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The Vedic medio-passive aorists, statives and their participles: reconsidering the paradigm

LEONID KULIKOV

1. -āṇa-PARTICIPLES IN PASSIVE USAGES:
PRELIMINARY REMARKS

The present paper deals with a group of athematic middle participles with the suffix -āṇa- which exhibit quite unusual syntactic properties in early Vedic, in the language of the Rgveda (RV). While the finite forms with which these participles are said to belong are employed only transitively, -āṇa-participles made from the same stem are attested in both transitive and intransitive (passive) constructions. This fact was noted already by Delbrück in his seminal Altindische Syntax. Such asymmetry in the syntactic properties of finite and participial forms requires an explanation. To begin with, I shall focus on two typical examples, the participles hinvāṇā- and yujāṇā-.

* I should like to take this opportunity to express my thanks to the audience of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference (University of Helsinki, July 2003), in particular to St. Insler, W. Knobl and C. Watkins for their suggestions and critical remarks. I am also greatly indebted to A. Lubotsky for his criticism and valuable comments on earlier drafts of the paper. I acknowledge my debt to the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) for their financial support, grants no. 220-70-063 (PIONIER project) and 275-70-009 (VENI-project).

† "Verhältnismässig häufig ist passivischer Gebrauch bei aus der Wurzel gebildeten Particien auf āṇā, die man zum Präsens oder Aorist ziehen kann" (Delbrück 1888: 264); see also Delbrück 1888: 379f.; Wackernagel & Debrunner 1954: 270.
hinvānā- (root *hi ‘impel’) occurs 18 times in intransitive (passive) constructions (as in (1a)), and 10 times in transitive constructions (as in (1b)) in the Rgveda (see e.g. Kümmel 1996: 141):

(1) a. RV 9.12.8b
sómo hinvānō ārṣati
‘Soma, being impelled, flows.’

b. RV 2.21.5
dhiyo hinvānā uṣijah
‘Uṣij’s, impelling the (religious) thoughts...’

The syntactic properties of hinvānā- are in sharp contrast with those of the finite middle forms made from the nasal present (3pl. med. hinváte etc.), with which hinvānā- is supposed to belong. These forms can only be employed transitively, meaning ‘impel’, as in (2):

(2) RV 9.65.11c
hinvé vājeṣu vājinam
‘I spur on this runner [in the race] for prizes.’

Similarly, the participle yujānā- (root *yuj ‘yoke’) occurs 8 times in intransitive (passive) constructions (as in (3b)) and 14 times in transitive constructions (as in (3a)) in the Rgveda (see Kümmel 1996: 90):

(3) a. RV 6.47.19a
yujānā haritā rāthe
‘... (Tvaṣṭar,) yoking two fallow [horses] to the chariot.’

b. RV 6.34.2c
rātho nā mahē śāvase yujānāḥ
‘... like a chariot yoked for the great power.’
Vedic grammars treat *yujānā-* as a middle participle of the root aorist (see, for instance, MacDonell 1910: 370). However, again, as in the case of *hinvānā-*, the corresponding finite forms (3sg.med. *āyukta* etc.) can only be employed in transitive usages, as in (4):

(4) RV 7.60.3

*āyukta* saptā haritaḥ

‘He yoked (now) his seven dun (horses).’

Such remarkable syntactic behaviour of the middle participles requires an explanation: why do these participles show the syntactic features different from those of the corresponding finite forms?

Here it is in order to take a closer look at the syntactic properties of the other forms of the paradigms, where the participles *hinvānā-* and *yujānā-* belong. Apparently, in order to find a clue to our problem, we need to look for finite forms which are derived from the same stem as the participles in question (i.e. *hinv-* and *yuj-*) and can be employed as passives. Such forms indeed exist. In the case of *hinvānā-*, these are the statives 3sg. *hinvé* ‘(it) is impelled’, 3pl. *hinviré* ‘(they) are impelled’. In the case of *yujānā-*, passive usages are attested for the passive aorist 3sg. *áyoji* ‘(it) was yoked’, 3pl. *áyujran* ‘(they) were yoked’.²

To put it in morphological terms, the stem *hinu-/hinv-*, is shared by the nasal present (3sg.act. *hinóti*, 3pl.med. *hinváte* etc.), which never occurs in passive constructions, and the stative (3sg. *hinvé*), which is employed in passive usages *(‘it is impelled’). Likewise, the stem *yuj-* (yój-*) is shared by the root aorist (3sg.med. *āyukta* etc.), never used in passive constructions *(āyukta* can only mean *(‘he) yoked’, not *(‘was yoked’)), and the passive aorist (3sg. *áyoji*, 3pl. *áyujran*), always employed as passive *(‘it was yoked’, *(they were yoked’).*

---

² For statives and (medio-)passive aorists (*i*-aorists), two formations with defective paradigms (3sg. and 3pl. only), which are mainly employed in passive usages, see Kümmel 1996. For statives, see also Gotô 1997.
Thus, the passive syntax of the participles hinvānā- and yujānā- can readily be explained on the assumption that they belong with statives (3sg. hinvé, 3pl. hinvirē) or passive aorists (3sg. áyoji, 3pl. áyujran).

This means that these participles are homonymous, or morphologically (grammatically) ambiguous, but their grammatical characteristics are distinguished by their syntax. hinvānā- is a middle present participle when employed transitively, meaning ‘impelling’, and a stative participle when employed intransitively (passively), meaning ‘impelled’. Likewise, yujānā- is a middle root aorist participle when employed transitively (‘yoking’) and a passive aorist participle when employed in passive constructions (‘yoked’):

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{PRESENT} & \text{STATIVE} & \text{ROOT AORIST} & \text{PASSIVE AORIST} \\
3\text{pl. hinv-āte} & 3\text{sg. hinv-ē} & 3\text{sg. á-yuk-ta} & 3\text{sg. á-yoj-i} \\
\text{transitive} & \text{intransitive-passive} & \text{transitive} & \text{intransitive-passive} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{‘impelling'} & \quad \text{‘impelled'} \\
\text{hinv-ānā-} & \\
\text{‘yoking'} & \quad \text{‘yoked’} \\
yuj-ānā- & \\
\end{align*}
\]

Despite the fact that participle forms are never listed in the standard Vedic grammars within the paradigms of statives and medio-passive aorists, the assumption that passive -āna-participles should be listed within these paradigms seems quite attractive, since it easily explains their abnormal syntax.

2. MEDIO-PASSIVE AORIST PARTICIPLES VS. MIDDLE ROOT AORIST PARTICIPLES

A similar account is appropriate for some other -āna-participles which display passive syntax. Particularly instructive is the case of the middle participles made from roots which do not have finite
root aorist forms. Traditionally, such forms are treated as middle root aorist participles, but, assuming that they belong with the (medio-)passive i-aorists, we can more adequately explain the syntax and morphology of these formations. In this section I shall briefly discuss a few such participles.

2.1. srj ‘set free, emit, create’: srjānā-

The participle srjānā- is attested exclusively in passive constructions, as in (5):

(5) RV 9.76.1c
   ḫāriḥ srjānō átyo nā sātvabhiḥ
   ‘The fallow [Soma], set free, like a horse, by warriors ...’

The only finite formation constructed directly on the root is the passive aorist (3sg. āsarji, 3pl. āṣrgran / āṣgram; see Insler 1968a: 326f. with fn. 23; Kümmel 1996: 129ff.), as in (6):

(6) RV 1.190.2
   sārgo nā yō ... āsarji
   ‘... like a discharge (= oblation) which has been discharged (in Agni = in the fire).’ (see Insler 1968b: 5)

Since srj does not form root aorists properly speaking, srjānā- can only belong with this passive aorist.

2.2. drś ‘see’: drśānā-

The participle drśānā-3 (RV 1.92.12, 10.45.8) ‘visible’ undoubtedly belongs with the passive aorist (3sg. ādarśi, 3pl. adṛśran/ādṛśram); the middle root aorist first appears in Vedic prose.

---

3 For the hapax drśāna- (RV 2.10.4), with a different accentuation, see Section 5 below.
2.3. $ruc$ ‘shine’: $rucānā$-
The participle $rucānā$- ‘shining, bright’ (6x in the RV) must belong with the medio-passive $i$-aorist ($a)roci$, 3x in the RV);$^4$ the middle root aorist forms properly speaking are unattested.

3. STATIVE PARTICIPLES VS. MIDDLE PRESENT PARTICIPLES
As in the case of $hinvaṇā$-, the passive syntax of several middle participles can easily be accounted for on the assumption that they belong with statives made from present stems, not with these middle presents properly speaking.

3.1. $su$ ‘press (out)’: $sunvaṇā$-
Unlike the finite middle forms of the nasal present $sunutē$, which are only employed in transitive usages, the middle participle $sunvaṇā$-, next to its transitive attestations, occurs once in a passive construction:

(7) RV 9.101.13
$sunvaṇāsyāndhasah$
‘...[speech ...] of the pressed sap.’
(see Gotō 1991: 689 fn. 79; Kümmel 1996: 126)

Most likely, this form belongs with the stative $sunvé$, $sunviré$, employed in passive usages (see Gotō 1991: 689 with fn. 78; Kümmel 1996: 123f.), as in (8):

(8) RV 7.29.1a = 9.88.1a
$ayāṁ soma indra tūbhyaṁ sunve$
‘This Soma is pressed for you, O Indra.’

$^4$ Thus, although hesitantly, Wackernagel & Debrunner 1954: 273 (“$rucānā$-: 3. Sg. $aroci$?”).
3.2. *stu ‘praise, sing*: stāvāna-, stavānā-, stuvānā-

We find in the RV three athematic middle participles made from the bare root *stu ‘praise*:⁵ stāvāna-, stavānā- and stuvānā-. Of these three formations, only the first, stāvāna-, is fairly frequent in the RV (18x), while the others two are hapaxes. It occurs in passive constructions, as in (9):

(9) RV 1.130.10cd

\[ \text{divodāśēhir indra stāvāno 'vāyṛdhīthā āhobhir iva dyauḥ} \]

‘Praised by the Divodāsas, O Indra, increase, as the heaven [increases] through the days.’

By virtue of its root vocalism, stāvāna- can only belong with the stative stāve (on which see, in particular, Oettinger 1976: 112, 120; Kümmel 1996: 131ff.; Gotō 1997: 180ff.), that has apparently generalized the full grade in the root (cf. the class I present stāvati formed from it⁶). By contrast, the participle stuvānā- (RV 7.96.3) is made in accordance with the rules of the derivation of the middle participles of the root aorist and therefore is likely to be a member of the paradigm of the i-aorist āstāvi (on which see Kümmel 1996: 132f.); its non-stative meaning (‘being praised’, rather than ‘praised’)⁷ corroborates this assumption:

(10) RV 7.96.3

\[ \text{cetati vājinīvatī grānā jamadagnivāt stuvānā ca} \]
\[ \text{vasiśṭhavāt} \]

‘[Sarasvatī] appears as rich in horses when being praised in the Jamadagni style and sung in the Vasiśṭha style.’

---


⁶ For the secondary character and genesis of this formation, see Narten 1969; Gotō 1987: 331ff. with fn. 807.

⁷ For the non-stative usage of the participle grānā in this passage, see Section 6.
The abnormal accentuation of the form *stavānā*- (a hapax in the RV) may result from contamination of the stative and passive aorist participles, i.e. *stāvāna*- and *stuvānā*.- The context does not help in determining its paradigmatic status:

(11) RV 6.46.2

sā tvām naḥ ... mahā stavānō ...
gām āśvaṃ rathyām indra sām kira

‘You, O Indra, ... bring us a cow and a horse for chariot together, when being praised / praised as the great one.’

3.3. *duh* ‘milk, give milk’: *dū*(g)hāna- / *duhānā*-  
As Kümmerl (1996: 58) has demonstrated (see also Gotō 1991: 681ff.; 1997: 170ff.), the meaning and syntax of the middle participles *dū*(g)hāna- and *duhānā*- depends on their accentuation: forms with the accent on the root give the meaning ‘giving milk, milch(-cow)’, whilst those with the suffix accentuation (2x in the RV) are employed in the sense ‘milking (for oneself)’. This semantic contrast is perfectly parallel to that between the stative 3sg. *duhē, 3pl. duhrē* ‘give milk’ and middle root present (3pl. *duhatē*) ‘milk (for oneself)’ (discussed at length by Kümmerl 1996: 52ff.). Obviously, the difference in accentuation between these formations correlates with their grammatical characteristics: the root-accented participle *dū*(g)hāna- belongs with the stative 3sg. *duhē, 3pl. duhrē* (‘give milk, be a milch(-cow)’), whilst *duhānā*- (with suffix accentuation) belongs to the paradigm of the middle root present, together with 3pl. *duhatē* etc. (‘milk (for oneself)’).

3.4. *idh* ‘kindle’: *indhāna*- and evidence from the Atharvaveda  
The participle *indhāna*- occurs 5 times in transitive usages (‘kindling’), as in (12a), and 3 times in passive usages (‘kindled’), as in (12b), in the Rgveda:

---

8 Cf. Wackernagel & Debrunner 1954: 273: “*stavānā*– (einmal; in *stuvānā*- zu verbessern?)"
(12) a. RV 2.25.1a

\textit{indhāno} agnim vanavad vanusyatāḥ

'The one who \textit{kindles} Agni will overpower those who envy [us].'

b. RV 1.143.7

\textit{indhāno} ... vidāthesu dīdyat ... úd u no yaṁsate dhiyam

'Being \textit{kindled}, shining during the sacrifices, [Agni] will raise our prayer.'

The ratio of the transitive and passive usages is summarized in Table 1:

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{transitive ('kindling')} & \textbf{intransitive-passive ('kindled')} \\
\hline
5x & 3x \\
RV 2.25.1, 8.102.22, & RV 1.143.7, 8.19.31, 8.23.11 \\
10.3.4, 10.45.1, 10.128.1 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 1

The usage of this participle nicely parallels the syntax of the finite forms derived from the stem \textit{indh-}: middle present (3sg. \textit{in}(d)dhē,\footnote{With the secondary loss of gemination.} 3pl. \textit{indhāte/indhatē}, etc.) is used transitively, as in (13a); by contrast, the form \textit{indhē}, attested at RV 7.8.1 in a passive construction (13b), must be a stative made from the present stem (see Kümmer 2000: 125f. fn. 80; Kulikov 2001: 46f.):

(13) a. RV 3.13.5c

\textit{fkwāno} agnim \textit{indhate}

'The singers \textit{kindle} the fire.'
b. RV 7.8.1ab

\textit{indhē} rājā sām aryō nāmobhir' yāsya práti kam áhutaṁ ghṛtēna

'With reverence the king, the noble [Lord] is \textit{kindled},

whose face is anointed with ghee.'

Thus, the transitive ('kindling') and intransitive-passive ('kindled') occurrences of \textit{indhāna}- belong with the transitive nasal present \textit{in(d)dhē} and with the stative \textit{indhē}, respectively.

Such an analysis of \textit{indhāna}- is further supported by evidence from the Atharvaveda (Śaunakīya). Since the category of stative almost disappears after the RV (see Kūmmel 1996: 11), we can expect that the -\textit{āna}-participles which are grammatically ambiguous in the RV (i.e. 'belong either to stative or to some other formation with which stative shares the stem) will no longer be ambiguous in the Atharvaveda (AV). This assumption is corroborated by the ratio of usages of \textit{indhāna}- in the AV, summarized in Table 2:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
\textbf{transitive ('kindling')} & \textbf{intransitive-passive ('kindled')} \\
\hline
2x & \\
AV 19.55.3, 19.55.4 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textbf{Table 2}

4. RECONSTRUCTING STATIVES AND MEDIO-PASSIVE \textit{i}-AORISTS

On the assumption that several -\textit{āna}-participles with the 'unexpected' passive syntax belong with statives or \textit{i}-aorists, we not only are able to account for their 'abnormal' syntax, but also to reconstruct some unattested statives and passive aorists.
4.1. ad ‘eat’: adānā- : *ádi

The middle participle adānā- (hapax in the RV) is employed in the passive usage (‘being eaten’; cf. (14)), whilst finite forms of the root present (3sg.act. ātti etc., middle forms are unattested and probably did not exist in the language of the RV), with which this participle is traditionally connected, never occur in passive constructions:

(14) RV 4.19.9

vamrībhīḥ putrām agrūvo adānām ... ājabhartha
‘You [O Indra] have carried out [of a hole] the virgin’s son, being eaten by ants.’

The passive syntax and the non-stative meaning (‘being eaten’, not ‘eaten’) of this RVic hapax are likely to point to the unattested passive aorist *ádi ‘was eaten’.

4.2. hū ‘call’: huvānā- : *áhāvi

The root aorist participle huvānā- (root hū ‘call’) is employed both in transitive (as in (15a)) and intransitive (passive) (as in (15b)) constructions:

(15) a. RV 7.30.3cd

ny āgniḥ sīdad ásuro nā hōtā ’ huvānō átra subhāgāya devān
‘Agni sits down, the Hotar, like the Asura, calling the gods hither for the fortunate [sacrificer].’

b. RV 10.112.3cd

asmābhīr indra sākhībhir huvānāh ’ sadhīcīnō mādayasvā niśādyā
‘O Indra, being called by us, [your] friends, be exhilarated, having sat down together [with us].’
By contrast, the finite forms of the root aorist (áhūmahi RV 6.45.10 and a few other forms) are employed transitorily. Thus, passive occurrences of huvānā- must belong with the unattested passive aorist *áhāvi ‘(he) was called’.\(^\text{10}\)

4.3. hi ‘impel’: hiyānā- : *áhāyi

The participle hiyānā-, attested 8 times in the RV, is only employed in passive constructions (‘being impelled’) and has no corresponding finite root aorist forms (active root aorists, such as 1pl. ahema, 3pl. ahyan, are employed transitively). Most likely, this is the participle of the unattested passive aorist *áhāyi ‘was impelled’.

5. SOME FORMAL FEATURES OF THE PASSIVE -āna-PARTICIPLES

In general, the rules of derivation of (passive) -āna-participles do not differ from those for athematic middle participles made from other stems. There are, however, some cases of accent vacillation which have not yet received a satisfactory explanation. The majority of the participles in question have the zero grade in the root and, accordingly, bear the accent on the suffix (-ānā-), not on the root. There are, however, a few participles made from the full grade root with root accentuation (śāyāna-, stāvāna-). It seems that the grade of the root depends on its structure: CaR (CaC) roots display the full grade (śi / śay: śāyāna-, stu / stav: stāvāna-), whilst CaRC / CRC roots have a zero grade (cf. ḍṛś: ḍṛśānā-, ṛuc: ṛucānā-, etc.). Although we find only two examples of the former type (śāyāna-, stāvāna-), active static participles (see Section 7 below) seem further to corroborate this regularity, cf. járanti- ‘old’ (not **jurānti-) and máhant- ‘great’ (made from CaR / CaC roots), as opposed to pṛṣant- ‘speckled’ and bṛhānt- ‘high’ (CaRC / CRC roots).

\(^\text{10}\) The morphologically unclear form huvē (RV 1.30.9) ‘(he) called’ cannot represent a stative; see Kümmel 1996: 142 ("[s] handelt sich um eine Augenblicksbestimmung nach 1. Sg. huvē in [pāda] b"); Lubotsky 1997: 1659 ("3sg., inf. or pf. w[ith]out red[uplication] (?)").
Perhaps, under the influence of the two very common stative participles, śāyāna- and stāvāna-, some stative participles with the zero grade in the root have undergone secondary accent shift to the root (cf. indhāna-, citāna-, dū(ɡ)hāna-). Thus, there may have been a weak tendency to generalize the root accentuation for all stative participles; cf. especially the root-accented participle dū(ɡ)hāna- (see Section 3.3) opposed to the middle root present participle duhānā- with suffix accentuation.

6. PARTICIPLE OF STATIVES OR Ī-ARISTS?

The morphological identification of most passive -āna-participles poses no problem, but in some cases we may need additional criteria in order to determine which of these two passive formations (stative, passive aorist, or either of them) the participle in question may belong with. Below I shall briefly discuss the features which can disambiguate some unclear -āna-participles.

(i) Stem

Since passive ī-arists can only be made from root stems, those -āna-participles which are derived from the stems other than the bare root (i.e. from non-root present or intensive stems) can only belong with statives. In cases where a participle is formed directly from the root it may, theoretically, belong either with the medio-passive ī-aorist or with the stative made from the root present stem. Most often, however, only one of these two formations exists, which rules out the other option. Only in cases where either both or none are attested we are faced with a dilemma: the participle of statives or ī-aorists?

---

11 For the only example of a full grade root participle with suffix accentuation (stavānā-, RVic hapax), see Section 3.2.

12 Statives derived from root aorist stems are almost unknown in Vedic, the only (possible) exception being citē (see Kümmel 1996: 10).
(ii) Accentuation
The accentuation of the passive -āna-participles, briefly discussed in Section 5, may provide an additional clue to the morphological identification of participles made from bare roots. Thus, the root accentuation of the participle citāna- (RV 9.101.11) ‘made perceivable’ may support connecting this formation with the stative cītē (RV 10.143.4) (as actually suggested by Kümmel 1996: 39 on semantic grounds), rather than with the passive aorist āceti.

 Quite remarkable is the difference in accentuation between two -āna-participles made from the root dṛś ‘see’. While dṛśāna- (RV 1.92.12, 10.45.8) ‘visible’, discussed in Section 2.2, is a regular participial derivative of the passive aorist, the hapax dṛśāna- (RV 2.10.4), judging from its abnormal root accentuation, might belong with the unattested stative *dṛṣē ‘is seen’. The context seems to support this analysis; note also the adjacent bṛhānt- ‘high’, which may represent a stative participle, too (see Section 7 below):

(16) RV 2.10.4

jīgharmy agnim ... vāyasā bṛhāntam vyāciṣṭham ānnai
rabhasāṁ dṛśānam

‘I besprinkle Agnī, ... which is high by vital force, most expansive, appearing (lit. seen) as impetuous through food.’

(iii) Temporal/aspectual semantics
The temporal/aspectual meaning of the form in question may also hint at its grammatical characterization. Thus, for the participle adānā- (see Section 4.1), both the non-stative meaning (‘being eaten’, rather than ‘eaten’) and the suffix accentuation (adānā-, not *ādāna-) seem to support the passive aorist analysis.

(iv) Paradigmatic features
There may also be some paradigmatic indications that favour one of the two interpretations. Thus, in the case of the passive participle
mrjānā- ‘(being) wiped, (being) cleansed’ (mrj ‘wipe, cleanse’), we can probably rule out the stative analysis (stative *mrjē?) and reconstruct the passive aorist *āmarji, since this root already has a stative participle, made from the intensive stem (marmṛjānā-).

To conclude this brief discussion of the features of the passive -āna-participles, a general methodological remark is in order. In some cases, evidence for the paradigmatic status (stative or passive aorist?) of -āna-participles is controversial. Thus, the well-attested participle gṛṇānā- (44x in the RV) can only belong with the stative gṛṇē ‘is praised’ (and the nasal present gṛṇīte), but some contexts rather point to the non-stative meaning, as in (10), where this form is coordinated with the passive aorist participle stuvānā ‘being praised’. Since the verb gṛ ‘praise, sing’ forms no aorists at all, one may assume that the participle gṛṇānā- could supply, where necessary, the participles of the non-existent passive aorist (*āgāri, *girānā-), thus being functionally shared by the two passive formations. This means that, even in cases where formal (morphological) features unambiguously determine the paradigmatic status of a participle, its actual usage can, in a sense, ‘accommodate’ both functional values, those of the passive aorist and stative.13

7. ACTIVE PARTICIPLES OF STATIVES?

Thus far, I have only discussed participles of statives and passive aorists formed with the suffix -āna-, thus presuming that only the middle morphology was possible for such participles (which, in general, meets our expectations with respect to the morphology of the forms employed in passive usages). Yet there seems to be evidence for the assumption that stative -āna-participles may have had active counterparts. It has frequently been noted (Renou 1966: 6 [= Chōix I: 22]; Watkins 1969: 142ff.; Schaefer 1994: 45f.) that

13 On the formal and functional overlapping of the stative and passive aorist, see Kümmel 1996: 20f.
the formation *stavánt*—(active participle?), which occurs three times in the family maṇḍalas of the RV (at 2.19.5, 2.20.5, 6.24.8, only in the nom. sg. form *staván*), attests quite an unusual (for an active form) passive syntax, cf.:

(17) RV 2.20.5c

muṣṇánn uṣásah súryena staván

‘...while (he), the praised one, abducted the dawns with the sun.’

By virtue of its suffix accentuation and active morphology, this form cannot belong to the class I present *stávate*, which is only attested in the middle (see also section 3.2). On the other hand, its semantics and passive syntax plead for the connection of this formation with the stative *stáve*, as the active counterpart of the (middle) participle *stávana*-

The assumption of the existence of active stative participles may shed light on the paradigmatic status of some other formations in -ānt- (most of which are traditionally taken to be adjectives). Watkins, who first drew attention to these formations (1969: 142ff.; see also Schaefer 1994: 45ff.), assumed that they represent active participles with the secondary accent shift marking their passive (intransitive) syntax. These participles include, besides *stavánt*-

(1) járant- ‘old’ (i.e. ‘(having) grown old’), treated by Gotō (1987: 153 with fn. 238) as an adjective outside the verbal paradigm because of its intransitive syntax (‘(grown) old’, not ‘making old’), different from that of the class I present *járati* ‘makes old’;

(2) pépišat- ‘adorned’ (RV 10.127.7; see Schaefer 1994: 45, 152ff.), which may point to the unattested stative *pépiše* ‘is adorned’ of the type cékithe (on which see Schaefer 1994: 44);

(3) pfšant- ‘speckled’ (see Wackernagel & Debrunner 1954: 165; Watkins 1969: 144);
(4) *bhánt- ‘high’ may be the active stative participle of the verb *br ‘be high, strong’ (on which see, in particular, Narten 1959: 45f. [= Kl. Schr. I: 7ff.]; Jamison 1983: 97ff.);

(5) *mahánt- ‘great’ [whose parallelism with *stavánt- was noted by Watkins (1969: 144)] may belong with the hapax stative *mahe ‘is able’ (RV 7.97.2); see Kümmel 1996: 79ff.; Gotô 1997: 179f.

8. PARTICLES OF STATIVES AND i-AORISTS:
   A SUMMARY

The results of this preliminary sketch of the passive *-āna-participle are summarized in tables 3 and 4, which bring together finite (3rd person singular and plural) and non-finite forms (participles) of the medio-passive aorists and statives attested in early Vedic, foremost in the RV:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>3sg.</th>
<th>3pl.</th>
<th>participle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*ad ‘eat’</td>
<td>*ādi</td>
<td></td>
<td>adānā- RV 4.19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*āmarjī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dṛś ‘see’</td>
<td>ádarśī RV 15x,</td>
<td>adṛśram RV 7x,</td>
<td>dṛśānā- RV 1.92.12, 10.45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ānedī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ābhāyi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhi ‘fear’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mṛj ‘wipe, cleanse’</td>
<td>*āmarji</td>
<td></td>
<td>mṛjānā- RV 3x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yuj ‘yoke’</td>
<td>áyōji RV 4x,</td>
<td>áyujran RV 2x,</td>
<td>yujānā- RV 8x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruc ‘shine’</td>
<td>aroci RV 2x,</td>
<td>ruci RV 1.121.6</td>
<td>rucānā- RV 6x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*āmarjī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vṛ ‘cover’</td>
<td>ávārī RV 4.6.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>vṛnā- RV 1.61.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>su ‘press (out)’</td>
<td>áśāvī RV 7x</td>
<td></td>
<td>s‘vānā- RV 32x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sṛj ‘set free, emit’</td>
<td>ásarjī RV 12x,</td>
<td>ásṛgran/m RV 19x,</td>
<td>sṛjānā- RV 11x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ādhāyi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ādāyi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hi ‘impel’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hū ‘call’</td>
<td>*āhāvi</td>
<td></td>
<td>huvānā- RV 10x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
### Statives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>3sg</th>
<th>3pl</th>
<th>participle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>idh 'kindle'</td>
<td>indhē RV 7.8.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>indhāna- RV 3x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gē 'praise'</td>
<td>grné RV 5x</td>
<td></td>
<td>grnānā- RV 44x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cit 'appear, perceive'</td>
<td>cité</td>
<td></td>
<td>citāna- RV 9.101.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RV 10.143.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duh 'give milk'</td>
<td>duhē</td>
<td>duhrē</td>
<td>dú(g)hāna- RV (12x(^{15})) +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RV (10x) +</td>
<td>RV (7x(^{14})) +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dṛś 'see'</td>
<td>*dṛśē (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>dṛśāna- RV 2.10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brū 'say'</td>
<td>bruve RV 5.61.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>bruvānā- RV 3.59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mjī 'wipe, cleanse'</td>
<td>*marmjē</td>
<td></td>
<td>marmjānā- RV 6x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śī 'lie'</td>
<td>śāye RV 11x</td>
<td>sēre AV</td>
<td>śāvāna- RV 18x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śubh</td>
<td>sōbhe</td>
<td></td>
<td>śubhānā- RV 2x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'be beautiful'</td>
<td>RV 1.120.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>su 'press (out)'</td>
<td>sunvé RV 3x</td>
<td>sunvirē RV 4x</td>
<td>sunvānā- RV 9.101.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stu 'praise'</td>
<td>stāve RV 5x</td>
<td></td>
<td>stāvāna- RV 18x (stāvānā- RV 6.46.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hi 'impel'</td>
<td>hinvē RV 2x</td>
<td>hinvirē RV 8x(^{16})</td>
<td>hinvānā- RV 18x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 4 |

### REFERENCES


\(^{14}\) 2x in transitive usages (‘they milk the cow/udder’).

\(^{15}\) 1x or 2x in transitive usages (‘milking’); see Kümmel 1996: 58.

\(^{16}\) 6x in transitive usages.


