)’ **465-467**,
 694, *krūḍya-te*, *krūḍaya-ti*
 465ff., 694, 754
kliś ‘hurt’ 644²⁰³¹, *kliśya-ti*, pass.
kliśya-te ‘be painfully affected’,
parikliśyamāna- 644²⁰³¹
kṣal ‘wash’ 694, **768**, *kṣālaya-ti*,
-kṣālya-te 694, 768, *kṣālāpaya-ti*
 768f.²²⁴⁰
kṣāya-ti ‘rule’ 14

- kṣā** ‘burn’ **532-533**, 688, 689,
723, *kṣāya*-^{ti} 15, 532f., 688,
723, 756, *kṣāpāya*-^{ti} 533
²**kṣi** ‘dwell’ 370⁹⁵⁵, 708, *kṣiyā*-^{ti}
349, 370⁹⁵⁵, 708
³**kṣi** (*kṣī*) ‘perish’ **370-373**, 685,
689²¹¹⁹, 709, *kṣīyā*-^{te} 12f., 23,
348, 370ff., 410, 439, 504, 541,
552, 685, 689²¹¹⁹, 709ff., 727,
743, 755, 770²²⁴¹, -*kṣīya*-^{ti}
370f., 373, 747, *kṣīṇāti*
‘destroys’ 12, 348, 719, 727,
kṣīṇōti 348⁸⁹¹, 719, 727, 729,
kṣāyi, *kṣeṣṭa* 373, 743
kṣip ‘throw’ **769**, *kṣipyā*-^{te} 370,
464¹⁵⁶⁶, 769, *kṣipyanti*,
kṣipyant-, *kṣipyet* 769
kṣudh ‘be hungry’ **534-535**, 687,
723, *kṣūdhyā*-^{ti} 28, 534f., 687,
723, 735, 756
-*kṣudhyā*- 524, 736
kṣéma- ‘rest, abode’ 792
kṣemayā-^{ti} ‘give rest, abode’ 792
khan ‘dig’ 5, **72-73**, 686, 692,
khāyā-^{te} 5f., 7⁸, 72f., 686, 692,
754, *khanya*-^{te} 7⁸, 73
khyā (*kṣā*) ‘see, consider’ **73-79**,
686, 690, 692, 694, 767, 797,
khyāyā-^{te} 73ff., 686, 690, 692,
695, 754, 797, aor. -*akhya*-^{ta}
75f., 797, fut. -*khyāyīṣya*-76f.,
738²¹⁹⁷, 745, 797, *khyāsyā*- 77,
-*khyāpāya*-^{ti} 76f., 694, 768,
-*kṣāpyāmāna*- 77ff., 694,
696²¹²⁸, 754, 767
gam ‘go’ **79-81**, 97²²⁶, 685, 693,
-*gamyāte* 79ff., 685, 693, 704,
742, 753, *gamayati* 80f.,
-*agāmi* 81, 742, *gamātas*,
gamāte 593, *agasmahi* 742,
gāchati 760
gā ‘sing’ **81-83**, 319⁸¹⁸, **535**, 686,
690, 692, 702, *gāyā*-^{te} 81ff.,
686, 692, 702, 753, *gāya*-^{ti} 15f.,
82f., 319⁸¹⁸, 535, 690
gup ‘protect’ 5, **83**, 683, 692,
gupyā-^{te} 5, 83, 683, 692, 701,
754, *gopāyati* 83, *jugupuh* 83
gūh ‘hide’ **83-84**, 683, 692,
guhyāmāna- 83f., 246, 683,
692, 753
gṛdh ‘be greedy’ **535-536**, 687,
723, *gṛdhya*-^{ti} 535f., 687, 723,
735, 756, *āgṛdhat* 536
gṛ ‘praise’ 738f., *gṛṇtē* 738f., *gṛṇē*
739²²⁰⁰
gopā- ‘protector’ 83
gra(b)h ‘seize’ 5, **84-86**, 683,
692, *grhyā*-^{te} 5, 84ff., 683, 692,
734, 741, *agr̥bhran* 86, 741
glā ‘be weary’ 10, **536**, 688, 723,
glāyā-^{ti} 10, 15, 536, 688, 723,
756, *glāpāya*-^{ti}, *glāyeran* 536,
749
ghṛ ‘drip’ **86-88**, 685, 694,
702, 705, *ghriya*-^{te} 86ff., 685,
705, 707f., 709²¹⁵⁰, 722, 755,
ghārāya-^{ti} 87f., 694, 694, 702,
-*ghāryā*-^{te} 86ff., 694, 702, 754
car ‘move, perform’ 10, **88-90**,
685, 692, *caryā*-^{te} 7f., 10, 88f.,
685, 692, 754, *cāratī* 10²⁰,
-*cārya*-^{te} 90, *carcūryā*- 549¹⁷⁸⁰
cāy ‘observe, respect’ **467**, 683,
692, *cāya*-^{ti}, -*cāyya*-^{te} 467, 683,
692, 754
ci ‘pile’ **91**, 467¹⁵⁷⁵, 685, 689,
692, *cīyā*-^{te} 91, 685, 689, 692,

- 753
cit ‘perveive, appear’ , *áceti*, *céti*
 742, 744, *céta*^{-te} 744
cint ‘think’ 694, 701, **770**,
cintaya^{-ti}, *cintya*^{-te} 694, 701,
 770
cintā- 770
cud ‘impel’ **770**, *codya*^{-te} 770
cṛt ‘bind, tie’ **91-92**, 684, 692,
-cṛtyá^{-te} 91f., 684, 692, 753
chad ‘cover, veil’ **467-468**, 694,
chādyā^{-te}, *chādāyā*^{-ti} 467f.,
 694, 754
chā ‘cut [the skin]’ **661-662**,
-ch_(i)yá^{-ti} 15, 661f., *(vi-)**chāyāti*
 241
chid ‘break, cut off’ **373-375**, 415,
 684, 709, *chidyá*^{-te} 373ff., 413,
 418¹⁰⁷⁶, 444, 482, 504, 684,
 709ff., 727, 735, 743, 755,
āchedi, *chedi*, *chitsi*, *chitsmahi*
 375, 415, 418¹⁰⁷⁶, 743, *chināti*
 719, 727
*jan*ⁱ ‘be born’ 5, 97²²⁶, 319,
320-322, 686, 689, 705, *jāyā*^{-te}
 5f., 7⁸, 21, 180, 319, 320ff.,
 477¹⁶⁰⁰, 686, 689, 705, 708,
 716²¹⁵⁸, 727, 742, 755,
jāna^{-ti/(te)} 477¹⁶⁰⁰, 727, *janya*^{-te}
 7⁸, 320, 322, *jajāna*, *jajñé* 320,
 747, *ājani*, *ājaniṣṭa* 320, 742,
janāyā^{-ti/te} 727
jabhya-, *jāmbhyā*- ‘grinder’
 537¹⁷⁴⁹
jas ‘disappear’ **536-538**, 687,
 723, *-jasya*^{-ti} 536ff., 687, 723,
 724, 756, *jāsamāna*-,
jāsayāmasi, *ajījasas* 537f.
jāgryā-, *jāgriyā*- 7¹¹
ji ‘win’ 377⁹⁷⁵, 584, **770-771**,
jīyá^{-te} 770f.
jīv ‘live’ **92**, 684, 693, *-jīvyá*^{-te}
 92, 684, 693, 754
juṣ ‘enjoy’, *ājuṣran* 742, 744
jī ‘grow old’ 6, **538-541**, 688,
 689, 723, *jīrya*^{-ti}, *jūrya*^{-ti} 6, 28,
 538ff., 688, 689, 723, 724, 730,
 756, *jīrya*^{-te} 538, 540f., 749,
jūrvasi 538, *jara*^{-te}, *jāriṣuḥ*
 539f., *jāra*^{-ti/(te)} ‘make old’,
jarāyā^{-ti} 539f., 730, *jurátam*
 ‘make weak, infirm’ 540,
jārayāyi 740²²⁰⁵
jñā ‘know’ 10, **92-95**, 562f.,
 686, 690, 692, 694, 797,
jñāyá^{-te} 10, 92ff., 686, 690,
 692, 695, 741, 753, 797,
-jñapyá^{-te} 93ff., 694, 754,
ājñāyi 95, 741, 797, *jānāna*-
 95, 797, *-jñapāyati* 95, 694
jyā ‘deprive of, suffer loss’ **375-**
380, 686, 710, 771, *jīyá*^{-te} 12f.,
 375ff., 686, 710ff., 727, 743,
 755, 771, *jināti* 12, 727, 729,
jinoti 727, 729, *ajyāsiṣṭām* 743
-jyāni- 378f.
jyut ‘shine’ **95-96**, 694, *-jyotyá*^{-te}
 95f., 694, 468, 754, *jyotāyati*
 95f., 694
jyēṣṭha- ‘superior’ 375
jvar ‘be/become feverish’, *jvaryate*
 8¹²
jval ‘burn, flame’ **468**, 694,
-jvālyā^{-te}, *jvālaya*^{-ti} 468, 694,
 754
¹*tan* ‘stretch’ **96-101**, 686, 692,
tāyá^{-te} 7⁸, 9, 96ff., 686, 692,
 732²¹⁸⁴, 741, 753, *tatā*- 96f.,

- tatya* 97²²³, 198f.⁴⁹⁶,
 -*tatyamāna*- 97²²³, 198f.⁴⁹⁶, pf.
tatāna etc. 97²²⁷, *tate*, *tatne*
 101, *tanóti* etc. 96ff., *tānáyati*
 96f., *tanya*-^{te} 7⁸, 9, 97²²³,
 -*tāyyāmāna*- 100, -*atāyi* 100f.,
 741, *tāyayām cakre* 101,
 periphr. fut. *tāyitā* 101²⁴⁰, abs.
 -*tāya* 101²⁴⁰
- ²*tan*⁽ⁱ⁾ (*stan*⁽ⁱ⁾) ‘thunder’ 540, **541-543**, 688, 689, 723, *tanya*-^{ti} 6, 541ff., 688, 689, 723, 757, *tanyatā*, *tanyú*- ‘thundering’, *tanyatú*- ‘thunder’ 541ff., 736f., 764
- tap* ‘heat’ **380-390**, 684, 710, *tápyá*-^{te} 380ff., 395, 684, 710ff., 728, 743, 755, *tápya*-^{ti} 380, 385, 388, 712²¹⁵³, 747f., *tápa*-^{ti} 380, 385, 710, 712²¹⁵³, 728, 748, *átāpi* 383, 389, 743, *átapthāḥ* 743, *tāpya*-^{te} 381, 389, *tapyatú*- ‘burning, heat’, *tapyatvái*, *tapatyái* 381, 385, 736, *atūtape* 389f.
- tápas*- 382f., 386ff.
- tā* → *stā*
- tāyú*- ‘thief’ 649f.
- tam*ⁱ ‘be exhausted’ **543-544**, 688, 723, *tāmya*-^{ti} 543f., 688, 723, 744, 756, *tāmya*-^{te} 543f., 749, *tamáya*-^{ti}, *tamat* 544, 744
- támodya*- 664, 736
- tāyú*- 649f., 737
- tuj* ‘set in motion’ **101-104**, 684, 692, *tujyá*-^{te} 101f., 684, 692, 726, 753, *tuñjāná*-101f., *túñjamāna*- 101f., *tujá*-^{ti} 102²⁴¹, 104, *tujánt*- 101f., *tujete* 103f., 462¹⁵⁵⁸
- tud* ‘incite, goad’ 739, 758, -*tundate* 739
- tuṣ* ‘be satisfied’ **544-545**, 687, 723, *tuṣya*-^{ti} 544f., 687, 723, 756, *tuṣya*-^{te} 544f.
- tṛp* ‘be satisfied’ **545-547**, 687, 723, 756, *tṛpya*-^{ti/(te)} 544, 545ff., 687, 723, 729, 730, 749, *tṛpyamāna*- 234⁶⁰⁴, 547, *tṛpñóti*, *tṛpñáti* 546, 730, *tarpáya*-^{ti} 545¹⁷⁷², 547, 729
- tṛṣ* ‘be thirsty’ **548**, 687, 723, *tṛṣya*-^{ti} 534f., 687, 548, 723, 735, 744, 756, 760, *tṛṣat* 534, 548, 744
- tṛh* ‘crush’ **104-106**, 684, 692, *tṛhyá*-^{te} 104f., 684, 692, 722, 753, *tṛṇedhi* etc. 722
- tṛ* (*tṛr*) ‘(sur)pass, overcome’ **469-471**, 550, 686, 692, 694, -*tṛya*-^{te} 469ff., 686, 692, 754, -*tārya*-^{te} 469ff., 694, 754, *tára*-^{ti} 469f., -*tirá*-^{ti} 469f., *tāráya*-^{ti} 470f., 694, -*tāri* 470f., *tārayām cakrus* 471
- tṛ* (*tṛr*) ‘surpass, overcome’ **549-550**, 688, 689, 724, *tṛya*- 469, 549f., 688, 689, 724, 757, *taruṣyat*- 549f., *aturyathuḥ* / *aturyathāḥ*, *tartūrya*- 549¹⁷⁸⁰, *tūrva*-^{ti} 550
- tūryantī* (plant name) 549f.
- trā* ‘rescue’ 10, **322-323**, 686, 690, 706, *trāya*-^{te} 15, 10, 322f., 686, 690, 706, 755, *trāyaka*- 322, 736
- tvác*- ‘skin’ 661
- dad* ‘hold’ **106**, 684, 692,

- dadyá*^{-te} 106, 684, 692, 753
dandramyamāṇa- ‘running around’ 302⁷⁷⁷
dabh ‘deceive’ 10, **472**, 684, 692, *dabhya*^{-te} 10, 472, 551, 553, 684, 692, 739²¹⁹⁹, 753, *dabhnóti*, aor. *dabhúh*, pf. *dadābha* 472
damⁱ ‘control’ **550-551**, 688, 723, *dāmya*^{-ti} 126f., 550f., 688, 723, 756, *damáyati* 550f.
dambh ‘hurt’ 472, *dambháya*^{-ti}, pf. *dadambha*, aor. -*dambhiṣat* 472
das ‘waste’ 537, **551-554**, 687, 723, *dasya*^{-ti} 537, 551ff., 687, 723, 730, 756, *dasya*^{-te} 551, 554, 749, *dasaya*^{-te} 730, -*dasyá*- (in *a-vidasyá*-) 551, 736
dah ‘burn’ **390-397**, 684, 710, *dáhyá*^{-te} 390ff., 710ff., 684, 728, 743, 755, *dahya*^{-ti} 390f., 395f., 747, *dáha*^{-ti} 395, 719, 728, -*dāhya*^{-te} 390, 396f., *adhākṣīt* etc. 743
¹**dā** ‘give’ 106, **107-109**, 111, 520, 673, 686, 692, 695, 792ff., 796, 797, *dīyá*^{-te} 107ff., 686, 692, 741, 753, 797, *adāyi* 77, 107, 109, 741, 797, pres. *dade* 106, pf. *dadé*, *dadriré* 106, 109, 797, *dāpyamāna*- 698²¹³³, *deyām* 108, -*ditsa*- 11, 108, -*ditsya*^{-te} 11, 107ff., 493f., 695, 699f., 754, *dāti*, *dātu* 673, *adāyiṣi*, fut. *dāyiṣye*, periphr. fut. *dāyitā*, *adiṣi*, *dāsyate*, *dātā* 738²¹⁹⁷
²**dā** ‘bind’ **109-110**, **663-675**, 686, 692, 794, 796, 797, -*dīyá*^{-te} 109, 675, 686, 692, 741, 753, 797, -*dāyi* 109f., 741, 797, pf. -*dadé* 110, 797, -*d(i)yá*^{-ti} 15, 663ff., *ditá*- 674
^{3/4}**dā** (*dī*) ‘cut, destroy’ **110-112**, **663-675**, 686, 692, 794, 796, -*dīyá*^{-te} 110ff., 686, 692, 753, -*d(i)yá*^{-ti/(te)} 15, 112, 663ff., *dāya*^{-te} ‘distribute, share’ 14, 666, *dāti* 664ff., *ádāt* 673f., -*diṣīya* 674, *diná*-, *ditá*- 674
dīs ‘point (out), prescribe’ **472-473**, 684, 692, *diśya*^{-te} 472f., 684, 692, 754
dih ‘smear’ **474**, 684, 692, *dihya*^{-te} 684, 692, 754, -*dihyet* 474
¹**dī** ‘fly’ 28, **554-556**, 687, 723, *dīya*^{-ti} 554ff., 687, 723, 757, *dīya*^{-te} 554, 556, 750
dīp ‘shine, blaze’ **323-324**, 684, 706, 744, *dīpya*^{-te/(ti)} 323f., 684, 706f., 742, 744, 747, 755, *dīpti*- 323, *dīpāya*- 323
dīv ‘play’ 5, **556-560**, 688, 723, *dīvyā*^{-ti/te} 5, 11, 556ff., 688, 723, 748, 749, 757
du (*dū*) ‘burn’ **474-475**, 685, 692, *dūya*^{-te} 474f., 685, 692, 753, *dunóti*, *duta*-, *dūná*- 474¹⁵⁸⁹
duṣ ‘spoil’ **560-562**, 687, 694, 723, *duṣya*^{-ti} 560ff., 687, 723, 724, 756, *duṣya*^{-te}, *dūṣya*^{-te} 560, 562, 694, 754, *dūṣāya*^{-ti} 561f., 694
duh ‘milk’ **112-121**, 684, 692,

- 694, 703, 797, *duhyá*-^{te} 112ff.,
684, 692, 703, 726, 753, 754,
797, *dógdhi*, *duhánti* etc.
113ff., *doháya*-^{ti} 112, 118f.,
694, *dohyámāna*- 112, 118f.,
694, 754, *dohita*- 119²⁸⁶, -*duhe*,
-*duhré* 120, 242⁶²⁵, 797,
duduhāná- 120, 797, *dhokṣyate*
121, *dú(g)hāna*-, *duhāná*-
242⁶²⁵
- dṛ** ‘heed’ **121-123**, 685, 706,
-*driyá*-^{te} 12, 121ff., 685, 706,
707f., 742, 755, -*dṛdhvam* 742
- dṛp** ‘be bewildered’ **562-563**, 687,
723, *dṛpya*-^{ti} 28, 562f., 687,
723, 735, 744, 756, *adṛpat* 744
- dṛś** ‘see’ **5**, **123-125**, 582, 684,
692, 798, *dṛśyá*-^{te} 5, 14, 22,
123ff., 473, 684, 692, 695, 741,
753, 798, *ádarśi*, *ádṛśran/-ram*
125, 741, 798, *dṛśāna*-,
dṛśāná- 125, 798, *dádṛśe* /
dadṛśé 125, 744²²¹², 798,
dṛkṣata 125, 144³⁵⁰, 741, 798
- dṛh** ‘be firm’ **563-564**, 687,
723, *dṛhya*-^{ti/(te)} 563f., 687,
723, 750, 756, 762, *drahyát*
564, 737, *dṛṇháya*-^{ti} 729, 770,
dṛṇha-^{ti/te} 762
- dṛ̐** (*dṛ̐*) ‘crack’ **397-400**, 686,
709, *dṛ̐yá*-^{te} 9, 397ff., 686,
413, 443¹¹⁴⁶, 504, 539, 709ff.,
727, 743, 755, ⁺*avadīryatī* 400,
dārṣat, *darṣasi* 398, 743, aor.
dárt, *dadṛvāms*-, *dártar*- /
dartár- 398, ^o*driyá*- 398,
-*dṛṇīyāt*, *daráyati*, *dārayati*
727, 729
devayánt- 9¹⁸
- driyá*- 398, 736
- druh** ‘be deceitful’ **564-565**, 687,
723, *drúhya*-^{ti} 564f., 687, 723,
744, 756, *adruhaḥ* 744
- druhyú*- ‘deceitful’ 615¹⁹⁵², 737,
764
- dham** (*dhmā*) ‘blow’ **5**, **125-130**,
686, 687, 692, *dhamyate* 5f.,
125ff., 686, 692, 753,
dhmāyá-^{te} 125ff., 646, 687,
692, 746, 754
- dhā** ‘put’ **8**, **130-134**, 686, 692,
798, *dhāyá*-^{te} 8, 130f., 180, 686,
692, 732²¹⁸⁴, 733f., 741, 753,
798, *ádḥāyi* 132, 741, 798,
-*dhāpyamāna*- 130, 132, 189,
697f., *dadhé*, *dadhíré*,
dádḥāna- 23, 132ff., 180, 798,
dadhīta 798, *hitá*- **8**
- dhā** ‘suck’, *dhāya*- **14**, 15²⁹, 460
- dhāv** ‘rub’ **475**, 684, 692,
-*dhāvya*-^{te} 475, 684, 692, 754,
dhāva-^{ti} 475, -*dhāveta* 128
- dhū** ‘shake’ **134-135**, 475¹⁵⁹³,
686, 692, -*dhūyá*-^{te} 134f., 686,
692, 753, *dhūnóti*, *dhūvāti* 135
- dhūp** ‘smoke’ **135-137**, 692, 694,
dhūpyá-^{te} 135ff., 692, 694, 701,
754, *dhūpāyá*-^{ti}, *dhūpāya*-^{ti}
136, 694, abs. -*dhūpya* 137
- dhṛ** ‘stay’ **138-140**, 685, 694, 705,
706, *dhriyá*-^{te} 12, 138f., 358,
685, 705, 706, 707f., 722, 727,
742, 755, *dhārāya*-^{ti/te},
dhāryá-^{te} 140, 694, 727, 754
- dhṛṣ** ‘dare’ 693, **771**, -*dhṛṣya*-^{te}
693, 771
- dhmā* → *dham*
- dhyā** ‘think of, meditate’ **565-568**,

- 688, 724, *dhyaāya*-^{ti/te} 15f.,
128, 565ff., 688, 724, 748, 750,
757, *dhyaāyīta* 128, 566,
dhyaāyēt 565ff., -*dhyaāyīn*- 16
dhva(m)s ‘become ruined’ **568-569**, 687, 723, -*dhvasya*-^{ti}
568f., 687, 723, 724, 756
nam ‘bend’ **476-477**, 685, 692,
namyá-^{te} 476f., 491f., 685, 692,
753, *nāma*-^{ti} 476, 748, *nāma*-^{te}
476f., 491, 748
¹***naś*** ‘perish’ **569-570**, 571f., 687,
723, *naśya*-^{ti} 28, 360, 569f.,
607, 608, 687, 723, 724, 729,
756, *naśya*-^{te} 569f., 750,
nāśāya-^{ti} 570, 607, 729,
anīnaśat 570
²***naś*** (*aś*) ‘reach’ **570-572**, 687,
-*āśyant*- 570ff., 687, 757,
aśnōti, *aśn(u)vānt*- 571,
-*āśvan*-, -*āśniya*-, -*naśśīn*-
570ff., (fut.?) -*aś(s)yati* 572
nah ‘tie’ **140, 572-578**, 684, 687,
692, 724, 730, *nāhya*-^{ti/te}
572ff., 603, 687, 724, 730, 760,
757, -*nahyāmāna*- 140,
575, 603, 684, 692, 730f., 753,
-*nahyuh* 572¹⁸⁴¹, *anāha*,
naddhá-, *naddhi*- 574
nāman- 446
nikramaṇa- ‘[ritual] footstep’ 71
nij ‘wash’ 665²⁰⁸³
nid ‘revile’ **140-141**, 684, 692,
798, *nidyāmāna*- 140f., 684,
692, 753, 798, *nidānā*- 141,
798, *nindya*-^{te} 140f., *nindita*-
141, *nīndati* 584f.
nī ‘lead’ **141-143**, 686, 692,
nīyá-^{te} 141ff., 485, 686, 692,
732, 753, *nāya*-^{te} 143
nud ‘push’ **477-478**, 684, 692,
nudya-^{te} 477f., 684, 692, 754,
nodaya-^{ti} 478
nṛt ‘dance’ 5, **578-580**, 684,
687, 693, 723, 730, *nṛtya*-^{ti} 5,
28, 578f., 687, 723, 730, 757,
nṛtya-^{te} 578ff., 684, 693, 704,
730, 749, 754, *nṛtta*- ‘dance’
579¹⁸⁶⁶, *nṛtāmāna*- 580
pac ‘cook; ripen’ 12, **400-406**,
684, 710, *pacyá*-^{te} ‘be cooked’
12f., 400ff., 684, 710ff., 728,
743, 755, *pācyā*-^{te} ‘ripen’ 12f.,
394f., 400ff., 489, 491, 684,
710ff., 728, 743, 755, *pāca*-^{ti}
719, 728, -*pacyá*- ‘ripening’
401, 736
pañ ‘bargain’ **143**, 685, 692,
paṇyāmāna- 143, 685, 692,
753
¹***pat*** ‘fall’ 329f., *patant*- 316, *āpāti*
330
²***pat*** ‘rule; possess’ **324-326**, 684,
706, *pātya*-^{te} 324ff., 684, 706f.,
755,
pad ‘move, fall’ 10, **326-330**,
478, 684, 694, 705, *pādyā*-^{tel/(ti)}
10, 22f., 180, 326ff., 400¹⁰²⁶,
485, 684, 705, 708, 716²¹⁵⁸,
720f., 727, 728, 734, 742, 747,
755, 760, 775, *papāda* 180,
pādāya-^{ti} 326, 329, 694, 727,
728, -*pādyā*-^{te} 326, 329, 694,
754, *padyet* 326, 329, *pādi*,
apadran 329f., 742, (*a*)*patsi*,
apatsata 742
panⁱ ‘admire’ **143-146**, 686,
692, 741, 798, *vipanyāmahe*

- 143ff., 686, 692, 753, 798,
paṇné, paṇiṣṭa 143, 741, 798
parimara- 179⁴⁴⁷
paryagnikaraṇa- 795
paś ‘see’ 535¹⁷⁴⁷, **580-583**,
 687, 724, *páśya*-^{ti/te} 360, 580ff.,
 687, 724, 749, 750, 757, 760,
 762; see also *spaś*
paśyata- ‘conspicuous’ 580, 737
¹**pā** ‘protect’ **583-584**, **pāya*-^{ti}
 583f.
²**pā** ‘drink’ **146-147**, 687, 692,
 798, *pāyá*-^{te} 146f., 687, 692,
 741, 753, 798, *ápāyi* 147, 741,
 798, *pape* 101, 147, 798,
paṇāná- 147, 798, *-pāyya*-^{te}
 146f., 697f.
pāpá- 585¹⁸⁸⁶
pāyú- ‘protector’ 583f., 737
piṭṭṭa-yajñá-, *piṭṭṭa-yāna-* 7
piś ‘adorn’ **147-148**, 684, 692,
 798, *piśyāmānā-* 147f., 684,
 692, 753, 798, *piṇṇé* 148, 798,
piṇṇé 148
piś ‘crush, grind’ **149-150**, 684,
 692, 798, *piśyá*-^{te} 149, 684,
 692, 722f., 753, 798, *piṇṇá-*,
piṇṇá 722f., *-piṇṇé* 149f., 798
piś ‘prosper’ **584**, 687, 723,
piśya-^{ti} 584, 687, 723, 756,
piṇṇá 584
pésuka- 584
²**pī** (**pī**) ‘blame’ **584-586**, 591,
 687, 689, 724, 733, *pīya*-^{ti}
 584ff., 615¹⁹⁵², 687, 689, 724,
 757, *pīyaka-*, *pīyatnú-*, *pīyāru-*
 ‘scornful’ 585, 733, 736f.,
pīyú- 585, 615¹⁹⁵², 733, 737
pīḍ ‘press, squeeze’ **478-479**, 684,
 692, 798, *pīḍya*-^{te} 478, 684,
 692, 754, 798, *piṇṇé* 478f., 798
puṇya-manyá-, *punar-manyá-* 337,
 343, 735f.
puṣ ‘prosper’ **586-590**, 687,
 723, *púśya*-^{ti} 25f., 353, 365,
 367, 586ff., 651²⁰⁴⁹, 687, 723,
 729f., 747, 756, 791, *puśya*-^{te}
 587, 590, *pośaya*-^{ti} 730, inf.
puśyáse 737
puṣṭí-, *póśa-* 587¹⁸⁹²
¹**pū** ‘purify’ **150-151**, 686, 692,
 798, *pūyá*-^{te} 150f., 282, 686,
 692, 753, 798, *punāná-* 151,
 798, *-pupuvāná-*, *pupuve*, 151,
 798, *pāvāya*-^{ti/te}, *pāvya*-^{te} 150f.
²**pū** ‘stink, rot’ **590-592**, 687,
 689, 723, *pūya*-^{ti} 590f., 687,
 723, 724, 756, *apūyīt* 591¹⁸⁹⁸,
-pūyita- 590
pūya-, *pūyá-* ‘pus’, *pūti-* ‘stinking’
 591
pṛ ‘be busy’ 708²¹⁴⁷, *-priyate*
 708²¹⁴⁷
pṛc ‘fill, unite’ **152-157**, 684,
 710, *pṛcyá*-^{te} 152ff., 684, 710,
 722, 732²¹⁸⁶, 755, *papṛcāná-*,
pṛcāná- 155f., *pṛñkté*, *pṛñákti*
 etc. 155f., 722
pṛch/prach ‘ask’ **157**, 684, 692,
pṛchāti 157, *pṛchyá*-^{te} 157, 684,
 692, 753
pṛ (**pūr**) ‘fill’ **406-412**, 686, 710,
 729, *pūryá*-^{te} 406ff., 686,
 710ff., 728, 734, 735, 743, 755,
 762, *-pūrya*-^{ti} 407, 411, 747,
pūrāya-^{ti} 407, 728, 729,
pūpurantu, *pūrñá-* 407, *pṛñāti*,
pṛñá-^{ti/te} (*-pṛñātām*, *-pṛñethām*)

- etc.) 406ff., 728, 762, -*apūri*,
-*apūriṣṭhāḥ* 411f., 743, *píparti*
728, 729
- pyā** ‘swell’ 10, **157-158, 330-332**, 687, 690, 694, 705,
pyāya-^{te} 10, 15f., 330ff., 511,
515, 554, 637²⁰¹⁰, 687, 690,
705, 742, 755, *pyāya*-^{ti} 330ff.,
748, *pyāyāya*-^{ti} 16, 157f., 332,
694, 748, -*pyāyyāmāna*- 157f.,
694, 696, *pyāsiṣīmahi* 742
- prā* 427¹¹⁰⁷
- praj(j)** ‘end, stop’ **592-594**, 687,
723, -*prj(y)a*-^{ti(ie)} (-*prjyanti*,
-*prjyāte*) 592f., 687, 723, 756,
-*prjja*-^{ti} 593f.
- pratihāra*- 310, 312, 694, 785, 790
- pravarā*- 250ff., 693, 701, 785,
788, 790, 792
- pravargyā*- 248, 694, 785
- prastāva*- 292, 295, 694, 785, 790,
792
- prā* ‘fill’ 741, *aprāyi* 741, 743²²⁰⁶
- prī** ‘please’ **479-480**, 686, 692,
prīya-^{te}, *priya*-^{te} 479f., 686,
692, 754, *prīṇāti* 479
- pruṣ** ‘sprinkle, spurt’ **594**, 687,
723, *pruṣṇuvānti* 594,
-*pruṣya*-^{ti} 594, 687, 723, 756
- pruṣvā* ‘drop of water’ 441f.
- praiṣā*- 525, 785
- plī* → **vlī**
- plu* ‘swim’ **481**, fut.
ploṣyamāṇa- 481
- pluṣ* ‘burn’ **481**
- prātar* ‘early in the morning’ 101
- psā* ‘chew’ **481**
- badh** → **vadh**
- bandh** ‘bind’ **158-159**, 684, 692,
779, 798, *badhyā*-^{te} 158f., 684,
692, 732²¹⁸⁴, 753, 779, 798,
bedhiṣe 159, 798
- budh** ‘awake; perceive’ **332-336**,
684, 705, 706, *búdhya*-^{te} 332f.,
358, 488, 684, 705, 706, 708,
727, 728, 731²¹⁸³, 742, 755,
ábodhi, *ábudhran/m* 336, 742,
búdhya-^{ti} 333, *bódha*-^{ti} 334,
bodháya-^{ti} 727, 728, *ábhutsi*
etc. 742
- bṛh* → **vṛh**
- brū* ‘say’ 745, *bruve* 745,
bruvāṇā- 745²²¹⁵
- blī* → **vlī**
- bhaks** ‘consume’ **159-160**, 684,
692, *bhakṣyāmāna*- 159f., 684,
692, 701, 753, *bhakṣāya*-^{ti} 160,
701
- bhaj** ‘share, divide’ 10, **160-167**,
684, 692, 798, -*bhajya*-^{te} 10f.,
160ff., 684, 692, 753, 798,
bhājya-^{te} 160ff., 684, 692,
696²¹²⁷, 753, 798, -*bhāja*-^{ti},
-*bhāja*-^{te} 161f., 164ff.,
bhājáyati 162, *vibhāgá*- 162,
-*bhejire* 165, 798
- bhañj** ‘break’ 163, 166, **481-482**, 684, 709, *bhajya*-^{te} 481f.,
684, 709, 722, 728, 743, 755,
-*bhajya*-^{ti}, *bhajyet* 481,
bhanákti 482, 728
- bhāṣ** ‘speak’ **482-483**, 684, 706f.,
bhāṣya-^{te} 482f., 684, 706f.,
755, *bhāṣamāṇa*- 483
- bhid** ‘split’ **412-415**, 684, 709,
bhídya-^{te} 412ff., 482, 684,
709ff., 722, 728, 743, 755,
bhinátti 722, 728, *bhedi*,

- bhitthāḥ* 415, 743
bhī ‘fear’ **771-772**, *bhīya*-^{te} 771f.
bhuj ‘consume’ **167**, 684, 692,
bhujyá-^{te} 167, 684, 692, 754
bhū ‘become’ 585, 693, **772-773**, *-bhūya*-^{te} 693, 772f., 780,
-bhūya-^{ti} 748, 772f.
bhr ‘carry’ **168-170**, 685, 692,
798, *bhriyá*-^{te} 168f., 685, 692,
708, 732f., 741, 753, 762, 764,
798, *-bhāri*, *babhrāṇá*- 169,
741, 798, *bhára*-^{te} 169f., 762,
798, *bhára*-^{ti} 762, *bibhramāṇa*-
170, 798, *bibharti*, *bibhr̥te*
315⁸⁰⁷, *bibhryāt*, *bibhr̥tāḥ* 7
bṛhāt ‘loudly’ 213f.
bhr̥j(j) ‘roast’ **483-484**, **594**, 684,
692, *bhr̥j(j)ya*-^{te} 483f., 684,
692, 754, *bhr̥j(j)yéyuh* 483¹⁶¹⁵,
594
bhra(m)ś ‘fall’ **484-485**, 684,
705, *bhraśya*-^{te}, *bhraṁśya*-^{te}
484f., 684, 705, 722, 755, 783,
bhráṁśa-^{te} 484, 783
bhram ‘wander, move’ 705, **773-775**, *bhrāmya*-^{te} 705ff., 773ff.,
bhrāmya-^{ti} 773f., *bhrama*-^{ti}
773²²⁵⁰, *bhrāmaya*-^{ti} 774f.,
bhramyāt 774
bhrāj ‘shine’, *ábhrāji* 742,
bhrāja-^{te/ti} 744
bhr̥ñāti 9¹⁷
mad ‘rejoice’ **170-171**, 684, 692,
-madyāmāna- 170f., 684, 692,
753
man ‘think’ 7, **171**, **336-346**,
685, 695, 706, *mánya*-^{te} 7,
336ff., 488, 685, 706, 708, 714,
735, 742, 760, 763, 755,
manya-^{ti}, *manyet* 336, 344f.,
747, *°manýa*- 337, 343,
ámamsta, *mamsi*, *māmsase* etc.
337, 742, *manuté*, aor. *ámata*,
ámanmahī etc. 341ff., *manávai*
344f.⁸⁸², *mánāmahe* 343f.,
mīmāṁsa-^{te} 345f., 699²¹³⁶,
mīmāṁsyámāna- 171, 337,
345f., 695, 699²¹³⁶, 753
mantr ‘pronounce a mantra;
address’ **171-172**, 695,
mantráya-^{te/(ti)} 11, 171, 695,
701, *-mantryá*-^{te} 11, 171f., 695,
701, 754
manth ‘stir; churn’ 5, **172-173**,
684, 692, *mathyá*-^{te} 5, 172f.,
684, 692, 753
²**mā** ‘measure’ 8, **173-175**, 176,
416, 739, 798, *māya*-^{te} 8, 173ff.,
739, 753, 798, *mīmīte* 174f.,
739, 798
mād ‘be drunk’ **595-596**, 687,
723, *mādya*-^{ti} 595f., 687, 723,
756, *mādáya*-^{ti} 595
mām-paśyá- ‘look-at-me’ 580
¹**mi** ‘fix, set up’ 8, 174ff., **175-**
178, 416, 685, 689, 692, *mīyá*-^{te}
8, 175ff., 685, 689, 692, 741,
753, *minóti* 175, *-māyi* 178,
741
²**mi** ‘change’ 416f., *maya*-^{te} 416f.,
mimūtaḥ etc. 417¹⁰⁷¹
mitháḥ ‘mutually’ 24, 105f.
mithunaṃ car- ‘perform
copulation, intercourse’ 549¹⁷⁸⁰
¹**mī** ‘damage’ 8, 174, 176ff., **415-**
420, 686, 709, *mīyá*-^{te} 12f.,
415ff., 439, 504, 686, 709ff.,
728, 743, 755, *miná*-^{ti} 417, 728,

- ámāyi, meṣi, meṣṭa* 420, 743
mīv ‘move, impel’ 5⁵, 415¹⁰⁶⁵,
 416, **485**, 686, 692, -*mīvyā-te*
 485, 686, 692, 754
muc ‘release, free’ **420-425**, 684,
 710, *múcyā-te* 12f., 23, 420ff.,
 434, 684, 710ff., 735, 743, 755,
 784, -*mucya-ti* 421, 424f., 747,
amoci, móci 422¹⁰⁸⁹, 424, 743,
mukṣata 743
muṣ ‘steal, rob’ **486**, 684, 692,
 703, *muṣya-te* 486, 684, 692,
 703, 754
muh ‘be confused, err’ **596-597**,
 687, 723, *múhya-ti* 596f., 687,
 723, 729, 744, 756, *muhya-te*
 596f., 750, *amuhat* 744,
moháyati 597¹⁹¹², 729
mṛ ‘die’ **179-181**, 685, 705
mriyá-te 7⁹, 12, 157, 179ff.,
 418¹⁰⁷⁷, 541, 685, 694, 705,
 707ff., 727, 742, 752, 755, 763,
māráya- 179, 181, 694, 727,
māryá-te 179, 181, 694, 754,
mṛṣi 742
mṛc ‘be harmed’ **597-598**, 687,
 723, -*mṛcya-ti* 597f., 687, 723,
 756
mṛj ‘wipe, cleanse’ **182-185**, 684,
 692, 798, *mṛjyá-te* 182ff., 487,
 684, 692, 726, 753, 798,
 -*mṛḍḍhvam*, -*mṛjatām* 183f.,
 -*mṛjāná-* 184f., 798, *māmṛje*
 184f., 798, *marmṛjāná-* 184f.,
 798, *marmṛjyámāna-* 185, 798
mṛt ‘destroy’ **487, 598**, 684, 692,
 -*mṛtya-te* 487, 684, 692, 754,
 -*mṛityét*, -*mṛityet*, -*mṛityeyuh*
 598
mṛd ‘rub, crush’ **185-186**, 684,
 692, *mṛdyá-te* 185f., 684, 692,
 722f., 754, *mṛdnā-ti* 722f.
mṛś ‘touch’ **186-187**, 684, 692,
 -*mṛśyá-te* 186f., 684, 692, 754,
mṛśāse 183
mṛṣ ‘forget’ **487-488**, 684, 706,
mṛṣya-te 487f., 684, 706, 722,
 742, 755, *marṣiṣṭhāḥ* 742
mṛ ‘crush’ 180⁴⁴⁹, **187**, 686,
 692, -*mūryá-te* 187, 686, 692,
 722, 754, *mṛṇīhi*, *mṛṇāti* 722
med ‘be fat’ 10, **599**, 687, 723,
médya-ti 10f., 599, 687, 723,
 756, *medáyati* 531, 599
mnā ‘mention’ **775**, -*mnāya-te*
 775
myakṣ ‘be fixed, attached; keep
 away’, *ámyakṣi* 742
mlā ‘wither’ **599-600**, 688, 723,
mlāya-ti 15, 599f., 637²⁰¹⁰, 688,
 723, 724, 756, *mlāpāya-ti* 600
yaj ‘worship’ 5, 10¹⁹, **187-189**,
 303⁷⁸², 684, 692, 703, *ijyá-te* 5,
 10¹⁹, 187ff., 684, 692, 703,
 754, *yājya-te* 188f., 697f.,
yajeta 780
yat ‘be/put in place’ **488**, 694,
yātáya-, -*yātya-te* 488, 694, 754
yabh ‘fuck, copulate’ **488-494**,
 684, 692, 695, 798,
 +*yabhyámānā* 488ff., 684, 692,
 753, 798, **yábhyate* 488ff.,
 +*yapsyámānā* 493, 798,
yīyapsya-te 488, 493f., 695,
 699f., act.part. *yīyapsyant-*
 494, 700f.
yam ‘hold’ 7, **189-192**, 685,
 692, 798, *yamyá-te* 7, 80f.,

- 189f., 685, 692, 741, 753, 798,
áyāmi 190, 741, 798, *yemānā-*
 190f., 798, *-yemire* 191, 798,
ayaṃsata 191f., 798
- yas** ‘be heated, boil’ **600-601**, 687,
 723, *-yāsyā-^{ti}* 600f., 687, 723,
 756, *yayastu* 600f., *yēṣa-^{ti}* 601
- ¹**yā** ‘drive’ **347-350**, 495f., 687,
 690, 705, 720, *īya-^{te}* 347ff.,
 353, 419f., 495f., 687, 690,
 705, 714, 720, 742, 755,
ayāsiṣṭa etc. 742
- ²**yā** ‘implore, request’ 347, **494-**
496, 687, 692, 798, *īya-^{te}* 347,
 494ff., 687, 692, 753, 798,
iyānā- 496, 798
- ²**yu** ‘keep away’, *áyāvi* 744
- yuj** ‘yoke, join’ 5, 26f., **192-195**,
 684, 692, 702, 738, 798,
yujyá-^{te} 5, 188f., 192ff., 204,
 603, 684, 692, 702, 732²¹⁸⁴,
 741, 753, 775f., 798, *yuñjānti*
 etc. 192f., *-yuñjate* 204, *áyoji*,
ajujran, *yujānā-* 195, 738, 740,
 741, 798, *yuyujé*, *yuyujré*,
yuyujānā- 195, 798, *ayukṣata*
 144³⁵⁰, 738, 740, 741, 798
- yudh** ‘fight’ 5, **601-604**, 687,
 723, *yúdhyā-^{ti/te}* 5, 28, 601ff.,
 687, 723, 748, 749, 757
- rakṣ** ‘protect’ **775-776**,
rakṣya-^{te} 775f., *rākṣamāṇā-*
 775f.
- raj** ‘color, become red’ **497-498**,
 684, 705, *rajya-^{te}* 497f., 684,
 705, 721f., 742, 755, *rajya-^{ti}*,
-rajja-^{ti} 497f., 747, *lajja-^{te/(ti)}*
 497f.
- ran⁽ⁱ⁾** (**raṇ⁽ⁱ⁾**) ‘rejoice’ **604-606**,
 688, 689, 723, *rāṇya-^{ti}* 546f.,
 604ff., 688, 689, 723, 730,
 760²²²⁴, 756, *rāraṇat* 605¹⁹³³,
raṇaya-^{ti} 606, 689, 730, *rāṇa-^{ti}*
 606, 730, *raṇva-^{ti}* 606,
arāṇiṣuḥ, *rāṇiṣṭana*, *rāṇitr-*,
 caus. *raṇaya-^{ti}* 689
- randh** ‘be subject’ **606-607**, 687,
 723, *rādhyā-^{ti}* 606f., 687, 723,
 756, *rādhyā-^{te}* 606, 750,
randhāya-^{ti} 606f., *radham*,
rīradhat, *randhīḥ*, *randhi* 607
- rabh/labh** ‘take, seize’ 10, **195-**
198, 684, 692, 695, *-rabhyá-^{te}* /
labhyá-^{te} 10, 195, 684, 692,
 699f., 754, *-lipsyāmāna-*,
-rips(y)amāna- 195, 197f.,
 493f., 695, 699f., 754, *-lipsate*
 699f., *-labha-^{te}* 699
- ram** ‘stop, be satisfied’ **777**,
-ramya-^{te} 777, *-ramyet* 777,
-ramantu 777²²⁶⁶
- rasya-* → ¹**naś**
- ²**rā** ‘bark’ **608-609**, 688, 690, 723,
rāya-^{ti} 15, 608f., 688, 690, 723,
 757
- rājasūya-* ‘royal consecration’
 284f.
- rādh** ‘succeed’ **350-353**, 684,
 705, *rādhyā-^{te}* 350ff., 684, 705,
 727, 742, 755, *rādhyā-^{ti}* 350,
 353, 747, *rādhyāsam* 350,
rādhnoti 350, 727, *árādhi*,
rādhiṣṭa 353, 740, 742
- ric** ‘empty, surpass, leave’ **425-**
428, 684, 710, *rícyá-^{te}* 14,
 425ff., 448, 684, 710ff., 728,
 743, 755, *reci*, *rikthāḥ*, *árikṣi*,
rikṣata etc. 428, 743, *riṇákti*

- 14, 728
riph ‘snarl’ **777-778**, *riphya*^{-te} 777f.
ribh ‘creak; sing’ **498-499**, 684, 692, *ribhya*^{-te} 498f., 684, 692, 753, *rēbha*^{-ti}, pf. *rirēbha* 498
riṣ ‘be hurt’ **609-611**, 687, 723, *riṣya*^{-ti} 609ff., 651²⁰⁴⁹, 687, 723, 729, 744, 748, 756, *riṣya*^{-te} 609, 611, 748, 750, *ariṣat*, *riṣāmā*, *rīṣant*-, *rīṣant*- 611, 744, *rīrikṣa*^{-ti} 611¹⁹⁴⁰, *reṣāya*^{-ti} 730
reṣin-, °*riṣā*- 611¹⁹⁴⁰
rī ‘whirl, swirl’ 6, **353-354**, 358, 686, 705, *rīya*^{-te} 6, 21f., 353f., 479, 686, 705, 708, 727, 728, 755, *riṇāti* 354, 358, 479, 727, 728, *riṇāte*, *riṇānā*- 354, 727
ruc ‘shine’ **499**, 694, *rocaya*-, *rocya*^{-te} 499, 694, 754, *aroci* 630, 740, 742, 744, *rōca*^{-te} 744, *ruciṣṭya*, *arociṣṭa* 740, 742
ruj ‘hurt’ 590, **778**, *-rujya*^{-te} 778
⁽¹⁾**rudh** ‘obstruct, keep’ 11, **198-207**, 684, 692, 696, *rudhya*^{-te/(ti)} 198ff., 684, 692, 696, 746, 753, *-rundhyāt*, *-rundhyeran* 198f.⁴⁹⁶, *ródhati* 203⁵⁰⁶, *-rurutsyāmāna*- 11, 199, 205, 493f., 695, 699f., 754, *-run(d)dhe* 198, 206f.
²**rudh** ‘grow’ 202f., 208⁵²³
rup ‘suffer (stomach) pain’ **612**, 687, 723, *rúpya*^{-ti} 612, 687, 723, 756, *ropāya*^{-ti} 612
ruh/rup ‘rise’ 202f., **207-208**, *-ropyāmāna*-, *-rohyāmāna*- 207f., 694, 754, *ropaya*- 208⁵²⁴, 694
lakṣ ‘mark’ 695, **778-779**, *-lakṣaya*-, *-lakṣya*^{-te} 695, 778f.
labh → **rabh**
lajj → **raj**
likh ‘scratch’ **779**, *-likhya*^{-te} 779
lip ‘stick, stain’ **208-211**, 684, 710, *lipyā*^{-te} 208ff., 645, 684, 710, 720, 722, 728, 743, 750, 755, *alipsata* 210f., 743, *limpā*^{-ti} 722, 728
lī ‘dissolve; adhere’ **354-359**, 505, 686, 705, *lāya*^{-te} 355, *līya*^{-te} 354ff., 505, 686, 705, 722, 727, 742, 755, *-līya*^{-ti} 355, 358f., 747, ⁺*lilīṣate* 356⁹¹², *lināti* 358, *-lāpāya*^{-ti} 727, *-aleṣṭa* 742
lup ‘damage, tear’ **428-430**, 684, 709, *lúpyā*^{-te} 428ff., 449, 684, 709ff., 728, 743, 755, *lumpāti* 719, 728, *-lopi* 430, 743, *-lopsīya* 743, *lolupa*^{-te} 429¹¹¹¹, *(lo)lupyamāna*- 233f., 428f.
lubbh ‘be disturbed’ 429¹¹¹¹, **612-613**, 687, 723, *lúbhya*^{-ti} 612f., 687, 723, 756, *lobháya*^{-ti} 613
vac ‘speak, call’ **211-218**, 221, 684, 692, 702, *ucyā*^{-te} 19f., 211ff., 684, 692, 695, 702, 734, 741, 762, 753, *ávāci* 217f., 741, *ávocāma*, *vocatu* etc. 212, *vācyā*^{-te} 211, 218, 697f., *vívakti* etc. 221ff., 762
vañc ‘move (waveringly)’ 211⁵³¹, **218-224**, 684, 692, 798, *vacyā*^{-te} 12, 14, 218ff., 684, 692, 696, 732²¹⁸⁴, 764, 753,

- 798, *vāñca*-^{ti} 219ff., *vívakti* etc.
221ff., *vāvakre* 223f., 798
- vad** ‘speak’ **224-225**, 684, 692,
694, *udyá*-^{te} 224f., 684, 692,
753, *vāḍāya*-^{ti}, *vādyá*-^{te} 224f.,
694, 697²¹²⁹, 754, *vāda*-^{ti}
697²¹²⁹
- vadh** ‘slay, kill’ **779-780**,
vadhya-^{te} 779f.
- vand** ‘praise’ 741, *vandi* 741,
743²²⁰⁶
- vap** ‘sow, scatter’ **225-230**, 684,
692, 702, *upyá*-^{te} 225ff., 684,
692, 702, 753, *avāpi* 54f.
- vārūtha*- 9¹⁷
- vāṣaṭ*-, *vaṣaṭ-kārā*- 62¹³⁵, 693, 785
- ²**vas** ‘scorch, burn’ → **uṣ**
- ³**vas** ‘dwell’ **231**, 694, *vāsāya*-,
-vāsyá-^{te} 231, 694, 754,
avasran 742
- vah** ‘carry’ 5, 226⁵⁸³, **231-239**,
684, 692, *uhyá*-^{te} 5, 231ff., 684,
692, 762, 753, *ūhyá*-^{te} 226⁵⁸³,
231f., 236ff., 732²¹⁸⁷, *vāha*-^{ti},
vāha-^{te} 762
- ¹**vā** ‘blow’ **615-616**, 688, 690,
723, *vāya*-^{ti/te} 615f., 688, 723,
757, *vāti* 615f., *-vānt*- 616,
vāsīt 615
- ²**vā** ‘wane, fade’ 609¹⁹³⁶, **613-615**,
688, 723, *vāya*-^{ti} 15, 609¹⁹³⁶,
613f., 688, 690, 723, 756,
vāya-^{te} 614f., 750, *vāsīt* 615
- ³**vā** ‘weave’ → **u**
- vāc*- ‘speech, voice’ 524
- vāyú*- 615¹⁹⁵²
- vāś** ‘bellow’ **359-361**, 684, 706f.,
vāśya-^{te} (*/vāśya*-^{te}) 359ff., 684,
706f., 755, *vāśya*-^{ti} 359, 361,
- 747, *vāsitá*- 360
- ví* 24, 106²⁵², 678
- vic** ‘sift, separate’ **239-240**, 684,
692, *-vicyá*-^{te} 239f., 684, 692,
753
- vich** ‘impel [by whacks]’ **240-241**,
661^{2074, 2075}, 684, 693,
-vich[y]á-^{te} 240f., 661²⁰⁷⁴, 684,
693, 754, *-vichāyāti* 661²⁰⁷⁵
- ¹**vid** ‘find’ **241-245**, 684, 693,
695²¹²⁴, 799, *vidyá*-^{te} 241ff.,
684, 693, 695, 741, 753, 799,
aor. *ávidat*, *vindāti*, *vivéda* 241,
vividé 245, 799, *avedi*, *védi*
241, 245, 741, 799
- ²**vid** ‘know’ **241-245**, 695²¹²⁴, pf.
véda, *vide*, *vidāna*-, *vidāná*-
241f., caus. *vedáyati* 241
- vidyút*- 666ff., 795f.
- vinam-grsás*- 492
- vip** ‘tremble’ **499-500**,
vepyamāna-, ⁺*vépamāna*-
499f., *vepáya*-^{ti} 500
- viś** ‘enter’ **780**, *-veśya*-^{te},
veśāya-^{ti} 780, *aviśran*-, *avikṣata*
etc. 742
- viś** ‘be active’ **500-501**, 680²¹¹⁸,
684, 693, 704, *viśya*-^{te} 500f.,
684, 693, 754, *veviṣyamāna*-
501
- viṣṭ** ‘wrap, cover’ **245**, 694,
veṣṭyāmāna- 245, 302⁷⁷⁸, 694,
754, *veṣṭaya*-^{ti} 245, 694
- vī** ‘pursue’ **246**, 686, 693, *vīyá*-^{te}
246, 686, 693, 753, *véti* 246
- vī-rúdh*- ‘plant’ 202
- vṛ* ‘cover’ 741, *ávāri* 741, 743²²⁰⁶
- vṛj** ‘prepare, do; lay’ **247-249**, 684,
693, 799, *vṛjyá*-^{te} 247ff., 684,

- 693, 732, 753, 799, *vāvrje* 249,
799, *-vrñjāte* 593
vrjana- 453f.
vr̥t ‘turn’ 11, **249-250**, 694,
vartāya^{-ti}, *-vartyā*^{-te} 11, 249f.,
694, 696, 754, *varti*, *āvṛtran*
250, *vavarti*, *avavṛtran* 740²²⁰⁵,
742, *avṛtsata* 742
vr̥dh ‘increase, grow’, *vārdha*^{-te}
vārdha^{-ti} 748
vr̥ṣ ‘rain’ 693, **780**, *-vr̥ṣya*^{-te} 693,
780, *vāvr̥dhuḥ* 27
vr̥h/bṛh ‘tear (off)’ **501-503**, 684,
-vr̥hya^{-te} (*-bṛhya*^{-te}) 259, 501ff.,
684, 722, 741, 754, *-varhi* 503,
741, *vr̥hā*^{-ti} 722
vr̥ (**vr̥**) ‘choose’ **250-252**, 685,
792ff., 799, *urāṇā-* 250, 799,
-varyāmāṇa-, *-vriyamāṇa-* 7f.,
250ff., 685, 701, 754, 799
vyadh ‘pierce’ 5, **616-618**, 684,
687, 693, 724, 730, *vidhya*^{-ti} 5,
616f., 687, 724, 730, 757,
-vidhya^{-te} 616ff., 684, 693, 730,
749, 754
vyā (**vī**) ‘envelop’ **252-255**, 687,
690, 693, 720, *vīyā*^{-te} 252ff.,
687, 690, 693, 720, 753,
vyāya^{-ti} ‘cover’ 14
vraśc (**vr̥śc**) ‘cut off’ **255-261**,
684, 693, 799, *vr̥ścā*^{-te} 167⁴⁰⁸,
255ff., 684, 693, 753, 799,
vr̥ścya^{-te} 255ff., 684, 693,
726²¹⁷⁴, 732²¹⁸⁴, 753, 799,
vr̥ścya^{-ti} 255, 260, *-vr̥kṣi*,
⁺*-vr̥kṣmahī* 260f., 799, *vr̥ścā*^{-ti}
260, 726²¹⁷⁴
vl̥ (**pl̥**, **bl̥**) ‘crush, collapse’ **503-**
507, 686, 693, 709, *vl̥ya*^{-te}
(*-pl̥ya*^{-te}) 357, 503ff., 686,
693, 709, 719, 722, 728, 743,
754, *-vliyeran* 8¹⁴, 506, 733,
vl̥ñāti, *-ávlināt* 506f., 722,
728, *vleṣiṣ* 743, *avevl̥iyanta*
506
śáva(s)- ‘power’/‘body’ 216f.
śams ‘recite, praise’ **261-264**, 684,
693, 702, 782, 799, *śasyā*^{-te}
261ff., 684, 693, 702, 741, 753,
782, 799, *śam̐si* 263, 741, 799,
śam̐samāna- 263f., 799, *-śasyet*
264
śak ‘be able’ **780-781**, *śakya*^{-te}
780f.
śad/śat 435f., caus. *śātáyati*
‘makes fall’ 435, 728, pf.
śasāda, *śeduḥ* 435
śada- ‘falling’ 435, 437f.
śap ‘curse’ **781**, *śapya*^{-te} 781
śamⁱ ‘become extinguished,
appeased’ **507, 618-624**,
627¹⁹⁸², 688, 694, 723,
śāmya^{-ti/(te)} 126f., 618ff., 688,
723, 750, 756, 774²²⁵⁴,
śamāya^{-ti} 618f., 623, 694,
śāmya^{-te} 618, 623f., 694, 754
⁽²⁾**śam**ⁱ (**śim**ⁱ) ‘prepare for sacrifice’
624-629, 624, 688, 724,
śímya^{-ti}, *śāmya*^{-ti}, *śāmya*^{-ti} 6,
618, 624ff., 688, 724, 757
śāmī-/śīmī- ‘sacrificial work, etc.’
618, 627f.
śas ‘cut’ **264**, 684, 693, *śasyā*^{-te}
264, 684, 693, 754
śā ‘sharpen’ 360, 638, 662²⁰⁷⁹,
675-677, *ś(ī)yā*^{-ti/(te)} 15, 360,
675ff., *-śya*^{-te} 675, 677, *śiśāti*,
śiśīte 675f., *-ś(y)āna-* 676

- śāyaya-* 435¹¹²¹
śās ‘order’ **781-782**, *śāśya-te*,
śiśya-te 781f.
śīmī- → *śámī-*
śimyu-, *śimyu-* 619, 737
śiṣ ‘leave’ **431-434**, 684, 710,
śiṣyá-te 431ff., 448, 636, 684,
710ff., 728, 743, 755, *-śeṣi*
743, *śiśya-ti*, *śiṣyet* 431, 434,
śināṣṭi, *śimṣati* 719f., 728,
-śiṣātai 433f., 735²¹⁹³
śī / *śáy* ‘lie’, *śáye* ‘lies’ 443,
śāyaya- 435¹¹²¹
śī ‘fall’ 360, **434-443**, 445¹¹⁵¹,
686, 710, *śīyá-te* 434ff.,
445¹¹⁵¹, 485, 509, 638, 686,
710ff., 743, 755, *śiyate* 360,
434f., *śāyaya-* 435¹¹²¹; see also
śad/śat
śuc ‘suffer’ **629-630**, 687,
723, *śúcya-ti* 629f., 687, 723,
730, 740²²⁰⁴, 756, 758, *ásoci*
630, 740²²⁰⁴, 742, 744, *śóca-ti*
629, 730, 744
śudh ‘purify’ **630-634**, 687,
723, *śudhya-ti/te* 630ff., 687,
723, 748, 756, *śudhya-te* 631ff.,
750, *śundhasva*, *śundhatām*
630f., *śundha-ti* 631¹⁹⁹³,
śundhayati 631¹⁹⁹³, 729, 770,
śodhya-te 631, 634
śundhyú- ‘pure’ 631, 737
śuṣ ‘dry’ **634-636**, 687, 723, 759,
śúśya-ti 634ff., 687, 723, 756,
-śuśya-te 634ff., 750, *śoṣáyati*
636
śī ‘break’ **443-448**, 686, 709,
śīryá-te 398, 443ff., 503, 539,
541, 686, 709ff., 728, 743, 755,
-śīrya-ti 443, 447f., 722^{2168, 2169},
747, *-śāri* 447, 503, 722²¹⁶⁸,
743, *śṛṇāti*, *śṛṇa* 728
śoci- 758
śyā ‘congeal, freeze’ 440f.,
445¹¹⁵¹, **636-638**, 688, 723,
795f., *śyāya-ti* 15f., 440f.,
636ff., 688, 723, 756
śyená- ‘falcon’ 637f., 795f.
*śram*ⁱ ‘tire; toil’ 5, **638-640**, 688,
723, *śrāmāya-ti* 5f., 11, 126f.,
638ff., 688, 723, 756, 774²²⁵⁴
śrā ‘become ready, cook’ **265**,
641-642, 688, 694, 723,
śrāya-ti 15f., 637²⁰¹⁰, 641f.,
688, 723, 756, *śrapāya-ti*,
śrapya-te 265, 640, 694, 754
śri ‘lay on’ 8, **265-271**, 685,
689, 693, 739, 799, *-śrīyá-te*
(*-śriya-te*) 8, 265ff., 506f., 685,
689, 693, 733, 739, 741, 754,
799, *-śritya* 269, *ásrāyi* 270,
741, 799, *śraya-te* 270f., 739,
799, *-śiśriyāṇa-* 270, 799,
śiśriye 271⁷⁰⁴
śrī ‘mix’ 641²⁰²³, 739, *śrīṇāti* 641,
śrīṇānā- 739
śrīv → *srīv*
śru ‘hear’ **271-273**, 685, 693, 799,
śrūyá-te 9, 19f., 271f., 685, 693,
695, 741, 745, 753, 799, *-śrávi*
272, 741, 799, *śuśruve* 272,
744²²¹², 799, *śuśrūyāḥ* 8,
śrāvāya-ti 273, *-śrāvya-te* 271,
273, *śṛṇvé*, *śṛṇviṣé*, *śṛṇviré*
272f., 745, 799
ślāgh ‘laud, brag’ **507**, 684, 693,
ślāghya-te 507, 684, 693, 754,
ślāgha-te 507

- ślāghā-* ‘praise, glory’ 507
śliṣ (*śriṣ*) ‘adhere, stick, clasp’
 210, 356⁹¹², **642-645**, 687, 723,
śliṣya-^{ti} 642ff., 687, 723,
 724²¹⁷¹, 756, 783, *śliṣya*-^{te}
 642f., 645, 750
śleṣmán- ‘slim’ 783
śvā ‘swell’ **645-646**, 688, 689f.,
 723, *-śūya*-^{ti} 645f., 688, 689f.,
 723, 746, 756, *śvāya*-^{ti} ‘swell’
 14, 646, 746
sa(ñ)j ‘hang, attach’ **273-275**, 684,
 693, *sajyá*-^{te} 273ff., 684, 693,
 714, 741, 754, *-āṣañji* 275,
 741, *sajja*-^{te/ti} 273ff., *-sāja*-^{te}
 275
sad ‘sit’ 11, **275-279**, 685, 694,
 792ff., *sadyá*-^{te} 275f., 685, 753,
 754, *āsādi*, *sādi* 278f.,
(úpa-)sīda-^{ti}, *sādāya*-^{ti},
sādyá-^{te} 11, 275ff., 694, 696,
-sanna-, *-sādita-* 277
sarvajyānī- 378f.
sā (*sī*) ‘bind’ **677-680**,
-s(i)yá-^{ti/(te)} 15, 519, 677ff.,
-sya-^{te} 677f., 680, *-set* 680,
-sāyeta 680
sādh (¹*sidh*) ‘succeed’ 508¹⁶⁷³,
646-648, 687, 723, *sídhya*-^{ti}
 646f., 687, 723, 730, *sidhya*-^{te}
 646, 648, 750, *sādhā*-^{ti/te} 647,
 730
sic ‘pour (out)’ **279-282**, 685,
 693, 703, 799, *sicyá*-^{te} 279ff.,
 685, 693, 696, 703, 732, 741,
 753, 799, *-āṣeci*, *-āṣikṣi* 281,
 741, 799, *-ṣiṣice*, *-ṣiṣicāná-*
 282, 746, 799, *sicyet* 282, 746
¹*sidh* → *sādh*
²*sidh* ‘repel’ **507-508**, 685, 693,
-sidhya-^{te} 507f., 685, 693, 754,
sīv ‘sew’ 5⁵, **648-649**, 688, 724,
sīvyā-^{ti} 11, 648f., 688, 724,
 757, *sīvyadhvam* 648f., 749
su ‘press (out)’ 8, **282-284**, 685,
 693, 799, *sūyá*-^{te} 8, 282f., 685,
 693, 741, 753, 799, *āsāvi* 283,
 741, 799, *sunvé*, *sunviré*,
sunvāná-, *suṣvāná-*, *s^uvāná-*
 283, 741, 799, *asoṣṭa* 283, 741
¹*sū* ‘impel’ 6, 8, 282, **284-286**,
 456, 686, 693, 726, 799, *sūyá*-^{te}
 6, 8, 284ff., 456, 686, 693, 732,
 753, 799, *suvá*-^{ti}, aor. *asāvīt*
 284, *suṣuvāná-* 286, 799,
soṣyāmāna- 286, 745, 799
²*sū* ‘generate’ 8, 282, 284f.,
 437f., **508-510**, 686, 693,
sūya-^{te} 8, 284f., 437f., 508ff.,
 686, 693, 754, tr. pres. *sūya*-^{te}
 ‘produce’ 509f., *sūte* 284f.,
sasūva 284
¹*sr* ‘run, speed’ 510
²*sr* ‘stretch’ **510-511**, 685, 694,
 705, *-sriya*-^{te} 510f., 685, 705,
 707f., 709²¹⁵⁰, 722, 727, 742,
 755, *sīsratām* 510, 727, *-āsāri*
 510, 742, *-sāraya*-^{ti/te} 727,
-sārya-^{te} 510f., 694, 754, *sarṣat*
 742
srj ‘set free, emit’ **286-291**, 685,
 693, 799, *srjyá*-^{te} 14, 22, 28fff.,
 685, 693, 696, 726, 741, 753,
 799, *-āsrjyanta* 184⁴⁶¹, *āsarji*,
āsrgran/m, *āsasrgram*, *srjāná-*
 144³⁵⁰, 288, 741, 799, *srja*-^{ti/te}
 286f.⁷⁴⁰, 289ff., *asrṣata*
 144³⁵⁰, 288f., 741, 799,

- sasṛjānā-*, *sasṛjire* 289, 799
sku ‘poke’ **291-292**, 685, 693,
skūyāmāna- 291f., 685, 693,
 754
stā ‘steal’ **649-650**, 688, 723,
stāyāt ‘secretly’ 15, 649f., 688,
 723, 757
stu ‘praise’ **292-297**, 685, 693,
 799, *stūyā-^{te}* 9, 292f., 685, 693,
 739, 741, 753, 799, *stāuti* 292,
āstāvi, *stuvānā-* 295f., 741,
 799, *stāve*, *stāvāna-* 295f., 739,
 799, *stāva-^{te}* 296, 739, 799,
astoṣṭa 296, 741, 799,
tuṣṭuvānā-, *āstoḍhvam*,
āstoṣata, *stuṣé*, *staviṣyase* 296,
 745, 799, *stuvītā*, *-stuvīmahi*
 296f., *stavān* 297, 799
stṛ ‘strew’ **6**, **297-299**, 686,
 693, 703, 739, 799, *stīryā-^{te}* 6,
 297ff., 686, 693, 703, 739, 741,
 754, 799, *āstāri* 298, 741, 799,
-strñtām 299, 739, *tistiré*
 298f., 799
stotrā- 292, 294f., 694
styā ‘become coagulated’ 440f.,
511-512, 687, 705, *-styāya-^{te}*
 15f., 511f., 515, 687, 705,
 721f., 755
sthā ‘stand’ **8**, 436¹¹²⁶, **512-514**,
 687, 693, 694, 704, *sthīya-^{te}* 8,
 512ff., 687, 693, 754,
sthāpya-^{te} 512ff., 694, 754,
sthāpāya-^{ti/te} 513f., 694, *sthitā-*
 8, 513, *sthāpita-* 513, *-asthiran*
 514, 742, *asthiṣata* 742
snā ‘bathe’ **782**, *snāya-^{te}*,
-snāyeyuḥ 782, *snāyati* 782²²⁷³
snih ‘stick’ **782-783**, *snihya-^{ti}*
 744, 782f., *snihyates* 783,
snihat 744
snīhān- ‘snot’ 783
snéhiti- 783²²⁷⁶
spas ‘watch’ 581, *paspāse*,
aspaṣṭa, *spāśāya-^{te}* 581; see
 also **paś**
spṛdh ‘compete’, *asprḍhran* 742
sphā ‘swell’ **514-515**, 687, 705,
-sphāya-^{te} 15, 687, 705, 721f.,
 742, 755, *sphīya-^{te}* 514f., 687,
 705
smṛ ‘remember’ **10**, **515-516**,
 685, 693, *smarya-^{te}* 7f., 10,
 515f., 685, 693, 695, 754,
smāratī 10²⁰
sramṣ ‘fall asunder, break’ 709,
 722, **783**, *-srasya-^{te}* 709, 722,
 783, *srasnīṣva* 722, 783,
srāmsa-^{te} 783
srīv ‘be aborted’ **5⁵**, **650-651**, 688,
 723, *srīvyā-^{ti}* (*śrīvyā-^{ti}*) 650ff.,
 688, 723, 756, *srīvyeyur* 650f.,
srévaya-^{ti} 651, *śrīvayāmi*,
śrevayāmi 650²⁰⁴⁶, 651
svadhā- 227
svayām ‘(by) itself’ 173
svālpika- 492f.
svid ‘sweat’ **652**, 687, 723,
svidya-^{ti} 652, 687, 723, 756,
sveda-^{te} 652
han ‘kill’ **7**, **299-302**, 516, 575,
 685, 693, *hanyā-^{te}* 7, 12, 22,
 105f., 299ff., 575, 685, 693,
 726, 732, 764, 753,
jaṅghanyamāna- 302
harⁱ (**hṛ**) ‘enjoy’ **10**, **652-659**,
 688, 723, *hārya-^{ti}* 10, 546,
 652ff., 688, 723, 756, 758,

- hárya*^{-te} 653, 655ff., 750,
harayanta 653²⁰⁵⁵
hári- ‘yellowish’ 653²⁰⁵⁶
haryatá- ‘enjoyable’ 653, 737
hā ‘leave (behind)’ **448-451**, 687,
 710, *hīyá*^{-te} 430, 448ff., 687,
 710ff., 728, 743, 755, 778,
áhāyi 451, 743, *jáhāti* 718²¹⁶¹,
 728, *hāsmahi*, *hāsta* etc. 743
hi ‘impel’ 738, 745, *hinvé*, *hinviré*,
hinvānā- 738, 745
hi(m)s ‘injure, harm’ 5, **516**, 685,
 693, *himsanti* 516,
āhimsyamāna- 5, 516, 685,
 693, 753
hiṃ-(*kārā*-) 62^{135, 136}, 693, 785,
 789f.
hu ‘offer, pour [an oblation]’
303-305, 685, 693, 703, 799,
hūyá^{-te} 303ff., 685, 693, 703,
 741, 753, 799, *áhāvi* 305, 741,
 799, *-júhvāna*- 303, 305, 799,
juhure 305, 799, *áhuta*- 303,
ahūyeta 303⁷⁸⁰, *juhóti*, *juhuté*
 etc. 305⁷⁸⁸
hū (*hvā*) ‘call’ **306-310**, 686,
 693, 799, *hūyá*^{-te} 306ff., 686,
 693, 753, 799, *hváyā*^{-ti} ‘call’
 14, 15²⁸, *hvaya*^{-te} 306, 308ff.,
 tr. pres. *hūyā*^{-te} 306, 308ff.,
 509f., fut. *hvāsyā*^{-te},
hvāyīṣyā^{-ti/te} 77, *-hvayīta* 128,
huvānā- 310, 799, *áhūmahi*
 310
hr̥ ‘bring’ 7¹⁰, **310-312**, 685,
 693, *hriyá*^{-te} (*hrīyā*^{-te}) 7¹⁰,
 310ff., 685, 693, 753
hr̥ṣ ‘be excited’ **659-660**, 687,
 723, *hr̥ṣyā*^{-ti} 659f., 687, 723,
 730, *hárṣa*^{-ti/te} 659f., 730,
harṣáyā^{-ti} 660

Avestan

- aṣha*-, *aṣhəmnaiiā*-, *-aṣhəmnō* 522
amuiiamna- 485
arəšūiaṇt- 528
irišūieiti 611
xsā 74¹⁶⁷
janiia- 764
paiia- (°*paiemi*, °*pāiiōiš*) 583
bairiia- 764
būdiia- 334⁸⁵⁵
mainiia-, *mainiieite* 344, 763
-marəšaṇt- 598
miriieite 181
vaniiāṇte 236
vaziiamnābiiō, *vaziiāṇte* 236
vaziia- 236
vašīietē 221, 223, 764
striia- 298
-siiōdūm 442¹¹⁴⁵
zaiia- 320

Old Persian*apayaīy* 583*amariyatā* 181**Khotanese***ysīrāre* 541**Greek**βούλομαι 707²¹⁴⁵ἔρχομαι 707²¹⁴⁵κλίνομαι 707²¹⁴⁵κυφός 530f.¹⁷³⁵

μαίνομαι 763

ῥέζω 498

χαίρω 653²⁰⁵⁸χάρις 654²⁰⁵⁴, 758**Latin***cliēns* 269*cupiō* 531*futuo* 491*morior* 181, 763

INDEX LOCORUM

Samhitās

RV 1.10.1	82	1.61.14	103
1.11.5	102	1.61.15	19
1.12.4	348f.	1.62.12	371, 552
1.12.5	611	1.64.4	42 ⁸⁵
1.17.9	306	1.65.8	664
1.18.4	610	1.67.9	203
1.18.7	647	1.78.5	212
1.24.1	343f.	1.79.5	56
1.24.4	628 ¹⁹⁸⁷	1.80.12	541, 542
1.26.6	304	1.81.9	588 ¹⁸⁹⁴
1.29.3	333f.	1.83.5	101
1.31.4	422	1.83.6	247
1.32.6	149	1.84.9	325
1.33.9	342	1.84.17	102, 103 ²⁴³
1.34.10	304	1.87.2	461
1.41.1	472	1.89.2	470
1.46.3	220	1.93.12	330
1.46.8	195	1.94.1	611
1.46.15	398	1.100.18	619
1.50.13	606 ¹⁹³⁵	1.101.1	492
1.51.10	408	1.102.1	49
1.58.1	739	1.103.1	153
1.57.2	677	1.103.3	17f., 518
1.59.3	132	1.104.7	534
1.60.2	278	1.107.2	292f.
1.61.6	102	1.108.4	49
1.61.12	524	1.110.1	98
1.61.13	358	1.110.4	154, 156, 732 ²¹⁸⁶

RV 1.112.18	604f.	1.164.13	374, 381, 383, 444
1.114.6	212	1.164.16	581
1.116.25	571 ¹⁸³⁷	1.164.18	84
1.117.4	538	1.164.47	250, 462f.
1.117.14	337, 343	1.169.8	296 ⁷⁶¹
1.119.6	471	1.170.4	98
1.120.6	498	1.173.3	143
1.120.11	231, 232 ⁶⁰¹ , 732 ²¹⁸⁷	1.176.2	226f.
1.122.7	296	1.180.7	144ff.
1.124.7	354 ⁹⁰⁵	1.182.3	540 ¹⁷⁵⁹
1.124.8	42	1.184.3	220
1.127.1	305	1.188.3	305
1.128.2	539	1.190.2	288 ⁷⁴⁷
1.129.5	339 ⁸⁶⁶	1.191.4	210
1.130.4	360 ⁹²⁶ , 531	1.191.7	537
1.130.10	295	1.191.10, 11	181
1.134.2	63	2.1.15	426
1.135.3,6	169f., 192	2.2.6	25, 115
1.135.7	354	2.8.3	416
1.135.8	402, 551f.	2.9.3	305
1.139.1	64, 109f.	2.11.15	564
1.140.2	317	2.12.10	342
1.141.5	516	2.13.9	669f.
1.141.6	155	2.17.2	178
1.142.4	218 ⁵⁶² , 220	2.18.6	233
1.143.7	57	2.21.4	17
1.144.2	347, 496	2.24.8	518
1.144.7	654	2.24.9	381, 385 ⁹⁹⁰
1.145.1	495	2.25.1	57
1.147.2	18, 585f.	2.28.4	639
1.151.8	563	2.32.4	374, 648
1.156.3	222	2.33.9	148
1.156.4	329	2.34.10	113
1.160.4	61	2.34.13	27
1.161.1	348	2.37.3	599
1.162.3	142	2.40.3	193
1.162.11	403	3.1.8	169
1.162.21	142	3.1.16	101
1.164.10	536	3.6.1	211 ⁵³¹ , 219 ⁵⁶² , 221f.

3.6.2	220	4.12.6	471
3.6.4	655, 656	4.16.2	679
3.8.2	271 ⁷⁰⁴ , 739	4.16.4	245
3.8.3	176	4.18.2	601
3.8.9	142	4.19.2	289
3.9.2	319	4.19.9	51
3.10.4	49	4.22.8	478f.
3.22.1	293	4.22.9	607
3.23.1	539	4.23.3	307, 310 ⁷⁹⁶
3.24.1	518 ¹⁶⁹⁷	4.27.1	555f.
3.26.3	55	4.28.1	20
3.27.9	64	4.29.2	339f.
3.31.11	114	4.30.4	486
3.34.1	666	4.30.5	602
3.35.1	193	4.30.20	518
3.36.2	190	4.33.1	527
3.39.1	218 ⁵⁶⁰ , 221	4.34.4	109
3.41.2	193, 299,	4.37.2	653 ²⁰⁵⁴
3.45.3	589 ¹⁸⁹⁴	4.38.2-3	535
3.46.1	538 ¹⁷⁵⁵	4.41.3	628 ¹⁹⁸⁷
3.50.1	407	4.44.5	110
3.51.6	132 ³²⁵	4.45.1	193
3.53.17	503	4.51.6	94
3.54.11	325, 325 ⁸³⁵	4.51.10	334
3.54.19	212	4.55.6	296f.
3.55.5	203 ⁵⁰⁷	4.56.2	462
3.55.20	272f.	4.56.6	232 ⁶⁰¹
3.56.5	325 ⁸³⁵	4.57.4	159
3.57.5	213	4.58.4	84
3.59.2	23, 300, 376 ⁹⁷² , 377	4.58.9	282
3.59.8	191	5.1.3	49
3.62.7	262	5.2.4	86
3.62.16	461	5.3.6	334
4.1.16	341f.	5.3.8	55
4.5.11	157	5.5.10	80 ¹⁸⁴
4.5.12	141	5.6.1	338f.
4.7.8	250 ⁶⁴⁸	5.9.1	338
4.7.10	666	5.11.6	172
4.12.2	57	5.14.1	57 ¹²⁶

RV 5.17.4	262	6.29.4	403
5.18.1	296 ⁷⁶¹ , 604	6.31.3	602
5.25.8	213	6.34.2	195
5.29.1	17, 59	6.34.5	217
5.30.14	46f.	6.37.2	317
5.31.12	168	6.37.3	317f.
5.32.4	300 ⁷⁷¹	6.38.2	59, 542
5.33.6	580	6.46.2	295f.
5.34.7	138	6.48.5	321f. ⁸²⁷
5.44.9	243	6.49.3	59, 148
5.52.16	340 ⁸⁶⁷	6.49.13	106
5.54.1	59 ¹²⁸	6.52.2	341
5.54.12	453f., 732 ²¹⁸⁵	6.52.3	140f.
5.55.1	347	6.54.7	445 ¹¹⁵⁰
5.55.8	224	6.59.7	98
5.57.1	658	6.60.4	144
5.57.6	148	6.63.3	298
5.59.4	169	6.64.4	469
5.60.4	148	6.65.1	95
5.63.2, 5	541	6.66.1	114
5.73.8	169f., 170 ⁴²²	6.66.4	120
5.74.3	604	6.67.7	487
5.79.10	416	7.2.7	338
5.80.6	354 ⁹⁰⁵	7.8.1	58
5.81.4	529	7.8.2	245
6.2.1	26, 588 ¹⁸⁹⁴	7.9.6	57 ¹²⁶
6.2.8	45	7.16.8	323
6.5.6	262	7.17.1	299, 739
6.7.3	321	7.18.5	619
6.12.1	97 ²²⁷	7.18.8	607
6.12.4	279 ⁷²⁶ , 740 ²²⁰⁵	7.18.18	300 ⁷⁷¹
6.16.19	81	7.19.11	178
6.20.4	329	7.21.3	223f.
6.21.1	495	7.22.5	487
6.24.6	143	7.23.3	26, 193
6.26.2	602	7.24.2	169f.
6.26.7	296 ⁷⁶¹	7.26.5	178
6.28.6	214	7.29.1	283
6.28.8	153, 156	7.30.3	310

7.32.5	495	8.23.11	57 ¹²⁵
7.32.9	588	8.24.16	296 ⁷⁶¹
7.32.12	426	8.26.6	555
7.35.10	323	8.27.18	569
7.36.1	58	8.32.13	82
7.37.1	407	8.32.16	147
7.39.2	247, 249	8.38.10	59
7.45.2	144	8.39.7	589
7.51.3	296	8.43.2	658
7.55.3	608	8.43.6	203 ⁵⁰⁶
7.56.5	25, 115	8.43.7	614
7.56.13	270	8.43.9	199, 202
7.57.5	587 ¹⁸⁹¹	8.43.17	657
7.63.3	171	8.47.6	614 ¹⁹⁴⁹
7.70.1	217	8.48.6	21, 338
7.70.2	383, 389	8.48.10	610
7.70.6	59	[= Vāḷakhilya:	
7.76.7	499	8.50.5	496
7.82.6	178	8.51.7	152
7.86.2	22	8.51.9	48
7.96.3	295	8.56.4	143
7.104.2	601	8.57.2	125 ³¹⁰
7.104.7	102	8.59.6	288]
7.104.10	449	8.61.11	343
7.104.11	635	8.63.1	23 ⁴⁸
8.1.4	549 ¹⁷⁸⁰	8.65.1	307
8.1.5	108	8.66.9	272
8.2.15	585	8.69.5	289
8.4.1	307	8.69.14	403
8.4.10	548	8.70.14	296
8.6.35	27f.	8.72.4	389
8.12.10	175, 739	8.78.5	580f.
8.12.11-12	175 ⁴³⁴	8.80.7	564
8.13.9	215, 340 ⁸⁶⁸	8.81.5	82
8.16.6	523	8.82.8	125
8.19.8	21 ⁴⁴ , 263	8.92.14, 22	426
8.19.31	57 ¹²⁵	8.93.5	338
8.21.14	586	8.93.32	241 ⁶²⁴
8.22.6	296		

RV 8.96.4	340 ⁸⁶⁹	9.71.2	354 ⁹⁰⁵
8.96.12	293 ⁷⁵⁷ , 294 ⁷⁵⁹	9.72.1	43, 46
8.96.13	783 ²²⁷⁶	9.72.3	492
8.96.14	601	9.73.8	617
8.98.9	26, 193	9.74.4	115
8.99.3	641f.	9.74.9	155f.
8.99.5	549	9.76.1	288
8.102.14	673 ²¹⁰³	9.76.2	42, 44, 45
9.2.2	219 ⁵⁶⁰	9.78.2	44f., 280
9.3.1	554, 556	9.79.4	110 ^{263, 264}
9.10.3	49	9.85.5	43
9.10.8	120	9.85.10	113
9.12.6	524, 525	9.86.12	19, 150, 282
9.14.4	354 ⁹⁰⁵	9.86.43	50
9.14.5	185	9.87.1	151
9.20.3	183	9.87.6	102
9.23.2	20	9.88.1	283
9.24.3, 5	556	9.88.5	286 ⁷³⁸
9.30.2	182	9.91.2	184 ⁴⁸⁴ , 185
9.32.3	46	9.95.1	286 ⁷³⁸ , 287
9.34.3	113	9.95.5	678
9.41.3	272	9.96.10	120
9.43.1	46, 182	9.96.16	150
9.45.3	42	9.96.23	82
9.49.3	25, 115	9.97.2	220
9.55.4	376 ⁹⁷² , 377	9.97.11	155
9.56.2	25	9.97.18	678
9.61.7	76	9.97.23	169
9.62.13	185	9.97.35	19, 45, 59
9.62.15	131	9.97.50	25, 115
9.64.9	524	9.99.5	461
9.64.25	524	9.101.13	283
9.65.16	495	9.103.1	211
9.67.3	283	9.107.21	183 ⁴⁵⁶
9.67.32	567	9.109.8	191
9.68.4	148	10.3.4	57 ¹²⁵
9.69.1	459, 524 ¹⁷¹³	10.14.7	406 ¹⁰⁴²
9.69.2	152	10.16.9	465 ¹⁵⁶⁹
9.70.8	62	10.17.7	98f.

10.22.1	19, 272	10.93.14	272
10.28.12	178	10.95.9	155
10.30.2	678	10.95.17	381
10.31.6	170	10.96.5	655, 656
10.31.7	539f. ¹⁷⁵⁷	10.96.6	657, 658
10.31.9	188f.	10.96.11	654, 655, 656
10.31.10	43f.	10.97.6	19, 215
10.32.6	131	10.98.8	171
10.34.5	448	10.99.9	262f., 264
10.34.8	397 ¹⁰¹⁷	10.99.12	496
10.34.13	557	10.100.8	213
10.37.1	235	10.101.1	333
10.40.9	20, 354	10.101.8	649
10.43.6	604	10.105.1	658
10.47.7	218 ⁵⁶⁰ , 221, 222 ⁵⁷⁵	10.110.4	247
10.48.3	523	10.112.3	310
10.52.1	345 ⁸⁸²	10.112.6	654
10.56.5	191	10.112.7	654
10.60.8	574	10.113.7	325f.
10.64.2	243	10.114.10	164 ⁴⁰⁰
10.64.15	213	10.117.6	589 ¹⁸⁹⁴
10.69.7	182	10.117.7	593 ¹⁹⁰⁴
10.72.6	579	10.118.4	43 ⁸⁸
10.72.8	518	10.120.3	601 ¹⁹²³
10.81.6	597	10.120.8	221f.
10.82.5	581f.	10.124.2	581
10.84.2	178	10.126.8	471
10.84.7	358	10.129.7	23, 133f.
10.85.5	331	10.130.2	101
10.85.13	232, 235, 300	10.131.2	664
10.85.27	364f.	10.132.4	284
10.85.28	44, 492	10.135.7	126
10.86.7	659	10.138.4	518
10.87.4	617	10.152.1	376 ⁹⁷² , 377
10.87.18	256, 258	10.161.4	25
10.89.6	142	10.162.5	328
10.90.13	20	10.168.4	271
10.91.2	271 ⁷⁰⁴	10.175.1	193
10.93.5	278	10.176.3	142

RVKh. 2.1.6	413	VS(M) 1.5	351
2.11.2	335	1.21	155
2.14.8	211 ⁵³⁴	2.17	55, 83, 84, 246
3.10 ² .16	566f.	4.23	76, 768
3.15.20	390, 392f., 546	4.26	71
4.2.7	326, 328	5.28	408
4.5.38	635	6.15	511, 631
5.3.4	331	39.5	33
5.7.2.a	526	8.54-59	33
5.7.3.a	168f., 168 ⁴¹³ ,	8.55	143, 232, 234,
	247		277
5.7.4.f	168f.	8.57	158, 230
5.9.1	218, 220	8.58	160, 277
5.15.2	518	8.59	311
5.15.7	530	9.19	183f.
5.15.10	412f., 481, 482,	9.20	570ff.
5.15.12-13	85	10.4	152
5.17.3-4	356	10.19	347 ⁸⁸⁷ , 353
5.21.2	219	10.28	607
5.22.3	403, 476, 488ff.	12.42	585f.
7.7.2	474f.	12.70	43
		13.41	91
RVKh. [ed. SATAVALAKAR]		13.49	40 ⁷⁹
29.17	635	14.28	131
29.47	532	14.31	620
		15.54 = 18.61	332, 335
SV(K) 1.267 [= 1.3.2.3.5]	642	19.30	53
1.291 [= 1.3.2.5.9]	108	22.32	571
1.299 [= 1.4.1.1.7]	269 ⁶⁹⁹	23.33-42	624ff.
1.573 [= 1.6.2.3.8]	211	23.47, 48	243
2.210 [= 2.2.2.10.2]	59	25.34	403
2.310 [= 2.3.2.2.3]	524	26.2	364
2.313 [= 2.3.2.3.3]	556	26.4	663, 665f.
2.314 [= 2.3.2.3.4]	556	27.16	326 ⁸³⁶
2.320 [= 2.3.2.4.3]	182,	31.18	244 ⁶³³
	183	33.82	48
2.328 [= 2.3.2.5.4]	377	34.8	337 ⁸⁶⁰ , 341
2.383 [= 2.4.1.1.3]	283	37.13	265, 268, 270
2.606 [= 2.5.2.2.1]	556	39.5	33, 96, 100, 141

	39.12	380, 385		2.2.7:21.4-6	458
	40.2cd (= ĪšU 2)	209		2.2.8:21.15-16	428
				2.2.9:22.13	367
VSK	9.7.7	277		2.2.13:25.13-14	161f.
	9.7.41	230		^m 2.3.4:31.1-2	87
				2.3.5:32.7-8	419
MS	^m 1.1.1:1.3	332		^m 2.3.5:32.19-20	87
	^m 1.2.16:26.8-9	631		^m 2.3.8:36.20	384f.
	1.4.6:54.1	420		2.4.1:38.15-16	368 ⁹⁴⁸
	1.4.11:59.11-12	374		2.4.5:43.6-7	460
	1.4.11:60.6	251, 789		2.5.2:48.11	617
	1.4.13:62.14-15	533		2.5.6:54.18-19	502
	1.4.13:62.19	413		2.5.6:55.14-15	457
	1.4.14:63.13	196, 198		2.6.1:64.1-2	436
	1.5.6:74.12	539		^m 2.6.8:68.6	290
	1.5.13:82.9	450		^m 2.6.11:70.12	347, 353
	1.6.5:93.15-17	404		^m 2.6.12:72.3	607
	1.6.5:95.4-5	324		^m 2.7.10:88.15-16	585f.
	1.6.10:103.1-2	378, 718		^m 2.7.12:92.7	43
	1.6.11:104.6	556f., 558		^m 2.7.17:102.14-15	40 ⁷⁹
	1.7.5:114.1-2	535		^m 2.8.6:111.1-2	620
	1.8.2:117.11	642		^m 2.12.4:148.6	335
	1.8.3:118.1, 5-6	116		^m 2.12.6:150.9	326 ⁸³⁶
	1.8.3:118.6-8	231		^m 2.12.6:150.16-17	677
	1.8.4:119.10-11	116		3.1.4:5.17	72f.
	1.8.7:126.10-11	378, 419, 718		3.1.5:6.22-7.1	66, 72 ¹⁶³
	1.10.11:151.6	594		3.1.8:11.2	413f.
	^m 1.11.3:163.11-13	183		3.1.9:12.22-13.1	675 ²¹⁰⁵
	^m 1.11.3:164.1-2	570ff.		3.2.2:17.11-12	409
	1.11.6:168.9-10	200		3.2.2:17.16	335
	1.11.7:169.8-10	183		3.2.3:19.1-2	504
	1.11.9:171.10-11	427		3.2.7:25.18-26.1	433
	2.1.2:2.8	457		3.4.7:53.11	419
	2.1.8:9.12-14	399f.		3.5.1:58.1	258
	2.1.10:12.11-12	620		3.6.3:62.6	50
	2.1.11:12.17-20	291f.		3.6.7:69.7	578
	2.1.11:13.5-6	391, 392		3.6.10:73.17-74.2	445
	2.2.5:19.2	186, 643		3.6.10:74.12-13	262
				3.7.3:78.6	539

3.7.4:78.12	629 ¹⁹⁸⁸	4.4.6:57.7	607
3.7.5:81.16-17	568	4.4.6:57.10	558
3.7.6:82.17-83.1	163	4.4.7:58.15-16	200
3.7.7:84.8	78 ¹⁷⁷	^m 4.4.9:61.3-4	281
3.7.8:86.12	576	^m 4.5.2:64.14	525
3.7.8:87.3-6	234f.	4.5.2:64.18-65.1	374f.
3.7.8:87.10	140	4.5.4:68.5	77ff.
3.7.10:90.4	225 ⁵⁸² , 672	4.6.1:78.12-13	543
3.7.10:91.3-4	647	4.6.9:92.11-12	651
3.8.7:104.8-9	249	4.6.9:93.5	107 ²⁵⁷
3.8.10:110.15-16	88	4.8.4:111.4	237
3.8.10:111.7	230	4.8.7:115.15	310 ⁷⁹⁷
3.9.3:116.2-5	315	4.9.1:121.8-9	642 ²⁰²⁵
3.9.4:119.6	504	^m 4.9.4:124.7	270
3.9.4:119.14	517 ¹⁶⁹⁵	^m 4.9.9:130.4	277
3.9.5:121.17	72 ¹⁶²	^m 4.9.24:137.13	351
3.9.5:122.16-17	277	^m 4.13.4:203.6-7	526
3.9.7:125.10-11 =		^m 4.13.4:203.11-12	661, 662
3.9.7:126.14-15	209	^m 4.13.8:209.9-10	169, 247
3.10.1:128.11-12	181	^m 4.14.1:215.16	654
3.10.1:128.13-14	631	^m 4.14.11:233.11	351
3.10.1:130.4	209	^m 4.14.14:238.8	538 ¹⁷⁵⁵
3.10.1:130.19-20	181		
3.10.3:134.1	599	KS ^m 1.1:1.2	332
3.10.5:137.1-2	368f.	^m 1.12:7.14-15	55, 83, 246
3.10.6:138.6	595, 596 ¹⁹¹⁰	2.5:11.7	76
^m 3.16.1:182.16-183.1	403	^m 2.5:21.3	679
^m 3.12.21:167.3ff.	624ff.	^m 2.6:12.3-4	71
4.1.2:3.12	418	^m 2.12:17.8-9	
^m 4.1.14:20.5-6	55, 83, 246, 255	= 3.3:24.6	408
4.2.1:23.1-2	609	^m 4.16:43.22	65
4.2.8:29.15-16	40	6.2:50.11	92
4.3.3:42.2-3	200	6.2:50.17-18	172
4.3.5:44.11-12	410	6.2:51.6	637
4.3.5:44.15-17	254f.	6.3:51.9-11	465ff.
4.3.7:46.16-17	438	6.3:52.1-3	116
4.3.7:46.18	780	6.3:52.3-4	266
4.3.9:49.1-2	285	6.5:53.12	209
		7.4:66.7-8	539

7.5:66.18-19	513	^m 18.17:278.3	677f.
7.10:71.19	487	^m 18.18:278.18	335
8.1:82.12	92	19.7:8.16-18	413 ¹⁰⁶¹
8.1:83.5-7	67	19.7:8.19-20	136
8.7:90.10-11	557, 558	19.9:10.13	485
9.3:106.11-12	534f.	19.12:15.12	335
10.3:127.5	457	^m 19.13:15.15	169
10.5:129.16-17	187	20.1:19.3-4	504
10.5:130.6-7	391, 392	20.9:28.4	63
10.9:134.21-22	205	20.9:28.9-10	733f.
10.11:139.2	217	21.2:38.22	503, 506
11.3:147.1-3	458	21.10:50.8-9	304
11.4:148.9	510	22.7:64.4	366 ⁹³⁹
^m 11.7:153.3-4	87	23.1:73.13	50
^m 11.9:156.13-14	462f.	23.2:75.13-14	506
12.3:165.1-2	146	23.4:79.7	400
12.8:170.14-16	254	23.6:82.3-5	445f.
12.9:171.22-172.1	402	24.3:91.22-92.1	568
12.10:172.21	281	24.6:95.17-18	588
13.2:180.18	502	24.6:95.18-19	71
13.3:181.22-182.1	513	24.6:96.19, 20	576
13.12:193.15-16	475	24.6:96. 20-97.1	576
^m 13.16:199.13	341	24.9:100.6	225, 672
^m 14.1:201.2	183	24.10:102.7-8	647
^m 14.1:201.9-10	570ff.	25.6:109.20-21	107, 187
14.10:209.6-7	427	25.6:110.18-19	24
15.1:209.14-15	436	25.10:118.13	408
15.5:212.7	173, 356	26.1:120.1	230
^m 15.6:213.9	290	26.1:121.11	303 ⁷⁶⁹
^m 15.7:214.20	353	26.5:127.17-18	408
^m 15.8:215.18	607	26.6:129.14-15	98
^m 16.10:232.14-15	585f.	26.9:133.11-12	306, 308
^m 16.12:234.20	227	26.10:135.6	512 ¹⁶⁸⁸
^m 16.12:235.1	43	27.3:141.20-142.1, 4-5	734
^m 16.17:241.7	40 ⁷⁹	27.5:144.6-7	543
^m 16.21:244.8	526	28.6:161.10	107 ²⁵⁷
^m 16.21:244.13-14	662	^m 28.17:277.18	326 ⁸³⁶
^m 17.5:249.7-8	620	29.1:167.8	595
18.12:273.18	571 ^{1833, 1838}	29.5:173.14-15	602

KS	29.9:179.1-2	452f.	^m 2.6:18.15	408
	30.5:187.6-7	443, 444 ¹¹⁴⁷	^m 2.10:20.8	408
	31.2:3.6-7	117	^m 2.11:21.9	465 ¹⁵⁶⁹
	31.11:14.10-11	55, 83, 246	4.1:37.3	92f.
	31.15:18.5	251	4.1:37.10	172
	33.5:30.16	121	4.1:38.6	637
	34.4:38.13-14	399	4.2:38.9-11	465ff.
	34.4:38.14-16	427	4.2:39.3-5	116
	34.14-16	33	5.3:53.4	539
	^m 34.14:46.4	143	5.4:53.14	513
	^m 34.14:46.4-5	277	5.9:57.7	487
	^m 34.14:46.6	234	^m 6.2:61.9	43 ⁸⁸
	^m 34.15:46.12-13	298	6.6:63.21	92
	34.15:46.16	502	6.6:64.9-11	67
	34.15:47.2	415 ¹⁰⁶⁵ , 485	7.4:75.2	557, 558
	^m 34.16:47.8	160	8.6:85.1	535
	34.17:48.9-10	362 ⁹²⁷ , 364	^m 25.1:94.6-7	585f.
	34.18:48.13	790f.	^m 25.3:96.11	227
	^m 35.14:60.10	455 ¹⁵⁴³	^m 25.3:96.14	43
	35.16:61.11-12, 16-17	552	^m 25.8:101.9	40 ⁷⁹
	35.16:62.1-2	444	^m 26.4:107.16-17	620
	35.17:63.2-3	533	^m 29.1:129.7-8	571 ^{1833, 1838}
	36.5:72.10	506	^m 29.5:133.7	326 ⁸³⁶
	36.6:73.1	594	^m 29.5:133.14-15	677f.
	^m 38.12:113.13	569 ¹⁸³⁰	^m 29.6:134.8	335
	^m 39.10:127.7	383	30.5:143.14-16	136
			30.7:144.2-3	485
KS-Aśvamedha	^m 5.1.10	33	31.2:149.21	335
	^m 5.1.10:154.2	109	31.3:150.12-13	504
	^m 5.1.10:154.3	33, 92	31.11:158.21-22	733f.
	^m 5.5.6:168.11-12	385	31.17:165.14	506
	^m 5.6.5:177.17-18	403	35.7:183.2	50
	5.10.2:184.12	196	36.1:188.9	400
	^m 5.10.5-6:185.5ff.	624ff., 661, 662	37.4:197.7-8	568
			37.7:200.22	71
			37.7:202.1-2, 3-4	576
KpS	^m 1.12:9.9-10	55, 83, 246	38.3:208.2-3	647
	1.18:13.14	76	39.4:215.20-21	107, 187
	^m 1.19:14.4	71	^m 40.3:225.1	408

40.4:226.4	230	^m 1.8.16.2	607
40.4:227.15	88, 303 ⁷⁷⁹	2.1.4.6-7	422
^m 41.3:238.4	408	2.1.9.4	589
41.4:239.22-23	98	2.2.1.3-4	368
41.8:245.4-5	512 ¹⁶⁸⁸	2.2.2.3-4	418
42.3:250.5-6, 10-11	734	2.2.2.5	530
42.5:252.8-9	543	2.2.3.2	90
44.6:262.20	107 ²⁵⁷	2.2.6.2	457
45.2:268.3	595	2.2.8.4-5	205
45.6:272.21	602	2.3.5.1	528
47.2:286.1-2	117	2.3.7.4	263
47.11:295.11-12	55, 83, 246	2.3.9.3	131
48.14:305.1-2, 6-7	552	^m 2.3.10.1	87
48.14:305.10	444	^m 2.4.5.1b	605
48.15:306.5-6	533	2.4.6.2	589
		^m 2.4.7.2 = 2.4.9.4	575f.
TS ^m 1.1.1.1	332	2.4.11.2	194
^m 1.1.10.1	577	2.5.1.7	50
^m 1.1.13.2	55, 83, 246, 255	2.5.8.2	620
^m 1.3.1.2	408	2.5.8.4	216
1.3.9.1	631	2.5.9.6	520
1.4.35.1	381, 385	2.5.11.3	546
1.5.1.1	440	2.5.11.4	53f.
1.5.2.2	366	2.5.11.5	568
1.5.4.4	534	2.6.1.4	188
1.5.7.3	539	2.6.6.5	672
^m 1.5.10.3	351	2.6.7.1	478
1.6.10.1	519	2.6.9.6	419
1.7.1.3	640	3.1.9.6	448, 450
1.7.3.2	365	^m 3.1.11.4	462
1.7.3.4	371	^m 3.2.1.1	638 ²⁰¹⁴
1.7.5.1	426	3.2.1.2-3	374
1.7.6.1-2	69	^m 3.2.8.1-2	384f.
1.7.6.4	89	3.2.8.4	258
^m 1.7.8.4	182, 183	^m 3.2.9.1	218
^m 1.7.9.1	570ff.	3.2.9.5	430, 450, 718
1.8.1.1	436	^m 3.3.11.3-4	341
^m 1.8.12.1	290	3.4.3.5	795
^m 1.8.14.2	353	3.4.9.7	228

TS 3.5.1.3-4	372	6.2.3.3-4	276, 786, 788
^m 4.1.8.2	326 ⁸³⁶	6.2.4.1	450
^m 4.2.3.4	585f.	6.2.7.5	432
^m 4.2.10.2	39, 40 ⁷⁹	6.2.9.4	311
4.3.10.3	620	6.2.10.5	408
^m 4.3.11.3	383	6.3.1.6	230
^m 4.4.9.1	33, 71, 134, 135, 150, 232, 234, 276, 277	6.3.4.8	93
^m 4.6.8.4	403	6.3.6.4	196
^m 4.7.13.4	324	^m 6.3.8.2	526
^m 4.7.13.5	335	6.3.10.3	112
5.1.9.2-3	413	6.3.10.5	672
5.2.2.6	335	^m 6.4.3.3	525
5.2.3.4	504	6.4.3.4	147
5.2.5.6	91	6.4.7.1-2	734
5.2.6.1-2	444 ¹¹⁴⁸	6.4.7.2	592
5.2.10.1	63	6.5.1.2-3	86
5.2.10.3	733f.	6.5.2.2	277
5.2.11-12	624ff.	6.5.5.1	597
5.3.1.1	592	6.5.6.2	365, 366
5.5.2.1	366 ⁹³⁹	6.5.8.6	78 ¹⁷⁷
5.5.2.3	391, 395	6.5.9.1	87 ¹⁹⁸ , 138
5.5.7.2	256, 258	6.5.11.1-2	194
5.6.2.1	286	6.6.4.5-6	174, 177
5.6.2.3	51, 53	7.1.1.4	288
5.6.2.4	620	7.1.5.1	640
5.6.3.2	51	7.1.5.3-4	315f.
5.6.22.1	196	^m 7.1.19.1	33, 91f., 109
5.7.3.4	432	7.2.1.4	378, 718
6.1.1.5	50	7.3.1.1	301, 449
6.1.3.5	444	7.3.10.3-4	595
6.1.4.8	257	7.4.2.4	574
6.1.7.1	254	7.4.3.6	274
6.1.7.4-5	568	7.4.9.1	672, 673
6.1.11.2, 4	576	7.5.3.1	121
6.2.2.1-2	565, 606, 672	7.5.4.1	86
6.2.2.4-5	418	7.5.5.2	399, 427
6.2.2.7	609 ¹⁹³⁶ , 614	AV(Š) 1.11.1	510
		1.14.2	135

1.20.4	377	5.6.11	328
1.23.1	497	5.7.3	647
1.28.4	24, 105	5.9.7	306 ⁷⁸⁹
2.12.1	381, 383	5.13.3	541, 542
2.12.2	192, 194, 452, 455	5.13.4	671 ²⁰⁹⁸
2.14.3	456, 528, 529	5.17.7	105f., 327, 430,
2.14.5	570	5.17.12	199f.
2.29.4	534, 548	5.18.15	586
2.31.3	431, 433f., 714	5.19.4-6	33
2.35.2	383f.	5.19.4	403
3.2.2	129	5.19.5	52, 146, 360
3.4.2, 4	161	5.19.6	281, 376 ⁹⁷² , 377
3.10.11	613	5.20.2	360
3.10.12	383f.	5.29.2	557
3.19.2	675	5.29.7	401
3.19.3	327	6.4.1	269 ⁶⁹⁹
3.19.5	675f.	6.18.2	528
3.29.3	62	6.22.1	462f.
3.30.1	654	6.26.3	528, 530
4.4.7	536	6.40.2	671 ²⁰⁹⁸
4.6.7	560	6.48.1	638 ²⁰¹⁴
4.8.7	182	6.49.2	454f.
4.11.4	330, 331	6.63.3	159
4.15.11	330	6.66.3	161
4.16.1	649f.	6.67.3	575
4.16.2	219	6.70.1	300
4.16.7	65	6.74.1	154
4.16.9	679	6.83.3	431 ¹¹¹⁵
4.18.4	435 ¹¹²¹	6.84.4	159
4.24.4	175	6.101.3	536
4.28.5	327	6.103.2-3	665, 669
4.29.7	671 ²⁰⁹⁸	6.104.1-3	669
4.34.8	52	6.107.1-2	322 ⁸³⁰
4.36.4	364	6.111.2	233
4.36.10	532	6.112.3	91f.
4.37.7	670f.	6.117.3	370 ⁹⁵⁵
5.2.5	675	6.119.1	556
5.4.8	165	6.131.2	341
		6.136.3	259

AV(Š) 6.139.2	635	10.7.42	593
7.4.1	21 ⁴⁴	10.8.10	99, 194
7.20.2	337 ⁸⁶¹ , 341	10.8.15	449f.
7.59.1	635	10.8.25	124
7.60.4, 6	534	10.8.27	219
7.61.1-2	382, 383, 384	10.8.29	40, 280
7.70.4, 5	574f.	10.8.35	336, 341
7.73.1	117	11.1.4	56
7.73.2	115f.	11.1.6	176
7.90.3	671	11.1.12	240
7.101.1	80, 124	11.1.30	639
7.108.1	649, 650	11.3.11	351, 352
7.109.4	557	11.3.14-15	85, 527
8.2.6	322 ⁸³⁰	11.3.56	26, 376, 378,
8.2.13	367 ⁹⁴⁵		718
8.2.16	132	11.4.15	215
8.2.24	418 ¹⁰⁷⁷	11.5.26	382
8.3.16	186, 256 ⁶⁶⁶ , 258	11.8.34	216
8.8.3	482	11.9.10	547
8.8.6	422	11.10.6	663
8.8.16	422	12.1.2	351
8.10.18	259	12.1.13	176
8.10.33	280	12.1.38	194, 603
9.1.11, 16	138	12.1.40	194, 603
9.1.24	335	12.1.41	579, 603
9.4.19	581	12.2.12	421, 423
9.4.23	153	12.2.39	180
9.5.4	662	12.3.28	227f.
9.5.10	107	12.3.31	673
9.6.6	159	12.3.33	132
9.6.14	228	12.4.2	552
9.6.24	337, 345f.	12.4.3	111, 391, 445,
9.9.11	374, 381, 444		674
9.9.18	84	12.4.5	445
10.1.32	423, 718	12.4.6	257f., 291f. ⁷⁵⁴
10.2.17	99	12.4.37	253, 255
10.3.6	791	12.5	33
10.4.18	104	12.5.15	111f., 663, 670
10.7.2	324	12.5.20	359

12.5.25	140, 575, 603	19.61.1	407 ¹⁰⁴⁵
12.5.28	33, 65, 160, 161, 165	19.67.3	333
12.5.29	33, 311	20.127.4	211 ⁵³¹ , 218, 220
12.5.31	600	20.128.13	518
12.5.32	404	20.129.11-12	94
12.5.33	63	20.130.8	530f.
12.5.34-35	311	20.131.1	413, 481, 482
12.5.36	148	20.131.11-12	85
12.5.37	52	20.134.3-4	354, 355f.
12.5.45	372	20.135.5	493
13.1.50	56	20.135.12	219
13.2.43	520f.	20.136.3	401, 403, 489
14.1.13	232, 235, 238, 300	20.136.8	390, 395f.
14.1.21	364f.		
14.1.42	573f., 576	AVP(-Or.)	
14.2.9	233, 237, 239	1.15.2	135
14.2.32	328	1.18.4	663
14.2.37	588	1.21.4	431 ¹¹¹⁵ , 630
14.2.70	576	1.39.2	605
15.1.1	469 ¹⁵⁷⁹	1.67.3	259
15.8.1	497	1.70.4	91f.
16.7.2	523f.	1.92.3	269
17.1.6	606	1.107.3	271f.
17.1.18	99	2.4.5	456, 528, 529
18.1.39	188	2.5.3	192, 455, 528 ¹⁷³⁰ , 530
18.1.54	406 ¹⁰⁴²	2.36.4	260f.
18.2.28	129	2.39.1	511
18.3.9	451 ¹¹⁶⁹	2.58.1	106 ²⁵²
18.3.10	470	2.79.3	544, 545
18.3.60	441f.	2.89.4	565
18.4.36	40	3.5.5	675 ²¹⁰⁶
18.4.39	545 ¹⁷⁷²	3.19.2	675
18.4.70	776	3.19.5	360, 675f.
19.2.5	545 ¹⁷⁷² , 548	3.25.2	330, 331f.
19.9.8	398, 400, 499f.	3.39.6	285f. ⁷³⁷
19.50.4	243	4.2.4	182
19.56.5	382	4.14.7	168
		4.16.2	536 ¹⁷⁴⁹

-
- | | | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| 4.16.6 | 537 | 9.15.7 | 105f. |
| 4.16.7 | 538 | 9.21.1-12 | 567f. |
| 5.3.3 | 537 | 9.21.6 | 258 |
| 5.7.7, 10 | 330 | 9.28.3 [Kashm. 9.25.3] | |
| 5.8.6 | 560 | | 600 |
| 5.13.7 | 252 ⁶⁵⁶ | 9.28.10 [Kashm. 9.25.10] | |
| 5.14.5 [Kashm. 5.14.6] | | | 393 |
| | 371 ⁹⁵⁹ | 10.2.4 | 270 |
| 5.15.5 [Kashm. 5.15.4] | | 10.2.6 | 246 ⁶³⁸ , 252 ⁶⁵⁴ |
| | 253 | 10.12.11 | 383 ⁹⁸⁶ |
| 5.16.2 | 305, 389 | 11.10.8 [Kashm. 12.3.8] | |
| 5.17.7 | 233 | | 612 |
| 5.22.6 | 168 ⁴¹² | 12.6.2 [Kashm. 13.3.12] | |
| 5.26.2 | 523 ¹⁷¹⁰ | | 600 |
| 5.31.1 | 121, 160 ³⁹⁰ , 359f. | 12.6.4 [Kashm. 13.3.14] | |
| 5.31.2 | 663, 665 | | 533 |
| 5.32.8 | 65 | 12.7.9 [Kashm. 13.4.9] | |
| 5.32.10 | 255, 259 ⁶⁷⁸ | | 670 |
| 5.34.5 | 608 | 12.8.5 [Kashm. 13.4.15] | |
| 5.40.1 | 52, 360, 458, 459 | | 595 ¹⁹⁰⁶ |
| 5.40.7 | 408 | 12.10.7 [Kashm. 13.5.16] | |
| 6.1.5 | 675 | | 231 ⁵⁹⁹ |
| 6.3.8 | 371 ⁹⁵⁹ | 12.19.10 [Kashm. 13.10.2] | |
| 6.9.1 | 85, 160 ³⁹¹ | | 158 |
| 6.12.3 [Kashm. 6.12.5] | | 13.2.5-6 [Kashm. 13.13.1-2] | |
| | 306 | | 574f. |
| 6.15.3 | 360, 434, 436 | 13.4.4 [Kashm. 11.7.9] | |
| 6.15.5-6 | 149 | | 591f. |
| 6.15.7 | 116 | 13.4.5 [Kashm. 11.7.10] | |
| 6.22.9 [Kashm. 6.22.8] | | | 538 ¹⁷⁵⁴ |
| | 52, 360, 458, 459, | 13.9.1.[2] [Kashm. 13.14.16] | |
| 7.6.7 | 360 | | 254 |
| 7.9.4 | 647 | 13.9.1.[5] [Kashm. 13.14.17] | |
| 8.8.11 | 548 | | 325 |
| 8.11.10-11 | 514f. | 16.5.4 | 418 ¹⁰⁷⁷ |
| 8.15.7 | 431, 612 | 16.7.8 | 186 |
| 8.18.10 [Kashm. 8.18.9] | | 16.16.8 | 104 |
| | 229f. | 16.54.8 | 85, 141, 527 |
| 9.6.7 | 537 | | |

16.60.6 [Kashm. 16.60.5]	17.28.5	618, 619 ¹⁹⁶¹
99	17.29.2	270
16.67.8 83, 84	17.29.7	270
16.71.1 265, 640	17.33.6	546
16.71.5 [Kashm. 16.71.6]	18.2.2	232
51f., 458, 459	18.26.3	336, 341, 344 ⁸⁸²
16.111.10 [Kashm. 16.111.14]	18.27.1	469 ¹⁵⁷⁹
228	19.3.1	72
16.113.1 337, 345f.	19.11.3	159
16.120.1 572	19.19.2	530
16.134.1 259	19.26.6	545 ¹⁷⁶⁷
16.135.9 [Kashm. 16.135.11]	19.26.15	396
280, 287 ⁷⁴¹	19.29.6	595
16.142.4 [Kashm. 16.142.6]	19.31.15	455 ¹⁵⁴³
359	19.33.10	91f.
16.144.1 160f.	19.37.10	524 ¹⁷¹²
16.144.5 [Kashm. 16.144.9]	19.46.13	560
51f.	20.4.7	71
17.12.5 355	20.17.3	635
17.16.3 111	20.35.10 [Kashm. 20.34.10]	
17.24.3 523f.	576	

Brāhmaṇas

AB 1.12.2	244	3.4.2, 5	660
^m 1.29.1, 4	249	3.12.2	218
1.29.21	267f.	3.22.7	358, 481, 497
2.5.1	795	3.43.5	82
^m 2.5.6	526	3.44.7	520
^m 2.6.14	661, 662	4.17.6-7	370 ⁹⁵⁵
2.7.8-9	563	4.19.2	506
2.9.7	164 ³⁹⁸	4.22.4	651
^m 2.10.1	112	4.29.8	216
2.11.1	520	5.11.1	226, 229
2.14.2	357	5.23.4	786
2.17.9	200	5.27.1	116
2.22.10	596	5.27.6	116, 360
2.37.2-3	613	5.30.2	82

6.1.4	572 ¹⁸⁴¹	21.6.1 [21.5]	488
6.2.6	430, 449, 718	24.8.3 [24.9]	229 ⁵⁹⁶
6.23.7	65	25.11.21 [25.12]	75
6.30.14	519	25.12.11-12 [25.13]	123
7.3.3	116, 360	26.3	301
7.4	560f.	28.2.5-7 [28.1]	525f., 787
7.5.8	622	30.1.18 [30.1]	521
7.8.4	622	30.4.21 [30.5]	569, 608
7.16.2	676	30.9.1-7 [30.11]	308f.
7.16.10	293		
7.25.4	786	PB 2.1.1	787
7.27.1-2	513f.	2.10.4	200
8.10.7	200	2.10.5	90
^m 8.22.8	543	6.7.15	362 ⁹²⁸ , 376, 379f.,
8.28.1	179		718
8.28.10	616	6.7.18	182, 184
		6.10.12	367
KB (numeration of ed. LINDNER		7.1.2	787
in [])		7.2.6	44
5.3.10 [5.3]	420 ¹⁰⁸⁴	7.5.11	464
8.9.23 [8.8]	93	7.7.15	779
^m 9.3.8 [9.3]	249	8.2.9	642
9.5.16-17 [9.5]	311	10.12.7	163, 165
9.6.7-8 [9.6]	329	11.5.8	367f., 446
10.3.2 [10.2]	265, 266, 268	14.11.28	631
10.3.15 = 10.3.23 [10.2]	253	15.4.1	641f. ²⁰²⁴
10.8.22 [10.5]	228	15.7.3	500
11.3.2-5 [11.4]	258f.	16.1.2	379, 718
12.6.16 [12.5]	24, 547	16.3.8	546
12.8.17 [12.7]	211 ⁵³¹ , 222 ⁵⁷⁵	16.15.9	201
14.2.28 [14.2]	330	17.8.3	365
14.4.11 [14.3]	217f.	18.5.6	198, 201
15.6.9 [15.5]	357	19.3.3	438 ¹¹³³
16.9.12-13 [16.9]	379	20.14.4	41, 48, 192
17.2.9 [17.1]	77	21.14.14	446
18.1.7-10 [18.1]	235	22.7.2	588
18.3.1-6, 13 [18.3]	473	22.17.3	90
18.3.23-24 [18.4]	245	25.6.5	366
18.7.16 [18.10]	298	25.10.11	504

25.10.20	379	1.325:1-3	790
		1.336:7	82
JB 1.1:4	172, 435, 438	1.360:1-3	130 ³²¹ , 553
1.39:4	155	1.362:1-6	68
1.53:1-2	117	2.1:4-5	272
1.58:1-2	116	2.2:6	651
1.60:4	117	2.24:8	649
1.70:8	175	2.42:4-5	316
1.75:1	787	2.69:2-4	89, 579f.
1.84:3	787	2.69:7	630
1.84:12	100	2.81:1-4,7	437f.
1.104:1	790	2.82:13	437f.
1.109:5	127	2.110:3	95
1.111:8-9	100	2.138:1-2	598
1.112:7-8	791	2.164:8	401 ¹⁰²⁶
1.125:5	529f. ¹⁵³¹	2.201:7	227 ⁵⁸³
1.130:5-6	786	2.204:10-11	95
1.140:2-3	312, 789	2.208:5-6	260
1.155:8-10	502f.	2.245:4-5	48
1.173:2	787f.	2.245:7	197
1.173:11-12	78 ¹⁷⁷	2.259:3	677
1.178:8-9	786f.	2.269:9-10	181
1.188:8-9	502	2.271:4	508
1.199:4-5	262, 781f.	2.304:11-13	643f.
1.220:13	122	2.306:3	591 ¹⁸⁹⁸
1.224:1-2	554	2.369:8-9	291
1.245:10	548 ¹⁷⁷⁶	^v 2.383:10-11	130 ³¹⁹ , 199, 205
1.248:8	90	2.422:7	379, 718
1.274:2	468	2.426:4	617f.
1.275:3-5	301	2.441:4	481
1.285:14-16	294	3.16:9	481, 503, 505,
1.288:10	771f.	3.24:5	44, 252
1.313:2-3	770f. ²²⁴⁶	3.40:8-9	505
1.314:6-7	552	3.72:1	505
1.315:9	281	3.82:9	505
1.318:5-6	511	^m 3.85 ^{2x} :8, 9	524
1.321:11-13	76	3.116:1	634f., 636
1.322:9	82	3.117:3-4	108
1.323:1-2	295, 791	3.117:6	638f.

JB 3.119:15	100	2.2.6.2	786
3.177:5	101	2.2.7.1	644
3.232:5	479	2.2.7.3	534
3.238:19	463, 478	2.2.9.2	302
3.239:4-6	470f.	2.2.9.3	387
3.264:2-3	168	2.2.11.5	534
3.267:4	503, 505	2.3.6.4	201
3.279:3	500 ¹⁶⁵⁷ , 680	^m 2.4.1.2	533
3.303:5	301f.	^m 2.4.1.4	679
3.303:14	211	2.4.2.2-3	574f.
3.359:9-10	260	^m 2.4.2.4	586
3.359:13-14	519	^m 2.4.7.1	85
3.360:11	521	^m 2.5.1.3	272
3.361:5, 6	414	^m 2.5.1.3	470
		^m 2.5.3.3	521
TB 1.1.2.5	67	^m 2.5.5.3	592f.
1.1.3.5	370	2.5.6.5	592
1.1.9.3	432	2.7.18.1	467
1.1.9.9	661 ²⁰⁷⁵	^m 2.8.1.4	654
1.2.5.4	196, 425	^m 2.8.2.5	211 ⁵³¹
1.3.4.1	200f.	^m 2.8.8.2	228f., 430
1.3.10.7	257	3.2.2.5	418
1.4.3.3	117	3.2.2.7	577
1.4.5.1	427	3.2.4.1	100
1.4.6.1	100	3.3.3.1	577
1.4.6.5	418f.	^m 3.3.3.2	577
1.4.9.1	380, 387	3.3.7.8	88
1.5.6.7	257	^m 3.3.9.5-6	55, 83, 246
1.5.10.5	372, 410f., 718	^m 3.6.5.1	526
1.6.1.1	436	^m 3.6.6.2	662
1.6.8.2 = 1.6.8.5 = 1.6.9.1	188	^m 3.6.13.1	169, 247
^m 1.7.6.1	290	3.7.1.3	533
1.7.10.5	607	3.7.3.5	290
1.8.5.4	402	^m 3.7.4.7	351
2.1.1.1-2	612	^m 3.7.4.10	577
2.1.2.1	389	^m 3.7.5.6	65
2.1.2.10	257	^m 3.7.6.5-6	298
2.1.7.1 = 2.1.8.2	117	3.7.6.17	533
2.1.10.1	137	3.7.6.20	432

^m 3.7.6.23	533	2.1.2.4	369, 375 ⁹⁶⁹
^m 3.7.9.9	370 ⁹⁵⁵	2.1.3.1	373, 410, 718
^m 3.7.14.4-5	437, 508, 509	2.2.1.2	265
3.8.2.3	433	2.2.3.20	139
3.9.4.4	439	2.3.1.6	287 ⁷⁴² , 421, 424
3.9.7.2	589 ¹⁸⁹⁴	2.3.2.9	136f.
^m 3.10.1.1	331, 411	2.3.2.12	622
3.10.9.1-3	666f., 795	2.3.3.7	99
3.11.9.5	320 ⁸²³	2.3.3.8	122
^m 3.12.7.2-3	439	2.3.3.12	313, 314
3.12.9.8	210	2.3.3.16	451
		2.3.4.9	228
ŚB(M) 1.1.1.3 = 1.1.1.6	289	2.4.4.18, 19	718
1.1.3.5	590f.	2.5.2.47	421, 424
1.1.4.8	510	2.5.2.23	53
1.1.4.14	186	2.6.1.3	418
1.1.4.22	240	2.6.2.12	423
1.2.2.2	155	3.1.1.3	432
1.2.4.1	444	3.1.1.8	637 ²⁰¹¹
1.2.5.20	140	3.2.1.31	598
1.2.5.21	123	3.2.4.6	579
1.2.5.26	620	3.2.4.13	80
1.3.3.4	433	3.3.1.11	78 ¹⁷⁷
1.4.1.18	172	^m 3.3.1.12	76
1.4.2.3	788, 795	3.4.3.1	618, 619, 623
1.5.1.9	788	3.4.3.8	423
1.6.1.15	83	3.4.3.19	257
1.6.3.4	595	3.4.4.21	602
1.6.3.7	74	3.4.4.27	118 ²⁸⁴
1.6.4.18	327	^m 3.5.3.16	249
1.7.1.18	118 ²⁸⁴	3.5.3.16	386f.
1.7.2.22	373, 718	3.5.3.25	649
1.7.3.11	618, 619, 623	3.5.4.1	73
1.7.3.18	584	3.5.4.9	73
1.7.3.20	401 ¹⁰²⁶	^m 3.6.1.21	408,
1.7.3.21	187	3.6.2.4	275
^m 1.7.3.28	547	3.6.2.14, 15	451
1.8.3.6	559	3.6.2.24	367
^m 1.8.3.22	55, 83, 84, 246	3.6.2.26	124f.

ŠB 3.7.1.13	266	6.1.1.15	338
3.7.4.9	95	6.1.2.13	352f.
^m 3.8.1.11	526	6.1.3.1-4	385, 388
3.8.1.14	264	6.1.3.3	299, 301 ⁷⁷⁴
3.8.2.17	66	6.3.3.26	428
3.8.3.16	451	6.4.4.20	630
3.9.2.16	311, 314	6.6.4.8	414
^m 3.9.3.15	525	6.6.4.11	374
3.9.3.22	535	6.7.4.8	391
3.9.3.27	167	6.7.4.11	570
3.9.3.34	428	6.8.2.4	202
4.1.2.10	280	7.1.1.12	86
4.1.2.13	75, 92	7.1.1.42	391, 421
4.1.2.25 = 26	313, 314	7.1.2.11	375
4.1.4.1	363, 364, 369 ⁹⁵²	7.2.1.8	399
4.1.4.4-5	290f.	7.2.2.5	404
4.2.4.6	293, 294, 295, 793	7.2.4.17	405
4.3.1.14	405	7.4.2.1	404
4.3.1.17	405	7.4.2.11	438
4.3.2.3	662 ²⁰⁷⁹ , 676, 795	7.5.2.2	406
4.3.4.23	190	7.5.2.4 ≈ 7.5.2.28	197
4.3.4.33	324	7.5.2.34	40 ⁷⁹ , 92
4.4.1.3	465	8.4.1.10	718
4.4.5.23	421, 424	8.4.3.19	620
4.5.1.3	94	8.6.3.23	335
4.5.10.4	594	8.7.1.11	237
4.5.10.7	398f.	8.7.2.16	414
4.6.7.9	89	9.1.1.3	405
4.6.9.11	82	9.1.1.44	74
4.6.9.13	421, 424	9.1.2.12	414
^m 5.1.5.27	182, 183f.	9.3.4.5 = 9.4.1.1	341
5.2.3.2	436f.	9.4.1.11	293
5.3.2.8	265	9.5.2.14	598
^m 5.3.4.27	154	10.1.2.5	75
5.3.5.17	321	10.2.3.18	288 ⁷⁴⁶
^m 5.4.4.15-19	607	10.2.6.8	274
5.4.4.23	559	10.3.1.7 = 10.3.1.8	613
5.5.4.13	368	10.3.5.13	546
6.1.1.12	461, 617	10.4.2.17	718

10.4.1.10	54	13.1.5.1	225
10.4.4.4	387	13.2.6.8	439
10.5.2.13	375 ⁹⁷⁰	13.2.9.8	589 ¹⁸⁹⁴
10.5.4.4	74	13.3.3.8	177
10.6.1.8	406	13.5.1.2	365
10.6.5.2 (= BÄUM 1.2.2)		^m 13.5.4.18	546, 595, 596
	302	^m 13.8.1.4	390
11.1.6.1	382 ⁹⁸³ , 387	14.1.1.10	248
11.1.6.30	327f.	14.1.1.11-12	184 ⁴⁶¹
11.1.6.32	327	14.1.2.12	592
11.1.6.34	531, 599	14.1.3.16	248
11.2.4.5	409	^m 14.1.3.26 = 27	268, 270
11.2.6.8	672	14.2.2.28-29	620
11.2.6.13	421, 424	14.2.2.32	589 ¹⁸⁹⁴
11.2.7.32	404, 566 ¹⁸²²	14.2.2.54	279, 356f., 391
11.4.1.5	415	14.3.2.1	399
11.5.2.4	386	14.4.2.5 (= BÄUM 1.4.5)	
11.5.3.2	70, 96, 117, 231		409f.
11.5.3.5	117	14.4.2.22 (= BÄUM 1.4.22)	
11.5.3.11	288		108
11.5.7.1	402, 406	14.4.2.28 (= BÄUM 1.4.28)	
11.5.7.4	380 ⁹⁷⁹		371f., 714
11.6.1.3	160, 166	14.4.3.7 (= BÄUM 1.5.7)	
11.6.1.8	166f.		372, 714
11.7.1.1	539	14.4.3.23 (= BÄUM 1.5.23)	
^m 12.3.4.3	638 ²⁰¹⁴		376, 378f., 714
12.4.1.6	117, 118 ²⁸⁴	14.4.3.29 (= BÄUM 1.5.29)	
12.4.1.9	116		610
12.4.1.12	116	14.4.3.31 (= BÄUM 1.5.31)	
12.4.2.2	112, 117 ²⁸²		639
12.4.2.3	118 ²⁸⁴ , 119 ²⁸⁵	14.4.3.34 (= BÄUM 1.5.34)	
12.5.1.2	304		139
12.5.1.6	118 ²⁸⁴	14.5.1.5 (= BÄUM 2.1.5)	
12.6.1.10	143		410
12.6.1.20	158	14.5.4.8 (= BÄUM 2.4.8)	
12.6.1.32	160		225
12.8.2.1	426	14.5.4.9 (= BÄUM 2.4.9) =	
13.1.1.1	432	14.7.3.10 (= BÄUM 4.5.10)	
13.1.2.2	298		127

14.5.4.12 (= BÄUM 2.4.12)	14.8.7.1 (= BÄUM 5.7.1)
357	667
14.6.2.12 (= BÄUM 3.2.12)	14.8.10.1 (= BÄUM 5.10.1)
130f., 646	405f.
14.6.2.13 (= BÄUM 3.2.13)	14.8.11.1 (= BÄUM 5.11.1)
131	387
14.6.1.10 (= BÄUM 3.1.10)	14.8.13.1 (= BÄUM 5.13.1)
323 ⁸³²	635
14.6.9.26 (= BÄUM 3.9.26)	14.9.1.2 (= BÄUM 6.1.2)
336, 714	409, 734
14.6.8.12 (= BÄUM 3.8.12)	14.9.1.10 (= BÄUM 6.1.10)
423	93
14.6.9.26 (= BÄUM 3.9.26)	14.9.2.7 (= BÄUM 6.2.7)
336, 714	336, 339 ⁸⁶⁶ , 714
14.6.9.28 (= BÄUM 3.9.28) =	14.9.3.9 (= BÄUM 6.3.9)
14.6.11.16 (= BÄUM 4.2.6) =	789
14.7.2.27 (= BÄUM 4.4.27)	
85 ¹⁹³ , 274, 446f., 714	ŠBK 1.4.1.7 228
14.6.10.15 (= BÄUM 4.1.15)	2.8.1.5 559
658f.	2.8.3.18 375
14.7.1.5 (= BÄUM 4.3.5)	3.1.1.1 137
93, 94	3.1.10.1 391, 392
^v 14.7.1.14 (= BÄUM ^v 4.3.14)	4.1.1.5 637
347, 714	4.2.1.21 405
14.7.1.19 (= BÄUM 4.3.19)	4.2.1.22 598
139	4.2.4.12 240f.
14.7.1.41 (= BÄUM 4.3.41)	4.5.4.1 73
206 ⁵¹⁶	4.5.4.6 = 4.5.4.15 73
^v 14.7.2.9 (= BÄUM 4.4.9)	4.8.1.11 264
424	4.8.2.12 66
14.7.2.27 (= BÄUM 4.4.27)	^m 4.8.3.9 112
85 ¹⁹³ , 274, 446f.	4.9.3.16 535
^v 14.7.2.28 (= BÄUM 4.4.28)	5.4.1.28 324
210	5.4.3.3 465
^v 14.8.1.1 (= BÄUM 5.1.1)	5.8.4.9 89
40f.	7.1.1.2 436f.
14.8.2.2 (= BÄUM 5.2.2)	8.1.1.9 461, 617
550	8.1.3.2-4 388
	8.3.2.36 428

8.4.4.5	630	2.3.1:189.3-4	545, 548
8.6.4.7	414	2.3.9:194.15-195.2	779
8.6.4.9	374	2.4.5:213.10	521
8.7.4.8	391, 421	2.6.11:260.5	226, 229
8.8.1.17	202	2.6.12:262.9-10	211 ⁵³¹ , 218,
8.8.2.34	391, 421		220 ⁵⁶⁶
8.8.3.11	375	2.6.13:264.8	569, 608
GB 1.1.2:1.11	388f., 640	ŠB 5.6.2	358, 497
1.1.3:3.5-6	483f.	5.8.2	615, 616
^m 1.1.9:8.5	316f., 318f.	5.9.2	396
1.1.25:17.7	292 ⁷⁵⁶	5.10.2	501, 652
1.1.28:20.14	349	^v 5.10.4	632, 633
1.1.28:21.1-2	568	5.10.6-7	619, 621
1.1.30:22.8	770	5.11.2	508
1.2.1	527	Lost-Br.	
1.2.2:34.3-4	507	p.111 [Bhāllavi-Br.]	486
1.2.9:41.12-1	312	p.35, 1.9 [ŚātyB,	
1.2.9:42.8-9	514	Fragm. XI]	333
1.2.14:47.12	431, 434	SVB 3.3.1	515, 768
1.2.18:51.5-6	623	3.9.5	362 ⁹²⁸
1.2.18:51.13	292	3.6.6-9	771
1.2.21:58.10-11	624	3.9.1	505f.
1.2.24:62.10-11	611	SUB 3.15-16	781
1.3.11:76.15-77.9	70, 112,	DevatādhB 3.4	782f.
	117, 231, 265,	ManB 1.1.11	335
	268, 312, 468	1.5.1	437, 508, 509,
1.4.13:104.13-14	487, 598	1.8.3	644
1.5.2:114.14-15	782	2.2.5	565, 567 ¹⁸²⁷
1.5.12:129.1-4	627f., 795f.	2.4.10	497, 498
1.5.21:133.11-12	611	ĀrṣB 1.6	326, 329
1.5.21:134.4-5	250, 251		
2.1.12:152.3-4	197		
2.1.12:152.7-8	197		
2.1.21:158.5	420 ¹⁰⁸⁴		
2.2.2:166.8	606		
2.2.4:168.2-3	614f.		
2.2.6:171.2-3	389		

Āraṇyakas

AA	1.3.4	601	^m 1.9.6	331
	1.4.1	456	^m 1.10.1	549 ¹⁷⁸⁰
	2.1.5	101	^m 1.12.1	515
	2.1.7	540	^m 1.14.1-2	371, 373, 410f.
	2.2.4	308	1.31.5	648
	2.3.4	786	^m 2.5.3	532f.
	2.3.5	520, 521	2.15.1	370 ⁹⁵⁵
	3.1.3	610 ¹⁹³⁹	2.16.1	425, 427 ¹¹⁰⁷
	3.2.4	74f., 615f.	^m 3.12.7	262 ⁶⁸⁶
			^m 3.20	380f., 385,
ŚĀ	2.17	75	^m 4.2.6 = 5.3.5 (16)	641f.
	4.2 (= KauṣU 2.2)	198, 206f.	^m 4.30	609
	4.6 (= KauṣU 2.6)	58, 60f.	^m 4.40	54, 230
	4.9 (= KauṣU 2.9)	370	5.1.7	84 ¹⁹² , 248
	6.15 (= KauṣU 4.15)	79, 80f., 189, 190, 796	5.6.1	248, 786
	6.16 (= KauṣU 4.16)	190	5.8.13	675
	6.20 (= KauṣU 4.20)	678, 680	5.10.2	248, 788
	7.11	610 ¹⁹³⁹	5.11.4	68
	8.2	282	^m 6.4.1	441f.
	8.9	482f.	^m 6.5.2	659 ¹⁸³⁰
	^m 12.5 (23)	561	^m 6.6.1	39, 40 ⁷⁹
			^m 9.10.1 (= TaiU 3.10.1)	352
KaṭhĀ	2.115:44.14-16	118	9.10.3-4 (= TaiU 3.10.3-4)	476f.
	^m 3.144:56.1-2	277	9.10.4 (= TaiU 3.10.4)	179 ⁴⁴⁷
	3.177:66.15	524	^v 10.10.3 = TĀ-Andhra 12.4	(= MNU 230) 424f.
	3.199:76:8-9	362 ⁹²⁷ , 363	10.43.1 (= MNU 277)	326, 329
	3.233:94.24-25	266, 499	10.51-52 = TĀ-Āndhra 65	(= MNU 440-441) 632
	3.233:100.6	207, 208	TĀ-Āndhra 45 (= MNU 388)	434, 437, 508
	3.234-235:100.15f.	362 ⁹²⁷ , 363, 412, 414, 642		
TĀ	^m 1.2.3-4	474		
	^m 1.3.2	477f.		
	^m 1.3.4	484f., 619, 621		
	1.6.3	484		

Kāth-Saṃk. p.18, 1.5-7	p.71, 1.5 [Cūḍākaraṇa-Br.]
[Agn'yādheya-Br. 7] 173	566
p.70, 1.4 [Annaprāśa-Br.] 50 ¹⁰⁸	p.141, 1.12 562
	p.141, 1.18 590

Upaniṣads

ChU (numeration of ed. MORGENROTH in [])	3.1.1.21 [3.1.21] 501
2.12.1 618, 622	3.1.4.2 [3.4.2] 349
3.12.3 437	3.4.1.5 [3.15.5] 640
3.16.2, 4, 6 430	3.4.4.3 [3.18.3] 525
3.17.5 283f.	3.5.1.1 [3.20.1] 615, 616
3.17.6 326 ⁸³⁷	3.5.2.2 [3.21.2] 616 ¹⁹⁵⁵
4.3.2 [4.3.1] 634	3.6.1.4 [3.29.4] 563
4.3.5 [4.3.4] 500f.	KenaU ^m [introd. prayer] 332
4.14.3 210 ⁵²⁸ , 645	BĀUK 1.4.3 409f.
5.3.3 409	1.4.10 108
5.10.10 [5.10.9] 210	1.4.15 371f.
5.13-15 443, 447	1.5.2 372
5.24.3 475	1.5.15 378f., 714
6.14.1 125f., 127-129	1.5.20 610
6.16. 2-3 [6.16.3-4] 390, 396	1.5.21 639
7.4.3 = 7.5.3 647	1.5.23 139
7.14.2 369	2.4.8 = 4.5.9 127
8.6.2 99	2.4.9 225
8.6.5 415, 419f., 769	3.1.8 323 ⁸³²
8.10.1 ≈ 8.10.3 561	3.2.11 130f., 646
8.12.4-5 336, 344f. ⁸⁸²	3.8.12 423
JUB (numeration of ed. OERTEL in [])	3.9.25 336, 714
1.1.5.5 [1.5.5] 644	3.9.26 446f.
1.1.5.6 [1.5.6] 294, 793	4.1.6 658
1.5.1.3 [1.19.3] =	4.2.4 446f.
1.18.2.9 [1.57.9] 257	^v 4.3.13 347
1.12.5.4 [1.39.4] 80	4.3.33 206 ⁵¹⁶
1.13.1.3 [1.40.3] 473	4.4.7 424

4.4.22	446f.	KaṭhŚiU ^m 4.3.8	604, 605f.
4.4.23	210		
5.2.1	550	ŚvetU 1.6	773f.
5.9.1	405f.	1.8	158
5.12.1	635	2.6	172, 192, 198, 204,
6.1.7	336, 339 ⁸⁶⁶	3.8	244 ⁶³³
6.2.2	409	4.7	596, 597
		5.9	464f.
KaṭhU 2.3	273, 275 ⁷¹⁸	5.10	775f.
2.5	245, 302	6.1	596, 773f.
2.8	770	6.8	244
4.6	582	6.15	244 ⁶³³
6.12	195 ⁴⁹⁰		
6.14	424	MuṇḍU 1.2.8	245, 302
		1.2.9	345
MaitrU 3.2	231, 233f., 428f., 546f., 772	2.2.8	718
3.3	772	3.1.2	596, 597
4.0/4.3	420, 618, 780f.	3.2.2	354f., 359
4.2	773f.	3.2.6	421, 424f.
6.1	174		
6.7	508, 509	PraśU 2.3	326, 329
6.16	508		
6.30	233f., 428f., 547	ĀrṣU 1.14	326, 329
6.34 [ed. COWELL]	420, 618, 780f.		
6.35	323, 354, 357, 503, 505	ChāgU 6:5.55-58 [ed. Adyar Libr. 25, 1.1ff.]	634, 636
^v 7.8	643, 773ff.	7:6.73 [ed. Adyar Libr. 25, 1.14]	590
^v 7.9	245, 302, 429 ¹¹¹¹		
		AvyaktaU ^m [introd. prayer]	332
MaitrāyaṇyU			
3.2	231, 233f., 428f., 546, 547, 772	Tejobindūpaniṣad 6.52	483 ¹⁶¹⁴
4.1.[4]	618		
4.[2].9	780f.	PraṇavU 34, 1	90 ²⁰⁵
4.[2].10	420		
5.1	174	Yogaśikhop. 1.127	513
5.7	508, 509	KubjU ^m 24.10	635 ²⁰⁰⁶

KauṣU → ŚĀ 3-6

BĀUM → ŚB(M) 14.4-9

TaiU → TĀ 7-9

ĪsU → VS

MNU → TĀ 10, TĀ-Āndhra

Sūtras, Smṛtis and other texts belonging to the Vedic tradition

Śrauta-Sūtras			15.21.11	676	
			15.22.1	295	
ĀśśS	1.5.10	777f.	16.4.6	494	
	^m 2.3.16	667	^m 16.9.10	595	
	^m 2.10.18	521	17.9.6	264	
	2.11.18	771	18.21.1	75	
	^m 3.3.1	662			
	3.6.23	463, 464	LāṭyśśS	1.7.9	570, 572
	5.12.15, 17	183 ⁴⁵⁶		1.8.1, 3	268
	8.3.24	493f.		2.3.12	309
	10.8.11	494		5.6.1	780
	11.2.6	337, 346		8.10.9	425
	11.2.18	205			
			DrāhyśśS	2.3.10	570, 572
				2.4.1, 3	268
śśS	1.16.9	778f.	3.4.2	486	
	1.17.5	544	4.3.13	309	
	^m 2.7.18	667f.	14.1.17	780	
	^m 4.8.3	667	14.3.15	312	
	^m 4.12.10	532	15.1.13	312	
	5.13.7	268			
	5.15.3	268			
	^m 5.17.4	662	JśśS (numeration of ed. GAASTRA in [])		
	12.2.10	261 ⁶⁸³			
	^m 12.23.1	356		1.18.25 [17:22.3]	312
	12.23.5	493f.		1.23.7 [22:28.5]	312
	14.3.1	488		1.24.14 [23:30.3-4]	119, 312
	14.3.13	458 ¹⁵⁴⁹		1.25.16 [24:31.3]	175
	15.1.28	66		1.24.20 [23:30.7]	276

MānŚS	1.2.2.21	616	11.9.4.14	273
	^m 1.2.5.8	607 ¹⁹³⁵		
	1.4.1.24	250f.,	VarŚS	1.1.2.31
	1.4.3.4	298		250f.
	^m 1.4.3.9	281		1.1.3.5
	1.5.5.3	779 ²²⁷⁰		349
	1.5.6.19	196, 198		1.2.1.7
	^m 1.6.2.17	606f.		332
	1.7.6.8	483		1.3.1.8
	1.7.6.49	543f.		238
	1.8.1.11	316		1.3.1.28
	2.1.3.11	333		1.4.4.12
	2.1.4.23	573 ¹⁸⁴³		557, 558
	2.2.3.14	268		^m 1.5.4.2
	2.3.2.6	483		667
	2.5.4.36	573 ¹⁸⁴³		1.7.4.51
	5.1.4.18	232, 238		543f.
	5.1.6.21	576		^m 2.1.2.1
	5.1.7.33	620		569 ¹⁸³⁰
	^m 5.1.10.35	456		2.1.3.31
	5.2.8.20	680		410 ¹⁰⁵²
	5.2.9.5	522		2.1.4.23
	5.2.10.26	680		573 ¹⁸⁴³
	6.1.1.16-17	70f.		2.5.4.36
	^m 6.1.2.26	569 ¹⁸³⁰		573 ¹⁸⁴³
	6.2.6.30	86		3.3.1.33
	7.2.7.21	312		779f.
	^m 8.20.8	782		3.3.2.19
	8.23.6	659		123f.
	9.1.4.22	557, 558		3.3.3.24
	^v 9.2.5.16 (= MānŚulbS			557, 558
	2.5.16)	508		3.4.4.24
	10.3.5.22	517 ¹⁶⁹⁶		226
	^v 10.3.7.1 (= MānŚulbS			
	3.7.1)	355	ĀpŚS	^m 1.12.13
	11.7.1.6	517 ¹⁶⁹⁶		430
	11.8.1.6	258		^m 3.1.2
	^m 11.9.2.5	480		64, 65 ¹⁴⁶
	^m 11.9.3.25	480		3.9.8
				309
				^m 4.1.6
				667
				4.9.6
				250f.
				^m 4.11.5
				533
				4.16.1
				533
				^m 4.14.4
				281
				^m 5.19.4
				556
				^m 6.5.3
				667
				6.9.1
				137 ³³⁶
				^m 6.9.3
				667
				7.12.2
				778
				^m 7.15.7
				526
				^m 7.16.7
				521
				8.3.8
				279
				8.13.6
				477 ¹⁶⁰¹
				9.1.17
				533
				9.5.8
				266, 268
				9.11.26
				267 ⁶⁹⁶ , 268

9.15.6, 7	533	6.8:164.21ff.	446
9.15.14	561 ^{1808, 1809}	^m 6.31:197.1	783
9.17.4	779	^m 9.12:282.10	276, 277f.
9.18.11	147, 698	10.21:19.15-17	513
9.20.4	274	14.1:152.15	780
10.7.12	151	14.14:178.5-6	783
10.19.16	680	16.16:262.12-14	370 ⁹⁵⁵
10.22.4	629 ¹⁹⁸⁸	18.45:401.1ff.	438 ¹¹³³
10.22.12-23.1	71, 789	^m 19.5:423.12-13	667
10.24.8	174	21.10:86.9-10	273
10.31.5	573 ¹⁸⁴³	21.11:88.18-19	680
11.8.2	677	23.5:155.11-12	290 ⁷⁵²
12.12.13	97 ²²³ , 199 ⁴⁹⁶	23.8:161.16	141
12.17.11	295	24.7:190.14-15	777
^m 13.9.11	650, 651	^m 24.26:211.14	265
^m 13.18.1	281	^v 29.8:380.3-4	53, 632
14.8.5	66, 174	^v 29.8:380.13	336
14.28.4	596		
^m 15.3.7	641	BhārŚS 1.1.9	775
^m 15.12.1	276, 277	^m 1.12.10	430
15.12.13	675	1.13.4	119
15.17.8	474	^m 3.2.7	64
^m 16.6.4	569 ¹⁸³⁰	4.5.4	298
16.17.8	174	4.8.3	298
18.13.11	123f.	4.13.1	250f.
18.15.4	643 ²⁰²⁹	4.17.5	232
18.18.6	572	^m 5.12.5	556, 559
18.19.2	557, 558	5.12.7	557, 558
^m 19.13.19	667	^m 6.1.5	667
20.16.8	573 ¹⁸⁴⁵	7.3.9	431, 434
21.19.5	643, 645	8.3.15	279
21.22.5	198	8.16.7	477
22.28.7	68f.	10.8.6	780
24.2.18	521	10.19.5	573 ¹⁸⁴³
24.3.21	779 ²²⁷⁰	11.17.10	474
		11.19.7	247
BaudhŚS 1.7:11.3-4	163f.		
^m 1.17:26.12-13	40 ⁷⁹	HirŚS 2.3.32	472
3.18:89.14	250f.	^m 3.5.8	556, 559

^m 3.7.62	667	VādhS (including VādhAnv and
3.8.63	163	VādhŚS; numeration of ed.
3.8.66	163	CALAND in []):
5.1.37	279	VādhAnv 1.19 [3.16:3] 51
6.3.9	232	2.13 [3.40:11] 303 ⁷⁸⁰
7.3.4	573 ¹⁸⁴³	3.11 [4.13:4] 199
7.5.27	677	4.10 [4.26:26] 72
10.8.10, 13	174	4.11 [4.27:13ff.] 492, 522
^m 11.1.69	569 ¹⁸³⁰	4.12 [4.28a:1] 406
13.3.40	252	4.13 [4.28d:6-7] 195, 260
13.5.14	123f.	4.16 [4.30:22] 536
13.6.18	572	4.31 [4.51:1] 232 ⁶⁰⁰
13.6.29	557, 558	4.35 [4.59a:12] 556 ¹⁷⁹⁶
14.3.31	573 ¹⁸⁴⁵	4.36 [4.59b:7] 175, 178
15.2.7	266, 268	4.47 [4.74:7] 88
15.7.12	596	4.47 [4.13:2] 459, 796
15.7.24	779	4.70 [4.86a:1ff.] 412
16.7.17	198f.	4.82f. [4.94a/b/c/d] 366 ⁹⁴²
23.4.47	68	4.84 [4.95:10] 322
^m 24.5.4	276, 277f.	4.94 [4.101:9] 188, 189,
		698
VaikhŚS ^m 1.4:5.14	479f.	5.15 [4.114:5] 198, 565
^m 3.7:38.6	430	VādhŚS 1.4.1.17 622
5.5:56.7-8	461	1.4.1.39 646 ²⁰³⁷
6.12:68.5-6	306, 309	1.4.2.1 646 ²⁰³⁷
12.11:141.4	532	1.4.2.12 573 ¹⁸⁴⁴
12.16:146.19	71, 789	1.4.4.1 646 ²⁰³⁷
12.22:152.19	573 ¹⁸⁴³	1.6 [2.4] 271, 273
13.8:161.15	680	6.1 [2.21:4] 232
^m 16.11:224.17-18	650, 651	^m 8.9 [3.49:5] 578
17.6:240.9	566	11.4 [3.71:7] 139
18.5:256.6	218	11.19 [3.88] 189
18.6:256.16	273, 275	11.21 [3.91:3] 557, 558
20.11:305.7	268	11.23 [3.95:2] 642
20.15:307.14-16	305	
20.24:312.17	268	KatyŚS 4.15.15/16 136f.
21.4:325.2	431, 434	7.1.32 70 ¹⁵⁴
		7.6.26 767f.

	14.1.23	572		^m 4.15.10	467f.
	15.2.9	88		5.8.5	569
	24.3.26	70 ¹⁵⁴		6.3.8	536
	^m 25.5.28	590			
	^m 25.5.28	281	KauṣGS	^m 3.14.16	777
				^m 4.2.3	467f.
VaitS	2.15	251	JGS	^m 1.3:3.19	56 ¹²¹
	5.17	132, 698		^m 1.6:6.18	479f.
	8.1	196, 197		2.7:32.7	359, 361
	10.2	255, 258			
	10.6	132	GobhGS	^m 1.9.3	547
	10.7	132		^m 3.10.19	565, 567 ¹⁸²⁷
	10.8	268			
	10.18	624	MānGS	^v 1.1.18	383 ⁹⁸⁶
	11.5	431, 434		1.13.17	609
	13.30	389		^m 2.7.4	621
	14.1	389		^m 2.11.17	587, 590
	16.1	312		2.13.6	326
	16.2	512		2.15.6	396, 481
	24.1	511	VārGS	8.4	192
	24.14	207		15.13	609
	24.15	464			
	27.6	207	ĀpGS	(1.)3.1-2	232, 235, 238
	28.8	779		(6.)14.14	550 ¹⁷⁸³
	28.24	232			
	29.13	65	ĀpM	1.4.8	335
Gṛhya-Sūtras				1.7.8	231, 233, 237, 239
				1.8.5	416, 417 ¹⁰⁷⁵
ĀśGS	^m 1.10.12	56 ¹²¹		1.12.8	600 ¹⁹²⁰
	^m 2.2.3	448 ¹⁰⁴⁶		2.8.10	572, 575
	2.8.16	268		2.20.35	380
	^m 2.9.5	590	BaudhGS	^m 1.1.24	479f.
ŚGS	^m 1.19.6	600 ¹⁹²⁰		3.5.7	268
	3.11.9	467		4.1.9, 10	238
	^m 4.2.6	777			
	^m 4.4.12	479f.			

BaudhGParīś.

2.15.13d:5.31 460
4.2:25.14-16 480

BhārGS 1.11:11.3 236, 237f.

1.12:13.1 232, 235, 238
1.18:18.9 232⁶⁰⁰, 238
1.22:22.14 550¹⁷⁸³
3.8:75.14 349⁸⁹³
^m3.16:85.5 479f.

HirGS 1.1.27 226⁵⁸³, 238

^m1.2.11 56¹²¹
^m1.11.4 572
^m1.15.1 600¹⁹²⁰
^m1.15.6 537
^m1.19.7 335
^m1.28.1 437¹¹³¹
2.2.8 550¹⁷⁸³
2.7.2 238

VaikhGS 3.14:45.15-16 550¹⁷⁸³

^m5.5:77.9 118
^m6.2:90.21-91.1 479f.

ĀgnivGS 2.1.3:46.16 550¹⁷⁸³

^m2.3.2:56.9 479f.
^m2.3.4:58.6 479f.
^v2.7.6:112.4 508f.
3.6.2:150.10 305
3.10.4:174.8 396

PārGS ^m1.5.11 335

^m2.14.17 572
^m2.16.3 448¹⁰⁴⁶
^m3.1.3 679
^m3.16 332

KauśS 2.31 269

43.8 268

^m45.16 362, 367⁹⁴⁵

48.7 781

52.8 781

59.28 609

^m62.21 121, 359f., 663,
665

63.20 218, 698

65.1 575

71.12 312

72.30 609

^m75.5 235^m79.18 35083.4 435, 438¹¹³⁴^m83.6 621^m83.7 390

137.1 680

Pitṛmedha-Sūtras**GautPS** 1.3.4-6 118^m2.6.13 777**BaudhPS** 1.10:14.12 305**Dharma-Sūtras****ĀpDhS** 1.2.12 3531.27.8 517¹⁶⁹⁶

2.4.24 516

2.13.6 230

2.26.8 486

BaudhDhS (numeration of ed.

ŚASTRI in [])

^v1.19.8 [1.19.10] 140^v2.6.42 621

	2.11.26 [2.11.28]	643		3.251	777
	^v 2.15.10	275 ⁷¹⁷		4.16	275 ⁷¹⁷
	^v 4.2.14	631		5.108	631, 634
				5.109	632
VaikhDhS	3.15:145.6	322		5.119	460
HirDhS	1.1.18	336		6.46	517 ¹⁶⁹⁶
	1.7.33	517 ¹⁶⁹⁶		6.55	275 ⁷¹⁷
	2.1.77	516		6.94	517 ¹⁶⁹⁶
	2.5.203	486		7.33	298
				7.179	772 ²²⁴⁸
VāsDhS	2.10	336		9.2	275 ⁷¹⁷
	^v 3.57	632f.		10.27-36	509 ¹⁶⁸⁰
	^v 3.58	633, 634		12.35	498
	^v 3.60	632f.			
	^v 6.5	458	YājñSmṛ.	1.244	480
	^v 11.27	275 ⁷¹⁷		1.251	777
	13.60	238		1.323	780
	19.38	560, 562		2.103	517 ¹⁶⁹⁶
	^v 21.12	632f.		3.35	517 ¹⁶⁹⁶
			NārSmṛ.	11.21	66
Smṛtis				12.17	484 ¹⁶¹⁷
				15-16.8	340 ⁸⁷¹
ViṣṇuSmṛ.	3.97	298		19.26	698 ²¹³³
	13.5	540 ¹⁷⁶⁰	Other ancillary texts		
	20.27	354 ⁹⁰⁶	APrāyaśc.	1.5	618
	^v 22.91	631, 634		2.4	116, 359, 361
	^v 22.92	632		^m 3.1	143
	23.6	497		^m 3.2	298, 312
	24.41	560		4.3	268
	30.47	336, 345		5.1	195
	43.42	769	AVPariś.	13.4.8	544
	^m 73.26	777 ^{2262, 2266}		40.4.2	782 ²²⁷³
	88.1	509 ¹⁶⁸⁰		48.116	541, 542
	90.5	587		64.7.4	500
	94.3	79			
ManuSmṛ.	3.125	275 ⁷¹⁷			
	3.226	517 ¹⁶⁹⁶			

67.6.3	652 ²⁰⁵²		
72.2.2	608	BṛhDev.	6.145 565, 566f.
72.4.7	195		

Texts of the Indian grammatical tradition

Pāṇ. (Aṣṭadhyāyī)		Kāśikā Vṛtti (on Pāṇ. 6.1.108)
1.3.61	707f. ²¹⁴⁷	188
2.3.61	525 ¹⁷¹⁵	
3.1.69	4	Kāty., Vārtt. 3 on Pāṇ. 1.3.29
3.1.70	773 ²²⁵⁰	519 ¹⁶⁹⁸
3.1.90	498	
3.4.55	644 ²⁰³¹	DhP I 513 591 ¹⁸⁹⁹
6.1.108	188	I 516 514
6.1.195	11 ²² , 394, 715 ²¹⁵⁶	I 547 653
6.4.43-44	7 ⁸ , 73, 97 ²²³ , 322	I 951 14
6.4.62	77, 738 ²¹⁹⁷	I 952ff. 15
7.3.74	5 ⁶	I 1055-1057 14
7.3.78	435	I 1059 646 ²⁰³⁶
7.4.23	237, 238, 239	VI 109 707f. ²¹⁴⁷
7.4.25	267	X 113 530f. ¹⁷³⁵
7.4.29	7	
Pat. (Mahābhāṣya)		Yā. (Nirukta)
ad Pāṇ. 2.3.60 (ed. KIELHORN,		2.2 483 ¹⁶¹⁴
vol. I, p. 466, l. 2) 557, 558		6.12 252
ad Pāṇ. 6.1.108 (ed. KIELHORN,		6.28 355
vol. III, p. 82, l. 2) 188		10.1.3 318 ⁸¹⁴

Other Sanskrit texts

GauḍĀgŚ 3.46	769 ²²⁴²	BhāgP 7.12.24	517 ¹⁶⁹⁶
KA 1.20.8	497 ¹⁶⁵³	Kathās. 41.14	731 ²¹⁸³
7.18.42	498		
8.5.28	497 ¹⁶⁵³ , 498	MBh. (crit. ed.) 1.16.15	769 ²²⁴³

Rām. (crit. ed.) 1.36.13 68¹⁵⁰ 3.64.11 206⁵¹⁷

Avestan

Gāthās

Y 34.8 344⁸⁸¹
 43.9 344⁸⁸¹
 44.11 221
 48.7 443¹¹⁴⁵
 53.5 236

Vd 2.41 344⁸⁸¹
 7.38 611¹⁹⁴¹
 13.37 611¹⁹⁴¹
 15.12 611¹⁹⁴¹
 15.48 611¹⁹⁴¹
 18.28 344⁸⁸¹

Yt 1.24 583
 5.89 583
 19.67 522
 14.43 236

Young Avestan

Y 57.28 522

INDEX RERUM

Aa

absolutive 229⁵⁹⁶
 accent
 shift 691, 696, 714f., 719ff.,
 759ff.
 accentuation 34
 , fluctuating 12, 34, 362ff.,
 704, 710ff., 720ff., 735
 and meaning 11ff., 706ff.,
 accusative
 , content 25f., 42, 69f.,
 320f.⁸²³, 377f., 382ff.,
 719, 791ff.
 of goal 25, 41, 348, 469ff.,
 513, 518
 of relation/scope/parameter
 25f., 115, 365, 580, 584,
 587ff., 704
 of time 26
 activity (verb) 28, 723f.
 affective. *See* transitive-affective
 agent 19f.
 Aktionsart 761
 anticausative 5, 20f.; *see also*
 48, 130, 133, 138, 150f., 156,
 169, 206, 209, 212f., 223,
 242f., 274, 280, 287f., 314ff.,

322, 363, 520f., 762

aorist

 , (medio-)passive (in *-i*) 32,
 51, 141 *et passim*, 740ff.
 , sigmatic 144³⁵⁰, 210f.,
 740ff., 281, 283f., 288f.,
 337, 342f., 740ff.
 , thematic 540¹⁷⁵⁹, 544¹⁷⁶⁶,
 611, 744

argument

 , syntactic 17

atelic 762

Cc

causative, 106²⁵², 696ff., 727ff.,
 759, 767f. *See also e.g.* 78ff.,
 767f. *See also* passive of
 causative
 causativization 697
 change of state *See* verbs of
 change of state
 compounds (verbal) 703f.
Cyáti type 15, 661ff., 725

Dd

decausative. *See* anticausative
 denominative 9, 10f., 701,
 770. *See also e.g.* 83, 136f.,
 145, 160, 171, 236, 241
 destruction and destructuring.
See verbs of destruction and
 destructuring
 dialects in Vedic 360, 395, 712ff.
 diathesis (active/middle), 17ff.,
 746ff. *et passim*. *See also*
 middle
 desiderative. *See* passive of
 desiderative
 ditransitives 26f. *See also* ‘two
 pattern’ verbs
 durative. *See* Aktionsart
 dynamic, 13ff., 238, 443

Ee

entropy increase. *See* verbs of
 entropy increase
 evidentiality 303⁵⁸⁰

Ff

figura etymologica 26⁵⁵, 139,
 156, 176
 future,
 , passive 76f., 121, 197, 296,
 745

Gg

gerundive 32
 Greek 23⁴⁷, 707, 763

Hh

hapax 32
 heating. *See* verbs of heating

Ii

imperfect, 142f., 156, 456, 518,
 655, 732ff.
 inchoative 28, 724. *See also*
 stative
 Indo-European, 29ff., 751, 758ff.
 infinitive 123, 320⁸³¹, 338
 injunctive
 , passive 284f., 456f., 732ff.
 intensifier. *See* reflexive
 intransitive 13, 17, 20f., 22ff., 26
et passim. *See also* transitive,
 transitivity
 intransitive/transitive (I/T) 27,

Ll

labile 27f., 297, 587, 610f.,
 651²⁰⁴⁹, 729
 lemma
 , structure of 35
 lengthening
 in roots 8f.

Mm

middle (diathesis), 17, 18, 34,
746ff. *et passim*. *See also*
diathesis
motion and body posture. *See*
verbs of motion and body
posture
mriyáte type 707ff.,

Nn

nominal derivatives 735ff.
nonce formation 32

Oo

object
 , direct 17ff., 24f.
objecthood 24f., 701
optative
 , passive 108, 127ff., 168,
732ff.

Pp

paradigmatic properties of the
 -*ya*-presents 719, 726ff. *See*
 also e.g. 144³⁵⁰, 285, 342ff.,
 395, 417, 482, 666²⁰⁸⁷, 673
participle
 , perfect passive 32
passive 13, 19f., 691ff., 715ff.,
744f., 748 *et passim*
 , agentless 19f., 695
aorist. *See* aorist

/non-passive distinction 22f.,
715ff., 759
of causative 10f., 694, 696ff.,
705ff., 752ff. *See also e.g.*
70, 77ff., 90, 95, 118f.,
132, 147, 151, 161ff., 208,
218, 225, 314, 316, 323,
397, 470f., 500, 513, 561f.,
587ff., 610f., 623f., 774
etc.
of desiderative, A.I.2 10f. ,
695, 699ff., 752ff. *See also*
e.g. 108, 197f., 205, 345f.,
493f., 516
 , quasi- 20⁴³
of quasi-denominative 250ff.,
294f., 785ff. *See also e.g.*
71, 108, 217, 248, 276,
312, 525f.
of reciprocal *See* reciprocal
-rich (hymns) 32f.
passivization 19
 test 24, 701, 703, 704, 794
perfect 744f. *See also e.g.* 49, 58,
64, 109, 125, 132ff.,
phonological similarity 719
phonological types of roots
683ff.
present 3
presents,
 of the type *Cyáti* 15, 661ff.,
 725
 of the type *mriyáte* , 15,
 661ff., 707ff.
 , root 726, 729
 , thematic full grade (class I
 presents) 14f., 690, 726
 , thematic zero grade (class
 VI) presents 15, 725, 726

with the nasal affix (nasal presents) 719, 726ff., 770, 783
 with the suffix -*ya-* (-*ya-* presents = class IV presents) 4ff., 313ff., 705 *et passim*
 with the suffix -*áya-* (-*áya-* presents, class X presents), 694ff.
 process (verb) 28, 723f.

Qq

quasi-denominative 693f., 701, 785ff.

Rr

reciprocal 24, 105f., 161ff., 582¹⁸⁷⁵, 749,
 reflexive 21f., 48, 133, 150f., 156, 169, 582¹⁸⁷⁵, 748f.,
 , emphatic (intensifier) 173
 reflexivization, 83
 root
 , laryngeal 14f., 686ff., 689f.,
 , nasal 5f., 126f., 685, 688f.,
 , primary 4ff., 691ff., 705
 , secondary 10f., 683, 705.
See also e.g. 83, 127, 137, 160, 236, 241
 types 683ff.

Ss

self-beneficient. *See* transitive-affective
 SIEVERS' law 8f., 11, 518
 sociative 24, 547, 581f., 672
 spontaneous. *See* verbs of entropy increase
 state (verb) 28, 723ff.
 stative 28, 32, 443, 744f. *et passim*
 subjunctive
 , passive 732ff.
 syntactic pattern 17ff.

Tt

telic *See* atelic
 transitive 17f., 24f.
 , absolute (= objectless) 18
 -affective (= self-beneficient) 18f., 748f. *et passim*
 transitivity. *See* objecthood
 transitive alternations 726ff.
 'two pattern'. *See* verbs, 'two pattern'

Uu

unaccusative. *See* anticausative
 unambiguously accented 34

Vv

valency 697

verbs

of caused motion 695f.
 of change of state 705, 749f.
 of cognition, 233ff.
 of destruction 703, 709ff.,
 716, 778
 of destructuring 703, 710f.,
 717
 of entropy increase 717f.,
 724f., 727f., 749f.
 of heating 710f., 728
 of mental activities 706ff.,
 722, 731, 744, 749f.
 of motion and body posture
 705ff., 722, 743, 749f.
 of perception 695f., 744²²¹².
 See also e.g. 74, 124, 242,

271

of speech/sound, C. 702,
 706f.,
 , ‘two pattern’ 26f., 701ff.
 See also e.g. 59, 66, 82,
 113ff., 188, 192, 212, 229,
 517f., 678, 769

version (subjective). *See*

transitive-affective

voice 17ff.

Yy

-ya-presents. *See* presents *et*
 passim

-yet-optative 747