

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

The gerund is part of the non-finite paradigm of the verb, being characterized by a set of (more or less) invariable morphosyntactic and semantic features, by which it contrasts with other members of the same paradigm. These 'categorical features' form a basis for understanding the constructions of the gerund, but do not determine all the syntactic and semantic features of the gerundial syntagm, which will be investigated in chapters 4-5.

The classification of the gerunds as inflectional rather than derivational categories is intuitively clear, but the general theoretical principle underlying this type of differentiation in the lexicon/grammar is impossible to formalize in a watertight way (cf. the discussion in Wurzel 1984, p. 40ff.). One of the traditional definitions is that inflection does not create a new word or change the word-class of a given word, as is the case in derivation. But apart from containing circularity, this argument would not solve the problem with non-finite verb-forms and other hybrid categories, such as the gerund.¹

Due to the lack of watertight formal criteria, Wurzel (1984) has reintroduced a largely semantically based differentiation between inflection and derivation. As a crude generalization it could be said that inflectional forms encode fully predictable (and hence abstract) semantic distinctions that are not blocked by the existence of homophones or synonyms, while derivational forms are characterized by less predictable (more idiosyncratic) changes of meaning, being blocked by the existence of homophones and synonyms. Hence inflectional forms are fully productive and exhibit a stronger tendency to paradigmatic leveling and/or resistance against lexicalization or isolation than derivational forms.²

Like other non-finite verb-forms, the gerunds belong to the verbal rather than nominal paradigm, although they are formed with the means of (reinterpreted) nominal derivational

¹ The classical generative framework has tried to dispense with the concept of 'paradigm' and hence the distinction between 'derivational' and 'inflectional' forms. In more recent morphological theory the paradigm has been reintroduced as a synchronically, diachronically and psycholinguistically relevant entity that cannot be reduced to some other theoretical construct (cf. Matthews 1974, Wurzel 1984, Karlsson 1985, Nyman 1982, etc.). The crucial role of the paradigm in processes of analogy was already envisaged by Paul (1920, pp. 106ff., 160ff.) and de Saussure (1949, p. 170ff.)

² This means that inflection and derivation are language-specific, relative concepts and that there may be formations that share properties of both types. E.g. Finnish frequentative verbs are usually considered to constitute a derived category from the point of view of word formation (with the traditional circularity of argument), but they could in principle be considered inflectional forms from the point of view of 'aspectual marking'. Apart from the fact that aspectual forms are not fully productive, a major reason why this inflectional category is not set up (aside with tense) is just that the semantics of Finnish frequentative verbs is less predictable and uniform than that of Finnish tense forms.

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

and inflectional formatives. Their verbal character is supported by their formal petrification and function as predicates (rather than nominal or adverbial constituents) in the gerundial syntagm and in their taking adverb(i)al rather than adnominal modifiers.

On the other hand, the gerundial syntagm is as a whole part of a syntactically larger unit expressing a predication and providing the implicit subject or agent ('controller') of the gerund. Constructionally the gerunds are thus adverbial or copredicative (cf. 1.2.B), and could in analogy with the participles (which are morphosyntactic hybrids between verb and adjective) be classified as 'verbal adverbs' (cf. Söhnen 1985; see 1.5.N).

3.1. THE NON-FINITE SYSTEM

The Sanskrit finite verb may be inflected for the following morphosyntactic categories: 'absolute tense', 'mood' (encoding illocutionary force and modality), 'voice' (encoding the discourse perspective on the participants/actants of an action or state) and 'person-number' (of subject). These are the categories prototypically expressed in the predicate of a full clause in Sanskrit and other Indo-European languages.

Non-finite verb-forms, on the other hand, may be inflected for 'gender', 'number', 'case' and 'relative tense', but lack inflection for 'absolute tense', 'mood' and 'person-number', frequently also 'voice'. By virtue of these features, non-finite verb-forms are incapable of heading independent full clauses other than temporally and modally unmarked or constrained ones. Instead they are specialized in heading reduced nominal or adverbial clauses or phrases lacking independent temporal and modal specification and, frequently, subject. Non-finite clauses are thus less 'sentential' than finite ones, but under circumstances of operational and coreferential dependency or redundancy, they represent a more economic means of linking predications than finite coordinate or subordinate clauses.

The system of non-finite verb-forms in Sanskrit is traditionally divided into three subsystems according to certain morphosyntactic features:

- (i) participles (and gerundives)
- (ii) infinitives
- (iii) gerunds

Participles are formed from tense bases or secondary verbal stems (exceptionally from the root) and have adjectival inflection. The most prototypical ("finite verb-like") participles are also inflected for 'voice' (cf. the active, middle and passive participles of the present and of the future, the active and middle-passive participles of the perfect and similarly of the aorist). The gerundives, though not being formed from tense bases, are sometimes called

'future passive participles' or 'participia necessitatis', but differ from other participles in not having the 'conjunctive' ("appositive") construction.

Infinitives and gerunds are recategorized petrified noun-cases (acc., dat., gen.-abl., loc. and instr.) of defective verbal nouns, but only the gerunds are inflected for 'relative tense' (non-past vs. past gerund), being thus more "verb-like" than the infinitives.³

3.1.A. PARTICIPLES

Among the participles one should count only those productive verbal adjectives that have verbal rection and take adverbial complements. This excludes many productive agent nouns and deverbal adjectives from being counted as participles (cf. also Benveniste 1948, p. 11ff.). A participle is morphologically dependent on an expressed or implicit noun phrase, which can be called the 'logical' subject of the participle. The bidirectional transformational relation is seen in that the 'logical subject' of the participle becomes the grammatical subject in the corresponding finite construction, e.g. [hīnā mātā]_{NP} 'the abandoned mother...' <=> [mātā hīnā]_S 'the mother is abandoned'. (The constituent order is not decisive.)

Six different constructions or syntactic functions of the participles may be distinguished: (i) '(restrictive or non-restrictive) attributive', (ii) 'conjunctive' or 'appositive', (iii) 'complemental', (iv) 'absolute', (v) '(main) predicative', (vi) 'periphrastic'.

Syntactically an attributive participle behaves like an attributive adjective, forming a (complex) noun phrase with its nominal head: [...PPlē]...N]_{NP} or [N...[PPlē...]]_{NP}, whereas a conjunctive participle is syntactically a peripheral constituent of the entire superordinate clause: [...NP...[...PPlē]...]_S or [...[...PPlē]...NP...]_S. Thus a conjunctive participle is *less* constrained to a position immediately before or after its nominal head than an attributive participle, cf. *sayānāḥ bhūñjate yavanāḥ* 'the Greeks eat (in the manner of) reclining => 'the reclining Greeks eat'/'the Greeks, who are reclining, eat'. Moreover, only a conjunctive participle may have an unexpressed generic logical subject, showing that unlike an attributive participle, it is not *syntactically* dependent on a noun phrase. But due to free worder, the essential semantic distinction between a conjunctive and an attributive participle is not always encoded otherwise than intonationally.

On the other hand, in cases of syntagmatic neutralization, a conjunctive participle parallels semantically a *non-restrictive/non-defining* rather than *restrictive/defining* attributive participle. Whereas a restrictive attributive participle (with its complements) predicates a characteristic or action that defines or identifies the referential class of its head ('logical subject', cf. 109), a non-restrictive one expresses a characteristic or action that provides

³ For a taxonomy and diachronic study of Indo-European non-finite systems, see Gippert (1978).

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

supplementary information or a further predication about the identified referent (cf. 110-112):

(109) RV 10.94.9cd

**tébhīr dugdhām papivān somyām mádhv indro vardhate práthate
vṛṣāyāte**

‘Having drunk of the Somic juice milked by them, Indra grows, extends himself and feels like a bull.’

(110) RV 6.47.1cd

utó nv āsyā papivāmsam indram ná kās canā sahata āhavéṣu

‘And nobody holds out in confrontation against Indra, who (= when he) has drunk of this.’

(111) RV 3.50.3cd

**mandānāḥ sómam papivāṁ ṛjīṣin sám asmábhyaṃ purudhā gā
iṣanya**

‘Intoxicated, having drunk Soma, gather for us, O lofty one, cows in plenty!’

(112) RV 10.34.10ab

jāyā tapyate kitavāsya hīnā mātā putrāsya cārataḥ kvā svit

‘The wife of the gambler grieves, forsaken, the mother (too) of the son, who wanders god knows where.’

In the ‘complemental’ construction, the participle with its dependents is (part of) the complement of a cognitive or communicative verb (*participium cum accusativo*), e.g.:

(113) RV 10.85.3a

sómam manyate papivān

‘One imagines oneself having drunk Soma’

(114) KūP 1.1.68

ḍṛṣṭvā devaṃ samāyāntam viṣṇum ātmānam avyayam

jānubhyām avanīm gatvā tuṣṭāva garuḍadhvajam

‘Having seen the imperishable god Viṣṇu, himself, approaching, I greeted the one with Garuḍa as his symbol by going down on my knees on the earth.’

The participle *samāyāntam* is part of the complement of the verb *ḍṛṣṭvā* in that it modifies its direct object *devaṃ*, which thus performs the double function of object of the

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

superordinate clause and implicit logical subject of the gerund. 'Fused constructions' such as these (cf. Matthews 1981, p. 181ff.) can also be described in terms of syntactic vs. semantic dependency (Nichols 1978a; cf. 1.2.B). The participle is *syntactically* dependent on the main verb, the object of which is *semantically* dependent on the participle.

The 'absolute' construction is similar to the conjunctive construction with the difference that the nominal head of the participle is not a constituent of the superordinate clause, being typically backgrounded (cf. Holland 1986, p. 182). A germinal form of this construction is found already in the Ṛgveda in backgrounded nominative and especially locative absolute phrases of time or place, cf.:

(115) RV 1.16.3

**īndram prātār havāmaha īndram prayaty ādhvaré | īndram sómasya
pītāye**

'Indra we call upon in the morning, Indra (we call upon) at the commencing sacrifice (or: when the sacrifice is commencing), Indra (we call upon) for the drinking of Soma.'

After the early Vedic period this became one of the most important uses of the participles and a means for condensing subordinate clauses, cf.:

(116) AV 9.6.38

asitāvaty ātithāv asniyāt

'He should eat (only) after the guest has eaten.'

Participles may also function as main predicates, being then subject to certain intrinsic temporal and modal constraints:

(117) MS 1.6.4 (93, 9)

hiraṇyam suvarṇam upāsyāgnir ādhéyah

'After a piece of pure gold has been inserted, the fire is to be replenished.'

When lexicalized as adjectives or recategorized as verbal nouns they lose their verbal rection and character:

(118) Rm 2.36.30 (quoted from Speijer 1886, p. 293 § 375)

tad alam devi rāmasya śriyā vihatayā tvayā

'So therefore, your majesty, enough of the destroying by you of Rāma's happiness!' (= "Do not destroy Rāma's happiness!")

3.1.B. INFINITIVES

The infinitives are indeclinable non-finite verb-forms originating as petrified oblique noun-cases of defective verbal nouns. They differ formally from plain verbal nouns in that they cannot occur in the nominative, be inflected for the plural, or take a genitive (logical) subject/object. Unlike the participles and gerunds, they lack inflection for 'relative tense' and are not always dependent on or controlled by some argument of the governing clause. Like the gerunds, they are mostly construed and conceived of as active rather than passive.

An infinitive may be construed as an adverbial (more seldom adnominal) complement or adjunct of purpose (119-120), source/limit (121) or content (depending on a modal, conative or existential predicate, e.g. 'wish', 'try', 'be able', 'deserve', 'be fit', 'be available/time'), its specific function being largely determined by the underlying noun-case. In the Veda it occasionally functions as the main predicate with imperative force (cf. Gippert 1984).

(119) RV 8.33.13a

éndra yāhi pītāye mādhu

'Come here, Indra, to drink the mead!'

(120) Śak. 1.11b

ārtatrāṇāya vaḥ śastraṁ na prahartum anāgasi

'Your weapon is for the protection of the afflicted not to hurl/be hurled at the innocent.'

(121) RV 2.17.5d

āstabhnān māyāya dyām avasrāsah

'He supported with marvellous power the heaven from falling down.'

Unlike the infinitives in other classical Indo-European languages, the Sanskrit infinitive is not normally used in the function of a clausal subject, which syntactic function is handled mainly by verbal nouns (Speijer 1886, p. 306 § 390; Gippert 1978; cf. 6.4.G).

3.1.C. GERUNDS

Like the infinitives, the gerunds are indeclinable non-finite verb-forms originating as adverbialized petrified oblique noun-cases of defective verbal nouns that have by usage become differentiated for relative tense ('ktvā' vs. 'ṇamul') and mainly active voice.

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

Being incapable of taking an independent or oblique logical subject and yet forming a predicative syntagm, a gerund is normally construed 'copredicatively', i.e. as (forming a unit which is) dependent on a superordinate clause as a (mostly) peripheral constituent predicating an action or state on the part of some core argument of the latter. (The restriction on coreference does not apply to lexicalized gerunds, cf. 4.8.)

Peripheral gerundial clauses can be subclassified semantically as either *propositionally restrictive* (122-123) or *non-restrictive* (124-126), where 'propositional restrictiveness' refers to whether the gerundial clause stipulates a temporal, causal, conditional or instrumental condition on the main clause proposition or not. The lack of a systematic formal codification of this functional distinction (which is subtler than and secondary to that between restrictive/defining vs. non-restrictive/non-defining attributive and participial clauses, cf. 3.1.A),⁴ confers double analyzability or indeterminacy to many gerundial clauses, the disambiguation of which depends on both semantic and pragmatic criteria to be dealt with in chapter 4.

(122) AB 8.28.3

vidyud vai vidyutya vṛṣṭim anu pra viśati
'The lightning, having lightened, enters the rain.'

(123) AV 10.7.42ab

tantrām éke yuvatī virūpe abhyākrāmam vayataḥ śaṅmayūkham
'A certain pair of maidens, of diverse form, weave, betaking themselves to it, the six-pegged web.' (Whitney 1905, p. 595)

(124) ŚB 1.8.1.3

**kumbhyām māgre bibharāsi sá yadā tām ativárdhā 'átha karṣūm
khātvā tasyām mā bibharāsi**
'In a pot you shall keep me first. Then when I have grown out of that, you shall dig a trench and keep me there.'

(125) BĀU 6.4.8

**sa yām icchet kāmayeta meti tasyām artham niṣṭhāya mukhena mukham
sāmdhāya upastham asyā abhimṛśya japet**
'Whom one should desire (thinking), "may she desire me", into her should one insert the member, join one's mouth to her mouth, touch her genitals and mutter'

⁴ Only a *non-defining* attributive/participial or relative clause can be further subclassified semantically as either propositionally restrictive (ii) or not (iii), cf. (i) *the headmaster resigning* (= that headmaster who resigned) *in September died before the end of the year* vs. (ii) *the headmaster resigned in September, wishing* (= because he wished) *to devote all his time to his book* vs. (iii) *the headmaster resigned in September, dying* (= and he died) *before the end of the year*.

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

More rarely the (past) gerund functions as an obligatory complement of content depending on **man-** + **iva** 'believe oneself to have V-ed'⁵ (126) or (in post-Vedic Sanskrit) an optional complement or adjunct of manner depending on an atelic durative verb (127-129).

(126) ŚB 9.5.1.35

etád vái prajāpatiḥ prāpya [rāddhvèvāmanyata]

'Having attained this, Prajāpati thought he had accomplished his aim.'

(Cf. Minard 1956, p. 41f. § 102, 102a.)

(127) Mbhṣy. 1.1.3. (2) (= 2.3.32, 2.4.34, 5.2.4, 6.1.17, 6.3.49, 7.2.117)

yathā maṇḍūkā utplutyotplutya gacchanti tadvad adhikārāḥ

≈ 'Just like frogs move by jumping and jumping, in the same way the heading rules (move).'

(128) Kauṣ. 5.1.3

rājānam avagṛhyopajīvināḥ

'those who live on (lit. 'by violating') the king'

(129) VikrC 18.0 (Southern recension; ed. Edgerton, p. 141)

vikramārko nītim ullaṅghya rājyaṁ na karoti

'Vikramārka does not rule his country in the manner of transgressing the rules of good conduct.'

Like a participle the gerund may also be construed periphrastically, in which case one may say that the superordinate clause is reduced to an auxiliary verb (cf. 4.4.D).

Twice in the Atharvaveda the past gerund seems to be used as a final adjunct in place of the infinitive, depending on a verb of motion (3.3.B):

(130) AV 9.6.53 (cf. 211-212)

yád vā átithipatir parivīṣya gṛhān upodāity avabhṛtam evá tád upāvaiti

'Verily, when the host goes up to the houses to serve, then he is really going down to the purificatory bath.'

The gerunds contrast thus morphosyntactically with both infinitives and participles: with the former in not (usually) having nominal (i.e. adverbial complemental) functions and with

⁵ Mainly in the Śatapathabrāhmaṇa, but once also in the Vādhūlasūtra (*anvākyāna on agniṣtoma: tīrtveva hi manyate* (7x) 'for he thinks he has traversed it' (Caland 1928, p. 125f. § 2.26; Renou 1935, p. 390).

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

the latter in not showing morphological dependence on a noun phrase nor (usually) main predicative construction. To sum up, the basic distinctive morphosyntactic features of the gerunds are:

- (i) non-finite vs. finite verb-forms: verbal rection but formally unspecified for person and number of subject, absolute tense, mood and voice (4.1)
- (ii) adverbial vs. [ad]nominal: indeclinable and syntactically dependent on a verb (phrase) or clause (4.4)
- (iii) coreferentially constrained: controlled by the Actor or topical subject of the main clause
(ii)+(iii) ≈ 'copredicative construction' (4.2)
- (iv) specified for relative tense: past gerund vs. non-past gerund (3.2-3.3)
- (v) (basically?) perfective vs. imperfective by aspect (3.4)
- (v) (basically) active vs. passive voice (3.5)
- (vii) potentially dependent on the operators of the main clause (4.3)

3.2. RELATIVE TENSE OF THE GERUNDS

Relative tense can be defined as the grammaticalization of the temporal location of an action or state of affairs ('E-rel') in relation to the temporal location of another action or state of affairs ('E-ref') as expressed in the context (typically a superordinate clause, less typically the time of speech). It differs from absolute tense in that it makes no direct reference to the time of speech (cf. Comrie 1985, p. 56ff.; Lyons 1977, p. 677; Jakobson 1957).⁶

Whereas finite verbs may partake both in the system of absolute and relative tense (mainly by means of compound tenses), the gerunds and participles have only relative tense, encoding the following basic oppositions of relative time reference:

- (i) E-rel simultaneous/overlapping with E-ref = 'relative present' (= : —)
- (ii) E-rel before E-ref = 'relative past' (. · — · — · — — —)
- (iii) E-rel after E-ref = 'relative future' (opposite of (ii))

Unless presupposed in the context, the action or state denoted by a form expressing only relative tense (such as the gerunds) is thus dependent on the absolute time reference of the action or state expressed in the superordinate clause, regardless of whether this refers to a single or habitual action, cf. AV 7.102.1 namaskṛtya dyāvāprthivībhyām antārikṣā-

⁶ Relative tense is thus part of the system of 'axis', defined by Jakobson (1957, p. 135) as the characterization of the narrated event (Eⁿ) in relation to another narrated event (Eⁿ/Eⁿ) and without reference to the speech event (Eⁿ/E^s) or the role of the participants in the latter.

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

ya mṛtyāve mekṣyāmy ūrdhvās tiṣṭhan 'I will (always) urinate (while) standing upright, *having (always) bowed down* to heaven and earth, the atmosphere and death'; Daś. Pūrvapīṭhikā 2. ucchv. (ed. Kale, p. 24) rājanandana kecid asyām atavyām vedādividyābhyāsam apahāya nijakulācāram dūrikṛtya satyaśaucādidharma-vrātām parihṛtya kilbiṣam anviṣyantaḥ pulindapurogamās tadannam upabhūñjānā bahavo brāhmaṇabruvā nivasanti 'Prince! In this forest there live many such that call themselves brahmins, who have abandoned the study of the Vedas and other sciences, abolished the practises of their own clans, and relinquished the duties of truth and purity etc., and while looking for sin and led by the Pulindas eat their food.'

It is also important to note that relative tense establishes a default (i.e. 'expected') temporal relation between the actual *point/period of event* of the action or state of affairs expressed by a verb-form and a contextually given external reference point/period. It does not refer to or interfere with the temporal implications of the inferred resulting state.

Although a form like *niṣadya* 'having sat down' may in some contexts imply the notion of a continuous simultaneous state ('while sitting'), the point of event of the *action* it expresses (i.e. that of 'sitting down' < ni+√sad) is specifically *anterior* to the external reference point, e.g. *piba niṣadya* 'drink after sitting down' ≠ 'drink while/at the time of sitting down'. Non-past relative time reference is thus a *contextually dependent* value of the gerund (cf. 1.5.K-L; 2.3.B). Since the default value for verb-forms lacking relative tense (e.g. infinitives and verbal nouns) is to a simultaneous *rather* than preceding action and since past (relative) time reference is semantically marked in relation to non-past (relative) time reference, it follows that the gerund is temporally marked. This is confirmed by the basic temporal opposition between 'ktvā' and 'ṇamul':

(131) RV 10.165.5

ṛcā kapōtam nudata pranōdam iṣam mādantaḥ pari gām nayadhvam
sam̐yopāyanto duritāni viśvā hitvā na ūrjam prā patāt patīṣṭhaḥ

'With a verse push the dove pushing (≠ having pushed) him away, take the cow around, (while) enjoying the nourishment, removing all difficulties. Having left (≠ while leaving) our strength behind, may he fly away as fast as he can.'

On the other hand, even when there is a formal opposition of relative tense, a category may show a certain amount of temporal ambivalence. Usually, when there is such ambivalence, one of the values can, however, be singled out as basic, while the rest are restricted to certain syntactic, lexical or pragmatic contexts.⁷

⁷ At this point we have to make a distinction also between real-world time reference ('metalinguistic tense') and linguistic tense ['language tense'; cf. Levinson 1983, p. 77]. Due to this distinction past events may be expressed by present tenses by a genre-conditioned transposition of deictic center, while hypothetical future events may be expressed by past tense forms through similar, modally conditioned transposition of deictic center.

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

For example, in the system of participles, the aorist participle has basically relative present time reference, but it may have relative past time reference in combination with ingressive aspect. This means that it is temporally less positively marked for relative present tense than the present participle or the non-past gerund in *-am*. Conversely, the *ktvā*-gerund has basically past relative time reference, but it may be temporally neutralized when repeated or when dependent on a limited class of durative atelic verbs denoting subsisting, behaving, moving, speaking, etc. (3.3).

At this point it must also be stressed that the relative tense of a verb-form does not predict its entire sphere of use in relation to verb-forms that have the corresponding distinctive feature in some other language. This can easily be seen from the fact that whereas the Sanskrit past gerund often translates idiomatically as a presential or non-past non-finite verb-form in European languages, European present participles or gerunds far from always translate as presential or non-past non-finite verb-forms in Sanskrit.

This yields different *relative* markedness to non-finite forms in different systems. Since Sanskrit 'presential' non-finite verb-forms should preferably not be used unless there is actual concomitance or at least some overlap of action, they are relatively speaking semantically more marked than their European counterparts, which may be used also when there is only partial or no overlap of action (cf. 3.2.D).

A further complication is that there is an ontologically based connection between the categories of relative(-absolute) tense and aspect. Since relative past tense forms imply the *completion* of one action or state *before* the commencement of another, they *combine aspectual and temporal notions* (cf. Lyons 1977, p. 689; Traugott 1978).

The combined temporal-aspectual meaning of the past gerund and past participle has sometimes been reduced to the concept of 'perfective aspect'. This involves a logical fallacy, since we can have perfective aspect without relative past time reference (cf. perfective infinitives with relative non-past time reference), but we cannot have the sense of *anterior* completion of action/activity without evoking the very concept of *relative time reference*. There is no purely aspectual category of 'completive aspect'.

Nevertheless, since the point of reference depends on the aspect(ual character) of the underlying verb and referent situation (cf. Lindstedt 1985), relative tense is partly *constrained* by aspect and vice versa. In other words, the relative past tense of the gerund presupposes that there be a phase of the situation denoted by the gerundial clause that can be taken as an initial reference point to an external situation. This would exclude a stative or durative atelic verb from gerund formation, except when aspectually embedded in a perfective (temporally or actionally 'bounded') context. This is consistent with the findings in 2.3.B.

But if the analysis of the relative temporal value of a grammatical form is affected by how we interpret the aspectual character of the underlying verb or the referent situation,

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

aspectually ambivalent verbs should provide ambiguity of relative tense for the gerund.

Supposing that the gerund was temporally unmarked or non-past rather than past by relative tense, an aspectually ambivalent form like **bhūtvā** < **bhū-** 'be; become' may then signify either an aspectually bounded action of 'becoming' or an aspectually unbounded state of continuous or habitual 'being' (which interpretation is quite common).

However, we know from the examples (98)-(99) that **bhūtvā** may also signify a completed bounded state of 'being', i.e. 'having been (for some time, but no longer being)'. While telic and punctual aspect often combine with relative past time reference in temporally unmarked or weakly marked forms, durative atelic and stative aspect rarely co-occur thus with relative past time reference in temporally unmarked forms. Perfectiveness of aspect does not alone account for the meaning 'having been for some time', as perfectiveness would also be compatible with the meaning 'going to be for some time' or even 'to be for some time'. Since we can derive the meaning 'being' from 'having become', but not 'having been for some time' from 'being', it would be impossible to postulate either 'being' or 'becoming' as the basic meaning of **bhūtvā**.

Similarly, when formed from atelic durative/stative or aspectually ambivalent verbs such as **ās-** 'sit', **śī-** 'lie (down)', **ram-** 'make love', **jīv-** 'live', **vas-** 'dwell', the gerund never refers to a simultaneous or impending activity or state (i.e. 'while sitting/going to sit/ in order to sit', etc.), but always to a completed transitory activity or state: 'having sat, etc. (for some time)', cf. (102)-(108). If the gerund was temporally as unmarked as has been claimed ever since the days of Franz Bopp, it may be asked why it does not have non-past relative time reference in connection with verbs that are aspectually most amenable to such a meaning (cf. the pr. pples: **āsāna-** 'sitting', **śayāna-** 'lying', **ramat-** 'making love').

On this evidence it is impossible to claim that the gerund is temporally unmarked or neutral in the same way as a finite aorist verb, which has only 'memorative' or zero-mood and no tense (cf. Hoffmann 1967).⁸ In the case of all other temporally weakly differentiated forms in Sanskrit (such as the aorist participle and perhaps the non-past gerund), past relative time reference occurs mostly only in connection with telic or punctual (esp. ingressive) aspect. Suggested comparison with the aorist tense (Söhnen, personal communication) limps in yet another important respect: a temporally neutral aorist finite verb "copies" not only the absolute tense but also the marked mood of a conjunct verb (cf. Kiparsky 1968, p. 37). The gerund does not necessarily depend on any one these categories: RV 8.17.1 **pibā... sadaḥ** 'drink... and sit' ≠ RV 1.177.4 **pibā niśādya** 'sit down and drink!' or 'having (already) sat down, drink!'.

Neither can we explain the predominantly relative past time reference of the gerund on the basis of the tendency for the gerund to precede the main verb according to the normal

⁸ Eitel (1941, p. 109) thought that the temporal relation of the action expressed by the gerund is entirely dependent on the context or situation, as in (so he claimed) the Greek aorist participle. But even the latter is not temporally quite so undifferentiated, inasmuch as it tends to express a completed action or by implicature, its resulting state (cf. Delbrück 1879, p. 125).

order of constituents, contrast (132)-(135) vs. (136)-(138):

(132) RV 10.17.2ab

ápāgūhann amṛtām mārtyebhyaḥ kṛtvī sāvarnām adadur vivasvate
 ‘They have hidden the ambrosia from the mortals; having made (≠ while making)
 one resembling it, they have given it to Vivasvat.’

(133) RV 10.109.6-7

...rājānaḥ satyām kṛṇvānā brahmajāyām pūnar daduḥ [6]
punardāya brahmajāyām kṛtvī devāir nikilbiṣām
ūrjam pṛthivyā bhaktvāyorugāyām ūpāsate [7]

[6] ‘...the kings, keeping their word, shall give back the brahmin’s wife.’

[7] ‘Having given back (≠ while giving) the brahmin’s wife and worked out
 freedom of offense with the gods and enjoyed the vigour of the earth, they worship
 the strider (= Viṣṇu).’

(134) RV 1.161.7d (cf. 1.177.1, 3; 5.40.4)

yuktvā rātham ūpa devāñ ayātana
 ‘Having yoked (≠ while yoking) the wagon, you went to the gods.’

(135) RV 7.104.18c (cf. 10.85.29, 10.145.5, 10.162.5; contrast: exx. 98-99.)

vāyo yé bhūtvī patáyanti naktábhīr
 ‘who having become (≠ while turning into) birds fly about through the nights’

(136) RV 3.42.7

imám indra gāvāsiraṁ yāvāsiram ca naḥ piba lāgátya vṛṣabhiḥ sutám
 ‘Drink this our (juice) mixed with milk and barley, having come (≠ while coming),
 (the one) pressed by bulls.’

(137) RV 3.60.3cd

saudhanvanāso amṛtatvám éire viṣṭvī sámibhiḥ sukṛtaḥ sukṛtyāyā
 ‘Sudhanvan’s sons have attained immortality having labored (≠ while laboring)
 diligently, the skilful ones with skill.’

(138) RV 10.129.4cd

sató bándhum ásati nir avindan hṛdi pratīṣyā kavāyo manīṣā
 ‘The bond of the existing in the non-existing the sages found out having searched
 (≠ while searching) with contemplation in their hearts.’

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

(139) AV 12.3.13a

yád yat kṛṣṇáh śakuná éhá gatvá tsáran viśáktam bila āsasáda

“Whenever the black bird, having come here stealthily, has sat upon the orifice, surprising what is resolved.” (Whitney 1905, p. 685)⁹

In the following sections, the relative tense of the gerunds will be explored in relation to other non-finite forms.

3.2.A. PAST GERUND VS. PERFECT PARTICIPLE

In early Vedic Sanskrit, the past gerund competed with and contributed to the loss of the conjunctive perfect participle (cf. Delbrück 1888, p. 377). In the numerous textual parallels involving these formations, the relative time reference is always to a completed preceding action, although there may be the implicature of a simultaneous resulting state, e.g. **tasthivas-** ‘standing’ (lit. ‘having stood up’), **suśupvas-** ‘sleeping’ (lit. ‘having fallen asleep’; cf. 62, 1.5.K). This mostly secondary ‘presential’ value is often lexicalized, cf. **anūcāná-**, ‘learned’, **vidvās-** ‘wise’, etc.¹⁰

By far the most frequent textual parallels are found in connection with the verb **han-** ‘slay, smite’. The gerund appears here originally somewhat less often than the perfect participle, suggesting that it came to replace the latter gradually as a morphosyntactically less cumbersome expression, cf. **hatvā** and **jaghanvas-** in (140)-(143):

(140) RV 2.12.3 (cf. RV 1.103.2)

yó hatvāhim áriṇāt saptá síndhūn yó gá udājat apadhā valásya

yó áśmanor antár agnīm jajāna samvṛk samátsu sá janāsa índrah

‘He who, having slain (**hatvā**) the dragon, released the seven rivers, who drove out the cows by the removal of Vala, who gave birth to fire between the two stones, the conqueror in combats, he, O folks, is Indra!’

(141) RV 1.32.11c (cf. RV 3.32.6; 4.18.7; 4.19.8; 4.42.7; 7.23.3; etc.)

apām bílam ápihitam yád āśid vṛtrám jaghanvām̐ ápa tád vavāra

‘The opening of the waters that was closed he has opened, having slain (**jaghanvām̐**) Vṛtra.’

⁹ Cf. Bloomfield (1897, p. 186): “Whatever the black bird that has come hither stealthily has touched of that which has stuck to the rim.”

¹⁰ Especially durative and stative verbs may have genuine presential sense in this form, but apparently this is mostly a secondary development (e.g. **sāshvas-** ‘conquering’; cf. Delbrück 1888, p. 374ff.).

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

(142) RV 1.100.18ab (cf. 2.17.6; 2.20.8)

dásyūñ chimyūms ca puruhūtá évair hatvá pṛthivyām sárvá ni barhīt

‘Much-invoked in the usual way (? with eager), having slain (**hatvá**) Dasyus and Simyus, he tossed them down on the ground with the arrow.’

Or: ‘...may he slay... and toss...!’ (cf. Geldner, Rigveda I, p. 129 fn. 18)

(143) RV 1.59.6cd

**vaiśvānaró dásyum agnir jaghanvām̐ ádhūnot káṣṭhā áva sámbaram
bhet**

‘Having slain (**jaghanvām̐**) Dasyu, Agni Vaiśvānara shook the logs, hewed down Śambara.’

Similarly, cf. **kṛtvī** : **caḥṛvas-** in (144)-(145) and **pītvā** : **papivas-** in (144)-(147):

(144) RV 1.161.3

**agnīm dūtám práti yád ábravītanáśvaḥ kártvo rátha utéhá kártvaḥ
dhenúḥ kártvā yuvaśá kártvā dvā táni bhrātar ánu vaḥ kṛtvý émasi**

‘What you answered to the messenger Agni: “A horse is to be made, and a wagon here is to be made, a cow is to be made and two young ones are to be made. Having made (**kṛtvý**) those things, brother, we shall come after you.”’

(145) RV 1.161.4a

caḥṛvām̐sa ṛbhavas tád apr̥cchata...

‘Having done (**caḥṛvām̐sa**) [that = a horse, etc. as mentioned in the previous stanza], O Ṛbhus, you asked thus:...’

(146) RV 1.4.8ab

asyá pītvā satakrato ghanó vṛtrāṇām abhavaḥ

‘Having drunk (**pītvā**) of that, O Śatakratu, you became a slayer of harassers.’

(147) RV 5.29.3d (cf. RV 10.94.9 = ex. 109)

áhann áhim papivām̐ indro asya

‘Indra slew the dragon having drunk (**papivām̐**) of it (Soma).’

In the following examples from the Brāhmaṇas, the past gerund is explicitly synonymous with a perfect participle, alternating with the latter in the same sentence or passage without any perceptible difference of meaning:

(148) AB 3.47.1

**chandāmsi vai devebhyo havyam ūḍhvā srāntāni jaghanārdhe
yajñasya tiṣṭhanti yathāśvo vāsvataro vohivāms tiṣṭhed evam**

'The metres stand, after having carried (ūḍhvā) the libation to the gods, exhausted at the rear of the sacrifice, like a horse or a mule would stand, having carried (vohivāms) its load.'

(149) ŚB 1.6.4.21

**taddhāike mahendrāyēti kurvanti. indro vā eṣā purā vṛtrāsya vadhād
ātha vṛtrām hatvā yāthā mahārājō vijigyānā evām mahendro 'bhavat
tāsmān mahendrāyēti. tād v indrāyēti evā kuryād indro vā eṣā purā
vṛtrāsya vadhād indro vṛtrām jaghnivāms tāsmād v indrāyēty evā
kuryāt.**

'Now some offer saying: "To Mahendra", since Indra he is before the killing of Vṛtra, but after slaying (hatvā) Vṛtra, just like a Mahārāja having conquered all (vijigyānā), he became Mahendra, and so "To Mahendra". But one may also do it saying: "To Indra", since Indra he is before the killing of Vṛtra and Indra (he is) having slain (jaghnivāms) Vṛtra, and therefore one may offer saying: "To Indra".' (Cf. Delbrück 1888, p. 377f.)

3.2.B. PAST GERUND VS. PAST PARTICIPLE

Except when lexicalized as an adjective, the past participle in *-tā/-nā-* refers to a previous completed action, or, by inference, a simultaneous resulting state. A form like *sthitā-* does not literally mean 'while standing up' but 'having stood up' > 'standing'. As in the case of the past gerund and perfect participle, this temporal value cannot be reinterpreted in purely aspectual terms.¹¹ Cf. AV 4.39.9a *agnāv agniś carati praviṣṭaḥ* "Agni moves (*car*), entered (≠ while entering/going to enter) into the fire" (Whitney 1905, p. 217); RV 10.51.1ab *mahāt tād ūlbam sthāviraṃ tād āsīd yēnāvīṣṭitaḥ pravivēsithāpāḥ*

¹¹ Cf. Delbrück's (1897 = Grundriss III:2, p. 484) definition of the 'verbal adjective' in *-ta-*: "[...] um auszudrücken, daß ein Substantiv von der Handlung des Verbums betroffen worden ist, so daß also sowohl die Vorstellung der Passivität als der Vollendung der Handlung erregt wird, z.B. *pītās* 'getrunken'. So auch im Griechischen, wobei aber oft der Zustand nicht als ein zeitweiliger sondern als ein dauernder erscheint." Even when used as the main predicate of a clause, the past participle refers mostly to a completed action with or without present relevance (as a perfect or 'stative tense'), cf.: RV 1.86.4 *sutāḥ sōmaḥ* 'the Soma is pressed' (Jamison 1984). This value can still be discerned in lexicalized verbal adjectives in *-ta-*, cf. *śakta-* 'able' (? < 'enabled'). Cf. also [ni]ṣatta- 'seated' (RV 7.56.18) : *niṣadya* 'having sat down' (RV 1.108.3 etc.), and *juṣṭaḥ* 'pleased' (RV 9.44.2) : *juṣṭvī* 'having become pleased' (RV 9.97.16).

‘Great was that steady membrane, into which you entered concealed’ : AV 1.25.1a **yád agnir āpo ádahat pravísya** ‘When Agni burned the waters, having entered (≠ while entering/going to enter) them’.

On the other hand, partly due to its completive perfective sense which foregrounds the logical object rather than the logical subject, the past participle tends to have passive voice with transitive verbs, which reduces the overlap with the past gerund, and thus increases the syntactic complementariness of these formations. But sometimes the past participle has active voice even when formed from a transitive verb, accounting for parallels such as:

(150) Nala 25.1ab

atha tām vyuṣīto rātrīm nalo rājā...

‘And then having spent (**vyuṣīto**) that night, king Nala...’

(151) Nala 26.1ab

sa māsam uṣya kaunteya bhīmam āmantrya...

‘Having spent (**uṣya**) one month, O son of Kuntī, and having invited Bhīma...’

The temporal synonymity or overlap of these formations is even more conspicuous in constructions that involve syntactic complementariness, cf. (152) : (153) and (154) : (155):

(152) AV(Ś) 8.8.10

mṛtyor ye aghalā dūtās tebhya enān prati nayāmi baddhvā

‘The sad messengers that are death’s, them I lead them to meet, having bound them (**baddhvā**).’

(153) AV(P) 16.29.10cd

mṛtyor ye aghalā dūtās tebhya enān prati nayāmi baddhān

‘The sad messengers that are death’s, them I lead them to meet, (in the state of being) bound (**baddhān**).’

(154) ŚB 1.6.2.3

ét puroḍāśam éva kūrmám bhūtvā śárpantam

‘Look, the sacrificial cookie crawling away having become (**bhūtvā**) a tortoise!’

(155) TS 2.6.3.3

apaśyan puroḍāśam kūrmám bhūtám śárpantam

‘[they] saw the sacrificial cookie crawling away having become (**bhūtám**) a tortoise.’

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

The syntactic complementariness between the past or perfect participle and past gerund is due to the different coreferentiality constraint of the gerund, which makes it unamenable to refer to another constituent than the subject, agent or oblique experiencer. Hence the gerund must be replaced by a participial form when its logical subject is the (in)direct object or some peripheral constituent of the superordinate clause. In such cases it is almost invariably the past or perfect participle that replaces the gerund, cf. (150) and (156):

(156) TS 2.5.3.1

indram vṛtrám jaghnivāmsam mṛdho 'bhi prāvepanta
'Indra, who had slain (*jaghnivāmsam*) Vṛtra, his enemies threatened.'

3.2.C. PAST GERUND VS. AORIST PARTICIPLE

The aorist participle was never a very productive formation in Sanskrit and was lost soon after the early Vedic period. It is rather weakly marked temporally, showing, however, mostly past relative time reference in combination with ingressive aspect and middle voice:

(157) RV 8.62.6cd

juṣṭvī dáksasya sominaḥ sákhāyam kṛṇute yújam bhadrá indrasya
rātāyaḥ
'(Having become) pleased (*juṣṭvī*) with the skilful Somist he (Indra) makes him a companion friend, blessed are the gifts of Indra.'

(158) RV 3.44.1cd

juṣāṇá indra háribhir na ā gahy ā tiṣṭha háritam rátham
'(Having become?) pleased with (*juṣāṇá*) us, come Indra with the golden ones, mount the golden wagon!'

According to Renou (1940, p. 211), this parallel is an indication of the temporal synonymy of the gerund and aorist participle, but it may be questioned whether the literal temporal value of these categories is 'presential' in these examples. It can hardly be a coincidence that also the perfect participle *jujuṣāṇá-* (cf. RV 1.91.10, etc.) and past participle *juṣṭá-* (cf. RV 9.44.2a; 4.23.1b) are frequently found in roughly parallel passages, whereas the present participle occurs so only once (4.23.1c).

3.2.D. PAST GERUND VS. PRESENT PARTICIPLE & NON-PAST GERUND

The past gerund contrasts temporally with the non-past gerund and present participle, which refer mainly to simultaneous actions or states. Occasionally there is functional overlap, inasmuch as both non-past and past non-finite forms may refer to immediately preceding or succeeding (partly overlapping) actions. The present participle is then usually based on a telic or punctual verb, which aspect is more consistent with actional sequence:

(159) RV 10.52.1ab

viśve devāḥ sāsāna mā yáthehá hótā vṛtó manávai yán niśádyā

‘O All-Gods, instruct me as to how I should meditate, chosen to Hotṛ-priest, having sat down (at my office)!’

(160) RV 9.92.2

áčhā nṛcákṣā asarat pavitre náma dádhānaḥ kavír asya yónau

sídan hóteva sádane camūṣūpem agmann ṣṣayaḥ saptá viprāḥ

‘The man-beholder (? “männlich Blickende” [Geldner]) has come, assuming his name in the strainer, the seer in his womb, seating himself in the *camū*-bowls like the Hotṛ-priest on the seat. To him the seven inspired seers have come.’

The temporal contrast appears most clearly when there is no temporal overlap of actions, cf. *bhūtvā* (161) vs. *bhavan* (162), and *nirñijya* vs. *anavamarsam* (163)

(161) AV 10.9.3cd

suddhā tvám yajñiyā bhūtvā divam préhi sataudhane

“Do thou, having become clean, fit for sacrifice, go on to heaven, O thou of the hundred rice-dishes.” (Whitney 1905, p. 602)

(162) AV 18.4.51cd

...tadā roha puruṣa médhyo bhávan práti tvá jānantu pitáraḥ páretam

“...that do thou ascend, O man, becoming sacrificial; let the Fathers acknowledge thee, who art departed.” (Whitney 1905, p. 884)

(163) ŚB 1.3.1.8 (= 1.2.4.8; cf. Gune 1913, pp. 22, 25)

**sá vái saṁmṛjya saṁmṛjya pratápya pratápya práyacchati | yáthāva-
mársam nirñijyānavamarsam uttamám parikṣālayéd evam tát tásmāt
pratápya pratápya práyacchati**

“Each time he has brushed and heated (a spoon), he hands it (to the Adhvaryu). Just as, after having rinsed (the eating vessels) while touching (*avamársam*) them, one

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

would finally rinse them without touching them, so here: for this reason he hands over each (spoon) after heating it.”

(Eggeling, SBE 12, p. 70; cf. Delbrück 1888, p. 406.)

Occasionally it may, however, be hard to determine from the context whether there is temporal overlap of action or not. In such cases we can only rely upon the default values of these forms, cf. *gūḷhvī* : *gūhantī*- in (164)-(165), *hatvī* : *ghnat*- in (166)-(167), and *ārúhya* : *āróhat*- in (168)-(169):

(164) RV 7.80.2

eṣā syā návyam āyur dádhānā gūḷhvī támo jyótiṣoṣā abodhi

ágra eti yuvatír áhrayāṇā prácikitat sūryam yajñám agním

‘Conferring new life, this here Dawn has awakened, having concealed (? while concealing) the darkness. In front the young lady goes unabashed. She has revealed the sun, the sacrifice, the fire.’

(165) RV 4.51.9

tā in nv évá samanā samānīr ámitavarṇā uṣásaś caranti

gūhantīr ábhvam ásitam rúsadbhiḥ sukrās tanūbhiḥ sūcayo rucānāh

‘Those dawns even now uniformly similar, of unchanging hue, move on, concealing the black monster (= the night), bright with gleaming forms, brilliant, shining.’

(166) RV 2.20.8cd (cf. RV 2.12.3; 10.157.4)

práti yád asya vájram bāhvór dhúr hatvī dásyūn āyasīr ní tārīt

‘When in his hands they laid the bolt, having slain (? while slaying) Dasyus he tore down the iron strongholds.’

(167) RV 6.73.2cd (cf. RV 3.30.4; 5.14.4)

ghnán vṛtrāṇi ví pūro dardarīti jáyañ chātrūṁr amitrān pṛtsú sáhan

‘Slaying harassers he tears asunder strongholds, conquering foes, vanquishing enemies in battles.’

(168) AV 8.5.7cd

sūrya iva dívam ārúhya ví kṛtyā bādhate vaśi

‘Like the sun, having ascended (? ascending) to the sky, it drives away the witchcrafts, powerful’

(169) AV 13.1.43

āróhan dyām amṛtáh prāva me vácaḥ

‘Ascending (? having ascended) to the sky as an immortal, favor my words!’

In the following examples (170-171), one might be tempted to consider the past and non-past gerunds synonymous:

(170) TS 3.1.2.3

yád abhikrámya juhuyāt pratiṣṭháyā iyāt tásmāt samānátra tiṣṭhatā hotavyām pratiṣṭhityai

‘If he offered after/upon stepping up/near (? while stepping up), he would go from his support, therefore he should offer standing at the same place for support.’

(Keith 1914, p. 224 interpreted **abhi+kram-** as having durative atelic aspect: “If he were to sacrifice moving about, he would lose his support”. But cf. TS 2.6.1.4 **abhikrámam juhóti** “he offers stepping near”, *ibid.* p. 210.)

(171) MS 1.4.12 (61, 8f.)

yām abhikrámam juhóti sábhikrámantī yām apakrámamjuhóti sápakrámantī yām samānátra tiṣṭhan juhóti sá pratiṣṭhitā

‘That (*āhūti*) which one offers (by, in the manner of) stepping up (**abhikrámam**) is called **abhikrámantī**, that which one offers stepping away (**apakrámam**) is called **apakrámantī**, that which one offers standing (**tiṣṭhan**) on the same spot is called **pratiṣṭhitā**.

Delbrück (1888, p. 405) had difficulties with explaining this sort of parallels (cf. 1.5.H), but it may be observed that the stepping up or away from the sacrificial fire is hardly wholly simultaneous with the pouring of the libation into it. Hence the past gerund may be said to have the expected past relative time reference, while the non-past gerund is used here either as referring to an immediately preceding or only partly overlapping punctual or telic activity (which uses were known already to Pāṇini: 3.4.29: **kanyādarśam varayati** ‘immediately on seeing a girl he woos her’), or it is to be explained as referring to the manner rather than time of performing the sacrifice. Any one of these interpretations resolves the conflict on the basis of the generally lesser temporal markedness of non-past vs. past forms in any system of relative tense.

Similarly, in TS 5.3.1.3 **anuparihāram sādāyati** ‘lays down [the five water tiles] in the manner of each time carrying them around [the altar]’, MS 2.2.2 (16, 4 & 6) **adhiśādya** ‘having sat down upon’ vs. KS 11.4 (148, 8) **adhiśādam** ‘while/in the manner of sitting down upon’, SB(M) 1.3.2.7 **ánādiśya** ‘without having announced’ vs.

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

SB(K) **anādeṣam** ‘without announcing’, and many other cases in the ritual Sūtras, where the non-past gerund is used with reference to an immediately preceding action or the manner of an action, as pointed out by Renou (1935, p. 366f.), e.g.:

(172) ĀsvGS 1.10.11

yady u vai samopya [śrapayet] vyuddhāram juhuyāt

‘mais s’il (fait cuire les quatre portions de *havis*) après les avoir versées en un même (récipient), il doit faire l’oblation en mettant (**vyuddhāram**) chaque (portion) dans un (récipient) différent.’ (Renou 1935, p. 366)

Cf. Oldenberg (SBE 29:1, p. 173): “But if he (cooks the portions) throwing (them) together, he should (touch and) sacrifice them, after he has put (the single portions) into different vessels.”

Stenzler (1865, p. 25): “wenn er die einzelnen Portionen herausnimmt... und dann opfern”.

Also the present participle is occasionally used to express an immediately preceding action or the manner of action in Vedic and Epic Sanskrit, e.g.:

(173) SvU 5.3

**ekaikam jālam bahudhā vikurvan asmin kṣetre saṁharaty eṣa devaḥ
bhūyaḥ sṛṣṭvā yatayas tathesaḥ sarvādhipatyam kurute mahātmā**

‘Spreading (? having spread) out one net after the other manifoldly, this god pulls it all together in this field. Having again created the disposers (*yatis*) the great self exercises his lordship over all.’

(174) AiU 2.1.4

sa itaḥ prayann eva punar jāyate

‘So (on) departing (**prayann**) from here, he is immediately born again.’

(Śaṅkara: **śarīram parityajann eva** ‘just on leaving the body’)

(175) Rm (ed. Schlegel) 1.1.99

paṭhan rāmāyaṇam naraḥ pretya svarge mahīyate

‘(By) reading the Rāmāyaṇa, a man enjoys bliss in heaven upon dying’¹²

Sometimes a non-past gerund referring to a preceding action is actually paralleled by the past gerund in a variant reading, cf.:

¹² Cf. cr. ed. Baroda 1.1.78 **etaḥ ākhyānam paṭhan rāmāyaṇam naraḥ | svaputrapautraiḥ
sagaṇaḥ pretya svarge mahīyate.**

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

(176) MŚS 1.3.1.31

...**paridhisamdhī anvavahāram āsīna uttarato juhōti**

‘...he offers sitting in the north bringing (? having brought/in the manner of bringing) [the oblations] near the two junctions of the enclosing sticks’

(177) MŚS 1.7.1.46 (cf. ĀpŚS 2.12.7, 2.13.11, 12.20.20)

agreṇottaram paridhim anvavahṛtyā

‘Having brought it in front of the northern enclosing stick’ (Gelder 1963, p. 42)

A philological problem is that the order of the ritual acts cannot always be determined from independent sources. In the following example, Renou (1935, p. 366) claims that there must be simultaneousness between the acts in reality, but this seems doubtful:

(178) PB 12.13 (= JB 1.77)

...**hiranyaṃ sampradāyaṃ ṣoḍaśinā stuvate**

‘...giving a piece of gold, he praises with the sixteenfold liturgical course’

(179) BŚS 17.3 (= JŚS 15 (18, 13))

...**hiranyaṃ sampradāya stuvate**

‘...having given a piece of gold, he praises’

Although not temporally indifferent, the present participle and non-past gerund are temporally less marked than the past gerund, inasmuch as they may refer to simultaneous actions or states as well as to immediately preceding and succeeding (i.e. partly overlapping) actions, whereas the past gerund refers to actions/states that have at least the final phase preceding or tangent to the initial stage of the subsequent action/state (cf. the configurations (i) vs. (ii) in (3.2)). By contrasting only with the past gerund, the non-past gerund is, in fact, less marked than the present participle, which also contrasts with the future participle. The relative unmarkedness of non-past vs. past verb-forms is even more pronounced in the other Indo-European languages, explaining why European present participles/gerunds cannot always be translated by corresponding presential forms in Sanskrit.

3.2.E. PAST GERUND VS. FUTURE PARTICIPLE, GERUNDIVE, INFINITIVE

Unlike the future participle, which is marked for relative future tense, the infinitive and gerundive are temporally unmarked. However, due to their common use in adjuncts or complements of purpose they tend to imply future relative time reference. Cf.:

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

(180) MS 3.6.9 (72, 17)

...iti vadet svapsyán suptvā vā prabúdhya

'...thus he should say (before) going to sleep (svapsyán), having slept (suptvā) or having woke up (prabúdhya).'

(181) RV 1.161.3

agním dūtám prāti yád ábravītanāśvaḥ kártvo rátha utéhá kártvaḥ

dhenúḥ kártvā yuvaśá kártvā dvá táni bhrātar ánu vaḥ kṛtvyémasi

'What you answered to the messenger Agni: "A horse is to be made, and a wagon here is to be made, a cow is to be made and two young ones are to be made. Having made those things, brother, we shall come after you.'"

(182) RV 8.33.13a

éndra yāhi pītāye mādhu

'Come here, Indra, to drink the mead!'

3.3. TEMPORAL NEUTRALIZATION OF THE PAST GERUND

It cannot be immaterial to our discussion that the Indian grammarians and scholiasts unani-
mously assigned relative past tense (cf. 1.5.A.) to 'ktvā', except when repeated, then
being synonymous with 'ṇamul'. To be sure, exceptions to this basic value were now and
then presented, but no rational explanation for the temporal vacillation was found. Had the
basic value of the gerund been non-past/presential, the temporal vacillation of the gerund
would have been in conformity with other temporally unmarked or weakly marked forms.

Before going into these cases, let us recall what Hendriksen (1944, p. 113f.) said about
the "simultaneous" value of the Pali gerund:

Sometimes the gerund indicates what is simultaneous with the principal verb. In
examining these instances it is necessary to proceed with the utmost caution. It must
be borne in mind that the gerund is used very frequently in Pāli, and often when
other languages would employ the present participle. When in the modern western
European languages the present participle or other synonymous constructions are
employed, it is because we think primarily of the actions as taking place, whereas in
Pāli, when the gerund is employed, stress is often laid on the commencement of the
action. The example Ja[taka, ed. Fausböll] I 141, 13 **antevāsītāpaso rājānam
disvā pi n'eva vuṭṭhāsi** is most naturally translated thus: "although the pupil-
ascetic saw the king, he did not stand up", but the exact meaning is "although the
pupil-ascetic had caught sight of the king, ...". Sentences where the gerund has an

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

iterative meaning are also treacherous: Vin[ayapiṭaka, ed. Oldenberg] III 105,16 **tam enam gijjhā pi kākā pi kulalā pi anupatitvā anupatitvā pāsuḷantarikāhi vitudenti**: “vultures, crows, and hawks pluck him between ribs, pursuing him all the time.” On account of the iterative meaning of the gerund-*āmreḍita*, we are inclined to regard the two actions, that of the gerund and that of the sentence verb, as simultaneous; but in Pāli it is the single, not the iterative action, that is considered, and here **anupatitvā** precedes the sentence verb in time.

(Hendriksen 1944, p. 113f.; cf. also Lorimer 1935, p. 330, see 6.8.A, fn. 25.)

This may be restated so that when the gerund seems to indicate simultaneousness of action, it is not necessarily the gerund but its idiomatic translation as based on a stative or atelic durative (rather than original telic or punctual) verb that has this literal sense. This fallacy has been amply illustrated in the preceding discussion (3.2), but let me cite one more typical example in point:

(183) AV 11.3.49

**tātaś cainam anyāyā pratiṣṭhāyā prāsīr yāyā caitām pūrva ṣṣayaḥ
prāśnan. apratiṣṭhāno anāyatanó mariṣyasīti enam āha. tám vā ahám
nārvāñcam ná párāñcam ná pratyāñcam. satyé pratiṣṭhāya. táyainam
prāśiṣam táyainam ajigamam.**

‘And if you have eaten it (= the Odana-porridge) with another firm standing than with which the ancient seers ate this, without firm standing, without support you shall die, they say to him. That I have not indeed (eaten) coming hither, nor retiring, nor coming against; having established myself (**pratiṣṭhāya**) in truth (I have eaten it); with that I have eaten it, with that I have let it go.’

In view of the parallel instrumental action noun **pratiṣṭhāyā** and nominative *bahuvrīhi* **apратиṣṭhāno** it might be conceived that also the gerund **pratiṣṭhāya** is presential or temporally unmarked, meaning literally ‘(while) standing firm’. This is principally possible, because the compound verb **prati+sthā-** has either stative aspect (‘stand firm’) as in AV 8.9.19 or punctual aspect (‘establish oneself’) as in AV 11.4.18:

(184) AV 8.9.19

kathám stómāḥ práti tiṣṭhanti téṣu táni stómeṣu kathám ārpitāni
‘How do the praises stand firm in them, how are they arranged in the praises?’

(185) AV 11.4.18

yás té prānedám véda yásmimś cāsi prátiṣṭitah
‘He who knows this about you, O breath, and in whom you are established’

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

But inasmuch as aspectually unambiguous gerunds seldom show non-past relative time reference, we would have to eliminate the stative interpretation of the gerund in (183) as inconsistent with a maximally homogeneous synchronic description. Clearly an explanation which accounts for diverse synchronic phenomena in a simple consistent way must *a priori* be preferred to one that accounts for them in an inconsistent or unpredictable way, such as the suggested temporal indifference or unmarkedness of the gerund.

In other words, the only *convincing* examples of the exception of the past relative tense of the gerund are those that are quite *unambiguous* (in their specific context) and subject to some lexical or syntactic constraints, such as Hendriksen's examples for the Pali gerund. On the other hand, this may still leave a residue of e.g. lexicalized relics or non-productive archaic idioms which cannot be accounted for synchronically by any rule at all.

3.3.A. NON-PRETERITAL MODAL-INSTRUMENTAL VALUE

Unambiguous examples of the 'non-preterital' (relative non-past) value of the gerund in the Ṛgveda are extremely rare (cf. 1.5.K). The only plausible case is found in a comparatively late hymn, which escaped Renou's (1940) attention:

(186) RV 7.103.3

yád īm enāṃ usatō abhy ávarsīt tṛṣyāvataḥ prāvṛṣi ágatāyām
akhkhalikṛtyā pitāraṃ ná putró anyó anyām úpa vādantam eti

'When it has rained upon them, those longing thirsty (frogs), at the arrival of the rains, one (frog), *while croaking/jubilating* (? having burst into croaking), goes up to another speaking one, like a son to his father.'

"der eine Frosch kommt hin zum andern in dem er Silben bildet wie der [noch nicht die Sprache mächtige] Sohn zum redenden Vater [kommt und ihm einzelne Silben nachspricht]" (Thieme 1954)

Independently of whether we interpret the first element of the *hapax* **akhkhalī+kṛtyā** with Sāyaṇa as an onomatopoeitic formation (**sabdānukaraṇam**) or with Thieme (1954) as an early Prakritism of **akṣara-** 'syllable' (cf. the context in 7.103.5: "Wenn von diesen [Fröschen] der eine des anderen Rede redet, wie der lernende [Dichterschüler] die Rede des mit [Dicht-]Kraft Begabten", Thieme, *ibid.*), the standard 'preterital' rendering of the gerund does seem awkward. In particular this is so because it would be natural to assume semantic correspondence with the parallel present participle **vādantam**, which obviously refers to a simultaneous durative activity.

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

The non-preterital modal-instrumental value of the gerund is, however, a mainly post-Ṛgvedic phenomenon, being most frequent in Middle and New Indo-Aryan and Prakritized or late forms of Sanskrit. Thus it is synchronically a case of *temporal neutralization* in Sanskrit, although historically it may sometimes be a dialectal archaism surviving in idiomatic constructions or marginal syntactic usages, as perhaps four times in the Śaunaka (but not the more westerly Paippalāda) recension of the Atharvaveda. In two cases (187-188) the gerundial clause is then used as a 'cognate instrumental', i.e. as an intensifying manner adverbial repeating the main verb, while in two cases (211-212; 3.3.B) it seems to function as a final adjunct, which use is known only from Middle and New Indo-Aryan.

(187) AV 6.135.2

**yát pibāmi sám pibāmi samudrá iva saṁpibāḥ
prāṇān amúṣya saṁpāya sám pibāmo amúm vayám**

'When I drink, I drink it all up, like the ocean an up-drinker. By drinking
(? having drunk) the breaths of him yonder, we drink him all up.'

(188) AV 6.135.3

**yád girāmi sám girāmi samudrá iva saṁgirāḥ
prāṇān amúṣya saṁgīrya sám girāmo amúm vayám**

'When I swallow, I swallow all up, like the ocean an up-swallower. By swallowing
(? having swallowed) the breaths of him yonder, we swallow him all up.'

Sāyaṇa paraphrases AV 6.135.2cd (rather pedantically) as: 'having first drunk the various breaths of the enemy, we then finally drink up the rest of him', which interpretation should be possible for 6.135.3cd as well. This interpretation is somewhat forced not only semantically, but especially because the Paippalādasamhitā has the present participle in both these verses: PS 5.33.8cd: **saṁpivām sapivāmy āham pivā** (ed. RaghuVira: **saṁpiban saṁ pibāmy ahaṁ pibam**); PS 5.33.9cd: **saṁgiram saṁ girāmy ahaṁ giram** (ed. RaghuVira: **saṁgiran saṁ girāmy ahaṁ giram**).

Temporal neutralization of the past gerund in modal-instrumental function is, in fact, quite common in later Vedic and Classical and Epic Sanskrit when the gerund is repeated iteratively or with continuous/durative implication, e.g.:

(189) Mbḥṣy. 1.1.3. (2) (= 2.3.32, 2.4.34, 5.2.4, 6.1.17, 6.3.49, 7.2.117)

**athavā maṇḍūkāgatayo 'dhikārāḥ. yathā maṇḍūkā utplutyotplutya
gacchanti tadvad adhikārāḥ**

≈ 'Or the heading rules may be said to have the motion of frogs. Just like frogs move by jumping and jumping (*utplutyotplutya*), in the same way the heading rules (move).' (Cf. Speijer 1886, p. 299 § 382 fn. 2.)

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

- (190) Māl. 4.11ab
pathi nayanayoḥ sthitvā sthitvā tirobhavati kṣaṇāt
'Just while standing (*sthitvā sthitvā*) in front of my eyes on the road, she disappears all of a sudden.'
- (191) Vedānt. 220
tatrādvitīyavastuni vicchidya vicchidyāntarindriyavṛttipravāho dhyānam
'There meditation means the continuously interrupted (*vicchidya vicchidya*) activity of the mind directed toward the non-dualistic reality.'
- Temporal neutralization of the non-repeated gerund occurs occasionally in post-Vedic Sanskrit in idioms (192) or as an optional or obligatory complement or adjunct of manner, dependent on an atelic durative verb expressing behaving, speaking, subsisting, etc.:
- (192) Vārttika to P 3.4.21 (Renou 1947, p. 167)
jhaṇatkṛtya patati
'It falls making (≠ having made) [the sound] *jhaṇat* (i.e. "it falls going Bang!")'
- (193) MBh 3.264.56 (= ex. 86, 1.5.N)
sītā madvacanāt vācyā samāśvāsya prasādyā ca
'By my command Sītā is to be spoken to consolingly and soothingly.'
- (194) Rm 3.41.8 (= ex. 56, 1.5.G)
evam bruvāṇam kākutstham prativārya śucismitā uvāca sītā...
'To the descendant of Kakutstha speaking in this way *dissuadingly* (≠ having dissuaded/while dissuading) Sītā said, smiling sweetly...'
- (195) VSms 8.7 (cf. also 8.3)
**vālakhilyo jaṭādharas cīravalkalavasano 'rkāgniḥ kārṭṭikyām paur-
ṇamāsyām puṣkalam bhuktam utsṛjyānyathā šeṣān māsān upajīvyā
tapaḥ kuryāt**
'The Vālakhilya-hermit, wearing matted hair, clothed in a tattered garment or in bark, having the sun as his fire, having abandoned on the day of the full moon in the month of Kārṭṭikī his abundant food, *subsisting* (*upajīvyā* ≠ having subsisted/while subsisting) otherwise during the remaining months, should perform ascetism.' (Cf. Caland 1929, p. 190.)

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

- (196) Rm 2.101.5 (= ex. 87, 1.5.N.)
ity uktaḥ kaikeyīputraḥ kākutsthena mahātmanā
praḡḡhya balavad bhūyaḥ prāñjalir vākyam abravīt
 'Having been spoken to in this way again by the great descendant of Kakutstha who embraced him forcefully, the son of K. said with his hands folded'
- (197) Daś. 6. ucchv. (ed. Kale 1966, p. 169; = ex. 57, 1.5.G)
viditam eva khalu vo yathāhaṁ yuṣmadājñayā piṭṛvanam abhiraḡḡya
tadupajīvi prativasāmi
 'Surely it must be known to you that by your order I dwell here *guarding* (≠ having guarded/while guarding) the cemetery, subsisting on that.'
- (198) VikrC 18.0 (= ex. 19, 129) (Southern recension, ed. Edgerton, p. 141)
vikramārko nītim ullaṅghya rājyaṁ na karoti
 'Vikramārka does not rule his kingdom *transgressing* (≠ having transgressed/while transgressing) rules of ethics.'
- (199) BrVaivP 61.43cd (= ex. 88, 1.5.N)
tasthau praḡḡsya sa munir mahendraṁ ca vinindya ca
 'that sage stood there *laughing* and *abusing* the great Indra.'
- (200) Pañc. 3.11
kasmim̄scin nagare bhikṣāṭanaṁ kṛtvā mahati devālaye kālam
yāpayati
 'Begging alms in a certain town he spends his time in a big temple.'
 (? Having begged [every day]..., he then spends [every day]...)
- (201) VSms 3.9
...striṣūdrābhyām anabhibhāṡyāparam adṛṡtvā bhartāraṁ paśyed
 '...without conversing with other women and *sūdras* and without looking at any other man, she should only look at her husband.' (Cf. Caland 1929, p. 79.)

It is important to note that the temporal neutralization of the gerund is incompatible with separate spatio-temporal settings for the clauses and that it leads to 'modal-instrumental' rather than 'presential' value, inasmuch as the temporally neutralized (non-repeated) gerund does not express a concomitant separate action but the manner or way of behaving or performing an action.

On the other hand, also a normal preterital gerund may express the manner of performing an action in terms of the result of a preceding action (cf. 4.7.C.5), e.g. *iṡṡvā*

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

'having sacrificed' > 'by having sacrificed' (\approx *yajñena* 'by the sacrifice'), but with temporally neutralized value: '[e.g. live/subsist] by sacrificing'.

Thus there is mostly a conspicuous difference in syntactico-semantic function between temporally neutralized modal-instrumental gerunds and temporally non-neutralized gerunds with instrumental implicature. Temporal neutralization occurs more often but roughly in the same syntactic and lexical contexts in Middle and New Indo-Aryan (cf. 6.3.B):

(202) Jāt. 41 (ed. Fausbøll, I p. 239, 9; quoted from Hendriksen 1944, p. 114f.)

...*atha so... bhatim katvā jīvati*

'...and so he lives by working as a day-laborer'

On the other hand, there are ambiguous cases especially in connection with verbs denoting verbal or mental processes, e.g. (*iti*) *matvā* 'while thinking thus' or 'having realized (that something is in a certain way)', *vilāpya/vihasya* + *verbum dicendi*:

(203) Pañc. 1.22

...*iti vicintya teṣām agre sakaruṇam vilāpyedam āha*

'having thought... he said lamenting (? having lamented) miserably before them.'

(204) Kath. 11.64

hanyāt tvām ko 'pi cet tāta me kā gatiḥ bhavet

ity ārtā tam avādīt sā sa ca vihasya tato 'bravīt

“‘What would become of me if someone killed you, daddy?’”, she said pained to him. But he just laughed and said (? said laughingly) then:’

Similar ambiguity may be at hand in other contexts as well, cf. the following problematic phrase from the *Mahābhāṣya*, which has been discussed in detail by Ojihara (1978): *Paspaśā* vt. 13 [I, 12, 9 f.], 6.3.34 vt. 3 [III, 151, 14f.], 8.2.6 vt. 10 [III, 393, 2f.] *na cedānīm ācāryāḥ sūtrāṇi kṛtvā nivartayanti*, rendered as “Ah non! Il ne peut se faire, en l’occurrence, que les Maitres (tel Kāt.) soient en train de tailler (à la manière de Pāṇ.) les *sūtra* (*śleṣa*: “fils”) tout en les composant (mentalement)!” (ibid, p. 230). It may, however, be suggested that this interpretation could be vindicated even without assuming presential value of the gerund, since the action referred to is anyhow only mental.

A more productive type of temporally neutralized modal-instrumental gerunds are those that occur in elliptical stage directions lacking an expressed main clause, cf.:

¹³ For further similar examples, see Söhnen (1985).

- (205) Śak. 1.7
rathavegam rūpayivā
 'While imitating (? having imitated/started imitating) the motion of a chariot.'
 Cf. Śak. 7.9 **rathāvataṛaṇam nāṭayivā** 'Having acted/While acting alighting the chariot'.
- (206) Śak. 3.7.
sparsam rūpayivā
 'While imitating (? having imitated/started imitating) the sensation of touch'
- (207) Mṛcch. 8.14 (ed. Kāle, p. 198)
adhiruhyāvalokya ca saṅkām nāṭayivā tvaritam avatīrya viṭam kaṅthe avalambya
 'Having amounted and looked around (? while looking around) and then alighted quickly while acting fear (? having acted fear/started to act fear), (then) throwing himself at the rogues neck [Śakāra says:]'

Possibly, but not very probably, these gerundial clauses express only the preceding commencement of an action, i.e. ingressive aspect. On the other hand, they seem to contrast with similar expressions based on the present participle, e.g.:

- (208) Śak. 6.31
ākarnya gatibhedam rūpayaṇ
 'Having heard, while imitating the change of speed'
- (209) Mṛcch. 5.46 (ed. Kāle, p. 154)
sparsam nāṭayan pratyālingya
 'While acting the feeling of touch, having embraced'

When these stage directions are expressed non-elliptically, the gerund has mostly the normal preterital value, implying that the temporal neutralization of the gerund in elliptical stage directions is a generalized idiom:

- (210) Ūrubh. 40
utthānam rūpayivā patati
 'Having acted rising up, he falls down.'

The conclusion is that the modal-instrumental value of the past gerund has spread from contexts where relative temporal contrasts are more or less excluded, as e.g. in obligatory

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

and optional complements or adjuncts of manner, where the gerund came to be used instead of non-past verb-forms or action noun phrases especially in Epic and (later) Classical Sanskrit. Unlike the Atharvavedic 'cognate gerund', which (like the final gerund) is an isolated phenomenon or genuine archaism, this use of the gerund is probably a 'Dravidism' rather than a reflection of the original instrumental origin of the gerund (cf. 6.5.B).

3.3.B. FINAL INFINITIVAL VALUE

The most striking case of non-preterital value of the gerund is at hand in its exceptional (though somewhat uncertain) use as a final adjunct twice in the Śaunaka recension of the Atharvaveda (211-212). Like the 'cognate gerund' (187-188), this could principally reflect the instrumental infinitival origin of the gerund, but it may also be an early Prakritisism in the same way as the absolute construction of the gerund in the Śaunakasaṁhitā (4.2.B).

(211) AV 9.6.53

**yád vâ átithipatir átithīn parivīṣya gṛhān upodāity avabhṛtam evá
tád upāvaiti**

'When the host goes up to the houses to serve (parivīṣya ≠ having served/while serving) the guests, then he is really going down to the purificatory bath.'

PS 16.116.9 has a confused reading: ...praviṣyāyanam yācate avabhṛtam eva tat prā hvayanti; ed. RaghuVira: parivīṣya.

(212) AV 5.20.5 (= PS 9.24.5)

**duṇḍubhēr vācam prāyatām vādantīm āśṛṇvatī nātūitā ghōṣabuddhā
nārī putrām dhāvatu hastagṛhyāmitrī bhītā samaré vadhānām**

'Listening to the voice of the drum speak produced, helpless and alarmed by the noise, may the woman run to her son to grasp his hand (hastagṛhya ≠ having grasped/while grasping his hand), the enemy, terrified at the clash of weapons.'

Whitney (1905, p. 255) conceived that the gerund is synonymous with an infinitive here, translating: "let the woman..., run to her son, seizing his hand — our enemy...". But sensing that this is in fundamental contrast with the normal value of the gerund, Bloomfield (SBE 42, p. 130) attempted to solve the anomaly by restructuring the sentence: "...may she aroused by the sound, distressed, snatch her son to her arms, and run, frightened at the clash of arms." The problem is that we cannot have the gerund severed from its object by the main verb. *hastagṛhya* occurs also in AV 5.14.4b, 5.17.12d (= RV 10.109.2d) and

14.1.20a (= RV 10.85.26a), but in these cases it has the normal preterital value: 'having grasped the hand' > "holding the hand" (cf. *pādagḥya* RV 4.18.12d, 10.27.4d and *karnaḡḥya* RV 8.70.15a).

The final gerund does not seem to occur elsewhere in Vedic (or even Epic and Classical) Sanskrit, although it has been wrongly claimed once in the *Aitareyabrāhmaṇa* (Gune 1913, p. 38, see 1.5.J.). There is, however, one doubtful case in the *Jaiminīyāsrautasūtra*:

(213) JSS 1.5.1 [with *Bhavatrāta* commentary]

udvāsya pravargyam athainam āmantrayante.

[*udvāsya pravargyam mahāvīram anantaram enam prastotāram āmantrayante. atra pravargyodvāsānārtham ādānam udvāsānam abhipreyate. prasiddhe tu pravargyodvāsane gṛhyamāne udvāsyeti paurvakālikapratyayo nopapadyate. pūrvam eva hi prasiddhād udvāsānāt prastotāmantraṇīya udvāsane sāmāgānārtham. athavā prasiddham evodvāsānam. ekam etat padam udvāsya pravargyam iti. udvāsyaḥ pravargyo 'nenety.]*

'To remove (?) the Pravargya-equipment, they then call on him (the Prastotṛ). [— They thereupon call on him the Prastotṛ to remove P., i.e. the Mahāvīra-vessel. Here removal means for the purpose of removing or taking the P.

— But if the removal of the Pravargya is to be taken as accomplished, then the expression '*udvāsya*', which has the suffix of the form used to express an action referring to preceding time (*paurvakālikapratyayo*), is not appropriate. For it is specifically before the accomplishment of the removal of P. that the Prastotṛ is to be called for the purpose of singing at the removal of the P.

— Very well, so let the removal be accomplished. But *udvāsya pravargyam* is just one (compound) word, meaning that the P. is to be removed by him.']

Bhavatrāta thus explains *udvāsya pravargyam* as a compound gerundive, meaning 'the one who is to remove the P.' This does not strike me as a convincing solution, but it shows (together with the term '*paurvakālikapratyayaḥ*') that the sense of relative past time reference of the gerund had become more or less axiomatic to Sanskrit speakers and writers.

At any rate it is not possible to interpret *udvāsya* here as 'while removing' or 'in the manner of removing', whereas in all other contexts *udvāsya* clearly means: 'having set aside, removed' (cf. TS 1.5.1.4; ŚSS 2.8.12-13; BhP 10.29.5). The final solution to this problem seems to remain open.

3.3.C. COMPLEMENTATION OF ALAM, KIM, MĀ

Somewhat more controversial is the temporal neutralization of the past gerund when it is construed with a prohibitive or inhibitive particle like **alam** 'enough, away with, have done with', **kim** 'why, what' or **mā** '(that) not; dont'. Historically, this type of construction may have evolved on the basis of the normal function of the gerund, e.g. **alam ruditvā** 'no good/use upon crying' > 'no good crying (any more/in the future)' > 'don't cry!'. But it seems that there has been a syntactico-semantic reinterpretation of the construction as a simple clause where the gerund functions as a temporally unmarked predicate, being interchangeable with an infinitive or, to some extent, instrumental action noun, cf.:

(214) Rm 2.28.25

tad alam te vanam gatvā

'So no good for you going to the forest!'

Cf. Rm 3.59.14 **alam viklavatām gantum** 'Do not despair!'

Rm 2.36.30 **tad alam devi rāmasya śriyā vihatayā tvayā** 'So have done with the destroying by you of Rāma's happiness, your majesty!'

Note that according to a *vārttika* to P 3.4.124 it is possible to use the prohibitive particle **mā** also with the present participle: **mā pacan** 'don't ever cook' (cf. Speyer 1896, p. 92 § 287; BRW, s.v. i. **mā** (6) and Wackernagel 1896 = Ai. Gr.¹ I, p. xlix).

3.4. ASPECT OF THE GERUND

The semantic domain of 'aspect' is the (view of the) *internal* temporal constituency of an event/state-of-affairs as expressed in the inflection or meaning of a verb (phrase) or in the morphosyntax of a clause (cf. Comrie 1976, p. 3). Unlike tense, aspect is thus not a deictic category, but by imposing certain limits to relative time reference it interacts with tense.

Situations can be viewed and expressed as either *perfective events* or *imperfective dynamic processes/non-dynamic states*, depending mainly on whether they are conceived of as actionally/temporally *bounded* or not, i.e. whether reference to them includes their end-points or not (cf. Lindstedt 1985, p. 277). Perfective expressions thus represent the action or state of affairs as a temporally bounded complex whole with consequent emphasis on realization, resultativeness or factuality, whereas imperfective ones represent it as actionally open, unlimited or unbounded with consequent emphasis on attendant or qualifying components of the event (cf. Nespital 1981, p. 58ff.).

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

This ontological distinction is also reflected on the lexical level in the more delicate aspectual semantics ('Aktionsart') of verbs/verb phrases, which can be classified as either *punctual vs. durative* (e.g. 'arrive' vs. 'swim'), *telic vs. atelic* (e.g. 'run to the store' vs. 'run [around]') and *dynamic vs. stative* (e.g. 'run' vs. 'love'), as determined by their compatibility with delimiting vs. durational adverbial phrases, resultative implicature in the perfect tense, and lack of progressive aspect, cf.: *he is arriving today!/*during three days* : *he is swimming today/during three days*; *he is running to the store* ≠> *he has run to the store* : *he is running around* => *he has run around*; *he is running* : **he is loving* (cf. Vendler 1967; Dowty 1972, 1979; Comrie 1976, p. 41ff.; Lyons 1977, p. 703ff).

On the other hand, perfective events may be embedded in imperfective contexts by "pluralizing" or extending them into habitual or iterative activities or states. Conversely, imperfective processes or states may be embedded in perfective contexts by imposing a temporal limit. Through this sort of recursive aspectual nesting or embedding, a sentence may come to contain any number of aspectual layers, the innermost of which is the inherent aspectual character of the main verb (cf. Lindstedt 1985, p. 169ff.).

The question is now, whether the gerund as an inflectional verb-form is marked for some particular aspect and whether it contrasts formally with some other verb-form(s) along this parameter. This must be investigated without reference to the underlying aspectual character of the verb in question. It has been proposed that the basically relative past tense of the gerund stems from its originally completive perfective aspect or "aorist sense" as encoded in its zero-grade vs. the full grade of the "presential" infinitives (cf. Speyer 1896, p. 68 § 223). Thus *kr̥tvā* has been etymologized as 'with the completion of the doing' ("in Folge der (vollzogenen) Handlung"; Speyer, *ibid.*).

This may be true historically, but since the attested gerund cannot usually (cf. 3.3.B) refer to actions *to be completed* in the relative future or present, it may be doubted whether the alleged aorist or perfective value has any crucial relevance for the synchronic state of affairs. If, on the other hand, the past gerund is synchronically indifferent to the distinction between perfective and imperfective aspect (as argued by i.a. Elizarenkova 1982, p. 366), the following example should have four possible translations, inasmuch as also the verb *gam-* 'go (to)' is aspectually ambivalent:

(215) RV 4.41.5c

sā no duhiyad yāvaseva gatvī

'May she milk for us as if having been going on pasture' (atelic + imperfective)

'May she milk for us as if having gone on pasture' (atelic + perfective)

'May she milk for us as if having kept going to pasture' (telic + imperfective)

'May she milk for us as if having gone to pasture' (telic + perfective)

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

Elizarenkova (ibid.) recognizes only the atelic imperfective reading here (“kak esli by hodila”), but all the given readings should be possible under the given circumstances.

In the following example, the gerund is, in fact, modified by a durative temporal adverbial, which seems to reinforce the imperfective reading of the gerundial clause:

(216) SSS 14.14.1

**devā ha paśukāmās caturo māsān vrataṁ caritvaitam udbhidaṁ
yajñakratum apaśyan**

‘The gods being desirous of getting cattle, having during four months observed
(?been observing) a vow, beheld that sacrifice, the *udbhid.*’

It would, however, seem that the *unmarked* or default value of the gerund is perfective rather than imperfective, since imperfectiveness can be expressed by repeating the gerund:

(217) Mbṣy. 1.1.7

**saṁskṛtya saṁskṛtya padāny utsṛjyante teṣāṁ yatheṣṭam abhisam-
bandho bhavati. tad yathā. āhara pātram pātram āhreti.**

‘The words are uttered upon being separately formed one by one; their connection is established according to intent. As e.g. “bring the pot” or “the pot bring”.’

(218) Mā1.4.11ab (= 190)

pathi nayanayoḥ sthitvā sthitvā tirobhavati kṣaṇāt

‘Just while standing in front of my eyes on the road, she suddenly disappears.’

But repetition of the gerund may also emphasize perfective aspect in the case of non-continuous or distributive action, cf.:

(219) Rudradāman: Girnar rock inscription, 150 A.D. (Diskalkar 1977, p. 1)

**...dakṣiṇāpathapateḥ sātakarṇair [sic] dvir api nirvyājam avajityāvajitya
saṁbandhāvidūratayānutsādanāt prāptayaśasā**

‘...who earned fame because of his not destroying Sātakarṇi, the lord of Dakṣiṇāpatha, on account of the nearness of their connection, in spite of having twice in fair fight indisputably defeated him’ (Diskalkar 1977, p. 3)

If the past gerund is supposed to be marked for perfective aspect, it could be expected to contrast aspectually with the non-past gerund, which is, however, aspectually just as ambivalent. The latter does have imperfective aspect when referring to a simultaneous action (220), but this may be a consequence of the incompatibility of perfective aspect with relative present time reference (cf. 3.3). On the other hand, it may have perfective aspect

when functioning as a manner adjunct (221) or when having relative non-past time reference (cf. 222-223):

(220) *Das. 3. ucchv.* (ed. Kale 1966, p. 121)

...*tām eva saṁhatorūm ūrūpapiḍam bhujopapiḍam copagūhya talpe*
'bhiramayann alpām iva tām nisām atyanaiṣam

'...and entertaining myself on the bed by embracing (*upagūhya*, past ger.) her with the firm thighs, while pressing her hard with my thighs (*ūrūpapiḍam*, non-past ger.) and arms (*bhujopapiḍam*, non-past. ger.), I passed the night, which felt just all too short.'

(221) *RV 10.165.5a*

ṛcā kapótam nudata praṇódam

'Push away the dove in the manner of (≠ while) pushing her away for good!'

(222) *P 3.4.29*

kanyādarśam varayati

'Immediately on seeing (≠ while seeing) a girl he woos her.'

(Cf. Speijer 1886, p. 299 § 382.)

(223) *P 3.4.52*

sayyotthāyam dhāvati

'(After) rising (≠ while rising) from his couch he runs.'

The propensity of the past gerund to express perfective (bounded) situations in narrative discourse (cf. 2.3.B) is therefore a consequence of its basically relative past tense rather than vice versa.

3.5. VOICE OF THE GERUND

Voice or diathesis is an inflectional category of the verb by which its argument structure (incl. pivot assignment) is rearranged in accordance with the discourse function and information structure of the participants (actants). By helping 'foregrounding' and/or 'backgrounding' participants and changing the information flow and transitivity of a clause, it has pragmatic, semantic and syntactic implications (cf. Foley & Van Valin 1984, pp. 27ff., 149ff.; 1985, p. 306ff.; Keenan 1985; P. Andersen 1985).

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

In accusative systems and active constructions, the Actor¹⁴ (or single actant) of a predicate is prototypically mapped as the grammatical subject and the Undergoer as the object or oblique complement (cf. 4.2).¹⁵ This confers pragmatic salience in terms of *topicality* and *pivotality* and mostly definiteness to the Actor as against the Undergoer, cf. **indraḥ somam pibati... hanti ca** 'Indra drinks Soma and [Ø = Indra] kills...'.¹⁶

In passive constructions the mapping is reversed, so that the Actor is usually *demoted* to a peripheral (structurally dispensable) non-topical (i.e. rhematic rather than thematic) or referentially indefinite/impersonal status, whereas the Undergoer is *promoted* to the status of topical and pivotal subject, e.g. **somaḥ (indreṇa) piyate/pītaḥ stūyate/stutaḥ ca** 'the Soma is/was drunk (by Indra) and [Ø = Soma] is/was praised'. With some simplification, it may be said that this is the normal construction in syntactically ergative languages or systems, which then must promote the Actor by a specific 'anti-passive' construction.

On the other hand, when the passive voice serves to *eliminate* the Actor as unknown or irrelevant and especially when the Undergoer is not topical/definite or totally affected by the process, the passive is often replaced by an active impersonal construction with an implicit generic subject, **somam piba(n)ti** 'they/one drink/s Soma', or: 'Soma is drunk'.

Hence the (Indo-European basic) passive has two distinct functions: it either foregrounds/topicalizes the Undergoer (while possibly rhematizing the Actor) or eliminates the Actor, but these processes need not co-occur, cf. **somaḥ piyate (indreṇa)** '(The) Soma (foregrounded theme, i.e. topic) is drunk by Indra (backgrounded Actor)'/ 'It is by Indra (rheme) that the Soma (theme) is drunk'/'Soma (topic) is drunk (generic/unknown Actor)'.¹⁷

Sanskrit displays both accusative and ergative clause structures. The latter may be based on the passive gerundive and *ta*-participle and are distinguished from passive structures in that they allow the Actor to be encoded as the instrumental or genitive¹⁶ agent and the Undergoer as the subject *without* entailing changes in their discourse status, word order, reflexivization and pivotality (cf. Hock 1982; P. Andersen 1985). In such morphologically (vs. syntactically) ergative structures, ellipsis and coreference across clauses continue to operate on an 'accusative' basis, i.e. in accordance with coreference of *intransitive* Actor with *transitive* Actor rather than with transitive Undergoer, cf. **indreṇa somaḥ pītaḥ stutaḥ ca** 'Indra drank the Soma and praised it' (≠ '...and it was praised').

Apart from the active and passive voices, Sanskrit also has middle voice, where the Undergoer is conflated with the Actor or in the 'pragmatic interest' or domain of the Actor, e.g. **indraḥ somam pibate** 'Indra drinks Soma (for his own good)'. Like the infinitives and verbal nouns, the gerunds are not inflected for the category of voice, but they may be formed from both active and middle verbs. Cf.:

¹⁴ Capital letters are used here to distinguish semantic roles from syntactic functions.

¹⁵ When there is a third actant, e.g. a Beneficiary or Recipient this is mostly encoded as a peripheral constituent (e.g. 'dativus [in]commodi') that cannot be promoted to subject by passivization.

¹⁶ Especially if animate and definite or given, cf. P. Andersen (1983, 1986a).

(224) JB 1.12.2

te paṣum ālabhya medaḥ samavadāya paśvāhutim ajuhavus

‘Having slaughtered (ā+√labh, middle voice) an animal and cut off parts (sam+ava+√dā, active voice) of its flesh they performed an animal sacrifice.’

A controversial question raised by Bopp and discussed i.a. by Kielhorn (1902/1903, p. 159, note 3), Keith (1906, 1907) and Rouse (1906) is whether the gerunds are also compatible with a passive interpretation. In other words, can they take passive construction (as indicated by an independent nominative subject and/or independent instrumental agent) or at least passive/impersonal sense (as indicated by the backgrounding of the Actor and/or foregrounding of the Undergoer)?

If so, one should find constructions such as: [[Aⁱ U^j_{NOM} Gd) Aⁱ U^j Pred], or even: [Aⁱ U_{NOM} Gd) A^j U Pred]. E.g. **lekho likhitvā mayā tubhyaṁ dattaḥ** ‘a letter, having been written [by me], was given to you by me’ (but with ergative interpretation: ‘Having written a letter, I gave it to you’), ***lekho nena likhitvā mayā tubhyaṁ dattaḥ** ‘a letter, having been written by him, it was given to you by me’. While the former construction does exist, the latter does not seem to occur in Sanskrit.

Whereas the passive gerund is common in Middle¹⁷ and New Indo-Aryan (mainly in the first-mentioned form), Sanskrit presents rather few *unambiguous* examples of it. Thus while Bopp and Kielhorn admitted the possibility of ‘passive voice’ for the past gerund, it was categorically denied by Keith (1906, p. 693ff.; 1907, p. 164ff.) and (somewhat less categorically) by Deshpande (1980, p. 110).

Quite a different position had been taken by Rouse (1906, p. 992), who argued against Keith, claiming that the gerund is entirely indeterminate in this respect, being an oblique verbal noun meaning simply ‘after V-ing’.

Although it is clear that the gerund is not formally marked for any one voice, the last-mentioned position is hard to maintain without qualifications, seeing that the predominant construction of the gerund is specifically active vs. passive or even nominal (where the Actor or Undergoer may appear as a genitive attribute). An oblique verbal noun does not consistently distinguish between active and passive construction due to not being able to encode the Actor in the nominative case. (On the other hand, this is a language-specific restriction: in English we can say either *because of the shooting of the hunters by the maniac*, or *because of the maniac shooting the hunters*, the former construction being “passive”, the latter “active” from the point of view of the morphosyntactic mapping and discourse functions of the Actor and Undergoer).

Despite the possibility of the gerund having passive or impersonal voice after the (early)

¹⁷ Occasionally Pali even *inflects* the gerund for the passive voice, cf. **duyhitvā/duhetvā** ‘having been milked’ (Hendriksen 1944, p. 126f.).

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

Vedic period, there are certain pragmatic and syntactic restrictions on this interpretation, demanding that the Undergoer and also the Actor of the gerund be coreferential with the corresponding participants of the main clause:

(225) MS 1.8.5 (122, 4)

**agnihotrahávanīm pratápya hásto 'vadhéyo hásto vā pratápyāgni-
hotrahávanyām avadhéyah**

'Having heated the fire-sacrifice spoon, the hand is to be inserted, or the hand, having been heated (? one having heated it; ? after heating it), should be inserted in the fire-sacrifice spoon.' (Delbrück 1888, p. 408: "nachdem man sie gewärmt hat")

This coreferentiality constraint entails that the alleged passive gerunds are mostly constructionally ambiguous or indeterminate: the coreferential Undergoer, even when expressed before the preceding gerund, may be syntactically connected with the main clause, the gerundial clause being conceived of as an active or impersonal clause (cf. 235-242).

The Actor and/or Undergoer is, in fact, quite often implicit or unexpressed, increasing the ambiguity between a passive and an impersonal active construction, e.g.: (Das.) **kim upakṛtya pratyupakṛtavatī bhaveyam**. According to Kielhorn (1902/1903, p. 159, note 3), the gerundial clause in this example is to be rendered passively as: "after having been favoured", while Keith (1906, p. 694) maintained an impersonal active construction: "How, when someone has benefited me, can I repay?".

Rouse (1906, p. 992) offered a neutralized nominal interpretation of the gerund: "after the favouring", the actant/participant structure of which must be determined from the context (i.e. 'after the favoring of me [= Undergoer/logical object] by somebody [= Actor/logical agent]'). But the main problem with this sort of nominal rendering is that it often makes violence to the basic syntax of the (non-lexicalized) gerund as a verbal adverb with *verbal rection* and *prototypically active voice* rather than a verbal noun with nominal rection and complete lack of voice differentiation.

One way of approaching the voice of the gerund in ambiguous cases is then to study anomalies in the mapping of the core arguments (actants) in relation to the normal coreferentiality constraint of the gerund. In the above example, the gerund has as its argument a backgrounded unexpressed Actor ('somebody') and a foregrounded/topical unexpressed Undergoer ('I'), which reoccur in the main clause as the demoted unexpressed Beneficiary and the promoted incorporated Undergoer (i.e. subject) respectively. It appears now that a passive interpretation of the gerund would be compatible with the normal coreferentiality constraint and the perceived backgrounding of the Actor (> implicit instrumental agent) and foregrounding of the Undergoer (> implicit nominative coreferential subject) of the gerund. The implicit subject of the gerund would be coreferential with the subject of the main clause: 'How, upon having been favored (by someone), shall I become free from debt?'

But a somewhat similar Actor-backgrounding effect could be achieved by assuming an impersonal active construction (Actor > implicit generic subject; Undergoer > implicit accusative coreferential object). The problem is that this analysis would lead to a syntactically irregular absolute construction of the gerund, as it would require that the implicit grammatical *object* (rather than the implicit grammatical subject or Actor) of the gerund be coreferential with the subject/Actor of the main clause. Such a construction would be extremely unusual, because normally the target of control is the Actor (> implicit subject or logical agent) or foregrounded/topicalized Undergoer (> implicit subject) of the gerund, not the demoted or backgrounded Undergoer (> object), cf.:

(226) ŚvU 1.8 (= 2.15, 4.16, 5.13, 6.13)

jñātvā devaṃ mucyate sarvapāśaiḥ

‘Upon knowing god (≠ upon god being known/someone knowing god), one is released from all fetters.’

[Coreference of Actor (> implicit nominative subject) of active gerund with promoted Undergoer (> unexpressed nom. subject) of intrans. main clause]

(227) MBh 13.7602 (ed. Calcutta quoted from Böhtlingk, Ind. Spr. I: 19)

akāryam asakṛt kṛtvā dṛśyante hy adhamā narāḥ

dhanayuktāḥ svakarmasthā dṛśyante cāpare 'adhanāḥ

‘For lowly men are seen (to be) rich, (although) having done innumerable misdeeds, while others are seen poor, (though) standing loyal to their duty.’

[Coreference of Actor (> implicit nominative subject) of gerund with promoted Undergoer (> nominative grammatical subject) of passive main clause]

(228) Nala 24.13ab

sākṣād devān apahāya vṛto yaḥ sa mayā purā

‘He who was formerly chosen by me, having rejected the gods in presence.’

[Coreference of Actor (> implicit nominative subject) of active gerund with demoted Actor (> instrumental agent) of passive main clause]

(229) VSmS 3.1

yad... vṛttavayaḥsāmpannam āhūyārhayitvā kanyālamkṛtā dāsyate sa brāhma iti gīyate

‘When (one) having called and respectfully received a young man of good conduct, a girl well-adorned is given, that is praised as the Brahman-form of marriage.’

[Coreference of Actor (> implicit nominative subject) of active gerund with demoted Actor (> unexpressed instrumental agent) of passive main clause]

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

(230) Ragh. 2.62

taṃ vismitaṃ dhenur uvāca sādho māyām mayodbhāvya pariṅṣito 'si
 'To that astonished one the cow said: "Good man! By me, having produced a
 phantom, you were tested."
 [Coreference of Actor (> implicit nominative subject) of active gerund with demoted
 Actor (> instrumental agent) of passive main clause]

(231) Das. 6. ucchv. (ed. Kale 1966, p. 168)

...na ca śakyaṃ vighnam apratikṛtyāpatyam asmāl labdhum
 '...and it is not feasible to have a child from him without having removed the
 obstacle.' [Coreference of Actor (> implicit nominative subject) of active gerund
 with demoted Actor (> unexpressed instrumental agent) of passive main clause]

(232) Kāvyaḍ. 1.91

alpaṃ nirmaṭam ākāśam anālocyaiva vedhasā
iḍam evaṃvidhaṃ bhāvi bhavatyāḥ stanajṛmbhaṇam
 'Space was measured too small by the Creator, not having foreseen this sort of
 future immense swelling of your breasts.'
 [Coreference of Actor (> implicit nominative subject) of active gerund with demoted
 Actor (> instrumental agent) of passive main clause]

Thus it appears that the gerund is partly indifferent to voice: it has basically active(-middle) vs. passive voice and construction, but it may have passive interpretation and construction when there is coreference of the promoted or topicalized Undergoer and/or the (demoted) Actor with the corresponding arguments of the main clause, which for that reason is also typically passive. Conversely, we might say that 'passiveness' in connection with the gerund implies the *foregrounding or topicalization of the coreferential Undergoer simultaneously with the backgrounding of the coreferential Actor*.

To this extent, the passive interpretation of the gerund may overlap with the active impersonal interpretation in an active sentence. This also shows that the 'passive gerund' cannot be explained merely by the ability of the gerund to refer to an instrumental agent, as suggested by Renou (1930, p. 128f. § 103e). The gerund may be passive even when the main clause is active, showing coreference with the *subject* rather than agent of the latter:

(233) TB 2.1.6.4

yad eva gārhapatyē 'dhiśrityāhavanīyam abhyudravet
 "If (any milk) should flow toward the A.-fire, after (the milk) has been placed on
 the G.-fire" (Cf. Ārtel 1926, p. 313: "the gerund [here] equals semantically an
 absolute locative: **adhīśrite**".)

(234) ĀpDhS 2.11.29.7

...ubhayataḥ samākhyāpya sarvānumate... satyaṁ praśnaṁ brūyāt
 “he should answer (the questions put to him) according to truth [...] with the
 consent of all, after having been exhorted (by the judge) to report fully (and be fair)
 to both sides.” (Gonda 1975 [1967], p. 91 [262])

In the following examples, the voice is principally ambiguous, though mostly to be
 explained as passive rather than active:

(235) AB 5.11.1 (cf. Gopathabrāhmaṇa 2.6.11; quoted from Certeel 1926, p. 311)

teṣāṁ yāni antarhastīnāni (GB: antarhastāni) vasūny āsaṁs tāny ādāya
 (GB: ādāyant) samudraṁ praupyanta (GB: prārūpayanta)
 ‘The treasures which were in the hands of the Asuras, they were scattered (by the
 gods) over the ocean, having been seized (? after [the gods] had seized them).’

(236) Manu 9.99

...anyasya pratijñāya punar anyasya dīyate
 ‘...having been promised (?? one having promised her) to another, she is given to
 another (by the same person)’

(237) Vikr. 1.15

purā nārāyaṇeneyam atisṛṣṭā marutvate
 daityahastād avācchidya suhrdā samprati tvayā
 ‘Long ago given by Nārāyaṇa to Indra was she, and now again by you, having
 been delivered (?? after you had delivered her) from the clutches of Daitya.’

(238) Madhuban Plate of Harṣa (cf. Banskhera Copperplate inscription of Harṣa)

rājāno yudhi duṣṭavājina iva śrīdevaguptādayaḥ
 kṛtvā yena kaśāprahāravimukhāḥ sarve samaṁ samyatāḥ
 ‘By whom the kings starting with Devagupta having been made to turn back by the
 lashes of the whip were all equally curbed.’ (Cf. Kielhorn 1902/1903, p. 157, fn. 3)¹⁸

(239) Daś. 4. ucchv. (ed. Kale 1966, p. 125)

mantriṇā punar aham āhūyābhyadhāyīṣi
 ‘Having been called again by the minister, I was told: ...’

¹⁸ But cf. Keith (1906, p. 694): “by whose action Devagupta and all the other kings together were
 subdued, although like vicious horses they turned away from the lashes of his whip.”

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

(240) Kath. 6.48a

sauvarṇo mūṣakaḥ kṛtvā mayā tasmai samarpitaḥ
 'A golden mouse having been made, it was given by me to him.'

(241) Kath. 75.127

ārūḍhas tām ca dṛṣṭvaiva dāsibhis tābhir āsu saḥ
rajjvotkṣipto gavākṣeṇa praviveṣa priyāntikam
 'And having mounted it, and as soon as having been seen by the servant girls, he was quickly pulled up by the rope and entered the abode of his beloved.' (Cf. 1.5.M.)

(242) Hit. 3.4 (Lanman [1884], p. 36, l. 6-7; = ed. Schlegel & Lassen, p. 83, l. 10)

tatas tena rātrau nītvā tatra (hrada-)jale cañcalaṃ candrapratibimbam
darsayitvā (sa) yūthapatiḥ praṇāmam kāritaḥ
 'Then having been brought by him (the messenger) in the night and shown the trembling reflection of the moon in the water, that leader of the (elephant) herd was made to bow (to the reflection).' (Cf. Bopp 1816, p. 49f.)

When embedded in a passive participial clause and controlled by the same agent, the gerund is mostly passive (but cf.376):

(243) Vet. 76.11-13

...ity eva kāle [[[syenena_{AG}> [ānīya] khādyamānasya] sarpasya]_{NP}
 garalam]_{NP} taddravye nipatitam
 '...at that very time, the poison of a snake being eaten, after having been carried away, by a hawk, fell into his food.'

Occasionally when the main clause is ergative, also the gerundial clause becomes ergative (cf. 225). This means that the Undergoer is not topicalized despite the demoted Actor. Thus in the following Prakrit example the topic carrying over from the preceding clause appears as an (implicit) instrumental agent, not as a nominative subject of the gerund:

(244) Mṛcch. 9.2

sakāra: adhialaṇamaṇḍavam gadua aggado vavahālam lihāvaiṣṣam
jadhā cārudattakeṇa vasantaseṇa moḍia mālidā
 (= *adhikaraṇamaṇḍapam gatvāgrato vyavahāram lekhayisyāmi yathā cārudattena vasantaseṇā mocayitvā mārītā*)
 'I'll just go to court and lodge a written complaint before any one else about how Cārudatta strangled and killed Vasantaseṇā' (≠ 'how Vasantaseṇā was strangled and killed by Cārudatta').

3. CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF THE GERUND

Also the non-past gerund is capable of expressing the passive voice:

(245) AB 3.17.3

tau vā etau pragāthāv astutau santau punarādāyaṃ śasyete

‘These two Pragātha-hymns, though not chanted, are recited with repetitions.’

The passive interpretation of the gerunds is nevertheless a mainly later Vedic or even post-Vedic phenomenon. In the Saṁhitās, there is only one possible case of it:

(246) RV 1.133.1

ubhé punāmi ródasī ṛténa drúho dahāmi sám mahír anindrāḥ

abhivlāgya yātra hatā amitrā vailasthānām pári tṛḷhā áseran

‘Both the worlds I purify with truth, the liars I burn all, the great Indraless ones, where having attacked (? been attacked/seized, “eingefangen” [Geldner]) the slain enemies lay crushed over the cemetery.’

“là où les ennemies après une attaque (de notre part) tués...” (Renou)

Unfortunately, the meaning of the verb (*abhi+*)*vlag-*, occurring only here and in the following verse, is not quite clear. Sāyaṇa glosses: **abhito gatvā hatāḥ sarvataḥ prāptā asmābhir ghātītā vā**, and Wilson translates: “wherever the enemies have congregated, they have been slain”. The same root seems to occur in RV 1.133.4 **abhivlānga** “Schlinge” (Geldner), but: “Bedrängen, Fortdrenge” (Grassmann 1873, s.v.). Whereas the gerund **abhivlāgya** in (246) might refer to an obnoxious activity on the part of the slain enemies, in the following verse it would refer to a retaliatory action on the part of the conquerors:

(247) RV 1.133.2

abhivlāgya cid adrivaḥ sīrṣā yātumātīnām | chindhi...

‘Having attacked/seized (“einfangend” [Geldner]) the heads of the sorceresses, O you master of the pressing-stone, cut them off...’

A further problem is that instead of a genuine passive construction of the gerund we could principally argue (with Renou) for an absolute active construction: ‘where the enemies lay..., [we] having attacked them’, or: ‘...after our attacking them’.