

Title	A morphological study of the first person subjunctive in the Rigveda
Author(s)	Doyama, Eijiro
Citation	待兼山論叢. 哲学篇. 39 P.1-P.19
Issue Date	2005-12
Text Version	publisher
URL	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/11094/4010">http://hdl.handle.net/11094/4010</a>
DOI	
rights	本文データはCiNiiから複製したものである
Note	

*Osaka University Knowledge Archive : OUKA*

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

Osaka University

# A morphological study of the first person subjunctive in the Rigveda

Eijiro DOYAMA

1 Tense stems (1.1 Athematic tense stems, 1.2 Thematic tense stems), 2 Modal suffix, 3 Personal endings (3.1 1sg. act., 3.2 1du./pl. act., 3.3 1sg. mid., 3.4 1du./pl. mid.), 4 Word list, **Appendix I** Forms in *-ā*, **II** Forms in *-am*

The subjunctive, a modal category in the Vedic verbal system, has long been in need of systematic and exhaustive philological research. As the first stage of such a study, I tried to clarify in my dissertation (Tohoku University 2004)<sup>1)</sup> the formation and function of the first person subjunctive in the Rigveda where the subj. is most productive and widely attested, strictly examining all attested forms. This article is the abridged version of the chapter on morphology in my dissertation.

The subj. form is made from three components: the tense stem (aorist, present, perfect and secondary [pres.] stems), the modal suffix (the thematic vowel *-a/ā-*), and the personal ending. The first person subj. in the RV amounts to 134 forms (254 inclusive of repetitions) of 97 tense stems formed from 83 verbal roots.

## 1 Tense stems

The 134(254) forms consist of 73(134) pres. stems, 46(101) aor. stems, 5(6) perf. stems, and 10(13) secondary [pres.] stems, i. e. caus. 6 (6) and intens. 4(7). No pass./desid./denom. stem is found.<sup>2)</sup>

**1.1 Athematic tense stems** The athematic tense stem with ablaut usually takes a full-grade root form and the accent is put on it: e. g. aor. *yój-ā*, pres. *kṛ-nāv-āma*, perf. *sū-sāv-āma*. Exceptions are:

1) *bhuvāni* The root-aor. (and the perf.) of *bhav<sup>i</sup>* shows the peculiar consistent zero-grade which is assumed to go back to PIE: ind.

*ābhūt* = Gr. (ξ)φῦ (cf. Lat. *fuī*, older *fūī*); subj. *bhāva-* = OAv. *buua-* < PII \**b<sup>h</sup>uH-a-*.<sup>3)</sup> It is difficult to assume that the pres. *bhava-* is the original aor. subj. (cf. OAv. *baumu-* as the subj.), because the ablaut pattern between the zero-gr. ind. and the full-gr. subj. is very unlikely, see GOTÖ I. *Präs.* 1987, 229f.<sup>4)</sup>

2) Intensive I The subjunctives of the intens. I are formed from the zero-gr. root forms (SCHAEFER *Intens.* 1994, 35ff.): the 1st persons *carkirāma*<sup>5)</sup> (cf. ind. *carkarmi*), *vevidāma*, *jaṅghānāni*, *jaṅghanāva*. SCHAEFER 70 (also PRAUST *Altindisch dṛ-/dṛ-*: *Indoarisch, Iranisch...* 2000, 428f.) explains a seemingly full-gr. for the expected zero-gr. as in the last two forms by SIEVERS' Law (*-gh<sup>h</sup>nn-*) which applies only before final syllables (see SCHINDLER *Notizien zum Sieversschen Gesetz: Sprache* 23 1977, 60ff.): subj./ptcpl. *jaṅghan-at* :: ptcpl. *jaṅghn-atas*; ind. *sarsr-āte*. But it does not hold true for our forms, inj. *jaṅghan-anta*, perf. ind. *sarsr-ē*, etc, so that multiple factors have to be taken into account. Besides analogical leveling<sup>6)</sup> (SCHINDLER 62f., PRAUST 429), difficult pronunciation of the double plosives *gh-n* after *-n-* can be responsible for the realization of *-ghan-*, while *-rsr-* is easy to pronounce since *s* is a continuant, sharing the place of articulation with *r*. Also the root-pres. subj. (*hānāva*, MS+ *hānāni*) may have influenced the intens. subj. — The intens. I subj. has an accent on the reduplication (*mārmṛjat*) as most other moods do. *jaṅghānāni* (cf. 3sg. *jaṅghanat*) is supposed to have been “misaccented” by Indra whose speech is slurred, drunk on Soma (X 119, 10).

3) Stems in *-ā* in full-grade Some stems with the ablaut *-aH/-H* appear sometimes (also) in zero-gr. in Ilr., forming the “short-vowel subjunctives”<sup>7)</sup>, typically seen in the 2nd/3rd persons: redupl. pres. *dād<sup>h</sup>as/-at* ≈ YAv. *-daθ-ō/-at* (besides *-daθā'ti*); *jah-at* AB, cf. OAv. *zaz-ənti*; nasal pres. *min-at*. The 1st person subj., on the other hand, can be derived either from zero-gr. or full-gr.: *dadhāma* < PII \**dad<sup>h</sup>aH-/dadH-āma* (*-ā-* see 2), similarly *dadhāni*, *jahāma*, *mināma*, (but *junāma*?<sup>8)</sup>). As the full-gr. forms were original in PIE (RIX *Hist. Gram.* 230) it is irrational to assume the reformation to the zero-gr. in the 1st persons. It is noteworthy that the short-vowel subj. took place where

the ind./inj. and the subj. could have the same form (see HOFFMANN *Injunktiv* 1967, 111f.), and serve to avoid possible confusion of modal forms (cf. subj. *dhāma* < \**dhaHāma*). So, we can rather regard the 1st person subjs. as the "hinge-forms" on which the original *-ā-* was remodeled into *-ā-* to maintain the identity of the subj. by analogy like *asāni/-āma* :: *asat* = *dadhāni/-āma* :: X, cf. HOFFMANN *Aufsätze* II 445f. n. 14. — The accent on the reduplication is assured for our forms by *dādhas/-at* etc RV and *dādhāni* ŚĀ, ŚB etc, *dādhāma* ŚB, for *jahāma* by *jāhāni* AV. *mināma*, *junāma* may have their accents on the nasal infix or on the subj. suffix.

4) *īdāmahai* Although *īd-* may etymologically represent the PIE redupl. pres. \**h<sub>2</sub>i-h<sub>2</sub>isd-* (cf. LIV<sup>2</sup> 260f. + n. 2) it is fossilized as a verbal root in the RV (*īdītā-*, *īd<sub>(i)</sub>ya-*). The root-pres. *īd-* shows no ablaut<sup>9</sup>) with the fixed accent and inflects only in the middle.

5) Nonce forms X 77,1 *pruṣā*, which appears to be the root-aor. of *proṣ* with an irregular zero-gr., was probably made ad hoc to rhyme with preceding *abhra-pruṣo* (see JOACHIM *Mehrfachprä.* 1978, 112f.) — III 33,10 *śaśvacāi*, seemingly the perf. subj. of *śvañc* 'bow', has an irregular zero-gr. and the accent on the ending unlike *śaśāvāma*, *tatānāma*. It is best understood as remodeled from the perf. ind. mid. *śaśvacē* analogically to the oxtonic thematic pres., like *viṣē* :: *viṣāi* = *śaśvacē* :: X, cf. THIEME *Kl.Schr.* 7f. n. 1.<sup>10</sup>) The reason why such analogy took place should be sought in the static meaning of the perf. stem 'keep bowed' which had to be retained in the subj. too, cf. also KÜMMEL *Perf.* 535. This idea matches the context: the river will lower her water level for the poet: *nī te naṁsai pīp yānēva yōṣā māryāyeva kan yā śaśvacāi te* 'I will bend down for you like a young woman swollen [with her breast milk] (to her baby). Like a young girl for a young man I will keep bowed for you.'

6) *sāksāma* The -s-aor. forms of *sah* in extended-grade are widely attested in the RV: ind./inj. [*a*]*sāksi*, subj. *sāksate*, impv. *sākṣva*, while subj. *sakṣat*, impv. *sakṣi*, *sākṣvā* show the regular full-gr., see NARTEN *Sigm. Aoriste* 1964, 264f. As KLINGENSCHMITT *Altarm. Verbum* 1982, 129 + n. 4 pointed out, the long *-ā-* was abstracted from the perf. ind.

*sasāhē*, itself an innovated form to the original \**sāh-* < PIE \**se-sg<sup>h</sup>*-. – The accent is put on the stem as in other -s-aorists.

**1.2 Thematic tense stems** The thematic tense stem does not change its stem structure and accent in the subj.: pres. subj. *vāhāni* :: ind. *vāhāmi*; aor. subj. *sānā* :: inj. *sānat*. Some forms draw notice:

1) *tāksāma* The subj. *tāksāma* can formally belong either to the themat. aor. (*ātakṣat*) or to the Narten-pres. (*tāṣti* AB, 3pl. *takṣati*); but no chance for the aor. inj., see 3.2, 3.5. The aor. subj. is preferred for syntactic reasons: V 73,10 *imā brāhmāṇi vārdhanā- sṣvibhyāṃ santu śāmtamā | yā tāksāma rāthāñ iva* ‘For both Aśvins these *brāhmaṇ*-words should be the most blessed strengthening drinks, which we will put together like chariots.’ The Rigvedic poets often finish their hymns referring to the preceding stanzas as *brāhmaṇs* (words with realizing power).<sup>11)</sup> *yā tāksāma* correlates with *brāhmāṇi* because *brāhmaṇ*-*takṣ* is a well-attested formula (I 62, 13, V 29, 5, X 39, 14). The whole sentence would only make sense when *tāksāma* represents an aor. form. Parallel to an aor. ind. which confirms the past at the present time, we may well assume that an aor. subj. confirms the results of the past at a future time.<sup>12)</sup> Our stanza reads so ‘Only when *imā brāhmāṇi* come to be *vārdhanā*, then we will be able to regard ourselves as really having made the *brāhmaṇs*.’<sup>13)</sup>

2) *-huvāmahe* *huvā* forms the presents *huvāya-*, *hāva-* and the thematic aorist *huvā-/huvāva-* (GOTÖ I. Präs. 347ff.) of which some unaugmented forms (*huvē* etc) are often thought to be the pres. tense (e. g. LUBOTSKY *Concord.* 1997 s. v.; *LIV*<sup>2</sup> 180f.), while also the root-pres. is attested in the RV: *hūmāhe*, *huvānā-*. But it is impossible to see four kinds of pres. stem for one verbal root. As GOTÖ 349f. indicates, the coincidental meaning of *huvē* ‘I call hereby’ (see App. II s. v. *stoṣam*) should rather belong to the aor. ind., and this function shared by the pres. and aor. ind. brought about the secondary root-pres. on the analogy of *bruvē*, \**brūmāhe*, *bruvānā-*. We can then not only do without the unnecessary pres. \**huvā-/huvāva-* besides the same-shaped aor., but explains also the isolated root-pres. in the RV. Thus *-huvāmahe* is an aor. subj. with the

normal prim. ending *-mahe*, cf. *sicāmahe* (3.4, 3.5).

3) Redupl. aorists Some redupl. aorists fluctuate between the themat. and athemat. stem: *dīdhar* ~ *ādīdharat* etc. The 1pl. subj. *rīram-āma* can be so derived from either of the two, cf. inj./subj. *rīramat* (see HOFFMANN *Inj.* 239). Also of *vōca-* (<\**uē-uk<sup>w</sup>e/o-*) not only the themat. subj. *vocāti*, but the athemat.(?) *vōcati* (5x) are attested. The latter, however, seems to be secondary since all other verbal forms are built from the themat. stem (ind. *āvocat*, impv./subj. *vocā*), but cf. BENDAHDAN *Redupl. Aor.* Diss. 1991, 202. The 1st person subjs. *vocā*, *vocāma*, *vocāvahai* are therefore to be judged to belong to the themat. stem. — Of *rīram(a)*- no accented form is attested. *vōcati* suggests the same accentuation in the subj. as in all other moods.<sup>14)</sup>

## 2 Modal suffix (thematic vowel)

The thematic vowel PIE *\*-e/o-*, which forms themat. tense stems, is used also as the modal suffix of the subj. The Indo-European evidence indicates that the vowel timbre in the active alternates between *\*-o-* in the 1sg./du./pl. and 3pl. (before *u/n/m/h<sub>2</sub>* of the endings), and *\*-e-* otherwise.<sup>15)</sup> So the long *-ā-* of Ved. 1du./pl. can be explained by BRUGMANN'S Law: *-ā-va/ma* < *\*-o-ue/me*, e. g. subj. *āy-ā-ma* ~ Gr. Hom. *τ-ο-μev* < *\*ē-o-*. However, the vocalism in the middle is not elucidated sufficiently. Yet there is "a general IE tendency" for act. *\*-e-* :: mid. *\*-o-* (JASANOFF *Stative and Middle* 1978, 51),<sup>16)</sup> and even the consistent *\*-o-* in the whole paradigm of the mid. is possible (KLINGENSCHMITT *Das Albanische ...: In Hon. H. Pedersen* 1994, 227). It seems at least that the 1st mid. forms in Ved. are all formed with *\*-o-*; note the entire accordance in the beginning sounds of personal endings between act. and mid., see 3 (but cf. also n. 18).

The thematic vowel, when standing in athemat. stems, is a distinctive marker of the subj. together with the consistent full-gr., e. g. ind. *ās-ti*, *s-thā* :: subj. *ās-a-t(i)*, *ās-a-tha*. In themat. stems the subj. suffix merges with an existing themat. vowel to form a long *-ā-* which was the only feature of the 2nd/3rd subj. (but not of the 1st person, see 3), and spread also to athemat. stems which properly had a short *-a-*:

hypercharacterization<sup>17)</sup>, e. g. aor. subj. *mar-ā-ti*, *var-ā-te* instead of/ besides \**mar-a-ti*, *vār-a-te*. It is noteworthy that the phenomenon took place also in other IE languages: YAv. 2sg. *kər²-nauu-ā-hi* = OP *kunav-ā-hiy* (~ Ved. *kṛṇāv-a-s*); Gr. 1pl. *ί-ο-μεν* besides *ί-ο-μεν* (cf. *áy-ā-t* AV+). Similarly the characteristic shape of the 2/3du. subj. mid. of themat. stems *-aithe/-aite* (ind. *-ethe*, *-ete*) was imported to athemat. stems: aor. *dhaithe* besides *dhēthe* (cf. also 3.3).

### 3 Personal endings

While both the prim[ary] and sec[ondary] endings are used in the 2/3sg. act. and 3pl. act./mid. (*kāra-s[ī]*, *kara-t[ī]*, *kṛṇava-nte/-nta*), only one of the two is assigned to each slot of the 1st persons.

act.	sg.(prim.)	<i>-ā/-āni</i>	du.(sec.)	<i>-va</i>	pl.(sec.)	<i>-ma</i>
mid.	sg.(prim.)	<i>-ai</i>	du.(prim.)	<i>-vahi</i>	pl.(prim.)	<i>-mahe/-mahai</i>

**3.1 1sg. act.: *-ā/-āni*** Ved. *-ā* is the inherited form of PIE \**-ō*: the subj. suffix \**-o-* + the prim. ending \**-h₂*.<sup>18)</sup> While the 1sg. subj. \**-ō* is clearly distinguished in the athemat. tense stems (*ay-ā*, *kṛṇav-ā*), \**-ō* of the themat. stems can reflect both the subj. \**-o-o-h₂* and the ind. \**-o-h₂*, as is preserved in Gr. ind./subj. *φέρω* etc. In IIr. this ambiguity was partly removed 1) by adding the 1sg. act. prim. ending of the athemat. stems \**-mi* to the themat. ind. \**-ā* (*bhārāmi*, YAv. *barāmi*, OP *barāmiy*) and further 2) by introducing the particle *-ni* to the subj. \**-ā* (*bharāni*, YAv. *barāni*, cf. Gr. Hom. *-ωμι*, see SCHWYZER *Gr. Gram.* I 1939, 661). The innovation 1) became so productive in Ved. that one cannot suspect any trace of the ind. \**-ā* (as in OAv. *pər²sā* ~ Ved. *prcchā-mi*). Also 2) seems to have almost perfectly pervaded the themat. stems (see below; cf. OAv. subj. *zbaiiā*), but it spread only half way in athemat. stems. From all these observations we can judge a verbal form in *-ā* to represent a 1sg. subj., rather than 1sg. ind., if the first person singular is supposed for the verb.

In the RV, however, we encounter a large number of ambiguous *-ā*-forms which can formally belong to other verbal categories. — I 165, 9 *karisyā* (so Pp.) was probably taken from IV 30, 23 *karisyā[h]*, the

2sg. fut. subj., without modifying Sandhi (see OLDENBERG *Noten* ad loc.): *yāni karisyā kṛnuhi* 'Do what you will/intend to do!' (the fut. subj. itself has yet to be discussed) – VIII 45,37 *jāhā* (*k̥*...) belongs to the perf. *jāhā*-/jah-, not to the pres. *jāhā*-/jah- because of the accent, cf. pres. subj. *jāhāni* AV (see 1.1-4). It most likely inherits the old 3sg. perf. ind. act. PIE \**ǵʰajʰāH*-a like *paprā* I 69,1 (GELDNER VIII 45,37, KÜMMEL *Perf.* 30f., 608f.), as no perf. subj. in *-ā* is attested and functionally seems unnecessary.<sup>19</sup> – There are still cases where an *-ā*-form can represent both a 1sg. subj. act. and 2sg. impv. act. in the same context. But our survey (App. I) assured only three themat. aor. forms as the 1sg. subs.: *vocā*, *mṛksā*, *sānā*. Note that the themat. 2sg. impv. of the aor. stems is far less attested than that of the pres. stems<sup>20</sup> where an *-ā*-form could lead to great confusion.

Finally it is to be examined if the 1st subj. act. may employ the sec. ending. HOFFMANN *Inj.* 247f. assumes that certain *-am*-forms of themat./athemat. stems show functions of the subj. (first mentioned by OLDENBERG *Noten* ad X 27,9 *vāyam*). But a subj. in *-am*, if inherited from PIE, is only possible in the athemat. stems because no expected subj. in the themat. stems \**-ām* < \**-o-o-m* is attested in Ved. (cf. Pāli 1sg. fut. *-ssam* < \**-syām*), so that a themat. *-am*-subj., if any, would be a secondary usage. Our survey (App. II) proved that all verbal forms in *-am* are understood by the functions of the inj. We can then save complementary distribution of the endings: subj. *-ā/-āni* :: inj. *-am*.<sup>21</sup> It should only be noted that many inj. appear in similar contexts with similar functions to those of the subj. (HOFFMANN 254.; App. II), and that an *-am*-subj. is actually attested at least once in VS *āsam* (remodelled from AV *āsat*, op. cit. 248). These facts suggest that *-am* was exposed to reinterpretation as a subj. ending in Ved. This was probably even accelerated for the inj. was becoming obsolete, while *-am* remained a characteristic marker of the 1sg. act.

**3.2 1du./pl. act.: *-āva/-āma*** Most of the subs. of the athemat. stems, clearly marked by the full-gr. and the subj. suffix, take the sec. endings: *hān-ā-va*, *ās-ā-ma*. But in the case of the athemat. stems in *-ā*



and the themat. stems, the subj. merge with the corresponding inds./injs. in Iir.: PIE inj. (ind.) \**b<sup>h</sup>ér-o-me*(s) :: subj. \**b<sup>h</sup>ér-o-o-me*(s) > PII \**b<sup>h</sup>ār-ā-ma*(s), cf. Gr. φέρ-ο-μεν :: φέρ-ο-μεν. Our research shows that all forms with the prim. ending should or can be understood as the pres. inds. while the injs. are only found in prohibitive sentences (*mā + cukrudhāma, riśāma*, etc; noticeably all are aor. stems), which indicates that the inj. had lost the productivity in the themat. stems.<sup>22)</sup> The sec. endings otherwise appear where any of the subj. functions is doubtless or very probable.<sup>23)</sup> Also the subj. in Av. shows only the sec. endings. Thus we can conclude that the sec. ending was exclusively used for the 1du./pl. subj. in the RV.

**3.3 1sg. mid.: -ai** The 1sg. subj. mid. of the athemat. stems is distinctly characterized, e. g. *κῆρᾰν-αι* (:: ind. *κῆρῶ-ε*). But the subj. of the athemat. stems ending in *-ā* and the themat. stems have the same shapes as the corresponding inds. in PII: PIE ind. \**H<sub>1</sub>ǵ-o-h<sub>2</sub>ai* ≠ subj. \**H<sub>1</sub>ǵ-o-o-h<sub>2</sub>ai* > PII ind./subj. \**ǵáj-āi*, cf. Gr. φέρ-ο-μαι :: φέρ-ο-μαι (see SCHWYZER *Gr. Gram.* I 667f., RIX *Hist. Gram.* 253). Iir. then come to reserve the characteristic shape *-ai* only for the subj., while *-e* was standardized for the ind. also in the themat. stems: ind./subj. \**ǵáj-āi* > subj. *yáj-ai*, YAv. *yaz-āi*, but ind. *yáj-e*, YAv. *-iez-e* (cf. also subj. mid. \**-ā-naí* parallel to the act. \**-ā-ni* in YAv. and OP). Obviously this innovation was completed in the RV. The only attested *-ai*-forms, *pychāi* (ind. *pychē*) and *yādhyai*, both have the subj. functions.<sup>24)</sup> The ending *-ai* characterized the subj. mid. so strongly that it also spread over to other mid. endings: 1du. *-vahai*, 1pl. *-mahai*, 2pl. *-dhvai*, 3sg. *-tai* (cf. 2). – VI 20,8 *syjā* (i°...) can be the 1sg. subj. mid. *syjai* or the 2sg. subj. act. *syjāh*.<sup>25)</sup> The unclear structure of the sentence makes it difficult to identify the form. We can only say that the context does not necessarily require the mid. voice and seems to prefer the 2nd person as the subject.<sup>26)</sup>

As in the act. we naturally suspect the use of the sec. ending as a possible subj. ending. Of the two mid. sec. endings, *-a* and *-i*, *-a* (< \**-h<sub>2</sub>a*) appears only in the optatives: *sacey-a*, OAv. *vāuraii-ā*. Any subj. form

in this ending is unsustainable and unnecessary: athemat. *\*kṛṇāv-a-Ha* > ?*kṛṇāv-ā* (= 1sg. act.!); likewise themat. *\*b<sup>h</sup>āra-ā-Ha* > ?*bhārā*. Another ending *-i* is used in the ind./inj.: (athemat.) OAv. pres. inj. *aoj-ī*, Ved. aor. inj. *vāms-i*; (themat.) impf. *avije*, aor. inj. *vōce*.<sup>27</sup> *-i* as a subj. ending is only possible in the athemat. stems: *\*-a-i* > *-e*, cf. themat. *\*-a-a-i* > *-ai* (= prim. ending!). The most suspected form would be VII 29,3 1sg. perf. *tatane* which seems to show a full-gr., cf. 3sg. ind. *tatn-e*. But it can be derived from the legitimate 1sg. ind. *\*tatṇHai*<sup>28</sup> < PIE *\*tetṇ-h₂ai*, see KÜMMEL *Perf.* 210 (or with anaptyxis *\*tat<sub>en</sub>-ai*), and the context also supports the ind. usage. Of the stems showing the same grade in the ind./inj. and subj., no single example in *-e* (e. g. *dadh-ē*, *īd-e*, cf. 1.1) speaks for a subj.<sup>29</sup> Finally, the secondary use of the themat. (aor.) inj. for the subj. is nowhere attested as in the act.<sup>30</sup> We can admit only *-ai* as the 1sg. subj. mid. ending.

**3.4 1du./pl. mid.: *-vahai/-mahe* ~ *-mahai*** In the athematic stems, only the extended prim. ending *-vahai* is attested for the 1du. subj. mid. (: ind. *-vahe*; see 3.3). For the pl. are employed the original *-mahe* as well as *-mahai* with almost the same frequency. In the themat. stems, the du. takes *-vahai* (the original prim. ending is seen only in the ind. *sācāvāhe* + *purā*). In the pl. the extended ending *-mahai* appears in two forms, while widely attested forms in *-āmahe* can represent both a pres. ind. and subj., cf. the themat. aor. subjs. *sicāmahe*, *huvāmahe*; 1.2-2). However, all the examples of the themat. *-āmahe* favor or accept their use as inds. Considering also that the extended subj. form have spread to the athemat. stems where no confusion could occur, it is reasonable to assume a clear division of the endings between ind. *-mahe* and subj. *-mahai* in the themat. stems. The sec. ending can hardly be assumed for the 1du./pl. subj. mid. Of the two themat. forms with the sec. ending found in the RV, the one is aor. inj. *gyhāmahi* (or pres. inj. for *\*gyhmahi*?, cf. HOFFMANN *Inj.* 88f.) with *mā*, and the other *śiśāmahi* is also understood as an aor. inj., see HOFFMANN *Inj.* 255. Thus we can conclude that the prim. endings (*-mahe* or the extended *-vahai/-mahai*) are the only option for the 1du./pl. subj. mid.

\* \* \*

We can see clearly a morphological rationale in the distribution of the subj. endings, i. e. the possible merger of the subj. and inj./pres. ind. are avoided in various ways. The subj. takes the prim. ending in the sg. act.; a new marker *-ni* was added to the original *-ā* in most themat. stems. In the sg. mid., on the contrary, it is the ind. that reshaped the original *\*-ai* to *-e*. In the du./pl. act., the inj. gave up the sec. endings *-va/-ma* on behalf of the subj., except for the case of the prohibitive *mā* + inj. In the du. mid., the original prim. ending is spared for the ind., while the subj. takes the extended *-vahai*. For the pl. mid., both the original *-mahe* and the extended *-mahai* are employed, whereas the themat. stems take only the extended *-mahai* except in aor. stems. Noticeably, selection of the prim./sec. endings of the subj. shows a complete accordance between the themat. and athemat. stems, though it is motivated only in the themat. stems. All the innovations in the themat. stems have spread, more or less, to the athemat. stems. We may say that a leveling process occurred in the whole paradigm of the subj. for "economy of inflection."

## Athematic stems

voice	active						middle					
	sg.		du.		pl.		sg.		du.		pl.	
num.	prim.	sec.	prim.	sec.	prim.	sec.	prim.	sec.	prim.	sec.	prim.	sec.
end.												
p.ind.	<i>-ni</i>	-	<i>-vas</i>	-	<i>-mas(i)</i>	-	<i>-e</i>	-	<i>-vahe</i>	-	<i>-mahe</i>	-
inj.		<i>-am</i>		-		(aor.) <i>-ma</i>		<i>-i</i>		(aor.) <i>-vahi</i>		(aor.) <i>-mahi</i>
subj.	<i>-ā</i> 9(17) <i>-āni</i> 9(12)	-	-	<i>-āva</i> 6(9)	-	<i>-āma</i> 35(91)	<i>-ai</i> 9(13)	-	<i>-āvahai</i> 3(3)	-	<i>-āmahe</i> 9(40) <i>-āmahai</i> 9(13)	-

## Thematic stems

p.ind.	<i>-āmi</i>	-	<i>-āvas</i>	-	<i>-āmas(i)</i>	-	<i>-e</i>	-	<i>-āvahē</i>	-	<i>-āmahe</i>	-
inj.		<i>-am</i>		-		(aor.) <i>-āma</i>		<i>-e</i>		-		(aor.) <i>-āmahi</i>
subj.	<i>-ā</i> 3(3) <i>-āni</i> 8(9)	-	-	<i>-āva</i> 7(7)	-	<i>-āma</i> 16(25)	<i>-ai</i> 2(2)	-	<i>-āvahai</i> 5(5)	-	(aor.) <i>-āmahe</i> 2(3) <i>-āmahai</i> 2(2)	-

#### 4 Word list

All the forms of the 1st person subjunctive in the RV are listed below. The doubtful or rejected forms examined in 3 (*jahā* etc) and appendices are not included. All examples of the same form are represented by an accented form, if the latter occurs. The number of occurrences is put in parentheses.

**pres.** 73 (134): act. sg. *carāṇi*, *nāyāni*, *pacāni*, *bhajāni*, *vāhāni*; *rājāni* (2); *syjāni*; *ayā*, *bravā*, *brāvāni* (2), *stāvā* (4); *dadhāni*; *anajā*, *kṛṇavā*, *hinavā*; du. *ājāva*, *cārāva*, *jāyāva*, *śāṁsāva*; *hānāva* (3); *piḅāva* (themat.); *aśnavāva*, *riṇācāva*, *kṛṇāvāva*; pl. *ārcāma* (4), *bhajāma*, *bhārāma*, *bhāvāma*, *mādāma*, *manthāma*, *yājāma* (3), *vadāma*, *vārdhāma*, *hārāma*; *āyāma* (3), *āsāma* (4), *kṣāyāma*, *brāvāma* (12), *vāsāma*, *stāvāma* (11), *hānāma*; *dadhāma* (2), *juhavāma* (2), *jahāma*; *inavāma*, *kṛṇāvāma* (9), *junāma*, *aśnāvāma* (2), *mināma* (2), *saknāvāma* (2), *ṣṛṇāvāma*, *sunāvāma* (5), *spṛṇāvāma*; mid. sg. *yūdhyai*; *pychai*; *stāvai* (3); *kṛṇāvai* (2), *manāvai*, *sunavai* (2); du. *brāvāvahai*; *kṛṇāvāvahai*, *tanāvāvahai*; pl. *sacāvahai*, *sahāvahai*; *yājāmahai*; *idāmahe*, *idāmahai*, *brāvāmahai* (2); *kṛṇāvāmahai*, *aśnāvāmahai*, *bhunājāmahai* (2), *ruṇādhamahai*, *siñcāmahai* (themat.) — **aor.** 46 (101): act. sg. *sānā*; *karā* (2), *kārāni* (2), *gamāni* (2), *gāni*, *pruṣā!*, *bhuvāni*, *yōjā* (5); *vocā*; *stoṣāni*; *daviṣāni*; *mṛkṣā*; du. *ruhāva*; *vānāva*; pl. *tākṣāma*; *kārāma* (2), *gamāma* (2), *dhāma*, *marāma* (3), *rādhamā* (2); *rīramāma*, *vocāma* (5), *siṣadhāma*; *jēṣāma* (2), *vāṁsāma* (2), *śreṣāma*, *sākṣāma*, *stoṣāma* (4); mid. sg. *mānai*, *marai*; *naṁsai*, *māṁsai*; du. *vocāvahai*; pl. *sicāmahe*, *huvāmahe* (2); *kārāmahe* (8), *gāmāmahai*, *dhāmahe* (3), *nāsāmahai* (3), *mānāmahe* (20), *marāmahe*, *vānāmahe* (4), *vānāmahai*, *starāmahe*; *yāciṣāmahe*, *saniṣāmahe* — **perf.** 5 (6): act. pl. *cākānāma*, *cakrāmāma*, *tatānāma* (2), *śūśāvāma*; mid. sg. *śaśvacāi!* — **sec.** 10 (13): caus. act. sg. *randhayāni*; du. *irāyāva*; pl. *irāyāma*, *dhārayāma*; mid. du. *inḅhayāvahai*, *kalpayāvahai*, intens. act. sg. *janḅhānāni*; du. *janḅhanāva* (2); pl. *carkirāma* (2), *vevidāma* (2)

#### Appendix I Forms in -ā: 1sg. subj. act. and 2sg. impv. act.

The 2sg. impv. act. (= the bare stem) of the thematic stems often shows the long-vowel variant in the RV (*ārcā*, *bhārā*, see OLDENBERG *Proleg.* 394ff.), i. e. the same form of the old subj. in -ā (3.1). Theoretically,

also a vowel shortening of the latter would be possible (cf. nom./acc. pl. *brāhma* for *brāhmā*). Usually the two forms in question are easily distinguished by contexts: VI 59,1 'Now in front of the pressed [Soma] for you two (gods), I will announce (*prā... vocā* 1sg. subj.) the heroic acts which you two have performed' :: I 132,1 (to Indra:) 'Declare [your] support now (*ādhi vocā* 2sg. impv.) for the one (= me) who is pressing [Soma]!' Note that the 2sg. impv. can be directed toward the speaker himself, typically in first stanzas: I 64,1 'O Nodhas (= the poet's name), bring forth (*bharā*) a good praise!<sup>31</sup> Thus we can identify two more themat. 1sg. subjs. besides *vocā*: V 75,2 *ahām sánū* (otherwise 2sg. impv.), VIII 74,13 *ahām ... mṛkṣā*. But in many ambiguous contexts we cannot tell whether a poet intends by himself or orders someone/himself to perform an act:<sup>32</sup> V 16,1 'Sing of a lofty vigor ... for Agni!/I will sing ...' Then, we need a working hypothesis. The bare tense stem as the 2sg. impv. act. did not undergo any change from PIE to the classical Sanskrit, while the 1sg. subj. innovated a new form in PII to avoid formal ambiguity (3.1). Considering these facts, we may regard an *-ā*-form as representing a 2sg. impv. if the context allows it, cf. HOFFMANN *Inj.* 248. Thus a great number of *-ā*-forms are excluded from the possible candidates for the 1sg. subj. But there still remain some knotty cases to be examined:

An *-ā*-form may be a 1sg. subj. when a different hearer is indicated already (a)<sup>33</sup>, or some 1st person verb/pronoun occurs within a closely related context (b)<sup>34</sup>, cf. GELDNER *passim*. But two different addressees in one context are not unusual in the RV, especially when different ritual acts are to be performed by different priests including the speaker: (a')<sup>35</sup>, (b')<sup>36</sup>.

(a) VIII 13,7 *pratnavāj janayā gīrah śṛṇudhī jaritūr hāvam* 'Give rise to (welcome-)songs like before! (to Indra:) Lend an ear to the singer's call!'

(b) V 59,1 *prā va spād akran ... | ārcā divé prā pṛthivyā ṛtām bhare* 'Your (Maruts') spies have raised their voices ... Recite for the heaven! For the earth I am offering the truth (the cosmic order).'

(a') II 3, 3 ... *agne ... devān yaksj ... | sā ā vaha marūtām sárdho ... indram naro barhiśadam yajadhvam* '... O Agni ... worship the Gods ...! Bring here the crowd of Maruts! O manly ones (= other priests), worship (2pl.) Indra sitting on Barhis!'

A morphological study of the first person subjunctive in the Rigveda 13

(b') I 186,10 pró aśvināv āvase kṛṇudhvam prā pūṣānaṃ ... | āchā sumnāya vavṛtiya devān 'Now place (2pl.) both Aśvins in front to help you, [place] Pūṣan ...! I want to make gods turn around for their good will.'

It seems more difficult to assume a 2sg. impv. when there appears another 2nd person of a different number (pl.) in the same sentence (c).<sup>37</sup> In fact, such distorted construction is also attested where the verbal forms cannot be missed (c'; also V 45,11, VIII 69,2):

(c) X 50,1 prā vo mahē māndamānāy.āndhaso 'rcā viśvānarāya ... 'Begin to recite (sg.) [hymns] for the great one (Indra) who is drunk on your (pl.) sprouts [of Soma], the one who is existent in all men ...!

(c') VIII 92,7 tyām u vah satrāsāhaṃ ... | ā cyāvayasya utāye 'And in order for an assistance you are moving (sg.) hither that your (pl.) [Indra] who conquers all together ...'

In these examples GELDNER (V 45,11, VI 16,22; Bd. IV 144 s.v. "Anrede") assumes a sentence with two different addressees calling it "Doppelanrede." But it is unrealistic to assume such a situation in one sentence, and even more so when a 2sg. impv. is "Selbstanrede." We should rather think of the 2pl. as the "elliptical plural" (DELBRÜCK *Ai.Synt.* 98) where the entity of the 2sg. is included in that of the 2pl. Since there are usually plural priests present at a ritual, it is quite natural that the gods/Soma modified by *vah* belong to plural persons whereas a single person is ordered to practice a ritual action. The same is true for all other examples of *vah* + *-ā*-form.

To conclude, we can propose only *vocā*, *mṛkṣā*, and *sānā* (see above) as the 1sg. subjs. act. of the themat. tense stems in the RV.<sup>38</sup>

## Appendix II Forms in *-am*: 1sg. subj. act. and 1sg. inj. act.

Here we examine if the form in *-am*, usually the 1sg. inj. act., may represent also the 1sg. subj. act., cf. 3.1.—The full-gr. *stoṣam* seems to be a subj. since the inj. would be \**stauṣam*, cf. *yauṣam* MS. In I 187,1 the poet can declare his will by a subj., or express an immediate future or coincidence (of utterance and action) by an inj. (see HOFFMANN *Inj.* 250-253): *pitām nū stoṣam mahō ... | yāsya tritō vcy bjasā vṛtrām vīparvam ardāyat* 'Now I praise hereby/will praise the meal ... by the great power of which Trita crushes

(inj.) Vṛtra to pieces joint by joint.' But because a subj. in *-am* is unlikely elsewhere, we had better follow NARTEN *Aor.* 277 to assume that the same ablaut usually shared by the aor. inj. and subj. of the 1sg. act., and functional similarity of the two created the "inj." *stoṣam* to the subj. *stoṣāni*, *stoṣāma* on the analogy of *vocam* and *vocā*, *vocāma*.—The zero-gr. stem of VIII 74,15 *dediṣam* seems to speak for the 1sg. intens. subj. (cf. 1.1-2)). Note, however, that all other intens. stems of the root type *CeC/CiC* are attested only in zero-gr. forms (e.g. *tētij-*, *pēpīs-*, *vēvid-*), and that the intens. tend to avoid double *-e-* in the redupl. and root syllables (only *veveti*), cf. *nōnavīti*, *navinot*, but no *\*nonot* (see LUBOTSKY *Ved. intens.*: *JAOS* 117, 1997, 559f., PRAUST *dr-/dṛ-* 433 n. 26). *dediṣam* is most likely a 1sg. inj. analogically formed to other *dēdiṣ-* forms (*dēdiṣte*, *dēdiṣat-* etc): *satyām tū tvā ... āva dediṣam | nēm āpo aśvaādātaraḥ sāviṣṭhād asti mārtayah* 'I repeatedly indicate you (hereby) the truth ... : O waters, there exists no such mortal who gives more horses than the mighty [king].' Here an immediate future or coincidence is adequate,<sup>39</sup> though a generalizing inj. (HOFFMANN *Inj.* 114f.) is also a possible option.<sup>40</sup>

The grade of stem being equal, all forms in *-am* belong most naturally to the inj., cf. HOFFMANN *Inj.* 249-254.—*ciketam* and *cakaram* both are the legitimate 1sg. perf. injs. act.:<sup>41</sup> X 28,5 'How do I understand (*ciketam*) this your [word]?: inj. in (rhetoric) interrogative sentence, see op. cit. 245f.—IV 42,6 'I (Indra) do/have done (*cakaram*) these all [acts]' states Indra's acts as always true or his past acts as his distinctive characters (op. cit. 167f.), cf. KÜMMEL *Perf.* 87.—HOFFMANN 247 takes X 27,9 pres. *vāyam* as a subj., assuming the agreement of the subjs. in the two clauses: 'When(ever) I (Indra) bring together the animals ... (*sām yād vāyam*), then a tied [horse] will seek (*ichād* subj.) the one who unties [it]...' But this stanza belongs rather to the "gnomische Periode," a kind of complex sentence with a generalized statement (op. cit. 238; the combination of an inj. in *yād*-clause and a subj. in main cl. is attested also in I 77, 2, see HETRICH *Hypotaxe* 351f.).

Finally we come to the most unlikely case, the subj. in *-am* of the themat. stems, cf. 3.3.—I 165,10 'What I will now summon up my courage to perform (*yā ... kṛṇāvai* subj.), ... what(ever) I undertake (*yāni cyāvam*), these do I control (*iṣe* ind.)' While *yā ... kṛṇāvai* focuses on future in general, *yāni cyāvam* rephrases almost the same action with a more generalized sense, emphasizing Indra's absolute authority. —VIII 1,31 'When(ever) I ... ride on

A morphological study of the first person subjunctive in the Rigveda 15 the chariot ... (*ā yād ... ruhām*), what(ever) animal belongs to Yadu will take note (*ciketati* subj.) also of the dear wealth.' This also seems to be a generalized statement (on *yād ... inj.* + subj., see X 27,9 above). — X 27,1 'There surely be such reaction of me ... that I stand by a sacrificer (*yāt ... śikṣam*) who is pressing [Soma]! I am the one expelling who offers no mixed milk (*ānāśtrdām ... prahantā*).' The 'reaction' is rephrased by the *yād*-clause where the inj. *śikṣam* merely gives the lexical contents of the verb (see HOFFMANN *Inj.* 166f.), or it may refer to Indra's general character which is expressed also by the nom. ag. *prahantār*<sup>42</sup>). — X 27,2 'If I bring together those who ... (*yādi ... samnāyāni* subj.), I will cook a fleshy bull for you (Indra) (*pacāni* subj.). I (then) pour in ... pressed [Soma] (*nt-śiñcam*).' A certain scene is fixed by the preceding sentence, so that the inj. *śiñcam* only have to mention the act without any tense or mood, see HOFFMANN 163ff. (cf. X 27,1) — X 89,4 *īrayam*, X 116,9 *īrayam* and VIII 61,6 *mahayam* are inj. with the generalizing function, cf. HOFFMANN 253f. For the last two a coincidence would be better if it were possible also for the pres. inj., cf. n. 39.

#### Notes

- 1) *Riguvēda ni okeru Ichininshō-setsuzokuhō no Kenkyū* published by Osaka University: *Memoires of the Graduate School of Letters*. Vol. XLV-II, March 2005. My sincere gratitude is expressed to my supervisor, Prof. Toshifumi GOTŌ (Tohoku Univ.). — The study was financed by *Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research of Japan Society for the Promotion of Science*. — Standard abbreviations are used throughout. On those of text names in Ved. see GOTŌ *I. Präs.* 1987, 15–18.
- 2) In the RV the future and passive subj. are poorly attested: fut. I 165, 9 *karīṣyā* [h] (see 3.1), IV 30,23 *karīṣyāḥ* and pass. V 31,12 *bhriyāte*.
- 3) *Lexikon der idg. Verben (LIV)* 2001<sup>2</sup>, 98 postulates the PIE root-aor. as *\*b<sup>h</sup>uēh<sub>2</sub>-/b<sup>h</sup>uh<sub>2</sub>-* and the perf. *\*b<sup>h</sup>e-b<sup>h</sup>uōh<sub>2</sub>-/b<sup>h</sup>uh<sub>2</sub>-* both of which, however, are based almost only on some italic forms, cf. *LIV* 99 n. 1, see also *RIX Hist. Gram. des Gr.* 1976, 214, KÜMMEL *Perf.* 2000, 349f.
- 4) Another consistent zero-gr. root-aor. (and perf.) is *asūt* (*sasūva*) of *sav*<sup>1</sup>. But this is seen only in IIr. and formally parallel to *ābhūt*, *babhūva*, suggesting its analogical formation to the latter, see GOTŌ *Materialien* 1991, 698 n. 141 (on perf. STRUNK *Ai. babhūva ...*: KZ 86 1972, 26f.).



- 5) Either directly from \*čarkṛH-āma (SCHAEFER 68 n. 170; 107) or, after disappearance of the laryngeal, from \*čark-r-āma (PRAUST 2000, 431f.).
- 6) Compare the prevailing -ghan- (ind. -jaṅghanti, subj. jaṅghanas, but cf. ptcls. in -ghn-) and the consistent -sr/sṛ- (ind. sarsṛte, ptcl. sársrānas).
- 7) HOFFMANN *Aufsätze* I 29f. n. 5; 224 n. 6; II 445f. n. 14.
- 8) Maybe from the full-gr. stem, cf. *junās* I 27, 7, probably a subj. \**junāH-a-s*. Of the root-aor. *gā-* (1sg. subj. *gāni*) no short-vowel subj. is attested, but cf. *dhat* (OAv. 3pl. *da'nti*) besides *dhāti* (= OAv. *dhāti*).
- 9) RV IV 3, 3 *idē* is understood as the regularly accented 3sg. ind. mid. perf. (KÜMMEL *Perf.* 122 + n. 69), not the 1sg. pres. mid. with an "irregular accent" (LUBOTSKY *Concordance* 1997, I 324).
- 10) WACKERNAGEL *Kl.Schr.* I 419f. assumes here an underlying perf. ind. \**saśvacé* which took -*āi* through perseveration from the preceding verb *naṃsai* (so also DUNKEL \**eḡō* and \**āḡō*, ...: *Idg. Synt.* 2002, 100f.).
- 11) But *takṣāma* cannot belong to the past, even if it were an inj., cf. NARTEN *Aor.* 125. The inj. only refers to the past that has still an effect at the present and future (HOFFMANN *Inj.* 214-219: used only in mythological facts). A generalizing inj. is hard to see because of *imā*, cf. n. 12.
- 12) HOFFMANN *Inj.* 254 holds the whole sentence to belong to the future, supposing that *imā* means 'such, like this.' But such usage of *idām* is not known otherwise. The only other example (X 148, 4 *imā*) he offers (op. cit. 226) can be interpreted differently.
- 13) An appositive relative clause with a subj. strongly tend to function almost equivalent to a final clause (HETRICH *Hypotaxe* 1988, 671ff.).
- 14) The uniform accent of the opt. (*vocēyam, vocés, vocēyur*) is taken from -*e*-opt. *gamēma* etc. On literature see GOTŌ *I. Präs.* 285 n. 662.
- 15) WATKINS *Idg. Gram.* 1969, 61f., RIX *Hist. Gram.* 230f., SZEMERÉNYI *Einf.* 1990<sup>4</sup>, 266f., MEIER-BRÜGGER *Idg. Sprachwis.* 2002<sup>8</sup>, 161f., 180.
- 16) But it is only the 3sg. and 2/3du. that JASANOFF 52f. reconstructs with \*-*o-* for sure in the mid., while he supposes \*-*e-* for the 2sg./pl. mid.
- 17) See HOFFMANN *Aufs.* I 30 + n. 1, also GOTŌ *I. Präs.* 81f., 97, 275, 291, 343 on the Ved. evidence, and KELLENS *Verb. av.* 1984, (175-)176 on Av. Examples in Ved. increase from AV on, e. g. *āsāt, āyāt, kṛṇavāt*.

- 18) The origin of  $*\bar{o}$  has been much discussed, most recently by DUNKEL 2002, 91ff. (on lit. see 91-93). He himself takes it to have originated in  $*\bar{o}h_1$  "the emphatic postposition" which, first appearing in the 1st pronoun  $*e\bar{g}H\text{-}\bar{o}h_1$ , then spread to a following verbal form like  $h_1\bar{e}i\text{-}mi$  through perseveration, making it a voluntative expression of the 1sg.  $*e\bar{g}H\text{-}\bar{o}h_1 h_1\bar{e}i\text{-}oh_1$ . We adopt the traditional  $-h_2$  here without going into the pre-PIE morphology. Important for our discussion is  $*\bar{o}$  as the starting form of the PIE 1sg. subj. Suffice it to point out that the act.  $*\bar{o}\text{-}h_2$  opposed to the mid.  $*\bar{o}\text{-}h_2a$  fits in a parallelism of the beginning sounds of personal endings between act. and mid., cf. 2.
- 19) VIII 45,37 *kó ... sákhā sákhāyam abravīt | jahā ...* 'Which ally, ... he (?) said, has left his ally behind?' (or: 'Which ally said to his ally: I will leave you?' OLDENBERG *Noten* ad loc.).
- 20) No impv. act. is attested in the  $-sa\text{-}aor.$ , but cf. redupl. aor. impv. *vočā* (App. I), *rīradhā* (see n. 38), themat. aor. impv. *mucā, sādā, sánā, sārā*.
- 21) DUNKEL "Thematisation" of Latin *sum ...: Mtr' Curad* Fs. Watkins 1998, 94f. sees an original PIE subj. in Ved.  $-am$ -form insisting that Lat. *sum* and Ved. *ásam* (see below) go back to the "subj."  $*esom$ . It is however improbable for a synchronic verbal system to show subj.  $-\bar{a}/\bar{ā}ni/-am :: inj. -am$ . His argument that those  $-am$ -forms for which HOFFMANN assumed the inj. functions "can be understood perfectly as subjunctives" get us nowhere as long as both are functionally possible. Also unconvincing for the same reason is the secondary introduction of a "subj." like *vocam* on the analogy of subj. *vočāma :: inj. avočāma = X :: inj. avocam* (INSLER *Vedic tvāyā*: IF 71 1967, 228 n. 10).
- 22) HOFFMANN *Inj.* 254. In general the Idu./pl. inj., themat. or athemat., are scarcely attested in non-prohibitive sentences: *karma* II 23,12, *ganvahi* VIII 69,7, *śiṣāmahi* VIII 24,1 (3.4). On the prec. *jeṣma* see HOFFMANN loc. cit.; *Aufs.* 465-474; on the intens. *marmyjmā* *Inj.* 254 n. 284, SCHAEFER *Intens.* 167 n. 504 (perf. ind), but cf. KÜMMEL *Perf.* 374 (pres. inj.). VI 2,9 *dhāma* is probably the nom. pl. of *dhāman-*, cf. GELDNER ad loc.
- 23) I 173,1 *arcāma* appears among many inj. of the stanzas 1-3 which describe ritual actions of different priests (*gāyat, arcad* etc), but still it can be a subj. (cf. HOFFMANN *Inj.* 143 n. 73). A poet has a wide lat-

- itude to express a thing. We can never prescribe it.
- 24) *-khyāi*, *-dāi*, *-māi*, *-yāi* are all dat. inf., see SGALL *Infinitive* 1958, 165f. (on VI 16, 26 *dā*, cf. GELDNER ad loc., SGALL 165 n. 62).
- 25) Unlikely a 2sg. impv. act. *syja* (= Pp.; OLDENBERG *Kl.Schr.* I 788, *Noten* ad loc.) or a 1sg. subj. act. *syjā* both with an irregular hiatus, but cf. loc. cit.; *Proleg.* 434ff. Probably VIII 17, 1 *pibā imām* and VIII 34, 11 *ranayā ihā* belong also to the 2sg. subj. (WACKERNAGEL *AiGI* 311).
- 26) VI 20, 8 *vetasūm... | ā tūgram śāśvad... āpa syjā iyādhyai* 'To Vetasu ... you Indra should continuously hand over Tugra ... for his (T.'s) coming (to obey)' (or: 'Indra [spoke] to Vetasu: "I will ...": GELDNER). The poet seems to request Indra to repeat his mythic heroism (cf. GELDNER ad loc., OLDENBERG *Kl.Schr.* I 787f.).
- 27) The pres. inj. of the themat. stems (*\*bhāra-i > -e*) cannot be distinguished from the pres. ind. Only functional observations may identify it, as HOFFMANN proposes in X 7, 3 *manye* (*Inj.* 112 + n. 14; 127 n. 43) and in X 95, 8 *ni-ṣēve* (*Inj.* 203). In YAv. where the augments often come off freely, an *-e*-form of a pres. stem is classified either as an ind. or an inj. (= Ved. impf.) depending on the contexts, e. g. *baire* as the ind. in Yt 14, 57, but as the inj. in Yt 5, 6 (see KELLENS *Verb. av.* 202, 228).
- 28) *\*-H-* can be derived also from the secondary *seṭ*-forms like pass. *tāyāte*, see GOTŌ Jinrui to shi no kigen (in Japanese): Fs. K. Hōjō 2004, 429 n. 20.
- 29) Following are all dat. inf.: *-dābh-e*, *-nās-e*, *-grābh-e*, *-cāks-e*, *-bhav-ē*, *bhuv-ē*, (*tān-e?*), see SGALL *Inf.* 164f. (on *vāre*, cf. op. cit. 164 n. 60).
- 30) INSLER op. cit. (n. 21), 227f. n. 10 thinks of *-e* as a subj. ending which was, he says, introduced analogically from the ind./subj. *-āmahe*. This is very improbable when there is a strong tendency to differentiate the ind./inj. and the subj. Also his argument that "forms in *-e* and *-āmahe* in first verses of hymns are usually subj." must be rejected as the ind. is quite normal there (so rightly KÜMMEL *Perf.* 210 n. 277).
- 31) See further e. g. V 52, 1, VII 23, 1, VII 96, 1, VIII 20, 19, VIII 23, 24, VIII 70, 2; probably also VI 50, 6, X 42, 1, X 42, 2 (voc. *jaritar*); V 52, 5.
- 32) The metre can hardly give any decisive evidence to distinguish the two, cf. OLDENBERG *Proleg.* 393ff., *Kl.Schr.* 132-181 (esp. 137-144).
- 33) Also IV 3, 1-4, VII 31, 1-3, VII 61, 3-4, X 101, 12; on I 37, 4-5, V 59, 1,

A morphological study of the first person subjunctive in the Rigveda 19

VI 49,11-12, VI 68,8-10, VIII 42,2 (*namasyā*), X 63,2-3 see (b) below.

34) Also I 37,4-5, I 52,1, II 33,8, III 54,2, IV 29,3, V 56,5, VI 49,10; 11-13, VI 68,8-10, VIII 66,7, X 35,9-10, X 63,2-3, X 89,3-4.

35) Also e. g. I 46,9, V 52,14, VIII 42,2 (*vandasva*), X 42,1.

36) Also e. g. II 21,2-3, VIII 26,9-11, IX 114,2-3; possibly V 56,1-2, III 38,1-2, VII 96,1. On V 45,11 see (c') below.

37) Also III 13,1, VI 16,22, VI 45,22, VIII 46,14, VIII 49,1, X 76,5.

38) Besides them HOFFMANN *Inj.* 248 takes *pruṣā* (see 1.1-5)) and the aor. *viradhā* X 30,1 for subjs. (but not our *sānā*), and leaves *vārdhā* VI 38,4 undecided. But *viradhā* falls under our (a), and *vārdhā* is also the 2sg. impv. despite other subjs. appearing besides it, see GOTŌ *I. Präs.* 291.

39) So HOFFMANN *Inj.* 253 n. 281; differently SCHAEFER *Intens.* 42f. An immediate future and a coincidence are almost restricted to the aor. inj. (not to the 1sg., cf. HOFFMANN 254 on *siṣāmahī*). But this is not necessarily true for *dedīsam*, because there exists no aor. form in the whole intens. system, and thus it is highly probable that the intens. pres. takes on the functions also of the aor. stem.

40) Also the subj. can be used in a general meaning, but mostly only in interrogative sentences (HOFFMANN *Inj.* 245ff.), negative sentences (op. cit. 239, 241) and "gnomische Periode" (see X 27,9 below).

41) HOFFMANN *Inj.* 247 n. 264 regards *caḥaram* as remodeled from the ind. *cahara* for the rhythm of the stanza, but cf. KÜMMEL *Perf.* 154 n. 243.

42) Cf. HOFFMANN *Inj.* 115, 167. According to TICHY *Nomina agentis* 1995, such general meaning with the verbal syntax (acc.) is characteristic of the acrotonic *-tar*-form, but can be shared also by the hystero-tonic type which more often means an occasional agent with an objective genitive, see op. cit. § 2.6; 3 (esp. 315f., 368ff.; on our stanza 363).

(Lecturer)

**Keywords:** Indo-Iranian, Vedic, Rigveda, mood, subjunctive, the first person, morphology