

Some Vedic Verb-Forms and their Variants In The Brahmanas

THE problems posed by the citation of the early mantras in the later exegetical prose tracts—which the Brāhmaṇas are—and the nature of the linguistic information which could, with profit, be gleaned from a study of these and kindred problems have already been discussed in an earlier article.¹ The present article purports to examine the forms of verbs as they occur in the mantras cited by the Brāhmaṇas, and their substitutes as proposed in the exegetical prose which generally follows such citations. The data collected from such a study would permit us to determine those aspects of the early Vedic verbal system which had become obsolete in the comparatively more recent period of the Brāhmaṇa texts.

(A) *Verbal stems.* The stems of certain verbal roots are confined in their use to the ancient language of the mantras, and tend to become archaic already in the period of the Brāhmaṇas, where variant forms are substituted in their place. The following are cases in point :—

1. The root *kr* ‘to do’. In the RV, this root is regularly treated in the present tense system as if it belonged to the *-nu* class (*svādigaṇa*). Thus the strong stem is *kr-ṇo*, and the weak stem in *kr-ṇu*. In the later language, already in the Brāhmaṇas, the root seems to be transferred to the *-u* class (*tanādigaṇa*), the strong stem being regularly *kar-o* and the weak *kur-u*, (*kur* irregularly for *kar*). The latter stem is found already in the tenth book of the RV, where the two forms *kuru* (imperative, 2nd person sg. act.) and *kurmas* (present ind. 1st person pl. act.) are found. The strong stem *kar-o*, appears, however, for the first time in the AV. In the Brāhmaṇas the transfer seems complete, for here, the only forms in use are those from the stems *karo/kuru*. Thus, where forms from the archaic stems *krṇo/krṇu* occur in the mantras that are cited, the gloss that follows replaces them with the corresponding forms from the later stem *karo/kuru*.

SB VI. 5.1.9. “*hastābhyāṃ mṛdvīm kṛtvā śinivālī krṇotu tām*”
 *sā enām hastābhyāṃ mṛdvīm kṛtvā karotu*
krṇotu/karotu

1. Ceylon University Review, Vol. XI. Nos. 3 & 4.

SB VIII. 6.3.20. “ adhaspadaṃ *kṛṇutām* ye pṛtanyavaḥ ”
adhaspadaṃ *kurutām* sarvān pāpmānaḥ
kṛtuṇām/kurutām

SB I. 9.2.20. “ aṅiṣaṃ naḥ pituṃ *kṛṇu* ”
akilbiṣamannaṃ *kuru*
kṛṇu/kuru

AB VIII. 26. “ avasyave yo varivaḥ *kṛṇoti* ”
avasiyase yo vasiyāḥ *karoti*
kṛṇoti/karoti

2. The root *pṛṇ* ‘to fill’. In the ancient language of the mantras, the root *pṛṇ* (*pṛṇati* 6th class, *tudādigāṇa*) is found to alternate with its variant form *pṝ* (*pṝṇāmi* 9th class, *kriyādigāṇa*, or *piparti* 3rd class, *huvādigāṇa*). From the time of the Brāhmaṇas we find the causative stem form *pūraya* used as a substitute for the primary root *pṛ*, which together with its variant *pṛṇ* are thereafter but little used in the language. It is perhaps for this reason that the forms of the root *pṛṇ* found in the mantras are replaced in the gloss by corresponding forms of the more recent stem *pūraya*.

Taittirīya Saṃhitā I. 5.7. “ yanme tanvā ūnaṃ tanma ā *pṛṇa* ”
yanme prājayai paśūnāmūnaṃ
tanma ā *pūraya*
pṛṇa/pūraya

The gloss of the SB on this mantra is different from the TS, *āpṛṇa* being replaced by *āpyāyaya* (root *pyā/pyai*), a root totally different but in sense identical with *pṛṇ*.

SBV VIII. 7.2.6. “ lokaṃ *pṛṇa* chidraṃ *pṛṇa* ”
lokaṃ ca *pūraya* chidraṃ ca *pūraya*
pṛṇa/pūraya

3. The root *grbh/grabh* ‘to seize’ (9th class, *grbh-ṇā-ti*) is employed frequently enough in the language of the RV, and in general in that of the mantras. By the side of this root, we find another similar one, namely *grh/grah* (also 9th class, *grhṇāti*). In the later language, and already in the Brāhmaṇas, the root *grbh* is no longer used. It is replaced exclusively by the root *grh*, its phonetic variant.

SB VIII. 6.3.19. “ nākaṃ *grbhṇānaḥ* ”
svargaṃ lokaṃ *grhṇānaḥ*
grbhṇānaḥ/grhṇānaḥ

SOME VEDIC VERB-FORMS AND THEIR VARIANTS

SB VI. 4.4.17. “ oṣadhayaḥ *pratigrbhṇīta* ”
 oṣadhayaḥ *pratigrhṇīta*
pratigrbhṇīta/pratigrhṇīta

SB V. 3.4.3. “ apo devā madhumatīr*agrbhṇan* ”
 apo devā rasavatīr*agrbhṇan*
agrbhṇan/agrbhṇan

SB I. 1.4.23. “ devo vaḥ savitā . . . *pratigrbhṇātu* ”
supratigrhītā asannīti
pratigrbhṇātu/pratigrhītā

4. Further evidence that at times ‘ h ’ represents ‘ bh ’ in Vedic phonology, is furnished by the root *bhṛ* ‘ to carry ’ and its variations in the Brāhmaṇas. This root is in common usage in all periods of the language ; as is also the root *hr̥*, which is probably a variant form. As far as the sense is concerned, however, the two roots are distinct : $\sqrt{bhṛ}$ ‘ to carry ’ and $\sqrt{hr̥}$ ‘ to take away.’ The root *hr̥* moreover, makes only a few forms in the most ancient period of the language, its usage extending more and more in the period of the Brāhmaṇas until it becomes very common in Classical Sanskrit. The relation of $\sqrt{hr̥}$ to $\sqrt{bhṛ}$ seems phonetically the same as that between $\sqrt{gr̥h}$ and $\sqrt{gr̥bh}$ (h for bh). From the fact that the forms *gr̥bh* and *bhṛ* are more common in the mantras than the corresponding forms *gr̥h* and *hr̥*, we may conclude that the former are the original roots, the latter being later derivatives. The root *bhṛ* however, is by no means archaic in the Brāhmaṇa period, for we find it in use even as late as in Classical Sanskrit. It is therefore difficult to understand the motive for its replacement in the SB by the root *hr̥*.

SB. III. 2.2.25. “ rāsveyatsomā bhūyo *bhara* ”
 rāsva na iyatsomā no bhūyo *hara*²
bhara/hara

SB VIII. 6.3.18. “ indhānā agniṃ svar ā *bharantaḥ* ”
 indhānā agniṃ svargaṃ lokaṃ ā *harantaḥ*
bharantaḥ/harantaḥ

SB VI. 6.3.8. “ aharaharaprayāvaṃ *bharantaḥ* ”
 aharaharapramattā ā *harantaḥ*
bharantaḥ/harantaḥ

SB VII. 3.1.22. “ taddevebhyo *bharāmasi* ”
 tadasmai daiṁvāya karmaṇe *harāmaḥ*
bharāmasi/harāmaḥ

2. SB (Kaṇva) IV. 2. 2. 25, *bhara*.

5. The root *gā* 'to go'. The root *gā* (*jigāti*) is found in places substituted for the common root *gam* in the language of the mantras. It is however rare, and has already fallen into disuse in the period of the Brāhmaṇas. The root is found occurring twice in the mantras cited by the SB ; viz :

SB I. 9.1.27.

“*ūrdhvaṃ jigātu bheṣajam*”

ūrdhvaṃ no'yaṃ yajño devalokaṃ jayatu

jigātu/jayatu. *jigātu*, present, imperative, 3rd sing. active of the root *gā* is here replaced by *jayatu*, corresponding form from the root *ji* 'to conquer.' Could the author of the SB have regarded *jigātu* as an archaic form of *jayatu*, influenced, probably by such forms as *jigāya*, perfect, indic. ? His explanation, however, does not seem acceptable.

SB I. 4.1.21.

“*devān jigāti sumnayuh*”

sa hi devān jigīṣati sa hi devān jighāṃsati

(in some manuscripts *jigāṃsati*)

jigāti/jigīṣati/jighāṃsati. Here, *jigāti*, pres. ind. 3 sing. act. of $\sqrt{gā}$ is brought into connection with *jigīṣati*, pres. ind. 3. sing. act. from the desiderative stem *jigīṣa* of the root *ji*, and *jighāṃsati*, corresponding form from the desiderative stem *jighāṃsa* of the root *han* 'to kill'. Thus the author proves himself subject to the same tendency which led him to explain *jigātu* by *jayatu*. The second explanation which he gives here could be intended to reinforce the first. It should be noted that Sāyaṇa also reads *jighāṃsati*, but he accords to the root *han* here the sense of 'to go' in accordance with the Nighaṇṭu II. 14. 1. It would appear that both the Nighaṇṭu and Sāyaṇa are trying to reconcile the explanation of the SB with the meaning of the root *gā*, by resorting to the desperate expedient of declaring that here the root *han* means 'to go' ! If, on the other hand the reading *jigāṃsati* is the correct one, the author would seem to be suggesting a connection with the root *gam* 'to go', in which case, this explanation would seem tenable.

6. The root *iṣ* 'to send'

SB III. 9.3.15.

“*apa iṣya hotar*” *summon* the waters—Eggeling

apa iccha hotar *desire* the waters—Eggeling

It is difficult to understand the motive behind the replacement of *iṣya* by *iccha* above, because though the two roots *iṣ* 'to desire, (*icchatī*) and *iṣ* 'to send' are common in the mantras, their present tense stem is distinct from each other. *iccha* therefore, cannot be the grammatical nor the semantic equivalent of *iṣya*. The latter, of course, is obsolete in the later language, only the stem *preṣaya* being in use. Yet, this does not explain *iṣya* = *iccha*, above.

SOME VEDIC VERB-FORMS AND THEIR VARIANTS

7. The root *vī* 'to rejoice, accept, undertake.' This is a rare and archaic root, limited to the language of the mantras. Twice in the SB and once in the AB, we find it replaced by the much employed root *vid* 'to find, obtain.'

SB I. 4.5.4. " agne verhotraṃ verdūtyaṃ "

agnirdevānām hotā ca dūtaśca tadubhayaṃ *viddhi*

ves/viddhi. *ves* injunctive, present, 2nd person sing. of the stem *ve* is here replaced by *viddhi*, present imperative, 2nd person sing. active of the stem *vid*.

Eggeling interprets the form *viddhi*³ here by connecting it with the root *vid* "to know" (*vetti*, 2nd class), in which case the explanation of the Brāhmaṇa would be doing violence to the meaning, for the root *vī* never has the sense of 'knowing.' A more plausible explanation of the Brāhmaṇa substitution of *ves* by *viddhi*, is that the author derived the form *viddhi* from the root *vid* 'to obtain, find,'⁴ a sense not far removed from that of *vī* 'to accept, undertake.' The replacement of the ancient injunctive by the common imperative is quite in accordance with the development of the vedic syntax. In the ancient mantra language the second person of the injunctive often has an exhortative value apart from the more usual imperative value.⁵

" sugā naḥ supathā *kṛṇu* pūṣanniha kratuṃ *vidaḥ* "

In the above example it will be seen how the present, injunctive, 2nd person, sing. active form *vidaḥ* is used in an imperative sense side by side the true imperative form *kṛṇu*.

Thus, the injunctive tending to fall into disuse already in the period of the Brāhmaṇas—with the exception of its use with the prohibitive particle *mā*—it is correctly replaced above by the imperative.

SB III. 9.3.31. " adhvaryo *averapā* "

avido apā ityevaitadāha

AB II. 20. " *averapo* ' dhvaryā u ' ' iti

apo vai yajñam *avido* yajñamityeva tadāha

aves/avidas. *aves*, imperfect, 2nd sing. act. of the root *vī*, replaced by *avidas*, aorist indicative, 2nd sing. active of the root *vid* 'to find' (*vindati*, 6th class).

3. *BE*. Vol. XII. p. 129.

4. Maedonell. *Ved. Gr.* (students) P. 418.

5. Maedonell *Vedic Grammar for Students* p. 350 b. 351 d.

8. The root *juṣ* 'to enjoy' is in common use in the mantras ; in the Brāhmaṇas, in two instances it is replaced by its causative stem *joṣaya*.

SB VI. 3.3.20. " arakṣasā manasā tad*juṣeta* "
ahiḍamānena manasā tad*joṣayeta*

juṣeta/*joṣayeta*.

TS. III. I.1. " viśve devā yad*juṣanta* pūrve "
viśve hycetaddevā *joṣayanti*

juṣanta/*joṣayanti*.

9. The root *hu* 'to sacrifice' (*juhoti*, 3rd class) makes in the language of the mantras, the irregular forms of the present imperative 2nd pl. active *juhota*, *juhotana* (with the strong form of the stem) in addition to the regular form *juhuta* (with weak stem). It would appear that the former are considered archaic already in the Brāhmaṇas, for there, they are replaced by the corresponding forms made from the weak stem.

SB I. 4.I.39. " ā *juhota* duvasyatāgñim "
ā *juhuta* ca yajata ca

SB VI. 8.I.6. " asmin havyā *juhotana* "
asmin havyāni *juhuta*

juhotana/*juhota*/*juhuta*.

(B) *Verbal Inflections*. Posterior to the language of the mantras, numerous verbal inflections fall into disuse. The Brāhmaṇas and the older Upaniṣads constitute a transition. In the SB we see a few of these old verbal inflections being replaced by others which are more usual since the Brāhmaṇa period.

10. The termination *-dhi* imperative, 2nd sing. act. is usual in the language of the mantras in connection with tense stems ending in a vowel or consonant : e.g. *ad-dhi*, *śru-dhi*. In the post-vedic period this termination becomes more or less obsolete. There is either no termination at all for the present imperative 2nd sing. act. or, if there is, it is generally *-hi*.

SB VII. 5.2.39. " *śṛnudhī girah* "
śṛnu na imāṃ stutiṃ

śṛnudhī/*śṛnu*.

11. The termination *-masi* present indicative 1st plural act. is equally archaic, and is found frequently in the mantras beside the more common ending *-mas*. In the Brāhmaṇas and after, only the ending *-mas* is in use.

SOME VEDIC VERB-FORMS AND THEIR VARIANTS

SB VII 3.1.22. “ taddevebhyo *bharāmasi* ”
taddevebhyo *harāmas*

bharāmasi/harāmas

12. The ending *-tana*, present imperative 2nd plural act. is also an archaic one restricted in use to the language of the mantras, where however, it is less in use than the ending *-ta*. In the Brāhmaṇas and after it disappears from use.

SB I. 5.1.26. “ viśve devā anu *śāstana mā* ”
viśve devā anu mā *śāsta*

śāstana/śāsta

SB VI. 8.1.6. “ asmin havyā *juhotana* ”
asmin havyāni *juhuta*

juhotana/juhuta

(C) *The moods*. As far as the moods are concerned, a richness of forms and tenses characterises the ancient language of the Rigveda. In this regard, the Classical Sanskrit can well be said to mark a stage of decadence. In the ancient language, the subjunctive, injunctive, optative and imperative could be conjugated in the three tenses of the present, perfect and aorist. In the Classical period, however, not only have the subjunctive and the injunctive, (with the exception of its use with the prohibitive particle *mā*) disappeared as independent moods, but also the imperative and the optative which survive are restricted in their formations to the present tense only. This tendency to limit model formations to the present tense only seems to operate already in the Brāhmaṇas. It is unaccountable, otherwise, why certain perfect and aorist mood forms occurring in the mantras are replaced by corresponding forms of the present tense.

(i) *Replacement of aorist tense mood forms by corresponding present tense forms.*

13. SB I. 3.4.12. “ ā tvā vasavo rudrā ādityāḥ *sadantu* ”
ete tvā *sīdantu*

sadantu/sīdantu

14. SB IV. 2.4.23. “ asapatnāḥ samanasaḥ *karat* ”
VS VII. 25. asapatnāḥ samanasaḥ *karavat*

karat/karavat

15. SB IX. 2.3.41. “ yathā devā ihāgaman ”
yathā devā ihāgacchan

gaman/gacchan

16. SB V. 2.4.16. “ varco *dhā* yajñavāhasi ”
sādhu yajamāne *dadhat*
dhās/dadhat
17. SB VI. 4.I.10. “ *bhṛtamagniṃ* puriṣyaṃ ”
bibhṛtamagniṃ paśavyaṃ
bhṛtam/bibhṛtam
18. SB III. 2.2.22. “ prabudhe naḥ punaskṛdhi ”
yathā itaḥ suptvā svasti prabudhyāmahā
evaṃ naḥ *kuru*
kṛdhi/kuru

19. An exception to the cases cited above is found in SB I. 2. 4. 19. where a root aorist injunctive is replaced by a reduplicated aorist injunctive :

“ drapsaste dyām mā *skan* ”
eṣa te divaṃ mā *paptat*

skan/paptat. *skan* root aorist injunctive 3rd sing. act. of \sqrt{skand} replaced by the form *paptat*, reduplicated aorist 3rd sing. act. of \sqrt{pat} . Here, however, it is a question of a formula with the prohibitive particle *mā*, where even in the Classical dialect, the aorist injunctive is tolerated (e.g. *mā kāṛṣīs*).

20. In the Aitareya occurs an isolated case where the secondary terminations of the subjunctive are replaced by primary ones :

AB II. 2. “ yadūrdhāvstīṣṭhā draviṇcha dhattāt
yadvā *kṣayo* māturasyā upasthe ”
yadi ca *tiṣṭhāsi* yadi ca *śayāsai*
draviṇaṃ evāsmāsu dhattāt

tiṣṭhās/tiṣṭhāsi

kṣayas/śayāsai. *Tiṣṭhās*, present, subjunctive 2nd sing. act. of $\sqrt{sthā}$ replaced by *tiṣṭhāsi*, corresponding form with the primary termination. *Kṣayas* present, subjunctive 2nd sing. act. of $\sqrt{kṣi}$ replaced by *śayāsai*, present subjunctive 2nd sing. middle of $\sqrt{śi}$. The endings *-asi*, *-ati*, *-asai*, *-atai* alone are found for the subjunctive in the Brāhmaṇas.

(ii) Replacement of one mood by another (the aorist being replaced by the present as above).

21. SB I. 9.I.12. “ asyāmṛdheddhotrāyām ”
asyāmṛādhnōtu hotrāyām
ṛdhet/rādhnōtu

SOME VEDIC VERB-FORMS AND THEIR VARIANTS

22. SB I. 9.1.16. “ tadasyāt tadṛdhyāt ”
tadasmai sarvaṃ samṛdhyatām
ṛdhyāt/ṛdhyatām
23. SB II. 3.4.24. “ samaham rāyaspoṣeṇa gmiṣīya ”
..... cetaiḥ samgacchai
gmiṣīya/gacchai
24. SB I. 5.4.1. “ askannamadya devebhya ājyaṃ sambhriyāsaṃ ”
avikṣubdhamadya devebhyo yajñam tanavai
sambhriyāsaṃ/tanavai
25. SB IX. 2.3.20. “ yakṣadagnirdevo devānā ca vakṣat ”
yakṣadagnirdevo devānā ca vahatu
vakṣat/vahatu
26. SB I. 5.1.26. “ yena pathā havyaṃ ā vo vahāni ”
yathā vo havyaṃ vaheyaṃ
vahāni/vaheyaṃ
27. SB IX. 5.1.41. “ svardeveṣu no dadhat ”
svarge loke dadhātu
dadhat/dadhātu
28. SB V. 1.4.3
& V. 1.4.6. “ tvayāyaṃ vājaṃ set ”
tvayāyamannamujjayatu
set/ujjayatu
29. SB V. 1.4.4. “ tasyām no devaḥ savitā dharma sāviṣat ”
tasyām no devaḥ savitā yajamānaṃ suvatām
sāviṣat/suvatām
30. SB II 4.2.20. “ atra pitaro mādayadhvaṃ yathābhāgaṃ
āvṛṣāyadhvaṃ ”
atra pitaro mādayadhvaṃ yathābhagamaśnīta
āvṛṣāyadhvaṃ/aśnīta
30. SB III. 3.3.8. “ sahasrapoṣaṃ puṣeyaṃ ”
bhūmānaṃ gacchāni
puṣeyaṃ/gacchāni

31. SB III. I.3.23. “ yatkāmaḥ pune tacchakeyam ”
 .. yajñasya udṛcaṃ gacchāni
śakeyam/gacchāni
32. KB XXVIII 6. “ jeṣatha abhitvarīn jeṣatha abhitvaryā ”
 senayā senām jayata
jeṣatha/jayata
33. KB XXVIII 5. “ ni vo jāmayo jihatā nyajāmayah ”
 yacca jāmi yaccājāmi tadvo nijihatām
nijihatā/nijihatām
34. KB XXVIII 6. “ śravadva indrah śṛṇavadvo ‘ gñih ’ ”
 śṛnotu va indrah śṛnotvagniḥ
śravat, śṛṇavat/śṛnotu

35. SB IV. 5.8.10. provides the exceptional case where an aorist optative replaces a present imperative.

“ devebhyo mā sukṛtaṃ brūtāt ” *vocer iti vā*
brū āt/voces

An important fact which emerges from a study of the cases discussed above is the substitution of one mood for another, a fact which raises the question of the syntactical value of the moods in the early language.

The Vedic religion being predominantly utilitarian in character we find the authors of the hymns often imploring the gods with a view to receiving some favour. They either exhorted, demanded, supplicated or desired. Thus the four ancient moods express spontaneously this ‘ desire’.

Thus : pra vāmaśnotu suṣṭutiḥ (*aśnotu* imperative)
 adyā no deva sāvīḥ saubhagam (*sāvīḥ* injunctive)
 imaṃ na śṛṇavaddhavam (*śṛṇavat* subjunctive)
 imamamṛtaṃ dūtam kṛṇvīta martyaḥ (*kṛṇvīta* optative)

The promiscuous substitution of one mood for another in the cases listed above must, doubtless, be due to the absence of a clearly defined syntactical value attributable to each mood. In fact, in the classical language, only the imperative and the optative have survived as independent moods, the subjunctive and the injunctive, already in the course of disuse in the period of the Brāhmaṇas, ceasing to exist as independent moods. It is however, noteworthy that several forms of these two moods continue

SOME VEDIC VERB-FORMS AND THEIR VARIANTS

to survive in certain formations attributed to the imperative in the classical dialect. In the ancient language of the Veda the only real imperatives are the 2nd & 3rd persons of the singular and the 3rd person plural. The imperatives of the 1st person, singular dual and plural of the later language are really the survivals of the vedic subjunctive, while the 2nd & 3rd dual and 2nd plural are vedic injunctives. This morphological transfer would not have been possible but for the syntactical overlapping of the three moods concerned.

(D) *The Aorist-system.* In the older language of the mantras the aorist is quite common, and has the whole variety of moods belonging to the present, and sometimes participles. In much of the classical Sanskrit however, it is a formation of nitfrequent occurrence, and it possesses no participle, nor any moods. A few variations have been noted in the Brāhmaṇas, sigmatic aorists replacing corresponding formations of the root aorist.

36. TS II. 6.9. “ *ārdhma sūktavākam* ”
 SB I.9.1.4. *ārātsma sūktavākam*

ārdhma/ārātsma

37. SB III 9.4.18. “ *mā bhermā saṃvikthāḥ* ”
 mā bhaisīrmā saṃvikthāḥ

bhes/bhaisīs

38. SB VII. 1.1.43. “ *abhārūkhā . .* ” *abhārṣīdukhā*
abhār/abhārṣīt

39. SB XIV. 2.2.16. “ *viśvān devān ayāḍīha* ”
 sarvān devān ayāḍīḥ

ayāt/ayāḍīt

- KB XXVI. 6. “ *yaccāha saṃṣṭhite yajñe ayāḍīyajñam jātavedā* ”
 ayāḍīdimam yajñam jatavedā iti tadāha

ayāt/ayāḍīt

40. SB IV. 4.4.2. “ *yānāvahaḥ usato deva devān* ”
 yān devānavāḍīstān

avahaḥ/avāḍīs

UNIVERSITY OF CEYLON REVIEW

41. SB VII. 3.2.23. is an exception to the above, in that a perfect form is substituted for an aorist :

“ iṣamūrjamahamita ādam ” iṣamurjamahamita ādade
ādam/ādade

(E) Other verbal peculiarities.

42. SB(kānva) II. 3.4.29. “ devān yakṣi svadhvara ”
devān yaja suyajñiya ”

yakṣi/yaja. *Yakṣi*, present indicative 2nd sing. act. is rare and archaic ; it is derived from *yaj* conjugated as if it belonged to the root class (*adādigāna*), whereas, actually it is a *bhuvādigāna* root. Such forms, numerous in the RV, are always employed with imperative value ; the Brāhmaṇa here substitutes in its stead the normal present imperative of the same root, viz. *yaja*.

43. SB VII. 5.1.25. “ yato vratāni paspaśe ”
yato'mnaṃ spāśayām cakre
paspaśe/spāśayām cakre. *paspaśe*, perfect, 3rd sing. ātm. replaced by the later formation of the periphrastic perfect, *spāśayām cakre*.

44. Precative forms, rare even in the mantras, are still in use in the period of the Brs.

SB II. 3.4.34. “ mayi vaḥ kāmadharaṇaṃ bhūyāt ”
ahaṃ vaḥ priyo bhūyāsam

SB VII. I.1.8. “ mayi te kāmadharaṇaṃ bhūyāt ”
mayi te paśavo bhūyāsuḥ

bhūyāt/bhūyāsam, bhūyāsuḥ. *bhūyāt*, root aorist, optative, 3rd sing. act. of $\sqrt{bhū}$, replaced by the precative forms *bhūyāsam*, and *bhūyāsuḥ*, the substitution of the 1st and 3rd persons respectively being due to the fact that the subject is modified from one text to the other. *bhūyāsam* and *bhūyāsuḥ* are frequent forms in the Brs themselves. In fact, for the 1st sing. and 3rd plural, they are even more frequent than the forms without -s. In employing the 1st sing. and the 3rd plural the author was obliged to use the precative form.

(F) *The Participle*. In Classical Sanskrit, participles from the aorist tense stems are totally absent, whereas in the language of the mantras they are a common occurrence. Here again the Brs seem to present a period of transition. In the SB the aorist participle and certain other participles occurring in the mantras are replaced by corresponding present participles.

SOME VEDIC VERB-FORMS AND THEIR VARIANTS

45. SB IX. 4.4.3
& VI. 3.3.14. “śvo *ruhāṇā* adhi nākamuttamaṃ ”
svargaṃ lokam *rohanto* ..
ruhāṇās/rohantas
46. SB VI. 7.2.2. “*dṛṣāṇo* rukma urvyā vyadyaut ”
dṛṣyamāno hyeṣa rukma urvyā vidyotate
dṛṣāṇas/dṛṣyamānas
- SB VI. 3.3.19. “vyaciṣṭhamannai rabhasaṃ *dṛṣāṇaṃ*
avakāśavantamannai annādaṃ *dīpyāmanaṃ*
dṛṣāṇaṃ/dīpyamānaṃ
47. SB VI. 4.1.2. “ajasreṇa bhānunā *dīdyataṃ* ”
ajasreṇārciṣā *dīpyamānaṃ*
dīdyataṃ/dīpyamānaṃ. *dīdyataṃ*, present part. act. of *di* replaced by *dīpya-*
mānaṃ, the former being a rare and difficult form.
- SB IX. 2.3.25. “viśvā āśā *dīdyāno* vibhāhi ”
sarvā āśā *dīpyamāno* vibhāhi
dīdyānas/dīpyamānas.
48. SB VI. 3.2.7. “*pratūrvam*chyavakrāmannaśaṣṭīḥ ”
tvarāmāna chyavakrāmannaśaṣṭīḥ
(*pra*)*tūrvan/tvaramānas*
49. SB VI. 4.2.7. “ni hotā hotṛṣadane *vidānaḥ* ”
vidāna iti *vidvā*mityetat
vidāna/vidvān. *vidāna*, present part. atn. nom. sing. of *vid*, explained by
vidvān, perfect part. act. nom. sing. The latter is always employed with
present tense meaning, although the form is that of the perfect ; *vidāna*,
however is archaic while *vidvān* is in common use even in classical sanskrit.
50. SB VI. 4.2.7. “tveṣo *didivā*nasadat sudakṣaḥ ”
tveṣo *dīpyamāno* ’ sadat sudakṣaḥ
didivān/dīpyamānas
51. SB IX. 2.3.28. “*iyakṣamānā* bhṛgubhiḥ sajoṣā ”
yajamānā bhṛgubhiḥ sajoṣā
iyakṣamānā/yajamānā

52. SB VIII. 6.3.20. “ *pr̥sthe pr̥thivyā nihito davidyutat* ”
pr̥sthe pr̥thivyā nihito dīpyamānaḥ
davidyutat/dīpyamānaḥ

53. SB VI. 3.3.20. “ *tanvā jarbhurānaḥ* ”
tanvā dīpyamānaḥ
jarbhurānaḥ/dīpyamānaḥ

54. SB VI. 4.4.21. “ *vi pājasā pr̥thunā śośucānaḥ* ”
vi pājasā pr̥thunā dīpyamānaḥ
śośucānaḥ/dīpyamānaḥ

55. SB III. 6.4.14. “ *svadhitetijānaḥ* ”
svadhitestejamānaḥ
tetijānaḥ/tejamānaḥ

56. SB VIII. 6.3.20. “ *ayamagniḥ satpatiscekitānaḥ* ”
ayamagniḥ satām patīścētayamānaḥ
cekitānaḥ/cētayamānaḥ

57. SB VI. 7.3.2. “ *kṣāmā rerihadvīrudhaḥ samañjan* ”
kṣāmā vai parjanya rerihyamāno . .
rerihat/rerihyamānaḥ

58. SB VI. 4.4.7. “ *praitu vājī kanikradat* ”
praitu vājī kanikradyamānaḥ
kanikradat/kanikradyamānaḥ

(G) *The Dative Infinitive.* Of the numerous varieties of this infinitive found in the mantras the only one which continues in common use in the Brs is that in *-tavai* ; the one in *-e* is very rare. One instance where such a dative infinitive in *-e* is replaced by the dative case form of the common substantive derived from the same root is found in :

59. SB VI. 4.3.9. “ *dṛśe ca bhāsā bṛhatā suśukvaniḥ* ”
darśanāya ca bhāsā bṛhatā suśukvaniḥ
dṛśe/darśanāya

60. SB IX. 5.1.53. “ *pra no jivātave suva* ”
pro’asmān jivanāya suva
jivātave/jivanāya. *jivātave*, if dative infinitive as suggested by Macdonell, is an irregular formation ; the regular form should be *jivītave*, like those

SOME VEDIC VERB-FORMS AND THEIR VARIANTS

actually found, viz. *jivītavai* and *jivītum*. *Jivātave* is the dative sing. of an old nominal stem *jivātu* fem. 'life,' found, for instance in SB I. 8.1.30. "*jivātumeva parokṣamāsāste*," where *jivātum* is the direct object of *āsāste*, and also in SB I. 9.1.14. "*tadeva jivātum tatprajāṃ tatpaśūn*", where again it is acc. sing. as shown by the accusatives *prajāṃ* and *paśūn* which follow. Its use, however as a dative infinitive is not precluded by what has been said above, for in SB IX. 1.1.33. is found the form *jivātavai*, which, clearly is dative infinitive. Whether considered as a dative infinitive or the simple dative singular of the stem *jivātu*, the formation *jivātave* is archaic, and therefore it is here replaced by the common *jivanāya*.

Conclusion. In respect to the classical Sanskrit it has rightly been observed that in accordance it has become different from the dialect of the Vedas by a process, not of growth, but of decay ; a large number of older forms having entirely disappeared. The difference referred to is especially great when considered in respect to the verbal system. The instances cited in this article, and the observations made in the course of it will help to show how the Vedic verb was becoming more and more attenuated with respect to primary formation and participial derivation, already in the Brāhmanas, and especially in the Śatapatha.

M. H. F. JAYASURIYA