

THE VEDIC IMPERATIVES *yódhi* ‘FIGHT’ AND *bodhi* ‘HEED’

JAY H. JASANOFF

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

The 2nd sg. imperatives *yódhi* (: *yudh-* ‘fight’) and *bodhi* (: *budh-* ‘awake, heed’) are usually seen as athematic imperatives in *-dhi* with irregular *guṇa* of the root syllable and reduction of the geminate cluster *-ddhi-* to *-dh-*. It is argued here, by contrast, that these forms are actually analogical creations on the basis of the 2nd sg. imperative *jóṣi* (: *juṣ-* ‘enjoy’). Etymologically and historically, *jóṣi* is a “*si-* imperative” (**jóṣ-ṣi*), haplogitized from a 2nd sg. subjunctive **jóṣasi* / **ḡéuseṣi*. Synchronically, however, it appeared to be an “*i-*imperative” based on the gunated root, and the overall parallelism of the verbs *yudh-*, *budh-*, and *juṣ-* led to the creation of *yódhi* and *bodhi* on the same model.

IT WAS FROM READING one of Stanley Insler’s stimulating articles nearly thirty years ago that I first came to appreciate the oddity of the Vedic 2nd sg. imperatives *yódhi* (: *yudh-* ‘fight’) and *bodhi* (: *budh-* ‘awake, heed’).¹ In dedicating this little study to him now, I hope that our honorand will be pleased to see how much my analysis owes to him.

yódhi is a hapax, occurring at *RV* V 3.9:

*áva sprdhi pitáram yódhi vidvān, putrō yás te sahasaḥ sūna
ihé*

Insler (p. 556) translates this passage as follows: “Protect (or free) the father. Knowing how, fight (for him) who is considered thy son . . .” In adopting this interpretation, he specifically upholds the traditional analysis of *yódhi* as a form of *yudh-*, correctly rejecting the attempts of Oldenberg, Geldner, and other scholars to refer it to *yu-* ‘keep away’.² Insler’s stated reason for preferring *yudh-* to *yu-* is functional: transitive *yu-*, he notes, never appears in the *Rigveda* without an overt direct object. But his discussion as a whole reveals another, more intuitive line of thought: since *yódhi* is inseparable from *bodhi*, and since *bodhi* is a form of *budh-*, *yódhi* must be a form of the morphologically parallel root *yudh-*.

bodhi itself—not to be confused with the homophonous but unrelated 2nd sg. impv. *hodhi* (*bodhí*) ‘be(come)’

(: *bhū-*)³—is attested ten times in the *Rigveda*. The typical use is seen in passages like *IV* 3.4:

rtásya bodhi rtacit svādhīh

Being of good attention, be aware of the truth, thou perceiver of truth.

and *VIII* 43.27:

agne sá bodhi me vácaḥ

Agni, be now aware of my words.⁴

Since both *yudh-* and *budh-* have characterized presents in *-ya-* (*yúdhya-*, *búdhya-*), the imperatives *yódhi* and *bodhi* must be classified as root aorists. As active athematic imperatives in *-dhi*, however, they are anomalous in at least two respects: 1) they show single *-dh-* rather than expected **-ddh-* for presumed underlying */-dh-dhi/*; and 2) they have full grade, rather than zero grade, of the root. The expected root-based imperatives of *yudh-* and

¹ I refer, of course, to Insler 1972 (hereinafter “Insler”), especially pp. 556–64.

² See Insler’s discussion, where full references are given. The connection to *yudh-* is maintained by Grassmann, Whitney, and Macdonell.

³ On *bodhí* ‘(be)come’, which was probably accented differently from **bódhi* ‘heed’, see especially Jamison 1997, with literature. Jamison’s point of departure is the present imperative *bhava*; she assumes that this gave monosyllabic **bho*, which was then extended by the addition of the imperative particle *-dhi*. To explain the special development to **bho*, she envisages a precocious Middle Indic sound change of *-ava-* to *-o-*; an alternative might be to start with a truncated imperative **bhav’* (i.e., 1lr. **bhav’*), typologically comparable to Lat. *fac’do*, *dic’* ‘say’, etc.

⁴ Insler’s translations in both passages.

budh—the present vs. aorist distinction makes no difference here—would have been **yuddhí* and **buddhí*. The problem is to explain why these forms seem to have been replaced by *yódhi* and *bodhi*.

Insler (p. 556f., n. 9) attributes the simplification of **-ddhi* to *-dhi* in *yódhi* and *bodhi* to the preceding heavy syllable, comparing the loss of the root-final consonant in *tr̥ndhi* (: *tr̥d-* 'bore'), *pr̥ndhi* (: *pr̥c-* 'mix'), *bhañdhi* (: *bhañj-* 'break'), *rundhí* (AV) (: *rudh-* 'obstruct'), and *vr̥ndhi* (: *vr̥j-* 'twist'). These examples, however, are not satisfying comparanda, since all involve the loss of the medial consonant in sequences of the type *-NC₁C₂-*. The **-ddh-* in **yóddhi* and **boddhi*, by contrast, was for all practical purposes intervocalic, even if—as is not unlikely—the root vowel at the time of the putative phonological reduction was the diphthong **-au-* rather than *-o-*. Clusters, and in particular geminates, were not simplified in this position; direct counterexamples can be seen in agent nouns of the type *yoddhí-* (: *yudh-*), *ceṭṭí-* (: *cit-* 'notice'), *bhettí-* (: *bhid-* 'split'), etc.⁵ An extreme variant of the "reduction" approach underlies Mayrhofer's attempt (1986: 111–12) to place the degemination of **-ddhi* to **-dhi* within Proto-Indo-European. According to Mayrhofer, "im Falle von RV 5, 3, 9 *yódhi* 'wehre ab!' (und in ved. *bodhi* 'merke, sei wachsam!') scheinen Wurzeln auf **^oeu^d* vor dem Morphem *-dhi* die Silbengrenze nach **^oeu-* zu legen, wodurch *^od^hd^hi* in der Position *.TTV* zu *.TV* vereinfacht wurde." This, however, is merely notational sleight-of-hand; it is almost inconceivable that a preform of the type **ⁱeu^dh^hi* could even have been syllabified **ⁱeu.d^hd^hi* in a phonetically meaningful way.

Even more surprising than the apparent reduction of **-ddhi* to *-dhi* is the unexpected gunation of the roots *yudh-*, *budh-* to *yo(dh)-*, *bo(dh)-*. The normal Vedic rule for the formation of aorist and present imperatives in *-dhi* (*-hi*) calls for zero grade of the root; cf. *śrudhí* (: *śru-* 'hear'; root aor.), *kr̥dhí* (: *kr̥-* 'do'; root aor.), *gahí* (: *gam-* 'go'; root aor.), *br̥hí* (: *br̥-* 'say'; root pres.), *ihi* (: *i-* 'go'; root pres.), *dhehí* < **dha(d)zdhi* (: *dhā-* 'put'; reduplicated pres.), *śṛṇuhí* (: *śru-*; nasal pres.), as well as *tr̥ndhi*, *pr̥ndhi*, etc., cited above. Exceptions occur; these, however, are mainly of the type *śagdhi* (: *śak-* 'be able'; root aor.), *edhi* < **azdhi* (: *as-* 'be'; root pres.), *sāhi* (: *sā-* 'bind'; root aor.), and *pāhi* (: *pā-* 'protect'; root

pres.), which illustrate "the overwhelming tendency of roots of the shape (C)CaC and (C)Cā to generalize their full-grade morphemes in root formations" (Insler: 552). *yódhi* and *bodhi* clearly have nothing to do with this phenomenon; roots in medial *-i-*, *-u-*, and *-r-* notoriously retain their inherited zero grades, and even extend zero grade at the expense of full grade in certain grammatical categories. As far as the origin of *yódhi* and *bodhi* is concerned, therefore, one of the following three general scenarios must be correct. Either 1) both forms go back to very ancient—in effect, late PIE—preforms with an atypical but historically justified full grade; or 2) one of *yódhi* and *bodhi* has a historically justified full grade and the other is analogical; or 3) neither *yódhi* and *bodhi* is old, but both are closely modeled on a third form or group of forms with a well-motivated full grade. The first possibility is purely theoretical; no one has ever adduced independent morphological evidence to support the proposition that late or dialectal PIE had both a full-grade **ⁱéudh-dhi^o* and a full-grade **bhéudh-dhi*. Practically speaking, the choices that need to be considered are 2) and 3). These are discussed below.

Insler's proposed solution to the problem of *yódhi* and *bodhi* falls under the broad heading of 2). The root aorist of *yudh-*, as he points out (558f.), is represented in the *Rigveda* not only by the imperative *yódhi*, but also by the 3rd sg. subjunctive *yodhat* and the middle participle *yodhāná-*. Although the full-grade form *yodhāná-*, standing in lieu of expected **yudhāná-*, is virtually unique, it recalls the present middle participle *stāvāna-* / *stavāná-* (: *stu-* 'praise'), with the regular weak vocalism—historically, **e*-grade—of a PIE "Narten" present.⁷ Insler makes no attempt to argue that the root **ⁱeu^dh-* itself formed such a present in the parent language, since the stem *yūdhya-* (< **ⁱudh-ⁱé/^o*) shows every sign of being an IE inheritance. He proposes instead to set up a Narten root aorist, differing in aspect from a Narten present but having the same **ē* : **^oē* ablaut pattern. The aorist middle participle *yodhāná-* (< **ⁱéudh-ono-* or **ⁱéudh-mh₁no-*),⁸

⁶ Or **Hⁱéudh-dhi*; cf. LIV 201f. Since the evidence for the initial laryngeal is inconclusive, the traditional reconstruction with **j-* will be retained here.

⁷ The term, which Insler does not employ, refers to the acrostatic (root-accented) present type with **ē* : **^oē* ablaut, as classically described by Narten (1968).

⁸ The position of the accent in *yodhāná-*, as Insler notes, must be secondary; the shift from acrostatic to "normal" accentuation is also seen in *stavāná-* beside *stāvāna-* and *ohāná-* (: *ūh-* 'consider') beside *ohāna-*.

⁵ While it is perfectly true that these forms could have restored the double dental sequences by analogy, it is hard to see why an analogical process that restored *yoddhí-* for **yodhí-* would not also have restored **yóddhi* for *yódhi*.

under this interpretation, was a typical Narten full-grade weak form; another was the imperative *yó(d)dhi* < **ǵéudh-dhi*. The inherited *yódhi*, according to Insler, triggered the analogical creation of *bodhi*. Crucial for the analogy was the fact that *budh-*, like *yudh-*, formed an active root aorist subjunctive (*bódhat*, *bódhati*, etc.). In proportional terms,

yudh-, subj. *yodhat* : impv. *yódhi* : : *budh-*, subj. *bódhat* :
impv. *X*.

where *X* was solved as *bodhi* (p. 561). As Insler correctly notes, the fact that the root aorist of *budh-* lacks active forms outside the subjunctive (cf. 3 sg. “passive” aor. *ábodhi*, pl. *abudhran* (-*ram*), *budhánta*, ptc. *budhánta-*) makes an analogical origin for *bodhi* likely in any case.

This intuitively attractive account is unfortunately compromised by two facts. The first, which Insler could not possibly have foreseen in 1972, is that Narten aorists—root aorists with **ǵ* : **ǵ̄* ablaut—seem not to have existed as a formal category in PIE. While the parent language did have a handful of root aorists with a Narten-like full grade, rather than zero grade, in the middle (e.g., 3rd sg. **mén-to* ‘brought to mind’ [> GAv. *mantā*]; **h₁ér-to* ‘got moving’ [> Ved. *árta*, ptc. *árāna-*]; etc.), none of these had lengthened-grade actives or, indeed, any active forms at all. More generally, lengthened grade is *nowhere* unambiguously attested or reflected in a root aorist, either in Vedic, Avestan, or any other early IE language.⁹ This is why most current students of the IE verbal system, including Harðarson (1993:57ff.) and LIV (20–21), maintain that, at least in the active, all PIE root aorists were of the “normal,” or **e* : zero apophonic type.¹⁰

⁹ Apparent cases of lengthened-grade root aorists are either secondary or better explained in other ways. Thus, e.g., Lat. *uēnit* ‘came’ and Toch. B *šem* ‘went’ point to a root-form **ǵ^hēm-*, but the original paradigm was probably a normal root aorist with a long vowel that arose through inner-IE sound changes (1st sg. **ǵ^hēm-mi* > **ǵ^hēm*; 2nd sg. **ǵ^hēm-s* > **ǵ^hēm* [→ **ǵ^hēn* |s|?]). Gk. ἐγήρα ‘grew old’ is traced to a lengthened-grade aorist by Peters (1980: 313f.), but the vocalism of this perennially troublesome form is inseparable from that of the present γηράσκω and the noun γῆρας ‘old age’. Pace Adams (1988: 87f.), the Tocharian imperfect/preterite type A *lyāk*, B *lyāka* ‘saw’ is better analyzed as a lengthened-grade (Narten) imperfect than as an aorist; see Weiss 1996: 674 and Jasanoff 1998: 306f., where an equation is suggested with the Latin type *lēgit* ‘read’.

¹⁰ It is important to emphasize, however, that “normal” root aorists were not necessarily the same as “normal” imperfects,

The second difficulty with Insler’s explanation of *yódhi* is that even if it *could* be shown that there were Narten root aorists in PIE, and even if it were known that the root **ǵéudh-* in fact formed such an aorist, there would still be no basis for predicting **ǵéudh-dhi* rather than **ǵudh-dhi* as its imperative. The only interestingly parallel Rigvedic case of a “Narten” imperative in **-dhi*, present or aorist, is *stuhí* (= YAv. **stūdi*) ‘praise’, found nearly two dozen times beside the present *stáuti*.¹¹ While it is not inconceivable that this form replaced an earlier full-grade **stóhi* or (Hr.) **stáudhi*, just as zero-grade *stuvánti* replaced earlier **stávati* (< **stéynti*) in the 3rd pl., the fact remains that there is not a single quotable example of a full-grade Narten imperative of the type allegedly seen in *yódhi*. The proposed derivation of *yódhi* from **ǵéudh-dhi*, in short, is so problematic as to be virtually untenable.

What, then, *can* we say about the origin of *yódhi* and *bodhi*? Insler is obviously right that *bodhi*, as an isolated active form embedded in a basically deponent paradigm, must be analogical.¹² He is also right to stress the morphological parallelism of the roots *yudh-* and *budh-*, which goes far beyond *yódhi*, *bodhi* and the subjunctives *yodhat*, *bódhat(i)*. Thus, e.g., both roots also make class IV (-*ya-*) presents, represented by the multiply attested *yúdhya-* (active and middle) and *búdhya-* (middle only), both with Iranian cognates. The stem *búdhya-* in particular conforms to a well-known Vedic (and, *mutatis mutandis*, IE) pattern. Like a number of other primarily intransitive roots, *budh-* underlies a “stative-intransitive system,” a synchronic array consisting, *inter alia*, of a present in -*ya-* (*búdhya-*), a stative perfect (ptcp. *bubudh-āná-*, subj. *búbodhati*), and an intransitive middle (“passive”) root aorist in 3rd sg. -*i*, 3rd pl. -*ran* / -*ram*

their counterparts in the present system. As repeatedly pointed out by Karl Hoffmann (cf., e.g., Hoffmann 1968: 7–8), there is good reason to believe that the zero-grade stem, which characterizes the entire dual and plural in the present/imperfect active, was confined to the 3rd pl. in the indicative of the root aorist.

¹¹ To which may be added *mṛddhi* (: *mṛj-*, pres. *māṛṣti*, ‘wipe’) in the *Atharvaveda*. Although *ad-* ‘eat’ and *takṣ-* ‘fashion’ made Narten presents, the structure of these roots makes it impossible to conclude anything from the imperatives *addhi* and *tāḥi*.

¹² This is also the tentative LIV view, which takes *bodhi* to be an alteration of the present imperative *bódha* (p. 67). But *yódhi* cannot be explained in this way, and the supposed change from -*dha* to -*dhi* is unparalleled in other thematic imperatives to roots in -*dh-*.

root aorist indic. active	yudh- none	budh- none
root aorist indic. middle	<i>yodhāná-</i> [<i>yutsmahi</i> (AV)]	<i>ābodhi, abudhran, budhāná-</i> [<i>abhutsi, -mahi</i>]
root aorist subj. active	<i>yodhat</i>	<i>bódhat(i)</i> , etc.
root aorist subj. middle	none	none
<i>iṣ</i> -aorist active	<i>ayodhit, yodhiṣat</i> , etc.	<i>bódhiṣat</i>
<i>iṣ</i> -aorist middle	none	none
aorist imperative active	<i>yódhi</i>	<i>bodhi</i>

(*ābodhi, abudhran*, ptc. *budhāná-*).¹³ Similar triplets of forms are associated with the roots *śúc-* ‘be kindled’ (pres. *śúcya-*, perf. ptc. *śúśukvāms-*, aor. *ásoci*), *pad-* ‘fall’ (pres. *pádyā-*, perf. 3rd sg. *papāda*, aor. *ápādi*), *jan-* ‘be born’ (pres. *jāya-*, perf. mid. *jajñē*, aor. *ājani*), and *tṛṣ-* ‘thirst’ (pres. *tṛṣya-*, perf. mid. ptc. *tāṛṣāná-*, aor. *tṛṣāná-*). Simple pairs consisting of a perfect and a passive aorist are particularly common (cf., e.g., perf. *cikéta / cikité* : aor. *áreti* [: *cit-* ‘notice / appear’]; perf. *śuśrāva / śuśruvé* : aor. *śrāvi*, GAv. *srāuuī* (: *śru-* ‘hear’]; perf. *ruroca / rurucé* : aor. *aroci* [: *ruc-* ‘shine’]; etc.).

The present *vūdhya-* suggests that the root *yudh-*, which etymologically meant ‘be(come) active / agitated’, may originally have formed a stative-intransitive system as well. The lack of a stative perfect does not rule out this possibility (cf. LIV 202), and neither does the absence of a finite middle or passive root aorist paradigm, which could easily be accidental or secondary. Indirect evidence for a middle root aorist of *yudh-* comes from the 1st pl. *s*-aorist injunctive *yutsmahi* (AV), which looks very much like the sigmaticization of an earlier **yudh-mahi*; compare 1st pl. *abhutsmahi* (RV V 3.4, VII 81.3), clearly the replacement of older **abudhmahi*.¹⁴ Pointing specifically to a 3rd sg. “passive” **áyodhi* is the apophonically aberrant participle *yodhāná-*. The closest par-

allel to *yodhāná-* elsewhere in the Vedic corpus is the privative adjective *áčetāna-* ‘unknowing’ (RV VII 13.7), which implies a full-grade participle **cetāná-* or **cētāna-*. The formal relationship of the participle *-cetāna-* to the passive aorist *áreti* (cf. above) is the same as that of *yodhāná-* to the suspected but unattested **ayodhi*. If, as I have suggested elsewhere, the PIE ancestor of the Indo-Iranian passive aorist had **o* : **e*, rather than **o* : zero ablaut, then *yodhāná-* and *-cetāna-* may well preserve the weak vocalism of the PIE “stative-intransitive aorist” in its original form.¹⁵

The general parallelism of the roots *yudh-* and *budh-* is underscored by the surprising and unexplained fact that both also underlie a very rare active *iṣ*-aorist. In the case of *budh-* this is restricted to the hapax 3rd sg. subjunctive *bódhiṣat* (II 16.7); in the case of *yudh-* the subjunctive *yodhiṣat* is flanked by an injunctive (2nd sg. *yodhis*), an imperative (2nd du. *yodhiṣtam*), and an indicative (3rd sg. *áyodhit*). Putting the *iṣ*-aorist together with the root aorist, we obtain a *Gesamtbild* of the aorist of *yudh-* and *budh-* that is best appreciated in tabular form as shown above. No more eloquent confirmation could be found for Insler’s insight that the imperatives *yódhi* and *bodhi* are inseparable. Finding an independently motivated explanation for *yódhi*, as Insler attempts to do, would clearly translate at once into an explanation for *bodhi*, and vice versa. Unfortunately, however, neither *yódhi* nor *bodhi* appears to lend itself to such an explanation. Neither has a discoverable Indo-European pedigree; neither can be generated analogically from within its own extended paradigm; neither has any claim to historical priority over the other. It will not be amiss at this point to recall, therefore, that there is another possibility to consider—the possibility that both forms are analogical to something else.

There is one, and only one, other verbal root in the Rígvēda that forms a root aorist with an exclusively

¹³ Stative-intransitive systems are discussed *in extenso* in Jasanoff (2002). At the IE level there was a fourth term—the “stative” present type (cf. LIV 15) vestigially represented in Vedic by forms like *cité* ‘appears’ (RV X 143.4). The middle root aorists associated with stative-intransitive systems were, with a very few lexical exceptions (e.g., **men-*, **her-*), of a distinctive formal type, originally characterized by **o* : **e* ablaut and other special features. Such PIE “stative-intransitive aorists” (briefly discussed in Jasanoff 1994: 164ff.) are reflected in Indo-Iranian by middle root aorists with a 3rd sg. “passive” in *-i* and a 3rd pl. in *-ran*, *-ram*, *-ra*. Our understanding of the synchrony of these forms owes an enormous debt to Insler 1968.

¹⁴ To which may be added 1st sg. *ābhutsi*. The process is discussed by Narten 1964: 26ff.

¹⁵ Cf. n. 13. Insler was thus probably correct to assign *yodhāná-* to an acrostic, if not to a Narten, paradigm.

“passive”-type indicative and participle beside an exclusively active subjunctive. Remarkably, it is a root that, like *yudh-* and *budh-*, also happens to form an active *is*-aorist subjunctive and a full-grade active aorist imperative. The relevant forms of *juṣ-* ‘enjoy’ are the following:¹⁶

root aorist indic. active	none
root aorist indic. middle	<i>ajuṣran, juṣāṇā-</i>
root aorist subj. active	<i>jōṣat(i)</i>
root aorist subj. middle	none
<i>is</i> -aorist active	<i>jōṣiṣat</i>
<i>is</i> -aorist middle	none
aorist imperative active	<i>jōṣi</i>

The relationship of the imperative *jōṣi* to the other forms, and in particular to the modal forms *jōṣat(i)* and *jōṣiṣat*, is on one level exactly the same as that of *yódhi* and *bodhi* to *yodhat*, *yodhiṣat* and *bódhat(i)*, *bódhiṣat*, respectively. But while *yódhi* and *bodhi* notoriously cry out for explanation, *jōṣi* is perfectly well understood. It is a *si*-imperative of the same formal type as *vákṣi* ‘convey’, *yákṣi* ‘sacrifice’, *néṣi* ‘lead’, *jéṣi* ‘conquer’, and nearly twenty others.¹⁷ *si*-imperatives, as shown by Szemerényi (1966) for Indo-Iranian and by the present author for Indo-European as a whole (Jasanoff 1986, 1987: 92–112), are haploglized 2nd sg. subjunctives in **-s-e-si*. The first **-s-* of the pre-haploglized sequence is typically the **-s-* of the *s*-aorist, as, e.g., in Ved. *vákṣi*, *néṣi* (cf. 3 sg. indic. *ávāt*, *ánaih* < **uḗǵh-s-t*, **néiH-s-t*) or OIr. *com-éi-r* ‘arise’ < **kóm-ess-ress* < **-reg-si* < **-reg-s-e-si* (: *s*-subj. **ress-* < **-reg-s-e/o-*). In other cases, however, the **-s-* is either another sigmatic morpheme (so, e.g., Ved. *śróṣi* ‘hear’ [= Toch. B *pāklyaus*] < **kleu-si* < **kleu-s-e-si*; Hitt. *paḥṣi* ‘protect’ < **peh₂-si* < **peh₂-s-e-si*, both probably from *s*-presents), or simply the final consonant of the root (so Hitt. *eṣi* ‘settle’ < **h₁éh₁si* < **h₁éh₁s-e-si* [*vel sim.*]). *jōṣi*, which forms a word equation with OIr. *tog* ‘choose’ (< **tó-gos(s)* < **-ǵeusī* < **-ǵeus-e-si*),¹⁸ is a case of the latter type.

¹⁶ Not shown is the very common thematic aorist *juṣá-*, best attested in the imperative and possibly a thematization of the middle root aorist. There was also a stative perfect *juṣṣa*, *juṣṣāṇā-*, etc., showing that the root **ǵeus-* / *juṣ-* formed a pair of the same type as *cikéta* : *ácceti*, *ruroca* : *aroci*, etc.

¹⁷ GAy. *dōiši* (: *daēs-* ‘show’) is the lone Iranian representative of the formation.

¹⁸ To be sure, the Irish form was remodeled: both the *si*-imperative **ǵeusī* and the associated subjunctive **ǵeuse/o-*

Merely to review these facts is to grasp the true position of *yódhi* and *bodhi*. Neither form is an archaism: both are analogical pendants to the inherited *si*-imperative *jōṣi* < **ǵeusī*. The inherent ambiguity of the form *jōṣi* caused it to be reanalyzed by some speakers as an “*i*-imperative,” and the ending *-i* was extended, dialectally at first, to the parallel roots *yudh-* and *budh-*.¹⁹ The proportion was

subj. *jōṣ-(iṣ)at* : impv. *jōṣ-i* : subj. *yodh-(iṣ)at*, *bódh-(iṣ)at* : impv. *X*,

where *X* was solved as *yódh-i*, *bodh-i*. A typologically similar process can be seen in Hittite, where bona fide *si*-imperatives of the type *paḥṣi*, *eṣi* (cf. above) induced the creation of Neo-Hittite *i*-imperatives of the type *zāḫi* ‘fight’ and *ḫāni* ‘draw water’, and other late forms. But in Vedic, unlike Hittite, the career of the imperative ending *-i* ended as quickly as it began. Transparent as the segmentation *yódh-i*, *bodh-i* may have been to the first generation of linguistic innovators, the subsequent propagation of *yódhi* and *bodhi* across the Vedic speech community clearly depended on the fact that they were perceived by most native speakers as containing the imperative ending *-dhi*. The synchronic reinterpretation of *yódhi* and *bodhi* as irregularly altered forms of **yóddhi*, **bóddhi* or **yuddhi*, **buddhi* was not an error of Western Sanskritists or the Indian grammarians. It was a reanalysis by the Vedic Aryans themselves.

were perceived as ordinary sigmatic formations and “clarified” to **ǵeus-si* and *ǵeus-se/o-*. The later shortening of expected **tó-gōs(s)* to **tó-gōs(s)* in the imperative was due to the influence of the *s*-subjunctive, where loss of length was phonologically regular in medial syllables and analogically extended to other positions. See the discussion by Thurneysen (1946: 392ff.), and compare n. 19.

¹⁹ This was not, of course, the only possible synchronic analysis. Since the sequence *-s-* was phonotactically impossible in Vedic, *jōṣi* could also be interpreted as the surface realization of an underlying “normal” *si*-imperative *ǵjōṣ-ṣi*; this parsing may have been responsible for the rise of the analogical nonce form *yóṣi* (RV I 132.4). In the subjunctive (*jōṣat*, etc.), where there were again two possible readings, the *is*-aorist offered an obvious way to distinguish the sigmatic from the non-sigmatic analysis. The result was the partial renewal of *jōṣat* by *jōṣiṣat*, whence the creation of *yodhiṣat* and *bódhiṣat*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Douglas Q. 1988. *Tocharian Historical Phonology and Morphology*. American Oriental Series, vol. 71. New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- Harðarson, Jón Axel. 1993. *Studien zum urindogermanischen Wurzelaorist und dessen Vertretung im Indoiranischen und Griechischen*. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, vol. 74. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Hoffmann, Karl. 1968. Zum Optativ des indogermanischen Wurzelaorists. In *Pratidānam: Indian, Iranian and Indo-European Studies Presented to F. B. J. Kuiper on his Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. J. C. Heesterman et al. Pp. 1–8. The Hague: Mouton.
- Inslar, Stanley. 1968. The Origin of the Sanskrit Passive Aorist. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 73: 312–46.
- _____. 1972. Some Irregular Vedic Imperatives. *Language* 48: 551–65.
- Jamison, Stephanie W. 1997. Syntactic Constraints on Morphological Change: The Vedic Imperatives *bodhí*, *dehí*, and *dhehí*. In *Syntaxe des langues indo-iraniennes anciennes. Colloque international -Sítges (Barcelona) 4–5 mai 1993*, ed. E. Pirart. Pp. 63–80. Aula Orientalis Supplementa, vol. 6. Barcelona: Editorial AUSA.
- Jasanoff, Jay H. 1986. Old Irish *tair* 'come!' *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1986: 132–41.
- _____. 1987. Some Irregular Imperatives in Tocharian. In *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill (1929–1985): Papers from the Fourth East Coast Indo-European Conference*, ed. C. Watkins. Untersuchungen zur indogermanischen Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft, vol. 31. Pp. 92–112. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- _____. 1994. Aspects of the Internal History of the PIE Verbal System. In *Früh-, Mittel-, und Spätindogermanisch: Akten der IX. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft*, ed. G. E. Dunkel et al. Pp. 149–68. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- _____. 1998. The Thematic Conjugation Revisited. In *Mír Curad: Studies Presented to Calvert Watkins*, ed. Jay Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert, and Lisi Oliver. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, vol. 92. Pp. 301–16. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- _____. 2002. *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- LIV. Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben: Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*, ed. Martin Kümmel et al., under the direction of Helmut Rix. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1998.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1986. *Indogermanische Grammatik. I/2. Lautlehre*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Narten, Johanna. 1964. *Die sigmatischen Aoriste im Veda*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- _____. 1968. Zum "proterodynamischen" Wurzelpräsens. In *Pratidānam: Indian, Iranian and Indo-European Studies Presented to F. B. J. Kuiper on his Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. J. C. Heesterman et al. Pp. 9–19. The Hague: Mouton.
- Peters, Martin. 1980. *Untersuchungen zur Vertretung der indogermanischen Laryngale im Griechischen*. Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, vol. 377. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Szemerényi, Oswald. 1966. The Origin of the Vedic "Imperatives" in *-si*. *Language* 42: 1–7.
- Thurneysen, Rudolf. 1946. *A Grammar of Old Irish*. Dublin: Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Weiss, Michael. 1996. Review of *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*, by Andrew Sihler. *American Journal of Philology* 117: 670–75.