

ROBERT S. P. BEEKES

The imperative Skt. *gṛhāṇa*

1. The type of 2 sg. imperative Skt. *gṛh-āṇa* has not been correctly explained as far as I see. RENO (1952, 267) assumed that the verbs in *-nāti* contained two suffixes, *-n-* and *-ā-*, that could be independently added to the root. This view is now no longer tenable.

The current view (GOTŌ 1987, 331; mentioned — and accepted? — in EWAia s.v. *grabh-*) is that it derives from a form *-nāna* with dissimilation of the first *n*; *-na* would be the particle seen in the 2 pl. *-tana*. For the latter I have no better explanation (see below). The former part of this interpretation seems incorrect to me. The dissimilation cannot be refuted or demonstrated (on GOTŌ's parallel see below), but more serious is that the assumed *-nā-* is unexpected. We expect the zero grade, as in the alternative *gṛbh-ṇī-hi*, cf. *kr-ṇu*.

This type of imperative is further found from the roots *aś-*, *bandh-* and *stambh-*. These roots all end in a pure (= unvocalizable) consonant, just like *gṛbh-*. And we now know that with these roots the following nasal was vocalized, giving *-ā-* < *-ṇh₂-*. That *gṛbhā-yāti* contains this *ā* had already been recognized by the discoverer of the laryngeals, DE SAUSSURE (1878, 251f). It was later first taken up by INSLER 1971, 574 n. 4 (independently?); then others found it independently: PETERS 1980, 323 mentions that WERBA, SCHINDLER and EICHNER all independently arrived at this interpretation (I owe the reff. to Peter Schrijver). This insight gives automatically the explanation of our imperative: we expect **]bh-ṇ-h₂* (cf. *-n-u*), which gave **]bh-ā*; this form was enlarged by the particle *-nā*.

2. Some questions are still to be discussed. It may be useful to give all imperative forms found with the *nā*-verbs:

2 sg. <i>-nīhí, -nāhí</i>	pl. <i>-nūtá, -nāta</i>
<i>-nūtāt</i>	<i>-nūtána</i>
<i>-āná</i>	
3 <i>-nātu</i>	<i>-nántu</i>

Our form is the only form where *-na* was added to the (2nd) singular. I am unable to explain that. The unextended form **gṛbhā* was probably not retained because it was not well characterized. More difficult is why we don't find **gṛbh-ā-hi*. This form may have been replaced by *gṛbhnihi* whereas *gṛbhā(na)* was retained because it was too aberrant. One might think that the type *gṛhnāhí* is a reshaping of expected **gṛbhāhi*, but the distribution does not seem to confirm that: it occurs further of the roots *gṛ-*, *śṛ-* and *pū-*, which are exactly the wrong roots (with vowel before the *n*); also these forms only occur in later texts (AV, SV, TS). So I think that these forms are late remakings. (They have the stress on *-hí*, which MACDONELL 1910, 350 n. 6 calls 'the wrong accent'; however, whether the forms replace *-nī-* or *-ā-*, it is the expected accentuation; old full grade, as in 3 sg. *-nātu*, is not to be expected; lastly, *-hi* always has the stress.) I don't know what the reason was for introducing *-nā-*. Note that it also happened in the plural, *punāta*, where again a reshaping of *-āta* < *-ṇh₂-te* (expected after pure consonant) does not seem probable.

3. It may be pointed out that the imperative in *-āna* is not without interest. In the first place it is the only form where *-ā-* is retained in the paradigm of the nasal present itself. It is understandable that it was retained longest in the imperative. The supposed original paradigm may be given:

pres. ind. sg. <i>-nāmi</i>	pl. <i>*-āmasi</i>
<i>-nāsi</i>	<i>*-āta(na)</i>
<i>-nāti</i>	<i>*-ananti</i> < <i>*-ṇh₂-enti</i>
imp. sg. <i>*-ā, *-āhi</i>	pl. <i>*-āta(na)</i>
<i>*-ātāt</i>	
<i>-nātu</i>	<i>*-anantu</i> < <i>ṇh₂-entu</i>

Then, our form shows the development of word final *-RH* after consonant. The only other instance I know is the nom. pl. of the neuter *n*-stems *-ā*, if this continues *-n-h₂*. Perhaps Greek had the same development, as is shown by the 1 sg. middle endings $-\mu\alpha\iota$, $-\mu\bar{\alpha}\nu$ from **-maH-* < **-mh₂*,

with later added *-i*, *-m*, as proposed by GARCÍA-RAMÓN 1985, 208.¹

One wonders what would have been the development of the 1 sg. middle in Sanskrit in the *nā*-verbs we discuss. The oldest form would have had $-\eta-h_2-h_2$. I expect this to become $-aH > -ā$, or perhaps $-aHi > -e$. In any case it is to be expected that this form was replaced by the normal endings $-e$ in the indicative and $-i$ in the imperfect; and these were then replaced by $-ne$, $-ni$.²

4. There are two middle participial forms that may be relevant here. GOTŌ, 1987, 331, suggests that the isolated participial form *sam-grbhāṇā-* MS II, 1,2^p: 3,2 was dissimilated from regular $-nāna-$. This raises the question of the regular development of $-\eta h_2-mh_1no-$ (if a pure consonant preceded the *n*). This might have given $-ā-mīna-$, a form which would probably have been replaced by $-ā-āna$ (or perhaps by $-ā-māna$ on which see below). One might consider the possibility that the *m* was also regularly vocalized, which would have given $-an-āna$. Anyhow, we may expect that the original form in the verbs concerned was not $-nāna-$. (We have now seen that the assumed dissimilation of *n* - *n* is not needed to explain the imperative.) Whether the form actually occurring is old, is difficult to say. — A second form, *stabhamāna-* AĀ I 4,1: 94,8, is taken by GOTŌ *ibid.* as a replacement of $*stabhāna-$. One might also consider that it is a replacement of $*stabh-anāna-$, the form that might have been the phonetically regular development. A second possibility is that it replaces $*-ā-māna$, the form that might have replaced $*-ā-mīna$ (see above).

5. In the 3rd pl. $-\eta h_2-$ before vowel gives $-an-$. We have considered this development in the preceding section for the middle participle; in the active we would expect $*-an-ant-$. Further we would expect it in the middle optative,

¹ Note that *-m* must have been added when it could no longer be vocalized, or after $-maH$ had become $-mā$, but *-i* before that. However, the development $-iH > -yα$ makes one expect $-mH > -μα$. This is the view of RIX (1976, 75), who assumes $-\eta h_2$ (noted thus!) $> -vα$, as in $*kṛh_2snh_2 > κάρηνα$. But here the ending can be easily analogical. KORTLANDT 1981, 130 assumed that $-μα$ developed after vowel stems ($o-mH$), and $-mām$ from $-mHm$ after consonant, which was generalized because of the aorists, e.g. $-s-mHm$. However, in this sequence I would expect $-(s)mHm > -σαμα$. If so, the forms are not yet explained.

² KORTLANDT 1981, 125 discusses such sequences, but only such as had consonantal *n*. He assumes that $vṛṇi$ directly reflects $-uṛṇh_1h_2$.

–*an-ī-*, and originally also in the plural of the active optative, before Sanskrit generalized –*yā-*; in Iranian it is still to be expected.

This –*an-* may be found in the mysterious stem *iṣaṇa-*. This was seen by Joh. NARTEN, 1982, 143. However, she rejected this possibility, for three reasons. First, “würde der Stamm *iṣaṇa-*, wenn er zu *iṣṇā-* gehört, jedenfalls etwas ungewöhnliches darstellen.” That is correct, but it could have formed a (perhaps incomplete) paradigm of its own. It would also explain why the forms are so rare. Secondly, there is the parallel in Avestan of *zaranaēma* (beside *zaranya-*). But this form is not a stem in –*an-*, but it represents trisyllabic /*zarnaima/*, from **zərənaēma* with analogical *zar-* (e.g. KELLENS, 1984, 179 n 19). Lastly we have *krpānanta*, beside *krpānyāti*. KELLENS, 1984, 179 n 19). Lastly we have *krpānanta*, beside *krpānyāti*. This is true, but now these forms would have a model in *iṣaṇa-*, *iṣānyāti*. (NARTEN dismisses Av. *pəšanaiti*, beside Ved. *pṛtanya-*, as irrelevant.) NARTEN’s alternative is that *iṣaṇ(a)-* was created as an aorist to *iṣānyāti*. She adds: “So ungewöhnlich die Annahme einer wie auch immer gearteten Entsprechung zwischen den vedischen Verbalstämmen auf –*anya-* und –*āna-* auch erscheinen mag ...” As the form is most probably an aorist (for the simple reason that *iṣānyā-* is the present) this is a strong argument against its origin from a 3rd pl. present. The aorist was rather created by simply removing the present suffix –*ya-*; cf. *tīpyati* : *ātrpat*. (In Greek the present type $\chi\alpha\nu\delta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$ is explained from –*C-ṇ-H-*; RIX 1976, 211.)

6. It seems obvious to explain *iṣānyā-* from the stem *iṣaṇ-* if this continued –*ṇH-*, with the suffix –*ya-*, cf. *gr̥bhā-yāti*. (This consideration makes it probable that the type *gr̥bhāyāti* was created when the suffix still had the shape –*nH-*, as it is improbable that the –*ā-* was taken from the 1st or 2nd pl., and the 3rd pl. had –*an-* when the two forms mentioned had –*ā-*.) However, deverbative –*anya-* mostly does not correspond with nasal presents. JASANOFF 1983 suggested that this suffix was connected with Hitt. –*annie-*, and this idea was worked out by OETTINGER 1992 [1994]. He proposed that it originated from a root enlargement –*en/n-* with –*je/o-*. He thinks (p. 150) that

Indo-Iranian requires *-enie-*, but it could as well be *-ñie-* as in Greek *-αινω*, which we would expect if the suffix is of PIE date.³

Bibliography

- DEMIRAJ, B. 1997. Albanische Etymologien. Amsterdam/Atlanta.
- DEMIRAJ, SH. 1993. Historische Grammatik der albanischen Sprache. Wien.
- GARCÍA-RAMÓN, J.L. 1985. Die Sekundärendung der 1. Sg. Medii im Indogermanischen. Grammatische Kategorien, Funktion und Geschichte, edd. B. SCHLERATH — V. RITTNER. Wiesbaden, Reichert, 202–217.
- GOTŌ, T. 1987. Die “I. Präsensklasse” im Vedischen. Wien.
- INSLER, S. 1971. Some Problems of IE **ə* in Avestan. *Language* 47, 573–585.
- JASANOFF, J.H. 1983. The IE. “*ā*-Preterite” and Related Forms. *IF* 88, 54–83.
- KELLENS, J. 1984. Le verbe avestique. Wiesbaden.
- KORTLANDT, F.H.H. 1981. 1st sg. middle **-H₂*. *IF* 86, 123–136.
- MACDONELL, A.A. 1910. Vedic Grammar. Strassburg.
- NARTEN, J. 1982. Präsensstämme *hr̥nāyá-*, *hr̥ñīyá-* und Verwandtes. *MSS* 41, 139–149.
- OETTINGER, N. 1992 [1994]. Zu den Verben auf vedisch *-anyá-* und hethitisch *-annie-*. *MSS* 53, 133–154.
- PETERS, M. 1980. Untersuchungen zur Vertretung der indogermanischen Laryngale im Griechischen. Wien.
- RENOU, L. 1952. Grammaire de la langue védique. Paris/Lyon.
- RIX, H. 1976. Historische Grammatik des Griechischen. Darmstadt.
- DE SAUSSURE, F. 1878. Mémoire sur le système primitif des voyelles dans les langues indo-européennes. Leipzig.

³ OETTINGER 149 compares *ὑφαίνω* with Alb. *ve(n)j* but B. DEMIRAJ 1997, 413 points out that **uebh-niō* would have given **vem*. The Albanian suffix *-ñiō*, which became very productive (Sh. DEMIRAJ 1993, 260–263), should be studied in its totality.