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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)\(^1\) 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.\(^2\)

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. yōj-ā, pres. kṛ-ṇāv-əma, perf. sū-śāv-əma. Exceptions are:

1) bhuvāni The root-aor. (and the perf.) of bhav\(^i\) shows the pecu-
liar consistent zero-grade which is assumed to go back to PIE: ind.
abhūt = Gr. (ε)φό (cf. Lat. fui, older fūi); subj. bhāva- = OAv. baua- < PII *bhūH-a.3 It is difficult to assume that the pres. bhava- is the original aor. subj. (cf. OAv. bauua- as the subj.), because the ablaut pattern between the zero-gr. ind. and the full-gr. subj. is very unlikely, see GOTO I. Präs. 1987, 229f.4

2) **Intensive** The subjunctives of the intens. I are formed from the zero-gr. root forms (SCHAEFER Intens. 1994, 35ff.): the 1st persons carkirāma5 (cf. ind. carkarmi), vevidāma, jānghānāni, jānghanāva. SCHAEFER 70 (also PRAUST Altindisch dr-/dṛ-: Indoarisch, Iranisch ... 2000, 428f.) explains a seemingly full-gr. for the expected zero-gr. as in the last two forms by SIEVERS’ Law (-ghṛṇ-) which applies only before final syllables (see SCHINDLER Notizien zum Sieversschen Gesetz: Sprache 23 1977, 60ff.): subj./ptcpl. jānghan-at :: ptcpl. jānghan-atas; ind. sarsr-āte. But it does not hold true for our forms, inj. jānghan-anta, perf. ind. sarsr-ē, etc, so that multiple factors have to be taken into account. Besides analogical leveling6 (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. (hānava, MS+ hānāni) may have influenced the intens. subj. —The intens. I subj. has an accent on the reduplication (mārmyjat) as most other moods do. jānghānāni (cf. 3sg. jānghanat) 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 -āH/H appear sometimes (also) in zero-gr. in IIR., forming the “short-vowel subjunctives”? typically seen in the 2nd/3rd persons: redupl. pres. dādh-as/-at = YAv. -da9-ō/-ā (besides -da9āti); jah-at AB, cf. OAv. zaz-enti; nasal pres. min-at. The 1st person subj., on the other hand, can be derived either from zero-gr. or full-gr.: dadhāma < PII *dadhaH-/ dadH-āma (-ā- see 2), similarly dadhāni, jahāma, mināma, (but jumāma?8). 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
A morphological study of the first person subjunctive in the Rigveda

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 asānī/-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 dādhnī ŚĀ, ŚB etc., dādhāma ŚB, for jāhāma by jāhāni AV. mināma, junāma may have their accents on the nasal infix or on the subj. suffix.

4) īdāmahāi Although īd- may etymologically represent the PIE redupl. pres. *h2i-h2isd- (cf. LIV2 260f. + n. 2) it is fossilized as a verbal root in the RV (idditā-, īd(i)ya-). The root-pres. īd- shows no ablaut9 with the fixed accent and inflects only in the middle.

5) Nonce forms X 77,1 prusā, which appears to be the root-aor. of pros with an irregular zero-gr., was probably made ad hoc to rhyme with preceding abhra-prāśo (see JOACHIM Mehrfachpräus. 1978, 112f.) — III 33,10 saśvacāi, seemingly the perf. subj. of śvaṅc ‘bow’, has an irregular zero-gr. and the accent on the ending unlike saśavāma, tatānāma. It is best understood as remodeled from the perf. ind. mid. saśvace analogically to the oxtonic thematic pres., like viśe :: viśāi = saśvace :: X, cf. THIEME Kl.Schr. 7f. n. 1.10 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 pīpyānēva yōgā māryāyeva kanvā saśvacāi 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) saṅkśāma The -s-aor. forms of saḥ in extended-grade are widely attested in the RV: ind./inj. [a]sāksi, subj. saṅkṣale, impv. sākṣva, while subj. sakṣat, impv. sakṣi, sākṣvā show the regular full-gr., see NARTEN Sigm. Aoriste 1964, 264f. As KLINKENSCHMIDT 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-. 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. (tāṣṭi 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 brāhmaṇi vārdhanā- śvibhyāṁ santu sāmtamā | yā tāksāma ráthāṁ iva ‘For both Aśvins these brāhmaṇa 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 brāhmaṇa (words with realizing power).11) yā tāksāma correlates with brāhmaṇi 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.12) Our stanza reads so ‘Only when imā brāhmaṇi come to be vārdhanā, then we will be able to regard ourselves as really having made the brāhmaṇa.’ 13)

2) -huvāmahe hvā forms the presents hvāya-, vàva- and the thematic aorist huva-/-huva- (GOTÔ I. Präs. 347ff.) of which some unaugmented forms (huva etc) are often thought to be the pres. tense (e. g. LUBOTSKY Concord. 1997 s. v.; LIIV² 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 GOTÔ 349f. indicates, the coincidental meaning of huva ‘I call hereby’ (see App. II s. v. stosam) 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/-huva- 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: didhar – ādīdhārat 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- (<>yē-ukwe/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. BENDAHMAN 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.14)

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/h2 of the endings), and *-e- otherwise.15) 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. t-o-μεν <*e-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),16) and even the consistent *o- in the whole paradigm of the mid. is possible (KLINGENSMITH 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\(^{17}\), e.g. aor. subj. mar-\(\ddot{a}\)-\(\ddot{t}\), var-\(\ddot{a}\)-\(\ddot{t}\) instead of/ besides *mar-\(\ddot{a}\)-\(\ddot{t}\), var-\(\ddot{a}\)-\(\ddot{t}\). It is noteworthy that the phenomenon took place also in other IE languages: YAv. 2sg. kər-\(\ddot{n}\)au-\(\ddot{a}\)-\(\ddot{h}\)i = OP kunav-\(\ddot{a}\)-\(\ddot{h}\)i (\(\sim\) Ved. kṛṇav-\(\ddot{a}\)-\(\ddot{h}\)i); Gr. 1pl. i-o-\(\ddot{m}\)v besides i-o-\(\ddot{m}\)v (cf. ḍy-\(\ddot{a}\)-\(\ddot{t}\) 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-[i], kara-[i], kṛṇava-nīe/-nīa), only one of the two is assigned to each slot of the 1st persons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>sg.(prim.)</th>
<th>du.(sec.)</th>
<th>pl.(sec.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>act.</td>
<td>-ā/-āni</td>
<td>-va</td>
<td>-ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid.</td>
<td>-ai</td>
<td>-vahai</td>
<td>-mahe/-mahai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1 1sg. act.: -ā/-āni  
Ved. -ā is the inherited form of PIE *-\(\ddot{o}\): the subj. suffix *-\(\ddot{o}\) + the prim. ending *-\(\ddot{h}\)\(_2\).\(^{18}\) While the 1sg. subj. *-\(\ddot{o}\) is clearly distinguished in the athemat. tense stems (av-\(\ddot{a}\), kṛṇav-\(\ddot{a}\)), *-\(\ddot{o}\) of the themat. stems can reflect both the subj. *-o-o-\(\ddot{h}\)\(_2\) and the ind. *-o-\(\ddot{h}\)\(_2\), as is preserved in Gr. ind./subj. φῄςω etc. In Ir. 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 (-bhārāni, YAv. barāni, cf. Gr. Hom. -ωμ, 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. pερεςā \(\sim\) Ved. pṛcchā-mi). Also 2) seems to have almost perfectly pervaded the themat. stems (see below; cf. OAv. subj. zbaīdā), 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 kariṣyāḥ[ḥ], the
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2sg. fut. subj., without modifying Sandhi (see OLDENBERG Noten ad loc.): 
vāni karisyā kṛṇuḥ ‘Do what you will/intend to do!’ (the fut. subj. itself has yet to be discussed) — VIII 45, 37 jahā (k‘...) belongs to the perf. jahā/-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. PII *fḫajīḥā 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.19 — 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. subjs.: vocā, myaksā, sānā. Note that the themat. 2sg. impv. of the aor. stems is far less attested than that of the pres. stems20 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 complemental distribution of the endings: subj. -ā/-āni :: inj. -am.21) It should only be noted that many injs. 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 Ṙṣam (remodelled from AV Ṙṣat, op. cit. 248). These facts suggest that -am was exposed to reinterpretation as a subj. ending in Ved. This was probably even more 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 subjs. 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.) *bhér-o-me (s) :: subj. *bhér-o-o-me (s) > PII
*bhār-a-ma (s), cf. Gr. φέρ-ο-μεν :: φέρ-α-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, riṣāma, etc.; noticeably all are aor. stems), which indicates that the inj. had lost the productivity in the themat. stems.22) The sec. endings otherwise appear where any of the subj. functions is doubtless or very probable.23) 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 themat. stems is distinctly characterized, e.g. kṛṇāvai (:: ind. kṛṇ-a). But the subj. of the themat. stems ending in -ā and the themat. stems have the same shapes as the corresponding inds. in PII: PIE ind. *ḥiḥā-g-o-haï ≠ subj. *hiḥā-g-o-o-haï > PII ind./subj. *iāf-āi, cf. Gr. φέρ-ο-μαι :: φέρ-α-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. *iāf-āi > subj. yāj-ai, YAv. yaz-āi, but ind. yāj-e, YAv. -īeiz-e (cf. also subj. mid. *-ā-nāj parallel to the act. *-ā-ni in YAv. and OP). Obviously this innovation was completed in the RV. The only attested -ai-forms, ṁṛchāi (ind. pṛchē) and yūḍhyai, both have the subj. functions.24) 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 spā (i"...) can be the 1sg. subj. mid. spājai or the 2sg. subj. act. spājah.25) 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.26)

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 (< *h2a) appears only in the optatives: sacey-a, OAv. vāwrai-a. Any subj. form
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in this ending is unsustainable and unnecessary: athemat. *krṇāv-a-Ha > ?krṇāv-ā (= 1sg. act.); likewise themat. *bḥāra-a-Ha > ?bḥārā. Another ending -i is used in the ind./inj.: (athemat.) OAv. pres. inj. aoj-t, Ved. aor. inj. vāṁs-t; (themat.) impf. avije, aor. inj. vōce27) -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. iān-e. But it can be derived from the legitimate 1sg. ind. *tātṛHai28) < PIE *tety-h2aı̯, see KÜMMEL Perf. 210 (or with anaptyxis *tātṛ₂-a₂i), 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-e, īd-e, cf. 1.1) speaks for a subj.29) Finally, the secondary use of the themat. (aor.) inj. for the subj. is nowhere attested as in the act.30) 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. (ː ind. -vahi; 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. sācīvahe + 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. subjhs. 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. grḥāmaḥi (or pres. inj. for *grḥmaḥi?, cf. HOFFMANN Inj. 88f.) with mā, and the other śiṣāmaḥi 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 -make 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>voice</th>
<th>active</th>
<th>middle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>num.</td>
<td>sg.</td>
<td>du.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end.</td>
<td>prim.</td>
<td>sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.ind.</td>
<td>-mi</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inj.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subj.</td>
<td>-ā</td>
<td>9(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-āni</td>
<td>9(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Thematic stems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p.ind.</th>
<th>āmi</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>āvas</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>āmas(ī)</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>āvahe</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>āmahe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inj.</td>
<td>-am</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(aor.)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(aor.)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subj.</td>
<td>-ā</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-āni</td>
<td>8(9)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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 (jahá 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 occurences is put in parentheses.

pres. 73 (134): act. sg. caréni, náyáni, pacáni, bhajáni, váháni; rágáni (2); sçjáni; ayá, bravá, bráváni (2), stává (4); dadháni; anajá, kṝnavá, hinavá; du. ájáva, çravá, jeyáva, stánsáva; hánáva (3); tibáva (themat.); aśnaváva, rináčáva, kṝnaváva; pl. árcáma (4), bhajáma, bháráma, bháváma, mádáma, mantháma, yájáma (3), vadáma, várdráma, háráma; áyáma (3), ásáma (4), kṣáyáma, bráváma (12), vásáma, stáváma (11), hánáma; dadháma (2), juhaváma (2), jaháma; inaváma, kṝnaváma (9), junáma, aśnaváma (2), mínáma (2), saknáváma (2), śrṇaváma, sunáváma (5), sṝṇaváma; mid. sg. yádhyái; pṛchái; stávái (3); kṝnąvái (2), manávai, sunávai (2); du. braváváhi; kṝṇavávahai, tanavávahai; pl. sacávahai, sahávahai; yájámahai; idámahe, Ídámahai, brávámahai (2); kṝṇávámahe, aśnavámahe, bhunájámahai (2), runádhámahai, sínçámahai (themat.) — aor. 46 (101): act. sg. sáná; kará (2), káráni (2), gamáni (2), gáni, pruscá! , bhuváni, yójá (5); vocá; stósáni; daviśáni; mýksá; du. ruháva; vánáva; pl. táksáma; káráma (2), gamáma (2), dháma, maráma (3), rādháma (2), ríramáma, vocáma (5), sǐdáháma; jéśáma (2), váhásáma (2), sresáma, súksáma, stósáma (4); mid. sg. mánai, marai; nánsai, máňsa; du. vocávahai; pl. sícámahe, huvámahe (2); kárámahe (8), gámámahe, dhámahe (3), nádámahai (3), mánámahe (20), marámahe, vánámahe (4), vánámahai, starámahe; yacisámahe, sanisámahe — perf. 5 (6): act. pl. cákánáma, cakrámáma, tatánáma (2), súśáváma; mid. sg. saśvacá! — sec. 10 (13): caus. act. sg. randhayáni; du. truyáva; pl. truyáma, dhárayáma; mid. du. tükhayávahai, kalpayávahai, intens. act. sg. jaṅghánáni; du. jaṅghanáva (2); pl. carkiráma (2), vevidáma (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 (árcá, bhává, 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. brähma for brähma). 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 (ádhī 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!'31) Thus we can identify two more themat. 1sg. subs. besides vocā: V 75,2 ahām sānā (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:32) 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)33), or some 1st person verb/pronoun occurs within a closely related context (b)34), 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) VIII 13,7 pratnavāj janavā gtrāk śṛṇudhā jāritār hāvam 'Give rise to (welcome-) songs like before! (to Indra:) Lend an ear to the singer's call!
(b) V 59,1 prā va śpād akran ... | ārca dīvē prā prthivyā rtām 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 yāksi ... | sā ā vaha marātām śārdho ... indrām naro barhiṣādām yajadhvam '... O Agni ... worship the Gods ...! Bring here the crowd of Maruts! O manly ones (= other priests), worship (2pl.) Indra sitting on Barhis!'
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(b') I 186.10 prā asvīnāv āvase krṇudhvam prā puṣāṇam ... | ācā suṃnāya
vavytīya devān 'Now place (2pl.) both Aśvins in front to help you, [place]
Puṣan ...! 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).37
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 māndamanāyāndhaso 'arcā visvānarāya... '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 tvām u vah satrāhām ... | ā cydvayasy 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, mṛksā, and sānā (see above)
as the 1sg. subjs. act. of the themat. tense stems in the RV.38)

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. stōṣam seems to be a
subj. since the inj. would be *stauṣam, cf. yauṣam MS. In I 187,1 the poet can
delcare his will by a subj., or express an immediate future or
coincidence (of utterance and action) by an inj. (see HOFFMANN Inj. 250–253): pītām nā
stōṣam mahō ... | yāṣya trītō vij yājasā vṛvrām viḥvarvam arddyāt 'Now I praise
hereby/will praise the meal... by the great power of which Trīta 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." stōṣam to the subj. stōsāṇi, stōṣāma on the analogy of vocām and vocā, vocāma.—The zero-gr. stem of VIII 74.15 dediṣam seems to speak for the 1sg. intens. subj. (cf. I.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-, pēpiś-, vēvid-), and that the intens. tend to avoid double -e- in the redupl. and root syllables (only veveti), cf. nōnaviti, navinot, but no *nonot (see LUBOTSKY Ved. intens.: JAOS 117, 1997,559f., Praust dṛ-/dṛ- 433 n. 26). dediṣam is most likely a 1sg. inj. analogically formed to other dediś-forms (dēdiṣṭe, dēdiśat- etc): satyām it tvā... āva dediṣam | nēm āpo āsvadātarah śāvīṣṭhād asti mārtṣyaḥ ‘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, though a generalizing inj. (Hoffmann Inj. 114f.) is also a possible option.

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.: 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 subs. in the two clauses: ‘When(ever) I (Indra) bring together the animals... (sāṃ 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 Hettrich 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 cavyam), these do I control (īṣe ind.).’ While yā... kṛṇāvai focuses on future in general, yāni cavyam rephrases almost the same action with a more generalized sense, emphasizing Indra’s absolute authority. —VIII 1,31 ‘When(ever) I... ride on
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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 ...
sīkṣam) who is pressing [Soma]! I am the one expelling who offers no
mixed milk (ānāśtrādam ... prahantā).’ The 'reaction' is rephrased by the yād-
clause where the inj. sīkṣam 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.42). —X 27,2 ‘If I bring
together those who... (yādī ... saṃnāyāni subj.), I will cook a fleshy bull for
you (Indra) (pacāni subj.). I (then) pour in... pressed [Soma] (nt-śīṅcam).’
A certain scene is fixed by the preceding sentence, so that the inj. sīṅcam
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 VII 61,6 mahayam
are injs. 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) Rigveda nī okeru Ichininshō-setsuzokuhō no Kenkyū published by
XLV-II, March 2005. My sincere gratitude is expressed to my
supervisor, Prof. Toshifumi Goto (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 through-
2) In the RV the future and passive subj. are poorly attested: fut. I 165,
9 kāraśyā[ḥ] (see 3.1), IV 30,23 kāraśyāḥ and pass. V 31,12 bhrīyāte.
3) Lexikon der idg. Verben (LIV) 2001², 98 postulates the PIE root-
aor. as *b³yēh₂/ *b³yēh₂- and the perf. *b³e- b³yōh₂/-b³uḥ₂- both of which,
however, are based almost only on some italic forms, cf. LIV 99 n. 1,
4) Another consistent zero-gr. root-aor. (and perf.) is asūt (sasūva) of
savi. But this is seen only in IIr. and formally parallel to ābhūt, ba-
bhāva, suggesting its analogical formation to the latter, see Goto
Materialien 1991, 698 n. 141 (on perf. Strunk Ai. babhāva...: KZ 86
1972, 26f.).
5) Either directly from *carkr̥H-āma (SCHAEFER 68 n. 170; 107) or, after 
dissappearance of the laryngeal, from *carkr̥r-āma (PRAUST 2000, 431f.).
6) Compare the prevailing -ghan- (ind. -jāghantī, subj. jāghanas, but 
cf. ptcls. in -ghn-) and the consistent -sr/sr̥- (ind. sārsyte, ptclpl. 
sārsvānas).
7) HOFFMANN Aufsätze I 29f. n. 5; 224 n. 6; II 445f. n. 14.
8) Maybe from the full-gr. stem, cf. jūnās I 27,7, probably a subj. 
*junāH-a-s. Of the root-aor. gā- (1sg. subj. gāṃi) no short-vowel subj. 
is attested, but cf. dhat (OAv. 3pl. daṃtti) 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. *saśvacē which took -ā through perseveration from the preceding 
verb nāṃsai (so also DUNKEL *eṅō and *āṅū, ...: Idg. Synt. 2002, 100f.).
11) But taksāma 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 (HETTRICH Hypotaxe 1988, 671ff.).
14) The uniform accent of the opt. (vocēyam, vocēs, vocēyur) is taken 
from -e-opt. gamēma etc. On literature see GOTO I. Präs. 285 n. 662.
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 GOTO 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, krṇavāt.
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18) The origin of *-ō* has been much discussed, most recently by DUNKEL 2002, 91ff. (on lit. see 91–93). He himself takes it to have originated in *-ōh₁* “the emphatic postposition” which, first appearing in the 1st pronoun *egH-ōh₁*, then spread to a following verbal form like *h₁eĩ-mi* through perseveration, making it a voluntative expression of the 1sg. *egH-ōh₁, h₁eĩ-ōh₁*. We adopt the traditional -h₂ here without going into the pre-PIE morphology. Important for our discussion is *-ō* as the starting form of the PIE 1sg. subj. Suffice it to point out that the act. *-o-h₂* opposed to the mid. *-o-h₂a* fits in a parallelism of the beginning sounds of personal endings between act. and mid., cf. 2.

19) VIII 45,37 kō ... sākhā sākhāyam abravit | 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-aor., but cf. redupl. aor. impv. vocā (App. I), riradhā (see n. 38), themat. aor. impv. mucā, sādā, sānā, sārā.

21) DUNKEL “Thematisation” of Latin sum ...: Mîr Curad Fs. Watkins 1998, 94f. sees an original PIE subj. in Ved. -am-form insisting that Lat. sum and Ved. āsam (see below) go back to the “subj.” *esom*. It is however improbable for a synchronic verbal system to show subj. -ā/-āni/-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. vocāma :: inj. avocāma = X :: inj. avocam (INSLER Vedic tvāyā: IF 71 1967, 228 n.10).

22) HOFFMANN Inj. 254. In general the 1du./pl. inj., themat. or athemat., are scarcely attested in non-prohibitive sentences: karma II 23,12, ganvahi VIII 69,7, sīṣāmahi VIII 24,1 (3.4). On the prec. jesma see HOFFMANN loc. cit.; Aufs. 465-474; on the intens. marmṛjmā 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 injs. 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. infs., see SGALL Infinitive 1958, 165f. (on VI 16, 26 dā, cf. GELDNER ad loc., SGALL 165 n. 62).

25) Unlikely a 2sg. impv. act. srjā (= Pp.; OLDENBERG Kl.Schr. I 788, Noten ad loc.) or a 1sg. subj. act. srjā both with an irregular hiatus, but cf. loc. cit.; Proleg. 434ff. Probably VIII 17, 1 pībā imām and VIII 34, 11 ranayā ihā belong also to the 2sg. subj. (WACKERNAGEL AίG I 311).

26) VI 20, 8 vetasām... | ā tāgram śāśvad... āpa srjā 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 787ff.).

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-sève (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 set-forms like pass. tāyāte, see GOTÔ Jinrui to shi no kigen (in Japanese): Fs. K. Hōjō 2004, 429 n. 20.

29) Following are all dat. infs.: -dābh-e, -nāś-e, -grābh-e, -cāks-e, -bhav-e, bhuv-e, (tān-e?), see SGALL Inf. 164f. (on vātre, 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. riradhā X 30,1 for subjs. (but not our sāhā), and leaves vārdhā. VI 38,4 undecided. But riradhā falls under our (a), and vārdhā is also the 2sg. impv. despite other subjs. appearing besides it, see GOTÔ I. Prśs. 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 lsg., cf. HOFFMANN 254 on śisṣāmahi). But this is not necessarily true for dediṣam, 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 cakaram as remodelled from the ind. cakara 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 hysterotonic 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)
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