

REMARKS ON THE VEDIC INTENSIVE*

A. LUBOTSKY

LEIDEN UNIVERSITY

The emphasis of the book under review lies on the semantics of the Vedic intensive. The author conclusively shows that the Vedic intensive has no demonstrable intensive or affective meaning at all and that in the majority of instances it displays an iterative or repetitive function. The morphological analysis, however, can be refined in several aspects. This review essay takes up a few morphological and etymological points where the author's treatment seems insufficient or where some further progress can be achieved.

THIS BOOK, WHICH REPRESENTS a revised version of Christiane Schaefer's 1989 doctoral dissertation, addresses various problems of the intensive, a fascinating, but rather neglected category of the Vedic verb. It consists of two parts of more or less equal length: the general part (I. "Vorbemerkungen," pp. 11–14; II. "Morphologie," pp. 15–71; III. "Semantik," pp. 72–100) and the discussion of the forms arranged in accordance with the verbal root (IV. "Monographischer Teil," pp. 101–208). The book is concluded by indices and a bibliography.

The emphasis of the book lies on the semantics of the intensive. Not only in chapter III, which is dedicated to this subject, but also in the discussion of the separate intensive formations, S. primarily deals with meaning. She conclusively shows that the Vedic intensive has no demonstrable intensive or affective meaning at all and that in the majority of instances it displays an iterative or repetitive function. This result is very important and is one of the major achievements of the book.

Whereas the semantics of the intensive is treated fully and adequately in S.'s book, the morphological analysis can be refined in several aspects. In the following, I shall take up a few morphological and etymological points where I disagree with S.'s position or where, in my opinion, we can reach a little farther.

MORPHOLOGY

The Subjunctive

S. convincingly shows that the intensive subjunctive had zero grade in the root in Indo-Iranian (cf. also GAv.

* This is a review article of: *Das Intensivum im Vedischen*. By CHRISTIANE SCHAEFER. Historische Sprachwissenschaft (Historical Linguistics), Ergänzungsheft 37. Göttingen: VAN-DENHOECK & RUPRECHT, 1994. Pp. 238.

vōiuuidāiti (ē Y 30.8). The only serious exception to this rule in Vedic¹ is the subjunctive of *√han-* 'to slay', viz., *janghanas*, *janghanat*, etc. S. explains these forms by Sievers' Law, but I do not think that Sievers' Law was ever operative with the nasals. In order to understand properly the origin of *janghanat*, it should be borne in mind that the first *n* of **nCn* clusters was regularly lost already in Indo-Iranian times.² The Avestan intensive to this root is (*ni-*)*jjamante*, (*auua-*)*jjamañ*, etc., with the expected loss of the first *-n-*. The Vedic speakers presumably considered the heavy reduplication essential to the formation, so that this *n* was reintroduced into the reduplication syllable. Since the cluster *-nghan-* was still awkward, the zero grade of the root *ghan-* was replaced by *-ghan-* (note that *-ghan-* may also be a reflex of the zero grade, e.g., in the pf. ptc. *jaghanvān*, with **ñ > an* before a resonant).³

¹ *sanišvanat*, which, incidentally, S. forgot to include in her "Monographischer Teil", may be due to the fact that *√svan-* has no zero grade. Moreover, it is a *set-* root, so that **^osunH-a-* would regularly yield *^osvana-*. *parpharat* is an artificial formation.

² Cf. for this rule Hoffman 1952: 130f. = 1976: 366, who points to forms like *RV yujmahe < *yujmahe*, *AV rudhmañ < *rundhmañ*, *RV agasmahi < *agamasmahi*, *GAv mēhmaidī* next to *mēnghi*.

³ In the active participle, however, *-ghan-* in the function of zero grade was probably less acceptable, cf. also subj. *dardirat* vs. ptc. *dārdrat* from the root *dr-* with a comparable syllabification pattern. The descriptive full grade in the ptc. is further only attested in *nānnamat* (8.43.8), where the cluster *-mm-* was evidently impossible, and the nonce form *pānīphañat*. The intensive active participle from *√han-* shows a remarkable variety of forms: next to the "normal" nom. sg. *apa-janghanat* (9.49.5) and *janghanat* (9.66.24c), we find gen. sg. *janghnatas* with a unique cluster (in the next verse, 25a!), and further nom. sg. *ghānighnat* (9.90.6), dat. sg. *ni-ghānighnate* (1.55.5) with

The fact that the subjunctive has zero grade in the root is of considerable importance. First of all, we get rid of the “thematic” intensives, which can now be explained as subjunctives. Secondly, it becomes clear that 1sg. *dedīsam* (RV 8.74.15) is a subjunctive and consequently, that *-am* can function as a 1sg. subjunctive ending, which was already proposed by Insler (1966: 228). As indicated by S., zero grade subjunctives are very rare in Vedic, but they point to the great antiquity of the formation. Apart from the intensive, zero grade in the subjunctive is only regular with roots in *-ā* in the reduplicated present (*dādah*, *dadhaḥ*, *dadat*, *dadhat*, *dadhan*, *dādhasē*, *dādhatē*, Av. *dadat*). We find several zero grade subjunctives in the perfect (*jūjuvat*, *śūśuvāt* vs. *śūśāvāma*, *vāvṛdhate*, *vāvṛdhāti*, *jujuṣan* vs. *jūjoṣaḥ*), but these forms are incidental and are hardly old.

The Reduplication

S. treats the reduplication on pp. 22–35 (synchronic analysis) and pp. 52–71 (the historical development). She correctly remarks that, historically speaking, the “heavy” reduplication of the intensive involves repetition of the second consonant of the root. In a synchronic analysis, she distinguishes four types which largely depend on the structure of the root:

Type I *Kā-*: root structure $K_1(R)\check{a}K_2$ (K_1 = any consonant, K_2 = an obstruent), e.g., *nānad-* : *√nad-*, *śāśvas-* : *√śvas-*.

In this category there is some overlapping with the perfect formations which sometimes show long reduplication. In order to distinguish between the two, we can use the accent, since the intensive normally has initial accentuation, in contradistinction to the perfect where we find final accentuation. This is not an absolute criterion, however. On the one hand, we find initially accented perfect forms, and intensives with final accentuation, on the other. For instance, *śāśadāna-*, which seems to belong to the system of the perfect (*śāśadūḥ*, *śāśadrē*), has initial accentuation. This word has probably exerted influence on *śūśujāna-* (book x, twice) used in the same context (*tanvā śūśujāna-* at the end of the line vs. *tanvā śāśadāna-* in the same position in RV 1.123.10a, 124.6c). Two more perfect medial participles have initial accentuation, viz., *śūśuvāna-* and *tūtujāna-* (next to *tūtujānā-*).

Forms with unambiguous intensive reduplication, but with final accentuation, must be considered intensive perfects, e.g., *badbadhé*, *sarsré*, *badbadhānā-*, *marmṛjānā-*.

S.’s attitude towards these forms is ambivalent. For instance, *badbadhé* is called 3sg. pf. middle in the table on p. 18, but on p. 156 it appears as 3sg. present, although in the discussion she says that these forms are “ihrer Funktion nach Perfekta.” On the contrary, *badbadhānā-* on p. 156 is labeled “ptc. pf.” but on p. 18 “ptc. pres.” As to *marmṛjānā-*, S. calls it a present ptc. both on p. 18 and on p. 167f., where the root *mṛj-* is treated, in spite of the fact that this is no doubt a participle of the intensive perfect, not only because of its accentuation, but also because of its passive meaning ‘cleaned’—cf. the perfect middle *māmṛjē*, which always displays this meaning when used without preverbs.

In a similar fashion, *vāvaśānā-* and *vāvaśre* can belong to the medial perfects of the intensive (as opposed to the plain perfect *vavāśire*). See further below.

It is clear that for some isolated formations the choice between the perfect and intensive perfect is difficult. A case in point is *rāraḥṣānā-* (*√raḥṣ-* ‘to protect’). It is unclear to me how S. interprets this form. On p. 18, *rāraḥṣānā-* appears in the table among the intensives, but it is not treated in the “Monographischer Teil,” and in the discussion of the reduplication (p. 27ff.) *rāraḥṣ-* is mentioned a few times without a clear statement on the matter. Considering the fact that *rāraḥṣānā-* (4.3.14b) is used in the same stanza with *vāvṛdhānā-* (4.3.14d), which is a perfect participle, we can safely assume the same interpretation for *rāraḥṣānā-*.

Yet another ambiguous case is *āvāvacit*, which can be taken as an intensive or as a pluperfect of *√vac-*. S. opts for an intensive, which is a possible choice, but forgets to mention the form in the discussion of the ambiguous formations (note that Macdonell [1910: 364] and Leumann [1952: 24], for instance, take *āvāvacit* to be a pluperfect).

Type II *Ke/o-*: root structure $(s)K(R)i/u(K)$, e.g., *cēkit-* : *√cīt-*, *rōruc-* : *√ruc-*.

Two roots in final *-ū* vacillate between type II and type IV, viz., *nōnavīti*, *nonumas*, *anonavur* vs. *navīnot*, and *dodhavīti*, *dódhuvat* vs. *davidhāva*, *dávidhvat*. S. admits that she is unable to account for the distribution of *nōnavīti*, etc., vs. *navīnot* (p. 69). The disyllabic reduplication of *navīnot* is most probably due to the fact that the expected **nonot* (older **naṇṇaṇt*) was considered awkward by the Vedic speakers and had to be avoided, the first *-u-* being prone to dissimilation.⁴ In the 3sg. imperfect, the normal way to repair the form was to add

⁴ It is well known that Vedic shows many examples of labial dissimilation, and, incidentally, S. points to a fine example of such dissimilation in the intensive (p. 143f.), viz. *nānnamīti*, *nānnamat* (< **nam-nam-*) vs. *nānnate*, *ānannata*.

the secondary disyllabic reduplication, which is the usual solution for intensive forms with double initial consonant in the root, see below.

the ending *-it* (cf. *áyoyavīt*, *ároravīt*, *ájohavīt*), but in the injunctive this ending was inappropriate,⁵ so that there was no other choice than to introduce the disyllabic reduplication.

The interchange of *do-* and *davi-* is of a different order. The locus of the disyllabic reduplication is the participle, where we find the following distribution: nom. sg. *dódhuvat* (books II, IX, and X), *dávidhvat* (book IV), *dávidhvāt* (metrically *dávidh^uvat*) (book VIII), gen sg. *dávidhvatas*⁶ (book X), nom. pl. *dávidhvatas* (books II, IV [twice]). These forms seem to point to an original paradigm nom. sg. *dódhuvat*, gen. sg., nom. pl. *dávidhvatas*. The only deviation from this pattern in the family books is 4.13.2b *dávidhvat*, which occurs in the same hymn as 4.13.4c *dávidhvatas*. This paradigm is obviously the result of Sievers' Law, which was only operative in the final syllable (Schindler 1977: 62), so that **daud^huat*, *daud^huatas* yielded **daud^hu^uat*, *daud^hu^uatas*. The form **daud^hu^uatas* had an impossible cluster and was replaced by *dávidhvatas*, which at the same time explains why we here find *d-* and not *dh-* (as opposed to *bháribhrati* vs. *járbhr-*, *ghánighnat* vs. *jánghan-* with the recent complete restructuring of the reduplication). The int. pf. *davidhāva* (*śrīngā davidhāva* 1.140.6) is most probably an artificial form based on 8.60.13b (*śrīnge dávidh^uvat*). 1.140 is a hymn playing with reduplication and intensives, and it is only to be expected that some of the forms are nonce.

In some of the participles, the analogy went in the opposite direction, cf. nom. pl. *nónuvatas* (8.92.33), *jóhuvatas* (7.93.3).

Type III *KaR-*: root structure (s)K(R)aR(K), e.g., *dardar-/dard(i)r-*: *√dr-*, *caṅkram-*: *√kram-*.

Also this type had to compete with type IV. We have already seen the interaction of *janghan-* and *ghanighn-* (see note 3). In a similar fashion, the ptc. to *tartariti* is *táritrat-*. It is peculiar that in old and frequently attested intensives *dar-dr-* (cf. Av. *niždarə.dariiā*) and *sar-sr-*,

the cluster *rCr* does not seem to present problems, ptc. *dádrat-* (book VI) vs. younger 3sg. subj. *dardirat* (book VIII), 3pl. impf. *adardirur* (book X); 3du. med. *sarsrāte* (book III), 3sg. pf. med. *sarsré* (books II, VI), ptc. *sársrāna-* (book V [twice]). On the other hand, in more "recent" intensives this cluster is avoided, and type IV reduplication has been introduced instead (*kárikr-*, *táritr-*, *bháribhr-*).

Type IV *KaRi⁷-*: root structure (s)K(R)aR(K), e.g., *kárikr-*: *√kr-*, *várivrj-*: *√vrj-*.

Type IV reduplication has become productive in those formations where the root began with two consonants because it helped to avoid difficult clusters. The late expansion of this type explains the forms like *gháni-ghn-*, *bháribhr-* without Grassmann's dissimilation and without palatalization of the initial consonant. Non-palatal offset is further found in *kárikrat*, *gánigmat-iganiganti*, *kánikra(n)d-*, and *kániṣkan* (*√skand-*), which is attested in the late "Anhang"-hymn 7.103 and seems to be younger than *caṅskadat* (8.69.9). For *dávidhvat*, see above. *páni-phaṇat* (4.40.4) is a nonce formation built in parallel to *saṃtávit^uvat* in the preceding pāda. If we leave out of consideration roots beginning with two consonants and other evidently secondary formations discussed above (i.e., *ganiganti* without palatalization, *navinot*, etc.), there remains a very small group of forms where we can look for the origin of disyllabic reduplication: *várivrjat*, *varivarti* (plus a few other forms from *√vrt-*), and three nominal formations, viz., plus *yaviyúdh-*, *vánivan-*, *saris^upá-*.

S. follows Beekes' explanation (1981) of this peculiar reduplication as being original in roots with an initial laryngeal: **HCeR-HCoR-* > Skt. *CaRi-CaR-*. Beekes was unable to find a root of this structure among type IV intensives, but as S. points out (p. 63), the intensive stem *várivrj-* to the root *vrj-* 'to bend', PIE **h₂/₃uerǵ-*, provides the model Beekes was looking for. I would suggest

⁵ As was pointed out by Leumann 1952: 23ff., the secondary endings *-is*, *-it* belong with 3pl. *-ur*. Since the latter ending does not occur in the intensive injunctive (see below), it is understandable that *-it* is limited to the intensive imperfect. A similar distribution is found in the pluperfect, where we find *acucyavīt*, *ájagrabhūt*, *arirecūt*, *ávāvacūt*, *avāvarīt*, but *rārán*. An exception is *dadharsīt*, which is a hybrid aorist formation, cf. Hoffmann 1967: 89.

⁶ This form is analyzed by S. as 3du. pres. (after Grassmann), which is impossible because of the thematic ending and the transitive construction (cf. Geldner ad 10.96.9). On p. 138 S. herself writes that the dual *śipre* is the object of *dávidhvatas*.

⁷ The distribution between the short and long vowels has been established by Kuryłowicz (1939-)1949: the long vowel appears before a single consonant, the short one before a cluster. The same distribution is found in the reduplication syllable of the reduplicated aorist. S. (p. 56, n. 123) mentions an additional condition suggested to her by E. Tichy, viz., that a short vowel also appears before a long vowel in the root. The evidence consists of the intensive perfect *davidhāva* and red. aor. *dīdīpāḥ*. Both forms are clearly secondary (to the ptc. *dávidhvat* and the caus. *dīpayāḥ*, respectively), however, and there are counterexamples like *navinot* (the rule claiming that a long vowel here behaves differently from a diphthong cannot be phonetically justified).

yavīyúdh- as another possible candidate, in view of the lengthening in compounds *amitrā-yúdh-* ‘fighting with the enemies’, Av. *aspāiiaoḍa-* ‘horse-fighter’, *frāiiaoḍa-* n.pr., which provides an indication that the root *yudh-* began with a laryngeal (cf. Mayrhofer, *EWAia*, s.v. YODH).

S. presents an attractive (at least, at first sight) scenario for the fact that some of the roots with an initial laryngeal (like *mṛj-* < **H₃mṛǵ-*) do not have disyllabic reduplication (pp. 63ff.). She assumes that the so-called Saussure-Hirt’s Law, according to which a laryngeal is dropped in the neighborhood of IE *o*-vocalism, has affected the forms of the intensive singular, e.g., 3sg. **HCeR-HCoR-ti* > **HCeR-CoR-ti*, but 1pl. **HCeR-HCR-me* > **HCeRḤCR-me* with disyllabic reduplication.⁸ Unfortunately, we cannot demonstrate this on the basis of the attested forms. The only root in the above-mentioned group of unambiguous formations which shows alternation in the reduplication syllable is *√vrt-*, and we find the following forms:

Type III: 3sg. *vārvarti*, 3pl. *vārvrtati*, ptc. act. *āvārvrtat-*, ptc. med. *vārvrtāna-*

Type IV: 3sg. *varivarti*, 3sg. impf. *avarivar*, 3pl. *avarivur* (analogical).

Especially puzzling is the co-occurrence of *vārvarti* and *varivarti* in one and the same hymn, 1.164 (verses 11 and 31, respectively).

The Endings

The intensive shows a very archaic pattern of the 3pl. endings, which has escaped S.’s attention. In the 3pl. imperfect active we find *-ur*, which is a regular replacement of **-at* < **-nt* (*ádardirur*, *anonavur*, *ájohavur*, analogical *ā-avarivur* from the root *vrt-*, and AV *acarkṣur*), whereas the 3pl. injunctive has the ending *-an* (*carkiran*, *pāpatan*, *dauidyutan*, *śośucan*).⁹ The pattern of **-nt* in

the imperfect vs. **-ent* in the injunctive has been postulated for the Indo-European verb by Kortlandt 1987: 219ff., 1988: 63f., but this is the first time that we have the real attestation of this system. For the endings *-is*, *-it*, *-itām*, which are only found in the imperfect, but not in the injunctive, see note 5.

In the middle voice, the situation is less transparent. For 3pl. injunctive, S. gives the following forms (p. 16): *caṅkramata*, *marmṛjata*, *sanīṣṇata* with the ending *-ata* vs. *nonuvanta*, *vāvaśanta*, *johuvanta*,¹⁰ *jāṅghananta* with the ending *-anta*. Some of the latter forms may represent subjunctives.¹¹ For instance, *jāṅghananta* (*RV* 1.88.2d) is likely to be a subjunctive (cf. Jamison 1983: 49). The first stanza of this Marut hymn is an invitation to the Maruts to come to the worshippers, while stanzas 2 and 3 describe the Maruts’ appearance. In this description, *jāṅghananta* stands between the present *yānti* in 2b and the subj. *kṛnavante* in 3b.

In a similar fashion, *johuvanta* (7.21.7d) may be a subjunctive (pace S., p. 206, n. 619). The pāda (*-īndram vājasya johuvanta sātaú* ‘they will invoke Indra again and again in the struggle for booty’) seems to be used in parallel to 6d (*nā śátrur ántam vividad yudhá te* ‘an adversary will not experience the end of your [power] in a fight’). The contexts of the other occurrence of *jāṅghananta* (2.31.2) and *nonuvanta* (4.22.4) are ambiguous, but a subjunctive cannot be excluded (cf. already Jamison 1983: 49 for *jāṅghananta*).¹²

The status of *vāvaśanta* is not easy to determine. We find two types of reduplicated formations with the root *vāś-* ‘to bellow’: *vavāśire* (2.2.2), on the one hand, and the long reduplication *vāvaś-*, on the other. The former must be a regular perfect middle, but for the forms with *vāvaś-* we have the choice between the intensive and the intensive perfect.¹³ It seems to me that 3 pl. med. *vāvaśre* (9.94.2) with its perfect ending and the ptc. *vāvaśānā-* (14 times) with the final accentuation typical

the speakers of Vedic because of its two *rs*, who substituted for the ending *-ur*, *-an* in this verb.

¹⁰ The accented *johuvanta*, given by S. on p. 16, is a mistake.

¹¹ The subjunctives always have the 3pl. ending *-anta* (*marmṛjanta*, *śośucanta*, *jarhṣanta*). S.’s account on p. 45 is confused: *jarhṣanta* and *marmṛjanta* (incidentally, given by S. with an accent mark) are first called injunctives, and then, in the same sentence, *marmṛjanta* is called subjunctive.

¹² Hoffmann 1967: 187 takes *nonuvanta* as injunctive, but it stands after the present *bhárati*, and its connection with the preceding injunctives is broken. I think that a subjunctive interpretation is conceivable.

¹³ There are no instances of perfects from the long vowel roots with long reduplication and shortening of the root syllable.

⁸ A comparable explanation of long reduplication in the perfect (e.g., 3sg. **H₂e-(H)₂ord^h-e* / 3pl. **H₂e-H₂rd^h-r* > *vavárdha* / *vāvrdhúh*) proposed by S. on p. 68, n. 171, was offered to me many years ago by the late Joki Schindler (including this particular example).

⁹ The anomalous full grade in *anonavur* and *ájohavur* is most probably due to the influence of the pluperfect (*ácucyavur*), cf. also 3pl. red. aor. *aśuśravur* (X¹), 3pl. red. pres. *ájuhavur* (X²). S. (p. 35, n. 45) invokes the 3pl. form *abibharur*, but this form is only attested in the brāhmaṇas (*TS*, *KS*, etc.), whereas the *RV* has *abibhran*. Seemingly, the expected 3pl. form *abibhrur*, attested in the *MS*, was considered awkward by

of a perfect, clearly point to the fact that the stem *vāvaś-* was associated with intensive perfect in Vedic. This has as a consequence that *avāvaśītām* is 3du. int. ppf. act., *āvāvaśanta* 3pl. int. ppf. middle, and, finally, *vāvaśanta* 3pl. int. pf. injunctive middle.¹⁴ This accounts for the ending *-anta*, which is the only attested ending of the 3pl. middle in the pluperfect, cf. *ātivīṣanta*, *ādardṛhanta*, inj. *caḅṛpānta*. The only exceptional form is the active ptc. *vāvaśati-* (4.50.5), which can be compared to the secondary ptc. *jāgrat-* to the perfect *jāgāra*.

We may conclude that the regular 3pl. medial ending of the intensive injunctive is *-ata*, whereas *-anta* belongs either to the subjunctive, or to the perfect injunctive.

ETYMOLOGY

Finally, I would like to offer a short comment on the etymology of two roots, vs. *√kāś-* and *√jamh-*.

Root kāś- (pp. 102–4)

S. convincingly argues that the intensive *cākaṣīti* means 'beschauen, betrachten', so that we have to postulate the original meaning 'to see, to cast a look' for the root. My only criticism concerns S.'s remark that the intensive is "im Rigveda die einzige Verbalbildung zur Wurzel" (p. 102). In the older literature, the present *cāṣte*, 3pl. *cāḅṣate* 'to see, cast a look' was considered a reduplicated present to *√kāś-* (i.e. < **k^wek^wk-*), and I believe that this view is correct. The present *cāṣte* exhibits exactly the same range of meanings proposed by S. for *√kāś-*,¹⁵ is used with the same preverbs and in similar contexts. Nowadays, however, the derivation of *cāḅṣ-* from **k^wek^wk-* is considered untenable¹⁶ because Vedic *cāḅṣ-* and Iranian **čaš-* show the same reflexes as if they represented PIE **k^wek^s-*. This is correct, but it does not mean that Skt. *kṣ*, Ir. *š* cannot reflect **k^wk-*. We now know that Skt. *kṣ*, Ir. *š* can go back to PIE **t^k* (cf. Skt. *takṣ-*, Ir. **taš-* 'to fashion by cutting' < PIE **tet^k-*, Gr. τέκτων), in spite of the fact that the exact details of the

¹⁴ S.'s assertion that the latter form belongs to the intensive because it is accented on the reduplication syllable (p. 180) is due to a mistake: on the same page she mistakenly accents the form on the reduplication syllable in the 1.62.3 passage.

¹⁵ All alleged examples of the meaning 'erscheinen, sich zeigen', given by Grassmann, must be translated 'sehen, beschauen'; see Geldner's translation ad loc.

¹⁶ Cf., for instance, Mayrhofer 1986–: 523: "Ved. *cāḅṣ-* (iran. **čaš*) kann nicht ohne Weiteres als redupliziertes *ca-kṣ-* ~ *KĀŠ* gedeutet werden . . ."

phonetic development are not entirely clear. It therefore seems probable that **k^wk-* developed in a similar fashion (possibly, **k^wek^wk-* > **čak^s-* > **čatt^s-* > PIIr. **čats-*, yielding Ir. **čaš-*, Skt. **caṣ-* > *cakṣ-*, cf. Burrow 1959: 88). Also *cāḅṣus-* n. 'eye', which is best analyzed as an original perfect participle (Leumann 1952: 105), points to the development **k^wk-* > Skt. *kṣ*, Ir. *š*.

Root jamh- (pp. 122–25)

S.'s notation of the root as *jamh-* is unfortunate. Its only attestation is int. *jāṅgahe*, found in *RV* 1.126.6, *AVŚ* 5.19.4 (= *AVP* 9.19.1) and *AVP* 19.34.7, which points to the root *ga(m)h-*. The meaning of the verb is disputed. In the difficult *RV* passage with its many hapaxes, it is said about a wanton girl:

āgadhitā pārigadhītā
yā kaṣikēva jāṅgahe
dādāti māhyaṃ yāduri
yāśūnām bhojyā śatā

Geldner translates: "Die angedrückt, umarmt wie das Ichneumonweibchen sich abzappelt, die wollüstige gewährt mir hundert Liebesgenüsse." S. suggested that the verb here means 'krümmt sich wiederholt, biegt sich immer wieder hoch', with references to the description of the copulation of ichneumons in the zoological literature. This meaning does not seem to fit *AVŚ* 5.19.4, however:

brahmagavī pacyāmānā yāvat sabbhī vijāṅgahe
tējo rāṣṭrāsya nīr hanti nā virō jāyate vṛṣā

"The Brahman's cow being cooked, as far as she penetrates (?), smites out the brightness of the kingdom; no virile hero is born [there]." (Whitney)

S. interprets *pādas ab* 'solange die Brahmanenkuh beim Braten sich zu seinen Schaden (Stück für Stück) auseinander biegt . . .' (p. 125), which, to my mind, does not produce a satisfactory sense. I believe that the best explanation for *vijāṅgahe* is given in *VWC* (s.v.), where this form is connected with *gandhā-* 'smell'. The *AV* passage thus gets a perfectly plausible interpretation: as far as the smell of the cooking of the brahman's cow reaches, it destroys the splendor of the kingdom, and no valiant sons are born there. We may find some support for this analysis in *AVP* (Kashmir) 19.34.7, which S. unfortunately left out of consideration, since, in her opinion, it provides "keinen brauchbaren Kontext zur Bedeutungsbestimmung" (p. 123). The passage is corrupt, indeed, but it does supply us with important information. It reads: *tvam atvamaṃ surabhiṣāṃ mādhyaṃ havator ami tayā vidur dhi jāṅgahe datvā varcasā dade*. Reading *uttamaṃ* for the evidently corrupt *atvamaṃ*, we get *tvam uttamaṃ*

surabhiṣāṃ ‘you are the highest of the fragrant ones’,¹⁷ which is a strong indication that *jaṅgahe* in pāda *c* means ‘smells’. Admittedly, for a definitive conclusion we have to wait for the edition of the Orissa version of the *AVP*.

We may therefore assume that (*vi*)*jaṅgahe* is an intensive to the root *gandh-* ‘to smell’. As I have tried to show elsewhere (Lubotsky 1995), one of the typical positions where *-dh-* > *-h-* is exactly *-VdhV#*. The advantage of this analysis is further that (*vi*)*jaṅgahe* can be explained as a derivative of the root attested elsewhere in Vedic.

Let us now return to the *ṚV* passage. It is well known that ichneumons are famous for their smell. When squeezed at their back, they emit a strong musk-like odor. The only problem is that this concerns males, whereas the form *kaśikā* (a hapax!) seems to indicate a female. I do not think that this is a decisive counter-argument, however, because *kaśikā-*, in spite of its gender, may be a generic name for the species and not specifically refer to a female, cf. *godhā-* f. ‘big lizard, alligator’, etc. An additional argument in favor of the interpretation of *jaṅgahe* as an intensive to *√gandh-* is the fact that the poet of 1.126 obviously plays with two different meanings of this root (*āgadhitā pārigadhitā yā kaśikēva jaṅgahe* “squeezed, embraced, she smells like an ichneumon”).

CORRIGENDA

Let me repeat that S.’s book is an important and useful contribution to the study of the Vedic intensive, which offers new insights and sharp analyses of many difficult problems. It is only a pity that the value of the book is strongly diminished by many mistakes, omissions, and inaccuracies on the part of the author. There are scores of wrong accents, omitted length marks and other omitted or wrong diacritics, inaccurately cited and translated text passages, wrong alphabetic order in the “Monographischer Teil” (pp. 111–13) and in the indices (passim), preverbs indiscriminately written together with the verbal form or separately or with a dash, wrong numbers of the passages cited, erroneously repeated headings (e.g., on pp. 18, 33–34, 135, 203), etc. In addition to what has been mentioned above, I here give a list of the most disturbing errors.

- P. 15, l. 25: Delete *vāvaciti*.
 P. 16, l. 9: *veviyate* belongs to the forms cited in the next line.

- P. 18, l. 12: Read: *séśidhat*.
 P. 18, ll. 30–31: Delete *rāraḥṣāṇās*. Note that *badbadhānā-* and *marmrjānā-* are int. pf. participles and must be removed from this list.
 P. 19, l. 23: Read: *jāgarti*.
 P. 27, n. 29: *vānīvanās* (S. gives *vānīvanās* in the text and in the index) is nom. pl. of an adjective and not an intensive participle. Since S. does not include this form in her “Monographischer Teil,” this must also be her opinion. Nevertheless, this unattested verbal stem appears further at p. 34, l. 26.
 P. 35, l. 8: Add *sarisppā-*, which is found in the *RV*.
 P. 46, n. 80: S. cites Gotō 1987: 153 and n. 238, who argues that *jārant-* ‘old’ cannot be an original participle to the present *jāratī* because of fem. *jāratī-*, which points to an athematic formation. Gotō therefore suggests considering *jārant-* an independent adjective. In fact, this fem. is only attested in a late hymn, 9. 112 (“Anhang”), and merely shows that at some period *jārant-* was indeed felt to be an adjective, to which the fem. was built in accordance with the pattern *brhánt-* : *brhatī-*, but this is by no means the original situation.
 P. 70, l. 5: Delete *bóbhuvati* (=AV).
 P. 70, l. 21: Read 3. du. med. *sarsrāte* for 3. pl. med. *sarsrate*.
 P. 106, l. 3: Read “VIII 20, 19” for “VIII 22, 6.”
 P. 109, l. 14: Read: (*abhi-*)*kānikradat* I³, II², IV, V², IX²³, X².
 P. 112, l. 9: Add voc. *cekitāna* II 33, 15.
 P. 114, l. 8: Read: *prāti jóguve* I 127, 10 = V 64, 2.
 P. 114, l. 9: Read: *úpa jóguvānas*.
 P. 135, l. 21: Add *ā-dardirā-* (VIII 100, 4; X 78, 6).
 P. 135, n. 395: Read: *RV* I 133, 6.
 P. 138, l. 10: Add VII 21, 4.
 P. 141, l. 22: Read: III 2, 11.
 P. 151, n. 448: *apāvrtā-*, *ānapāvrt-* do not contain two preverbs, *āpa* and *ā*, but only *āpa* with a regular lengthening before the root *vṛ-*.
 P. 152, n. 449: (lines 4–5) read “Perfekt des Intensivs” for “Perfekt des Partizips.” The rule proposed in Lubotsky 1981 is cited incorrectly. Read “VHD > VD,

¹⁷ Barret’s reconstruction (1940: 53), *tvam uttamaṃ surā-dhasāṃ*, is probably wrong.

	when followed by a consonant (D = any voiced unaspirated stop)."	P. 192, l. 9:	Read: I 164, 31 = X 177, 3.
P. 154, l. 2:	Read: I 30, 16.	P. 202, bottom:	Add $\sqrt{\text{svan}}^i$ - 'to resound', 3sg. subj. act. <i>saniṣvanat</i> VIII 69, 9.
P. 175, l. 23:	Read: (= X 8, 1).	P. 203, l. 9:	Read: IX 66, 24.
P. 175, l. 28:	Add IX 71, 2.	P. 203, l. 20:	Read "zwei" for "drei."

REFERENCES

- Barret, L. C. 1940. *The Kashmirian Atharva Veda*, books nineteen and twenty. New Haven.
- Beekes, R. S. P. 1981. The disyllabic reduplication of the Sanskrit intensives. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 40: 19–25.
- Burrow, Th. 1959. On the phonological history of Sanskrit *kṣām*- 'earth', *fkṣa*- 'bear' and *likṣā* 'nit'. *JAOS* 79: 85–90.
- Geldner, K. F. *Der Rig-Veda, aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt und mit einem laufenden Kommentar versehen*, 4 vol., Cambridge, Mass., 1951–57.
- Gotō, T. 1987. *Die "I. Präsensklasse" im Vedischen*. Wien.
- Hoffmann, K. 1952. Zur vedischen Verbalflexion, *MSS* 2: 121–37.
- _____. 1967. *Der Injunktiv im Veda*. Heidelberg.
- _____. 1976. *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik*, ed. J. Narten. Band 2. Wiesbaden.
- Insler, S. 1966. Vedic *ivāyā*, *IF* 71: 221–35.
- Jamison, S. W. 1983. Two problems in the inflection of the Vedic intensive, *MSS* 42: 41–73.
- Kortlandt, F. 1987. Archaic ablaut patterns in the Vedic verb. In *Festschrift for Henry Hoenigswald on the occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. G. Cardona and N. H. Zide. Tübingen, 219–23.
- _____. 1988. The Greek 3rd pl. endings, *MSS* 49: 63–69.
- Kurylowicz, J. (1939-)1949. Les racines seř et la loi rythmique *i/i*. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 15: 1–24.
- Leumann, M. 1952. *Morphologische Neuerungen im altindischen Verbalsystem*. Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, afd. Letterkunde, nieuwe reeks, deel 15, no. 3. Pp. 73–123.
- Lubotsky, A. 1981. Gr. *pégnumi*: Skt. *pajrá*- and loss of laryngeals before mediae in Indo-Iranian. *MSS* 40: 133–38.
- _____. 1989. The Vedic *-āya*-formations. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 32: 89–113.
- _____. 1995. Sanskrit *h* < $*d^h$, b^h . In *Sthāpakaśrāddham: Professor G. A. Zograf Commemorative Volume*, ed. N. V. Gurov and Ja. V. Vasil'kov. Pp. 124–44. St. Petersburg.
- Macdonell, A. A. 1910. *Vedic Grammar*. Strassburg.
- Mayrhofer, M. 1986–. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen [EWAia]*. Heidelberg.
- Schindler, J. 1977. Notizen zum Sieversschen Gesetz. *Die Sprache* 23: 56–65.
- Śāstrī, Viśvabandhu. 1942–63. *A Vedic Word Concordance [VWC] (Vaidikapākānukramakoṣaḥ)*, vol. I: *Samhitās*. Lahore.
- Whitney, W. D. 1905. *Atharva-Veda Samhitā*. Cambridge, Mass.