

## 5. COMPETING AND CONTRASTIVE STRUCTURES

By virtue of their wide range of syntactic and semantic functions, gerundial constructions overlap and contrast paradigmatically with numerous other non-finite and finite structures over a number of syntactic, semantic and pragmatic parameters. While some of these competing and contrastive structures may be described within the framework of simple clauses, others involve clause complexes, i.e. the coordination, juxtaposition or subordination of full (occasionally reduced) clauses. All these structures can be approached syntactically in terms of the functional theory of 'clause linkage' as outlined in the previous discussions. The focus of this chapter will be on peripheral gerundial clauses, which show the greatest variety of semantic interpretations and paradigmatic relations.

Following Halliday's classification (1985, p. 193ff.) of the logico-semantic relations in clause complexes, we may distinguish between two basic types of interpropositional relationships: *expansion* and *projection*. In expansion the 'secondary clause' expands the 'primary clause' by (a) elaborating, (b) extending or (c) enhancing it. (By 'secondary clause' is meant the *dependent* or *non-initial* clause in the clause complex.)

In *elaboration* one clause expands another by restating, exemplifying or specifying it or commenting on it. In *extension* one clause expands another by extending beyond it, adding some new element, giving an exception to it, or offering an alternative. In *enhancement* one clause expands another by embellishing around it or qualifying it with some circumstantial feature of time, place, cause or condition. In *projection*, on the other hand, the secondary clause is projected through the primary clause, which instates it as (a) a *locution* or (b) an *idea*.

With some qualifications, these semantic relations may obtain between the linked clauses independently of their 'tactic' relation, i.e. interdependency. In complex structures there is always some kind of formal asymmetry: either one unit is *initial* and the other *non-initial* (which order may be semantically or pragmatically conditioned), or one unit is syntactically (distributionally) *dependent* on the other. This provides a universal basis for distinguishing between 'paratactic' and 'hypotactic' complex structures. In *paratactic* structures, units of syntactically equal rank are (a)syndetically connected into complex units, while in *hypotactic* structures one unit is distributionally dependent on the other because of not being able to occur alone as a morpho-syntactically complete utterance even if made referentially non-elliptic. This definition corresponds roughly to that of 'coordination' vs. 'subordination' in traditional grammar, with the difference that it does

not imply an equation of 'subordination' with 'embedding' or 'rank shift'.<sup>1</sup>

Among hypotactic complex structures one may therefore further distinguish between such that involve the embedding or syntactic incorporation of one element as a syntactic constituent of the other as against such where one element is syntactically dependent on the other but not a constituent of it, cf. '[[at the time of X] Y]' vs. '[[when X] [then Y]]'. According to this parameter, correlative structures are hypotactic (rather than paratactic) but do not involve embedding inasmuch as they cannot be incorporated in a discontinuous constituent of the 'main' clause nor can their interpositional relation be foregrounded in the same way as an operationally integrated embedded subordinate clause or adverbial phrase, e.g. *Was it because you saw him that you got angry?*, but \**Was it whereas you saw him that you got angry?*

Non-finite asyndetic peripheral clauses (such as e.g. conjunctive and non-restrictive participial and gerundial clauses) are somewhat ambivalent or neutral as to the parameter of embedding (which parameter is redundant for adpositional and adverbial phrases), and may have to be treated as a separate constructional category, especially because they tend to behave differently from either embedded or non-embedded dependent clauses in relation to the scope of operators. Semantically they may correspond to either hypotactic or paratactic clauses, but their system-specific operational and coreferential constraints may confine them to textually backgrounded or operationally constrained contexts.

Apart from differences in dependency and embedding, there may also be differences in the *structural layer* at which the units are connected. Although it does not seem that all languages encode the level of juncture in clause or predication linkage as transparently as the aboriginal Australian languages that have served as the initial impetus for the functional model of clause linkage, there is typically a major formal dichotomy between nuclear and non-nuclear junctures, e.g. *keep playing it* ≠ *keep it playing*; cf. LSS 4.1.10 *imam ullikhann āsva* 'sit/keep playing it' ≠ *ullikhann imam āsva* 'sit (while) playing it'.

The distinction between peripheral and core-layer junctures tends, however, to be less well demarcated in Indo-European languages, especially for additive relations. According to the definition, core-layer junctures involve the sharing of all peripheral arguments and operators and at least some core argument (actant/central participant). By this criterion, gerundial and participial clauses are somewhat intermediate, since they tend to lack an independent subject and independent peripheral operators, but they may have independent peripheral arguments.

The dichotomy between parataxis and hypotaxis as defined above may sometimes seem to be formally neutralized in structures that involve a purely asyndetic juxtaposition of finite clauses ("parataxis" in traditional grammar). In such cases we can only use *logical* criteria

<sup>1</sup> For an analysis of the various degrees of formal and prosodic 'connexity' in parataxis and hypotaxis, see Bednarczuk (1971, p. 34).

for differentiating between parataxis and hypotaxis. Paratactic structures differ from hypotactic ones logically in that they are (a) *symmetrical* (e.g. *P and/or Q* entails *Q and/or P*, but *P when/if Q* does not entail *Q when/if P*) and (b) *transitive* (e.g. *P and Q and R* entails *P and R*, but *P when Q if R* does not entail *P if R*; cf. Allwood & al. 1980, p. 105 and Halliday 1981, p. 32).<sup>2</sup> To the extent that we can determine the logico-semantic relation even when it is not explicitly codified, *asyndetically juxtaposed clauses* that do not express logically symmetrical or transitive relations must be regarded as hypotactic rather than paratactic.

A corollary of this is that asymmetrical relations cannot be unambiguously expressed by paratactic structures, e.g. *P when/if Q* ≠ *P and Q*.<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, symmetrical relations *can* be expressed by hypotactic structures, but this entails *thematic* asymmetry, i.e. topicalization or backgrounding, cf. *apart from/in addition to P, Q* (≈ *P and also Q*) ≠ *apart from/in addition to Q, P*. Hence both logico-semantic and pragmatic (discourse) factors determine the choice of hypotactic vs. paratactic structures for the expression of interpropositional relations.

A further complication is that logical symmetry may be canceled due to some additional semantic component of the interpropositional relation, e.g. 'temporal sequence' in copulative relations. Thus it is clear that *P and (then) Q* does not entail *Q and (then) P*. On the other hand, the relation remains transitive: *P and (then) Q and (then) R* entails *P and (then) R*.

Similarly, logical symmetry may be blocked by pragmatic dependence, forbidding a coreferentially or operationally constrained elliptical clause to occur as initial, cf. 'He read *and* [he] studied', but not (in English): \*'Studied *and* he read'; 'Did you read *and* [did you] study?', but not \*'Study *and* did you read?'. This restriction does not exist for most hypotactic structures, although also they show preferred or functionally conditioned limitations on word order.

Most of the logico-semantic relations can obtain at different levels of juncture. In general it holds that the looser the interpropositional relation is conceptually, the less restricted it is to a certain level of juncture. E.g. the additive(-sequential) relation may obtain between single predicates, between predicates with complements, and between full clauses or independent sentences. By contrast, circumstantial relations are not available

<sup>2</sup> Hence one cannot add coordinative conjunctions to coordinative or subordinative conjunctions, cf. *and when*, but \**when and*, \**and or* (cf. Dik 1968, p. 35). A further difference is that only paratactic structures allow layering: *A and [B and C]*, but \**A when [B if C]*.

<sup>3</sup> The 'conditional *and*' in constructions like 'eat this *and* you'll grow tall again' ≠ 'you'll grow tall again and eat this' ≠ 'you'll eat this and grow tall again' might seem to be an exception, but note that the conditional *and* demands a logically non-symmetrical and non-transitive structure that is non-recursive and pragmatically constrained (shift of mood despite possible zero-anaphora of subject). I.e. the conditional *and* implies a hypotactic rather than paratactic structure (cf. Palmer 1986, p. 206), although the conjunction is attached to the head clause rather than to the modifying clause.

between single predicates or (usually) independent sentences, whereas participational relations are specifically restricted to core-layer junctures.

The following table lists the basic types of semantic relations that can be expressed more or less unambiguously in Sanskrit clause linkage. The asterisk indicates the availability of a gerundial structure, brackets indicating ambiguity or the need for special modification.

*Extensional relations*

Iteratively recursive:

purely additive ('P and (also) Q'): **ca (ca), u(ta)<sup>4</sup>, api**, asyndeton

\*add.-sequential/consecutive ('P and then/so Q'): **at/dha,u(ta)**, asynd.± **sa/sā**

alternative ('P or Q'): **vā**

Dyadic: (\*)contrastive ('P but (yet)/whereas Q'): **tu, param, u(ta)**, etc.

commentative ('as to P, Q'): **yad (tad)**

*Elaborative relations*

equivalence ('P, i.e. Q'): **arthāt**, asyndeton

elaboration ('P, which is Q'): **yad**

*Circumstantial (incl. spatio-temporal) relations (= enhancement)*

Characterization:

\*manner of action ('P in the manner of Q'): instr., pres. pple, **ṇamul**, etc.

description of participant ('A which is P'): **ya- (ta-)**

(\*)comparison ('P like Q'): **iva, -vat**

Propositional setting or implication:

place of event ('P at Q'): **yatra (tatra)**, loc.

\*time of event ('P when/after/before Q'): **yad(ā), yāvat**, pple, loc.

\*accompaniment ('P with Q'): pres. pple, **ṇamul**, instr.

\*cause-effect ('P because of Q'): **yad (tasmāt), yena (tena)**, abl., loc., pple

\*means-effect ('P by the means of/through Q'): instr., pple

(\*)means-purpose ('P for the purpose of Q'): **yāvat (tā..)**, inf., dat.

\*condition-result ('if P, then Q'): **yad(i)**, pple

(\*)concession-result ('although P, yet Q'): **yadyapi (tathāpi)**

*Projection*

direct discourse complement projecting wording ('A says P'): **yad, S+iti**

\*direct discourse compl. projecting meaning ('A thinks/believes P'): **S+iti**, pple

*Participation*

(\*)direct perception complement ('A perceives X doing P'): participium cum inf.

modal complement ('A wants to/tries/orders, etc. P'): inf.

<sup>4</sup> For a descriptive and diachronic study of these particles in the R̥gveda, see Klein (1974; 1978).

The brief glosses of the interpropositional relations<sup>5</sup> are only suggestive and do not apply homogeneously to all stages of the language. In the following sections the synchronic and diachronic role of gerundial structures in the expression of these interpropositional relations will be described in relation to competing and contrastive non-finite and finite structures.

### 5.1. CIRCUMSTANTIAL (INCL. TEMPORAL) RELATIONS

Circumstantial relations are always asymmetrical by implying a 'head/modifier' or 'topic/comment'-distinction. The modifying element predicates a propositional restriction or setting for the head element, whereas the particular interpropositional relation may be *marked* on either the modifier or the head, less regularly on both (cf. Nichols 1986; Thompson & Longacre 1985).

It follows that circumstantial relations can be unambiguously expressed only by hypotactic structures or adpositional or adverbial phrases, while non-finite clauses differ from finite ones in their tendency to being backgrounded, and and/or syntactically more constrained and semantically less specific. Backgrounded circumstantial qualifications ranking low in discourse prominence (relative informational value) are thus often expressed by non-finite rather than finite structures.

The gerund competes semantically and contrasts syntactically with the conjunctive and absolute participles in the expression of most circumstantial relations, except usually 'description of participant', cf.:

(580) Śak. 4.1

**tataḥ praviśati suptotthitaḥ kaṇvaśiṣyaḥ**

'Then enters Kaṇva's disciple, who had (= in a state of having) just risen from sleep.'

It does not appear that **suptotthitaḥ** can be replaced by **suptvotthāya** 'after sleeping and rising from sleep', since it does not provide the temporal or circumstantial setting or even the sense of sequence of actions, but characterizes the particular physical condition or state of mind of the subject.

#### 5.1.A. PERFECT PARTICIPIAL VS. GERUNDIAL CLAUSE

The perfect participle in **-vās/-ānā-** was a productive formation down to the middle Vedic period, but it was gradually supplanted by the (past) gerund (and to some extent the past participle) when dependent on the subject or (topical) Actor (cf. Delbrück 1888, p. 377; see

<sup>5</sup> The terminology is mainly Halliday's, but draws also on Nida (1975) and Berry (1971, p. 170ff.).

3.2.A). Like the gerund, the perfect participle expresses a preceding or completed action and by inference a resulting state (e.g. *tasthivas-/sthitvā* 'standing' < 'having stood up', cf. *sthita-* ≈ 'standing'), with or without further logical implicatures (cf. VS 17.22 *vāvṛdhānaḥ* 'having grown' ≈ MS 2.20.2 *vardhanena* 'due to the growing').

The perfect participle is both temporally and aspectually more constrained than the gerund, which may have both ingressive and completive aspect when formed from the same verb, cf. RV 1.161.13a *suṣupvāmsa ṛbhavas tād apr̥chatā* 'Having slept, O Ṛbhus, you asked thus' vs. AV 10.3.6a *svāpnam suptvā yādi pāsyaṣi pāpām* 'If, having fallen asleep, you shall see an evil dream' and TS 5.2.2.6 *tāsmāt suptvā prajāḥ prā budhyante* 'Therefore creatures wake up (every time) after sleeping'.

It is also more constrained pragmatically to express backgrounded information, being mostly used in modally unmarked narrative statements. It is hardly ever used in chaining clauses recursively in the same additive-sequential way as the gerund, which appears thus already in the later portions of the Ṛgveda. On the other hand, it is also not used in core-layer manner adjuncts or complements. Gerundial and perfect participial clauses overlap therefore mainly in expressions of temporally or circumstantially restrictive or backgrounded predications referring to the subject, experiencer or (topical) Actor:

(581) RV 1.161.4a (cf. also 1.72.1, 5.29.14, 5.43.3, 8.14.5, 9.44.4, etc.)

*cakṛvāmsa ṛbhavas tād apr̥chata...*

'Having done (*cakṛvāmsa* ≈ *kṛtvā*, cf. 582) [that], O Ṛbhus, you asked that...'

(582) RV 1.161.3d (cf. also 10.15.12, 10.17.2, 10.109.7, 10.159.4)

*dvā tāni bhrātar ānu vaḥ kṛtvy émasi*

'Having made (*kṛtvy* = *kṛtvī*) those things, brother, we shall come after you.'

(583) RV 8.14.5-6

*yajñā indram avardhayad yād bhūmim vyāvartayat cakṛāṇā opasām divi*

*vāvṛdhānasya te vayām vísvā dhānāni jigyūṣaḥ ūtīm indrā vṛṇīmahe*

'The sacrifice made Indra grow, when he rolled asunder the earth, having made (*cakṛāṇā* ≈ *kṛtvā*) a topknot in the heaven. We opt for your help, who have grown big and won all the treasures.'

(584) AV 3.14.3

*samjagmānā ābibhyuṣir asmin ghoṣṭhé kariṣiṇīḥ*

*bībhratīḥ somyām mádhv anamivā upétana*

'Having come together (*samjagmānā* ≈ *samgatya*), unaffrighted, rich in manure, in this stall, bearing the sweet of Soma, come hither, free from disease.'

- (585) AV 11.1.16cd (cf. also 3.4.7, 9.4.15, 11.6.21, 18.2.26)  
**ārṣeyā daivā abhisamgātya bhāgām imām tāpiṣṭhā ṛtūbhis tapantu**  
 ‘Let those of the seers, those of the gods, having come together unto (**abhisam-**  
**gātya**) their share, being most hot, heat this with the seasons.’
- (586) RV 5.29.3 (cf. also 1.61.7, 2.11.10, 3.50.3, 5.30.11, 10.94.9, 10.112.5)  
**utā brahmāṇo maruto me asyéndraḥ sómasya sūṣutasya peyāḥ**  
**tád dhī havyamánuse gā ávindad áhann áhim papivám̃ indro asya**  
 ‘Also of this my Soma, well-pressed, O devoted Maruts, should Indra drink, for  
 this libation (= Soma) found the cows for Manu. Indra slew the dragon, having  
 drunk (**papivám̃** ≈ **pītvā**, cf. 590) of it.’
- (587) RV 1.108.13ab  
**evéndrāgnī papivám̃sā sutasya vísvāsmabhyam sám jayataṁ dhánāni**  
 ‘So having drunk (**papivám̃sā** ≈ **pītvā**, cf. 590) of the pressed (Soma), O Indra  
 and Agni, conquer for us all the riches!’
- (588) RV 3.50.3cd  
**mandānāḥ sómam papivám̃ ṛjīṣin sám asmábhyam purudhā gā iṣanya**  
 ‘Intoxicated having drunk (**papivám̃** ≈ **pītvā**, cf. 590) Soma, gather for us, O  
 lofty one, cows in plenty!’
- (589) RV 10.94.9cd (= 109)  
**tébhīr dugdhám papivān somyám mádhv indro vardhate**  
 ‘Having drunk (**papivān** ≈ **pītvā**) of the Somic juice milked by them, Indra grows’
- (590) RV 9.23.7 (= 545; cf. also 1.4.8, 8.69.7, 8.92.6, 9.108.2, 10.44.8, etc.)  
**asyá pītvā mādānām indro vṛtrāny aprati**  
**jaghāna jaghānac ca nú**  
 ‘Having drunk (**pītvā**) of his potions, Indra has slain harassers irresistible/y, and  
 so he shall slay now again.’ (Note the causal implicature in 589 and 590.)
- (591) RV 1.165.8ab  
**vádhīm vṛtrám maruta indriyēṇa svēna bhāmena taviṣó babhūvān**  
 ‘I slew Vṛtra, O Maruts, with my Indric power, having become (**babhūvān** ≈  
**bhūtvā**, cf. 592) fierce in my wrath.’
- (592) RV 10.145.5 (= AV 3.18.5: **bhūtvā**)  
**ahám asmi sáhamānātha tvám asi sāsahīḥ**



**ubhé sáhasvatī bhūtvī sapátnīm me sahāvahai**

'I am a conqueror and you are victorious. Having both become (= being: **bhūtvī**) mighty, let us overpower my rival!'

(593) MS 1.8.6 (123, 18)

**yó vái bahú dadivān bahv ijā3nó 'agnīm utsādáyate**

'He who having given (**dadivān** ≈ **dattvā**) much, having offered (**ijā3nó** ≈ **iṣṭvā**) much, removes the fire.'

(594) RV 7.70.5ab

**suśruvāmsā cid asvinā purūṇy abhi bráhmāni cakṣāthe ṣṣīṇām**

'Though having heard (**suśruvāmsā** ≈ **śrutvā**, cf. below) so many songs of praise, O Asvins, pay attention to those of our Ṛṣis!'

(595) RV 6.50.5cd

**śrutvā hávam maruto yád dha yáthā bhūmā rejante ádhvani právikte**

'Having heard (**śrutvā**) the call, when you come, Maruts, the whole earth resounds at your chosen road.' (Note the concessive implicature in 595 and 596.)

(596) RV 1.32.14ab

**áher yātāram kām apaśya indra hrđi yát te jaghnúṣo bhír ágacchat**

'Whom did you see as the pursuer of the dragon, Indra, when fear came into your heart, having slain (**jaghnúṣo** ≈ **hatvā**, cf. 4.2.A) (him)?'

(598) AB 3.47.1 (= 148)

**chandāmsi vai devebhyo havyam ūḍhvā śrāntāni jaghanārdhe**

**yajñasya tiṣṭhanti yathāśvo vāsvataro vohivāms tiṣṭhed evam**

'The metres stand 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.'

(599) ŚB 1.6.4.21 (= 149)

**...átha vṛtrám hatvā yáthā mahārājó vijigyāná evám mahendro 'bhavat tásmān mahendrāyēti... indro vā eṣá purā vṛtrāsya vadhād indro vṛtrám jaghnivāms**

'...but after slaying (**hatvā**, cf. **jaghnivāms**) Vṛtra, just like a Mahārāja having conquered all (**vijigyāná**), he became Mahendra, and so "To M."... since Indra he is before the killing of Vṛtra and I. (he is) having slain (**jaghnivāms** ≈ **hatvā**) V.'



(600) JB 2.409 (1)

**prajāpatiḥ prajāḥ sasṛjānaḥ sa vyasraṁsata**

‘Prajāpati having (**sasṛjānaḥ** ≈ **sṛṣṭvā**) created the creatures, he fell asunder.’

Cf. SB 7.1.2.1 **prajāpatiḥ prajā asṛjata sá prajāḥ sṛṣṭvā sárvam ājím itvā vyasraṁsata** ‘Prajāpati created the creatures. Having created the creatures and run the whole race, he fell asunder’.

(601) KU 1.1.11

**yathā purastād bhavitā pratīta auddālakir āruṇir matprasṛṣṭaḥ  
sukhaṁ rātrīḥ sayitā vitamanyus tvāṁ dadṛśivān mṛtyumukhāt  
pramuktam**

‘Just as before Auddālaki, son of Aruṇa, will recognize you, through my favor.<sup>6</sup> Peacefully he will sleep his nights, with his anger gone, having seen (**dadṛśivān** ≈ **dṛṣṭvā**) you released from Death’s mouth.’

(Note the *relative* past time reference of the perfect participle, cf. 3.3.)

By not being coreferentially constrained the perfect participle played originally a complementary role with the gerund in expressions of circumstantial qualifications or attendant circumstances, although it was gradually supplanted by other constructions (e.g. past participle), cf.:

(602) RV 3.32.6

**tvāṁ apó yád dha vṛtrám jaghanvāṁ átyāṁ iva prásrjaḥ sártavájáu  
śáyānam indra cáratā vadhéna vavṛvāmsam pári devír ádevam**

‘When having slain Vṛtra you released the waters to run like runners on a course, with the nimble weapon, O Indra, the godless one who lay (**śáyānam** ≠ **śayitvā**) having encompassed (**vavṛvāmsam** ≠ **vṛtvā**) the godly ones.’

(603) RV 1.52.6

**párim ghrṇā carati titviṣé sávo ‘pó vṛtví rájaso budhnám āśayat |  
vṛtrásya yát pravaṇé durgrībhiṣvano nijaghántha hánvor indra tanyatúm**  
‘Around him heat moves, the power was stirred up. Having encompassed (**vṛtví** ≈ **vavṛvān**) the waters he lay over the bottom of the earthly region, when you, Indra, struck the thunderbolt between Vṛtra’s jaws, who was hard to grasp in the waterfall.’

<sup>6</sup> Radhakrishnan (1953, p. 599) proposed the emendation **matprasṛṣṭam** ‘(when) set free by me’ in accordance with **tvatprasṛṣṭam** ‘set free by you’ in the previous stanza.

(604) TS 2.5.3.1-2

**indram vṛtrám jaghnivámsam mṛdho 'bhí prāvepanta... indro vṛtrám  
hatvā devātābhiś cendriyéṇa ca vyārdhyata... indrasya vṛtrám jaghnúṣa  
indriyám vīryám pṛthivím ánu vyārchat**

'Indra (obj.), who (≈ because he) had slain (**jaghnivámsam** ≠ **hatvā**) Vṛtra, his enemies threatened... Indra (subj.), having slain (**hatvā** ≈ **jaghanvān**) Vṛtra, was deprived of the divinities and his might... The Indric power of Indra (gen.), who (≈ when he) had slain (**jaghnúṣa** ≠ **hatvā**) Vṛtra, went down into the earth.'

(605) AB 3.42.1

**devā vā asurair vijigyānā ūrdhvāḥ svargam lokam āyan**

'The gods having been conquered (**vijigyānā** ≠ **vijitya**) by the Asuras went upwards to the heavenly world.'

The perfect participles which are found in the later Vedic literature are mostly lexicalized, being difficult to render by either gerunds or past participles, e.g. **vāvṛdhāna-** 'having grown; mighty', **tatṛṣāna-** (cf. **tṛṣita-**) 'thirsty'. **cikityas-** 'having perceived; wise', **vidvas-** 'having found out; wise', **anūcāna-** 'having reiterated; learned'.

### 5.1.B. PAST PARTICIPIAL VS. GERUNDIAL CLAUSE

Like the gerund and perfect participle, the past (passive) participle in **-tá/-ná-** has basically past relative tense and perfective aspect, but differs in having passive sense and construction when formed from a transitive verb (cf. 3.2.B). Hence past participial, perfect participial and gerundial constructions partly overlap and partly complement each other in temporal-circumstantial qualifications. In the Veda the past participle actually joined forces with the gerund in rendering the cumbersome perfect participle more or less redundant, finally also losing ground to the gerund itself due to its greater operational constraints (cf. Delbrück 1888, p. 380f.):

(606) ŚB 6.1.1.8 (cf. 1.6.4.2)

**bhūyānt syām prājāyeyēti sò 'srāmyat sá tápo 'tapyata sá srāntás  
tepānò bráhmaivá prathamám asṛjata**

'May I become more numerous, let me procreate myself, thus (thinking) he exerted himself and performed austerity. Exhausted (**srāntás**), having performed austerity (**tepānò** ≈ **taptvā**), he then first created Brahman.'

- (607) RV 8.2.40  
**itthā dhīvantam adrivaḥ kāṇvām médhyātithim**  
**meṣo bhūtò 'bhí yán náyah**  
 'O master of the pressing stone, having become (**bhūtò** ≈ **bhūtvā**) a ram, when  
 you led the pious Kāṇvic Medhyātithi'  
 Cf. ŚB 1.1.15 **medhātithim ha kāṇvyāyanam meṣo bhūtvā jahāra**; Sāyaṇa:  
**svargaṁ nināya** (cf. Geldner, Rigveda II, p. 285.)
- (608) RV 10.85.29cd  
**kṛtyāiṣā padvatī bhūtvvy á jāyá viṣate pátim**  
 'This witchcraft, having become (**bhūtvvy**) provided with feet, enters the man as his  
 wife.'
- (609) RV 7.56.18ab  
**á vo hótā johavīti sattáḥ satrácīm rātīm maruto gṛṇānāḥ**  
 'The Hotṛ-priest calls aloud upon you, seated (**sattáḥ** ≈ **niśadya**), praising your  
 joint gift, O Maruts!'
- (610) Bṛhadd. 5.20  
**niṣaṇṇaḥ sa tayā sárdham āsandyām kaśipāv api**  
**tām upāmantrayām cakre kam etaṁ tvam iti tv ṛcā**  
 'Seated (**niṣaṇṇaḥ** ≈ **niśadya**) together with her upon a stool on a cushion, he  
 addressed her with the verse: "Whom do you here...?"'
- (611) ŚB 1.6.2.3  
**ét puroḍāśam éva kūrmám bhūtvā sárpantam**  
 'Look, the sacrificial cookie crawling away having become (**bhūtvā** ≈ **bhūtam**) a  
 tortoise!'

Since the past participle has normally passive sense when formed from a transitive verb, it cannot be interchanged with a gerund when formed from a transitive verb, unless embedded in a *bahuvrīhi*-compound or construed absolutely. E.g. :

- (612) AB 7.2.1  
**ya āhitāgnir upavasathe mriyeta katham asya yajñāḥ syāt**  
 'If one who has established the fires (**āhitāgnir** ≈ **agnim ādhāya**) dies on the  
 fast day, how is it with his sacrifice?'

(613) AiU 2.1.4

**athāsyaīyam itara ātmā kṛtakṛtyo vayogataḥ praiti**

‘Then the other self of his (father) having accomplished his work (**kṛtakṛtyo** ≈ **kṛtyam kṛtvā**), having reached his age (**vayogataḥ** ≈ **vayo gatvā**), departs.’

(614) Kauṭ. 3.14.5

**karmaniṣṭhāpane bhartur anyatra gṛhītavetano nāsakāmaḥ kuryāt**

‘(If) having received wages (**gṛhītavetano** ≈ **vetanam gṛhītvā**) from another than the employer, he is not to work against his will upon the completion of his (former) assignment.’

(615) Kauṭ. 2.27.20

**bhogam gṛhītvā dviṣatyā bhogadviguṇo daṇḍaḥ**

‘The penalty for a woman having received (payment for) enjoyment (but then) changed her mind is twice the (payment for) enjoyment.’

(616) Śak. 7.24 (p. 103)

**[rājā:] uddhṛtaviṣādaśalyaḥ kathayāmi**

‘[The king:] I shall tell you, having first pulled out the dart of grief.’  
(**uddhṛtaviṣādaśalyaḥ** ≈ **viṣādaśalyam uddhṛtya**)

Past participial and gerundial structures are hence complementary in temporal and circumstantial qualifications and temporal concatenation, cf.(623)-(627):

(617) RV 6.47.3a

**ayām me pītā ūd iyarti vācam**

‘This (Soma), (when) drunk (**pītā** ≠ **pītvā**), stirs up my song.’

(618) RV 10.34.4cd

**pītā mātā bhrātara enam āhur**

**nā jānīmo nāyata baddhām etām**

‘Father, mother, brothers say of him: “We don’t know him, take him away, (in the condition of being) bound (**baddhām** ≠ **baddhvā**)!”’

(619) RV 10.34.10ab

**jāyā tapyate kitavāsya hīnā mātā putrāsya cārataḥ kvā svit**

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

- (620) TS 2.4.12.1  
**tvāṣṭā hatáputro víndraṃ sómam ā harat**  
 'Tvāṣṭr, whose son had been slain (**hátaputro** ≠ **putraṃ hatvā**), offered Soma to others than Indra.'
- (621) TS 2.6.3.3  
**apāsyān puroḍāśam kūrmām bhūtāñ śárpantam**  
 'They saw the sacrificial cookie crawling away having become (**bhūtāñ** ≠ **bhūtvā**) a tortoise.'  
 (Contrast with 611, where the the acc. log. subject is governed by the particle **éd**.)
- (622) TS 5.5.1.6-7  
**yáthā samvatsarām āptvā || kálā āgaté vijāyate**  
 'As one having spent a year (**āptvā**), when the time has come (**kálā āgaté** ≠ **āgatya**), propagates.'
- (623) ŚB 7.1.2.1  
**prajāpatih prajā asṛjata sá prajāñ sṛṣṭvā sárvaṃ ājim itvā vyāsraṃsata**  
**tásmād visrastāt prāṇó mádhyata úd akrāmad áthāsmād víryam úd**  
**akrāmat tásminn útkrānte 'padyata tásmāt pannād ánnam asravat**  
 'Prajāpati created the beings and having created (**sṛṣṭvā** ≠ **sṛṣṭāḥ**) the beings and gone (**itvā** ≈ **gataḥ**) to every contest, he collapsed, and from him collapsed (**visrastāt** ≠ **visraṃsya**) the breaths departed from the middle, and so also his manly potency departed from him. When it had departed (**útkrānte** ≠ **utkramya**), he fell down. From him thus fallen down (**pannād** ≠ **patitvā**), food flowed forth.'
- (624) ŚB 10.6.5.6  
**tásya śrāntásya taptásya yáso víryam úd akrāmat**  
 'From him, thus wearied (**śrāntásya** ≠ **śramitvā**) and heated (**taptásya** ≠ **taptvā**), glory and vigour departed.'
- (625) ŚvU 1.6cd  
**sarvajīve sarvasamsthe bṛhante asmin haṃso bhrāmyate brahmacakre**  
**pṛthag ātmānam preritāram ca matvā juṣṭas tatas tenāmṛtatvam eti**  
 'In this all-enlivening, all-settling vast Brahma-wheel the goose (= soul) flutters about, having perceived (**matvā** ≠ **mataḥ**) itself and the instigator as different. When favored (**juṣṭas** ≠ **juṣṭvā**) by him, he goes to immortality.'

(626) ChU 2.23.2

**prajāpatir lokān abhyatapat tebhyo abhitaptebhyas trayī vidyā samprā-  
srauat tām abhyatapat tasyā abhitaptāyā etāny akṣarāṇi samprāsrauanta  
bhūr bhuvah svar iti**

‘Prajāpati brooded on the worlds. From them, thus brooded upon (**abhitapte-  
bhyas** ≠ **abhitapya**), the three-fold wisdom issued forth. He brooded on this and  
from it, thus brooded upon (**abhitaptāyā** ≠ **abhitapya**), issued forth these  
syllables: **bhūh**, **bhuvah** and **svah**.’

Occasionally, the past participle does have active voice and construction even when formed  
from a transitive verb (cf. 3.2.B; Speijer 1886, p. 280 § 360).

(627) VSms 9.13

**madhyāhne suddhe jale mṛdādbhīḥ pādau hastau ca dhāvayitvācamyā-  
ṅgāni samśodhyāpaḥ punantv iti jale nimajjed ācānto vaiṣṇavair  
mantrair viṣṇum hiranyaṣṅgam iti varuṇam ca praṇamyāghamarṣaṇa-  
sūktenāghamarṣaṇam kṛtvedam āpaḥ sīvā iti snāyād...**

‘At midday, having washed his feet and hands in clean water with clay and water  
and, after having sipped water (**ācamya**) and cleansed his limbs, he should dive  
into the water, with the mantra: “May the Earth purify the waters”. When he has  
(again) sipped water (**ācānto**), he should make obeisance to Viṣṇu, with the  
mantras addressed to this god, and to Varuṇa, with the mantra: “I take refuge with  
gold-horned Varuṇa” then with the *aghamarṣaṇa*-hymn perform *aghamarṣaṇa*,  
and bathe, with the mantra: “There are the waters, the blessed”.’

Especially in operationally unmarked contexts in post-Vedic narrative and procedural  
discourse, conjunctive participial clause (or participle-based *bahuvrīhi*-compounds)  
overlap with both gerundial and finite coordinate clauses also in additive-sequential linkage:

(628) Pañc. 1.18

**atha tathānuṣṭhite sa mattagajo makṣikāgeyasukhān nimītanetraḥ  
kāṣṭhakūṭāpahṛtacakṣur madhyāhnasamaye tṛṣārto bhraman maṇḍūka-  
śabdānusārī gacchan mahatīm gartām āsādyā patito mṛtaś ca**

‘Then this having been arranged (**anuṣṭhite** ≠ **anuṣṭhāya**), that rutting elephant,  
who had closed his eyes (**nimītanetraḥ** ≈ **netre nimīlya**) in his rapture at the  
singing of the fly, got his eyes knocked out by the woodpecker (**kāṣṭhakūṭāpahṛ-  
tacakṣur** ≠ **kāṣṭhakena cakṣur apahṛtya**) and, roaming at midday tormented by  
thirst, following the sound of the frogs, reached the big pit and fell into it and died.’



## 5.1.C. AORIST PARTICIPIAL VS. GERUNDIAL CLAUSE

Like the perfect participle, the aorist participle distinguishes only between active and middle(-passive) voice. It differs from the former in being less strongly marked for perfectiveness and/or relative past tense (cf. Delbrück 1888, p. 381; see 3.2).

After the early Vedic period the aorist participle was mostly supplanted by the gerund or past participle when referring to (the resulting state of) a preceding action, e.g.  $\sqrt{\text{bhī}}$  'fear, become frightened': **bhiyāná-** (aor, pple) 'having become frightened' ( $\neq$  'while getting frightened')  $\approx$  **bhīta-** (past pple) 'scared'  $\neq$  **bhayamāna-** (pres. pple) 'while fearing'. (Note that there is no gerund \***bhītvā** 'having become frightened'; cf. 3.2.C). Like the perfect participle, it figures mostly in propositionally restrictive or textually backgrounded clauses, accounting for sporadic parallels such as:

(629) RV 3.44.1 (cf. 7.7.2, 8.48.2)

**ayám te astu haryatáh sóma á háribhiḥ sutáh**

**juṣāná indra háribhir na á gahy á tiṣṭha háritam rátham**

'May this Soma be desirable to you, pressed out by the golden (stones). Pleased (juṣāná), Indra, come here to us with your steeds, ascend your golden chariot!'

(630) RV 1.118.5ab (cf. 8.62.6, 9.97.16)

**á vām rátham yuvatis tiṣṭhad átra juṣṭví narā duhitā sūryasya**

'May the young lady ascend your chariot here, pleased (juṣṭví) with (you) (? it), O men, the sun's daughter!'

When having the ingressive aspect and relative past time reference, the middle aorist participle is occasionally interchangeable with the past passive participle, which contributed to the redundancy of the former:

(631) RV 7.67.2ab

**ásoci agniḥ samidhānó asmé úpo adṛśran támasas cid ántāḥ**

'The lightened (samidhānó  $\approx$  sámiddha) fire has shone by us, the very ends of darkness have appeared.'

## 5.1.D. PRESENT PARTICIPIAL VS. GERUNDIAL CLAUSE

According to P 3.2.124-126 the present participle, which is the only non-finite form that is inflected for all voices, is used instead of a finite verb in predicating a concomitant action

on the part of the Agent, e.g. **sayānāḥ bhuñjate yavanāḥ** 'the Greeks eat in the manner of reclining' (*participium coniunctum*), or (obligatorily) with reference to a simultaneous action on the part of some other constituent of the clause, e.g. **paśyantam devadattam paśya** 'watch Devadatta cooking' (*participium cum accusativo*; cf. 3.1.A.)

Conjunctive present participial clauses contrast mostly with peripheral gerundial clauses in expressing simultaneous temporal or attendant circumstances or, by implicature, cause, condition or concession. On the other hand, the same logical relations may often be inferred from gerundial clauses expressing resulting states, e.g. (639)-(640), cf. 3.2.D.

(632) RV 8.14.8

**ūd gā ājad āngirobhya āviṣ kṛnvān gūhā satīḥ**

'He drove out the cows for the Aṅgirases, revealing (**āviṣ kṛnvān** ≠ **kṛtvā**) the concealed ones.'

(633) RV 1.67.3ab

**hāste dādhanō nṛṇṇā viśvāny āme devān dhād gūhā niśīdan**

'Holding all his potencies in his hand, he put all the gods in confusion, sitting down (**niśīdan** ≠ **niśadya**) in secret.'

(634) AV 13.1.43

**ārōhan dyām amṛtāḥ prāva me vācaḥ**

**ut tvā yajñā brāhmapūtā vahanty adhvagāto hārayas tvā vahanti**

'(While) ascending (**ārōhan** ≠ **āruhya**) to the sky as an immortal, favor my words! Sacrifices, purified by Brahman, carry you up, yellow roadsters draw you.'

(635) AV 14.2.74ab

**yedām pūrvāgan raśanāyāmānā prajām asyāi drāviṇam cehā dat[t]vā**

'She who has come here before, girdling herself (? **raśanāyāmānā**), having given progeny and wealth to this woman.' (Cf. Whitney 1905, p. 767.)

(636) AV 18.2.47cd

**té dyām udityāvidanta lokām nākasya pṛṣṭhé ādhi dīdhyānāḥ**

'They, having risen (**udityā** ≠ **udyantāḥ**) to heaven, have found a place, shining (**dīdhyānāḥ**) upon the back of the firmament.'

(637) TS 5.6.6.1

**tām devā bibhyato nōpāyan**

'Him the gods, fearing (**bibhyato** ≈ **bhītāḥ** ≈ **bhiyānāḥ**), did not approach.'

(638) Manu 2.195

**pratiśravaṇasambhāṣe śayāno na samācaret  
nāsīno na ca bhuñjāno na tiṣṭhan na parānmukhaḥ**

‘One should engage in conversation neither while lying (**śayāno**, cf. **śayitvā** ‘having lain [down]’), nor sitting (**āsīno** ≠ **āsitvā**), nor eating (**bhuñjāno** ≠ **bhuktvā**), nor standing (**tiṣṭhan**, cf. **sthitvā** ‘having stood [up > standing]’) nor with averted face (**parānmukhaḥ**).’

When the implicature is that of a simultaneous state resulting from a previous action the gerund of a punctual or telic verb is interchangeable with the present participle of a stative or durative verb (cf. Minard 1956, p. 62ff.), e.g.:

(639) RV 1.114.5cd

**hāste bibhrad bhesajā vāryāni śarma vārma chardīr asmābhyam yaṃsat**  
‘Holding (**bibhrad** ≈ **grhītvā** ‘having taken’ > “holding”) cures and treasures in his hand, may he confer us shelter, shield, protection!’

(640) RV 3.29.10

**ayām te yōnir ṛtvīyo yāto jāto ārocathāḥ  
tām jānānn agna ā sīdāthā no vardhayā girāḥ**

‘This is your regular womb, from whence you shone forth having been born. “Knowing (**jānānn**, cf. **jñātvā** ‘having found out’) it, Agni, take your seat and further our songs!’”

Alternation between a present participial and gerundial clause may also be due to the relative unmarkedness of presential (vs. preterital) forms (cf. section 3.2.D):

(641) RV 10.116.5ab

**ni tigmani bhrāśayan bhrāśyāni āva sthirā tanuhi yātujūnām**

‘Making your sharp arrows blunt, loosen the stiff (bows) of the demon-incited (foes)!’

(642) AV 5.20.4ab

**saṃjāyan pṛtanā ūrdhvāmāyur gṛhyā gṛhṇāno bahudhā vi cakṣva**

‘Wholly conquering (**saṃjāyan** ≠ **saṃjitya**) the fighters, shrill-crying, do thou, seizing (**gṛhṇāno**, cf. **gṛhītvā** ‘having grasped’ > ‘holding’) those that are to be seized, look abroad on many sides” (Whitney 1905, p. 255)

(643) ŚvU 5.3

**ekaikam jālam bahudhā vikurvan asmin kṣetre samharaty eṣa devaḥ  
bhūyaḥ sṛṣṭvā yatayas tatheśas sarvādhipatyam kurute mahātmā**

‘Having spread (lit. ‘spreading’: **vikurvan** ≈ **vikṛtya**) out one net after the other manifoldly, this god pulls it all together in this field. Having again created the dispersers (*yatis*) the great self exercises his lordship over all.’

(644) Rm 1.1.99 (ed. Schlegel, cf. cr. ed. Baroda 1.1.78)

**paṭhan rāmāyaṇam naraḥ pretya svarge mahiyate**

‘(By) reading (**paṭhan** ≈ **paṭhitvā**) the Rāmāyaṇa, a man enjoys bliss in heaven upon dying.’

(645) Tantr. 1.3

**tatra ca marakatasadṛśāni śaṣpāgrāṇi bhakṣayan katipayair ahobhir  
haravṛṣabha iva pīnakakudadhārī balavān samvṛttaḥ**

‘And there while eating (**bhakṣayan** ≈ **bhakṣayitvā**) emerald-like grass sprouts he became in just a few days strong like Hara’s bull having a fat hump.’

The present participle is sometimes used instead of the temporally neutralized gerund in non-preterital adverbial adjuncts or complements of manner, cf.:

(646) Pañc. 1.27 (ed. Hertel, p. 111)

**sa ca bakabālakāny ajātapakṣāny eva sadaiva bhakṣayan kālam nayati**

‘And he spends his time always eating (**bhakṣayan** ≈ ? **bhakṣayitvā**) the heron nestlings before their wings have grown.’

(647) Kath. 9.76

**tataḥ sa śavaro 'vādīj jīvikeyam mama prabho**

**kṛpaṇo 'ham hi jīvāmi bhujagam khelayan sadā**

‘Then that Śabara said: “This is my livelihood, master, for miserable me, I live by making the snake dance (**khelayan** ≈ ? **khelayitvā**).”’

(648) Vet. Introductory story (ed. Emeneau, p. 5)

**sa khalu nṛpatir.. tadrājyasukham anubhavan kālam nayann avatiṣṭhate**

‘Now that king... keeps spending his time enjoying (**anubhavan** ≈ ? **anubhūtvā**) the pleasures of that royalty.’

The corresponding use of the gerund especially in Middle and New Indo-Aryan was

mentioned in 3.2.B and will be returned to in 6.3.C. Note that the temporally neutralized instrumental reading of the gerund may contrast with the temporally non-neutralized one in the same lexical context, cf. (646) and:

- (649) Vet. 1 (ed. Emeneau, p. 20f.)  
**tatas taṁ nihatya kālāṁ nayāmi**  
 'So I shall kill him and then pass the time (with my lover).'  
 (≠ 'I shall pass my time with my lover by killing him')

### 5.1.E. NON-PAST GERUNDIAL VS. PAST GERUNDIAL CLAUSE

Non-past gerundial clauses are used under the same syntactic conditions as past gerundial clauses in expressions of temporal and circumstantial qualifications, but contrast in terms of relative time reference (cf. 3.2.D). E.g.

- (650) ŚB 12.8.3.14  
**dvāu dvau samāsam hutvā sāte samsravānt samāva nayati**  
 'Having offered each pair while joining them (**samāsam** ≠ **samāsyā**), he pours the remainder in the *sata*-vessel.'

There is some degree of alternation between past and non-past gerundial clauses in expressions of manner or immediately preceding actions. Examples of this have been given in section 3.2.D, to which we may add ŚB 2.6.1.31 **upothāya... juhōti** 'offers having stepped up', ŚB 2.6.1.32 **upothāyam... juhōti** 'performs the libation in the manner of stepping up (to the sacrificial fire)'. Cf.:

- (651) TS 5.3.1.3 (cf. 5.3.10.1 & 4, KS 20.8 & 10 [27, 21; 30, 5], KapS 31.10 & 12)  
**yād ekadhō 'padadhyād ekam ṛtūṁ varṣed anuparihāram sādāyati**  
**tāsmāt sārvaṅ ṛtūṅ varṣati yāt prānabhṛta upadhāya vṛṣṭisānīr**  
**upadādhāti tāsmād vāyupracyutā divō vṛṣṭir īrte**  
 "If he were to put them [the rain-winners] down in one place, then would fall rain in one season only; he puts them down after carrying them round in order (**anupari-hāram**); therefore it rains in all the season. Since having put down (**upadhāya**) the breath-supporters he puts down the rain-winners, therefore the rain starts from the sky, impelled downwards by the wind." (Keith 1914, p. 418f.)

(652) KS 11.4 (148, 8)

**sarvā imāḥ prajā adhiṣādāṃ adyād**

‘He should eat all these creatures sitting down upon them.’

(653) MS 2.2.2 (16, 4 & 6)

**upāriṣṭād vā asā ādityā imāḥ prajā adhiṣadyāti...**

‘Having sat down upon these creatures from above that Āditya eats them.’

The past gerund of a (potentially) telic or punctual verb compounded with a nominal stem (type **hasta+gḥhya**) can be interchanged with a corresponding non-past gerund with stative or durative aspect (cf. 1.5.J, 2.2.A):

(654) RV 10.109.2d

**agnīr hōtā hastagḥyānināya**

‘Agni as Hotṛ-priest brought (her) here, having taken (her) hand (**hastagḥhya** ≈ **hastagrāham** ‘while holding her hand’ ≈ **hastam gḥitvā** ‘having taken...’).’

(655) MS 2.4.8 (45, 13)

**yāthā vā idāṃ nāmagrāham āsā āsā iti hvāyati**

‘Just like one here calls out “Hey you over there!”, mentioning (a person’s) name (**nāmagrāham** ≈ **nāmagḥhya**).’

The non-past gerund is often glossed in the commentaries as a repeated past gerund, e.g. BSS 6.13 **upasaṃgrāham** ‘while taking hold of’ (**upasaṃgḥhya upasaṃgḥhya**; cf. Caland 1910, p. 43; Renou 1935, p. 367). In Classical Sanskrit (P 3.4.22 = 34) the repeated non-past gerund is occasionally used in the same way: **pāyam pāyam** ‘while continuously drinking’.

#### 5.1.F. FUTURE PARTICIPIAL VS. GERUNDIAL CLAUSE

As a circumstantial qualification a future participial clause contrasts with a gerundial clause by expressing an impending or posterior action or state:

(656) RV 4.18.11c

**āthābravīd vṛtrām indro haniṣyān**

‘Then Indra said intending to slay (**haniṣyān** ≠ **hatvā**) Vṛtra’



- (657) MS 1.8.5 (122, 11)  
**yát pūrvām āhutiṁ hutvōttarām hoṣyān pratikṣate**  
 'When having offered (*hutvā* ≠ *hoṣyān*) the first *āhuti* while going to offer (= before offering: *hoṣyān* ≠ *hutvā*) the second, he waits.'
- (658) TS 2.5.1.4  
**vṛkṣāt || parābhaviṣyānto manyāmahe**  
 "We deem that we shall be overcome through pruning (*parābhaviṣyānto* ≠ *parābhūya*)." (Keith 1914, p. 189)
- (659) ŚB 5.1.3.13  
**ātha yát purā pracāred yāthā yām ādhvānam eṣyānt syāt tām gatvā**  
**sá kvā tátah syād evám tát**  
 'And if he should go on ahead, then it would be just as if he were going to go (*eṣyānt* ≠ *itvā*) the same way already having gone it (*gatvā* ≠ *gamīṣyān*), so where would he then be?'
- (670) Megh. 45c  
**vyālabethāḥ ... mānayaṣyan ... (comm. pūjayitum)**  
 '...linger for a while to honor...'

#### 5.1.G. INFINITIVAL VS. GERUNDIAL CLAUSE

Infinitival clauses appear basically as final adjuncts or complements of phasal and cognitive verbs. Except for two doubtful cases in the Atharvaveda, final gerunds are not found in Sanskrit, though they do appear in Middle Indo-Aryan (cf. 3.3.B, 4.7.E.). E.g.:

- (671) RV 1.55.2c (cf. 1.16.3, 3.42.4, 8.17.15, 9.2.5, 9.97.20, etc.)  
**īndrah sómasya pītāye vṛṣāyate**  
 'Indra gets to feel like a bull for the drinking (*pītāye* ≠ *pītvā*, cf. 672) of Soma.'
- (672) RV 9.108.2a  
**yāsya te pītvā vṛṣabhó vṛṣāyāte**  
 'Of whose yours (draught) having drunk the bull gets to feel like a bull'

Also in the idiomatic 'prohibitive' construction with **alam/kim** the gerund and infinitive are sometimes interchangeable, although **alam** has mostly the sense of 'capable of' in

construction with the infinitive (Speijer 1886, p. 302 § 384 Rem. 1):

(673) *Mṛcch.* 3.6 (= ex. 401)

(Cārudatta:) **alam̐ saptajanam̐ prabodhayitum**

(Cārudatta:) 'No good waking a sleeping (**prabodhayitum**) person!'

For the temporal neutralization of the gerund in this construction, cf. 3.3.C and 4.4.C.

### 5.1.H. ACCUSATIVE ACTION NOUN PHRASE VS. GERUNDIAL CLAUSE

Oblique action noun phrases may be used as adverbial adjuncts expressing various circumstantial or temporal relations. Unlike the gerunds and the other non-finite verb-forms, action nouns are, however, unspecified for relative tense and have nominal rather than verbal rection.

Without the help of temporal adpositions (= pre- or postpositions) adverbial action noun phrases are hence incapable of expressing explicitly a particular temporal relationship, being prototypically expressive of concomitant action or attendant circumstances.

Unless coreferential with the main clause subject/object the logical subject/object of an action noun appears as a genitive modifier (attribute) or compounded (possibly with other complements or modifiers) with the action noun.

Adverbial accusative action noun phrases appear mainly as qualifications of manner or attendant circumstances, being functionally equivalent to the non-past gerund, cf.:

(674) *ŚB* 3.2.1.13 (Cf. *AB* 3.17.3 = 245)

**tāsmāt stukāsārgam̐ sṛṣṭā bhavati**

'Therefore it is plaited like a braid of hair.'

Adverbialized accusative thematic action nouns may be formally indistinguishable from accusative verbal adverbs and non-past gerunds or accusative infinitives, cf.:

(675) *RV* 10.134.7

**nākir devā minīmasi nākir ā yopayāmasi mantraśrūtyam̐ carāmasi  
pakṣébhir apīkākṣébhir ātrābhī sam̐ rabhāmahe**

'Wir versäumen nichts, o Götter, wir vertuschen nichts, wir halten darauf, (deinen) Rat zu hören (**mantraśrūtyam̐ carāmasi**). An den Flanken, dicht an den Gurten klammern wir uns dabei fest.' (Geldner, *Rigveda* III, p. 367)

According to Grassmann (1873, s.v.) the *hapax* compound \***mantra+śrútya-** is a neuter action noun occurring only in the accusative and having adverbial value (“den Aussprüchen (der Götter) gehorsam” (cf. BRW, s.v.: “Folgsamkeit, Gehorsam”), compare 10.134.6b **mantumaḥ** voc. ‘rich in advice’). Being an optional complement to a verb of motion, **mantraśrútyam** is interchangeable with an infinitive or non-past gerund in **-am**. Etymologically it may be derived from the same type of stem in **-(t)ya-** which underlies the compound gerund in **-(t)yā/a** (cf. **upa+śrutyā/a** ‘having overheard’). Cf. 6.1, 6.4.B.

### 5.1.I. INSTRUMENTAL ACTION NOUN PHRASE VS. GERUNDIAL CLAUSE

An adverbial instrumental action noun expresses an accompanying action or the manner or cause of action. It may often paraphrase a past or non-past gerundial clause with instrumental or causal implicature, but unlike a gerundial clause it cannot express a purely temporal qualification:

(676) RV 1.110.4ab (cf. 1.5.K)

**viṣṭvī śámī taraṇitvéna vāgháto mártāsaḥ śánto amṛtatvám ānaśuḥ**  
‘Having labored (**viṣṭvī**) with diligence (**śámī**) and dexterity (**taraṇitvéna**), the oblation-pourers (? singers), being mortal, achieved immortality.’

(677) RV 8.23.14

**śruṣṭy āgne návasya me stómasya vīra viśpate**  
**nī māyīnas tápuṣā rakṣāso dāha**  
‘In willing hearing (**śruṣṭī**) of my new song of praise, Agni, hero and chief of your tribe, burn with your fervor down the deceitful demons!’

(678) RV 8.24.2ab

**śávasā hy ási śrutó vṛtrahátyena vṛtrahā**  
‘For through your prowess you are known, through the slaying of Vṛtra (**vṛtrahátyena**), (you are known as) the Vṛtraslayer.’

(679) RV 4.36.4

**ékam ví cakra camasám caturvayam níś cármaṇo gām arinīta dhītibhiḥ**  
**átha devēṣv amṛtatvám ānaśa śruṣṭí vājā ṛbhavas tād va ukthyam**  
‘The single cup you have made fourfold, from the skin you let free the cow with wisdom, and so you have achieved immortality among the gods by service/readily (**śruṣṭī**), O Vājas and Ṛbhus. That is something for you to talk about!’

## 5. COMPETING AND CONTRASTIVE STRUCTURES

Like the past gerund, and more often and appropriately than this, an instrumental action noun is also used in manner complementation of (atelic durative) verbs denoting behaving, subsisting, moving, etc.:

- (680) Pañc. 1.2 frame-story (ed. Vidyasagara, p. 28, quoted fr. Speijer 1886, p. 50 § 67)  
**tasya sakāsam gatvā bhrāṭṛsnehenaikatra bhakṣaṇapānaviharaṇakriyā-**  
**bhir ekasthānāśrayeṇa kālo neyaḥ**  
'You are to go to him and while living in brotherly affection with him you are to spend the time in the same place in the activities of eating, drinking and rambling together.' (Cf. ed. Hertel, p. 16, l. 10f.)

As for **alam** + gerund/instrumental, see 3.3.C, 4.4.C. Cf. also **astu** 'let be', **kṛtam** '(be) done (with)' + instrumental: **alam ākranditena** 'enough of (your) crying!', **athavā kṛtam samdehena** 'well, enough of hesitation!', but Mahāv. II (p. 25) **astu durāsadena tapasā** 'Let be with your impossible penance!' (Speijer 1886, p. 57 § 76).

### 5.1.J. DATIVE ACTION NOUN PHRASE VS. GERUNDIAL CLAUSE

Dative action nouns are used mainly to express purpose or intent, hence contrasting rather than overlapping with gerundial clauses (for sporadic exceptions, see 3.3.B, 4.7.E.). Cf.:

- (681) RV 5.29.7 (cf. 8.89.5)  
**sākhā sākhye apacat tūyam agnir asyā krátvā mahiṣā trí satāni**  
**trí sākām indro mānuṣaḥ sārāmsi sutām pibad vṛtrahátýāya sómam**  
'The friend Agni cooked snappily for his friend at his wish three hundred buffaloes with dexterity. Indra drank for the slaying of Vṛtra (**vṛtrahátýāya**) at once three lakes of Soma extracted by the man.'

In the Veda, dative action nouns are not always to be distinguished from dative infinitives, which disappear in the later Vedic period.

### 5.1.K. ABLATIVE ACTION NOUN PHRASE VS. GERUNDIAL CLAUSE

Adverbial ablative action nouns are used to express source, reason or cause and may paraphrase gerundial clauses with causal implicature. However, they do not express purely

temporal qualifications, unless headed by temporal adpositions such as **ūrdhvam**, **param** 'after', etc.

In the following sentence the gerundial clause is paralleled by instrumental, ablative and locative action noun phrases, all expressing cause or attendant circumstances. These parallels do not, however, cancel the relative past tense of the gerund, since in all the phrases the implicit relative time reference is to the (immediate) past:

(682) ŚvU 1.11

**jñātvā devaṃ sarvapāśāpahāniḥ kṣīṇaiḥ kleśair janmamṛtyuprahāniḥ tasyābhidhyānāt tṛtīyaṃ dehabhede visvaisvaryam kevala āptakāmaḥ**  
 'By [one's] coming to know (**jñātvā**, ger.) god there is a falling off of all [one's] fetters; when the sufferings are destroyed (**kṣīṇaiḥ kleśair**, absolute instrumental), there is cessation of birth and death. By meditating on (**abhidhyānāt**, ablative) him, there is the third state; on the dissolution of the body (**dehabhede** locative), universal lordship; being alone/absolute (? : **kevala**, nominative or locative), his desire is fulfilled.'

#### 5.1.L. LOCATIVE ACTION NOUN PHRASE VS. GERUNDIAL CLAUSE

A locative action noun phrase may function as a temporal or circumstantial qualification, referring to a simultaneous action or state. Hence it may paraphrase a past gerundial clause only when there is causal or conditional implicature and the sense of a preceding action is backgrounded (e.g. through the implicature of a resulting state).

In the following example, the locative phrase has purely temporal value and contrasts with the past gerund:

(683) RV 9.108.2

**yāsya te pītvā vṛṣabhó vṛṣāyāte 'syá pītā svarvidaḥ**  
**sá supráketo abhy ākramīd iṣo 'chā vājam náitaśaḥ**  
 'Of whose your (draught) having drunk (**pītvā**) the bull gets to feel like a bull, at the drinking (**pītā**, loc. < **pīti-**) of this sunfinder, this (Soma) has with good indications moved toward the refreshments, like Etasa to the booty'.

#### 5.1.M. ADPOSITIONAL PHRASES VS. GERUNDIAL CLAUSE

Adpositional phrases headed by temporal adpositions like **ūrdhvam**, **prabhṛti**, **param** 'after, upon', **purā** 'before' and **ā** 'until' may be used to paraphrase finite and non-finite

temporal clause especially when the temporal relation is brought into focus, cf.:

(684) ŚB 10.1.4.11

**saṁcitē 'gniḥ praṇīyate praṇītād ūrdhvām samīdha āhutaya iti hūyante**  
 'When the (fire-altar) has been fully constructed (**saṁcitē**, absolute locative),  
 Agni is brought forward. After the bringing forward (**praṇītād ūrdhvām** ≈  
**praṇīte** ≈ **praṇīya**), the kindling sticks called "Oblations" are offered.'

On the other hand, being nominal rather than copredicative, adpositional phrases are not coreferentially constrained, accounting for a certain amount of syntactic complementariness with gerundial structures, cf.:

(685) Manu 1.122

**abhivādāt param vipro jyāyāmsam abhivādayan**  
**asau nāmāham asmīti svam nāma parikīrtayet**  
 'After the salutation (**abhivādāt param** ≈ **abhivādya**), the brahmin saluting the  
 older one, should announce his name "I am called so and so".'

(686) AiU 2.1.6

**sa evam vidvān asmāc charārabhedād ūrdhvam utkrāyāmuṣmin**  
**svarge loke sarvān kāmān āptvāmṛtaḥ samabhavat samabhavat**  
 'Knowing thus, having risen upwards upon the destruction of this body (**charāra-**  
**bhedād ūrdhvam** ≈ **sarīraḥ bhittvā**), and having enjoyed all the pleasures in  
 yonder world, he became immortal, became immortal.'

(687) TS 6.1.3.8

**nā purā dākṣiṇābhyo nétoḥ kṛṣṇaviṣāṇām āva cṛted**  
 'He should not let go of the horn of the black antelope before the bringing of the  
 fees (**purā dākṣiṇābhyo nétoḥ** ≈ **dakṣiṇā nītvā**).'

(688) MS 2.1.8 (p. 9, l. 12)

**yādi purā samsthānād dīryetādyā varṣiṣyatīti brūyād yādi sāmsthite**  
**svō vṛṣṭēti brūyād yādi cirām iva dīryeta nāddhā vidmēti brūyāt**  
 'If (the vessel) should break before the completion (of the sacrifice) (**purā**  
**samsthānād** ≈ **samsthāya**), he should say: "Today it will rain!"; when after the  
 completion, he should say: "It will rain tomorrow!". If it should break slowly, he  
 should say: "Actually we do not know!".'



## 5.1.N. VERBAL ADVERB VS. GERUNDIAL CLAUSE

Adverbs of manner are derived from deverbal nouns by inflecting them in certain oblique cases, especially the accusative, instrumental and ablative, e.g.: **ár-a-m** ≈ **ál-a-m** 'sufficiently, suitably, enough' (< √ṛ 'go'), **kāma-m** 'at will' (< **kāma-** 'love'), **oṣ-á-m** 'promptly' (< √uṣ 'burn'), **vi+śrab-dha-m** (< **vi** + √**śrambh**) 'confidently', **gūh-ā** 'secretly' (< √**guh** 'conceal'). As mentioned in 5.1.H, there is considerable overlap between verbal adverbs and accusative action nouns or even non-past gerunds. Verbal adverbs differ nevertheless from the latter in not being able to take optional complements or adjuncts, although such elements may be incorporated by compounding, e.g. **yāvaj+jivam** 'as long as one lives' (cf. Delbrück 1888, p. 184ff. § 126; Renou 1935, p. 371).

## 5.1.O. FINITE DEPENDENT VS. GERUNDIAL CLAUSE

Most of the above circumstantial relations may also be expressed by finite hypotactic or correlative clauses headed by various subordinating or correlative (topicalizing) conjunctions. Owing to the semantic vagueness of the latter (cf. Holland 1984) and the deficiency of absolute-relative tense distinctions in the finite conjugation, finite dependent clauses are, however, less differentiated than non-finite ones:

- (689) RV 1.56.5cd (cf. RV 2.12.3 = ex. 72)  
**svarmīḥe yán máda indra hársyāhan vṛtrám nír apām aubjo arṇavám**  
 'When (? After) you, Indra, slew the dragon, rejoicing at the fight for the sun in intoxication, you let out the stream of water.'
- (690) RV 1.32.4ab  
**yád indráhan prathamajám áhīnām ān māyīnām ámināḥ prótá māyāḥ**  
 'When you slew the first-born of the dragons, Indra, then (? by that) you also reduced to nil the tricks of the tricksters'
- (691) ŚB 4.1.2.4  
**yátra vái sómaḥ svám puróhitam bḥhaspátim jiyau tásmāi púnar dadau**  
 'When/After Soma had subdued his own Purohita-priest, B., he returned it to him.'
- (692) ŚB 4.1.4.8  
**tám yátra devá ághnamś tám mitráam abruvamś**  
 'When/After the gods had killed him, they said to Mitra'

(693) RV 1.38.9

**dīvā cit tāmahaḥ kṛṇvanti parjanyaenodavāhēna yāt pṛthivīm vyundānti**  
 ‘Even by day they produce darkness, when they flood the earth with (the) water-bearing Parjanya(-cloud).’

Sometimes the aorist is used as a pluperfect, while the temporal relation may be further specified by means of a temporal connective in the main (resumptive) clause, cf.:

(694) RV 1.52.2

**sá párvato ná dharūṇeṣv ácyutaḥ sahasramūtis táviṣīṣu vāvṛdhe indro yad vṛtrám ávadhīn nadivṛtam ubjánn árṇāmsi járhṣāṇo ándhasā**  
 ‘Unshaken like a mountain in his foundations, providing a thousand aids, he, Indra, grew in strength, when he had slain the river-encompassing Vṛtra, letting out the streams, greatly rejoicing in the juice.’

(695) RV 1.51.4cd (cf. 1.51.4, 1.63.7, 1.68.4, 2.20.8, 5.31.3; Delbrück 1888, p. 579)

**vṛtrám yád indra sávasāvadhīr áhim ād it sūryam divy ārohayo dṛśé**  
 ‘When you had slain Vṛtra the dragon with force, Indra, then you raised the sun into the sky to be seen.’

In most of the above sentences the subordinate clause could be paraphrased by a gerundial or participial clause. Already in the Atharvaveda one can detect a decrease of finite adverbial clauses in correlation with an increase of gerundial and other non-finite clauses.

On the other hand, non-finite clauses are syntactically and pragmatically more constrained than finite ones, as they cannot freely select core arguments and/or absolute tense and mood. Moreover, they do not seem to allow the interpositional relation itself to be questioned or negated and cannot easily occur with emphatic main clauses (but cf. 4.5.A). Thus in the following sentence, the subordinate clause cannot very well be replaced by either an absolute participial clause or adpositional phrase:

(696) ŚB 2.1.1.8-9

**sā yātra devān upajagāma || tād dhócuḥ**  
 ‘When she (= the earth) came near the gods, then verily they said’

Although gerundial and complementary non-finite structures allow for a more exact and compact expression of the interpositional relation, informationally weighty or focalized adverbial clauses thus remain largely finite in all genres and periods (cf. 6.3.).

## 5.2. EXTENSIONAL AND ELABORATIVE RELATIONS

Extensional and elaborative relations are expressed by means of syndetic or asyndetic finite paratactic and, especially after the early Vedic period, various non-finite structures, which are dependent on some argument and/or operator(s) of the main clause. Again there is a pragmatic difference between finite and non-finite expressions, in that the latter involve a greater degree of textual backgrounding or modal and topical cohesion. Non-finite clauses provide thus for a generally more compact form of expression in additive-sequential linkage.

Finite paratactic clauses show a certain amount of overlap with subordinate clauses in constructions that involve zero-anaphora of subject and/or accentual integration with the conjunct:

(697) TS 2.5.7.1

**hīm karoti sāmāivākar**

‘He says *hīm*, so he has produced the Sāman.’

‘He makes the noise ‘Hīm’; verily he makes the Sāman.’ (Keith 1914, p. 196)

‘er macht hīa und hat damit ein sāman hervorgebracht.’ (Delbrück 1888, p. 287)

The elaborative or specifying rather than purely additive interpropositional relation between the coordinate clauses is apparent from the independent accent and switch of tense (aorist as expressing an immediately succeeding or simultaneous event; Delbrück, *ibid.*) in the continuing coordinate clause, which hence appears as if dependent on the initial conjunct. With some thematic modification we could then substitute the finite verb **karoti** for a gerund **kṛtvā**: ‘by having made *hīm* he has produced the Sāman’.

## 5.2.A. FINITE COORDINATE CLAUSE VS. GERUNDIAL CLAUSE

Being free to select core-layer and peripheral arguments and operators, finite coordinate or asyndetically chained clauses are syntactically and pragmatically less constrained than non-finite ones, which are coreferentially and/or operationally constrained. Finite structures are more common than non-finite structures in topic-continuous additive-sequential linkage during the early Vedic period. Gerundial clauses seem to replace finite paratactic clauses mainly in procedural and post-Samhitāic narrative discourse (especially in and after the Brāhmaṇas and ritual Sūtras). In the following early Vedic examples, finite paratactic and gerundial clauses seem to be more or less interchangeable:

- (698) RV 4.28.1 (cf. RV 2.12.3 = ex. 72)  
**tvā yujā táva tát soma sakhyá indro apó mánave sasrútas kaḥ**  
**áhann áhim áriṇāt saptá síndhūn ápāvṛṇod ápihiteva khāni**  
 ‘In alliance with you, then, O Soma, in your friendship, Indra made the waters streaming for Manu. He slew the dragon, released the seven rivers, opened the channels that were as if closed.’
- (699) RV 1.85.9  
**tváṣṭā yád vājraṁ súkṛtaṁ hiranyáyaṁ sahasrabhṛṣṭim svápā ávartayat |**  
**dhattá indro náry apāmsi kártavé 'han vṛtrám nír apām aubjad arṇavám**  
 ‘When T., the artificer, hurled the well-construed golden thousand-pointed bolt, Indra took it to execute manly deeds. He slew Vṛtra, released the stream of waters.’
- (700) RV 2.15.2 (cf. 4.42.3, 7.86.1)  
**avamśé dyām astabhāyad bṛhántam ā ródasī apṛṇad antárikṣam**  
**sá dhārayad pṛthivím papráthac ca sómasya tá máda indras cakāra**  
 ‘He supported the high heaven in the place where there is no cross-beam, he filled both the worlds (and) the atmosphere. He has made the earth firm and broadened it. In the intoxication of Soma, Indra did that all.’  
 Cf. RV 10.65.7cd **dyām skabhitvy ápa ā cakrur ójasā yajñám janitvī**  
**tanvī ní māmṛjuḥ** ‘Having supported the sky you have brought forth the waters, having given birth to the sacrifice you have rubbed it down for yourself.’
- (701) RV 8.48.3ab  
**ápāma sómam amṛtā abhūmāganma jyótir ávidāma devān**  
 ‘We have drunk Soma, we have become immortal, we have gone to the light, we have found the gods.’ (Cf. RV 3.60.3cd **saudhanvanāso amṛtatvám érire**  
**viṣṭvī sámībhiḥ...** ‘The sons of Sudhanvan attained immortality by having labored diligently...’; not the instrumental implicature.)
- (702) TS 2.1.2.1  
**sò 'bravíd váraṁ vṛṇīṣvātha me púnar dehíti**  
 ‘He said: “Choose a boon and then give (them) back to me!”’
- (703) TS 5.4.9.1  
**tám devā abruvann úpa na ā vartasva havayám no vahéti**  
 ‘The gods said to him: “Turn back to us, carry the oblation for us!”’

(704) TS 6.1.6.1

**kadrū́s ca vái suparṇī́ cātmarū́páyor aspardhetāḿ sá kadrū́ḥ suparṇīḿ  
ajayat sábravīt́ tṛtíyasyāḿ itó divi sómas táḿ á hara ténātmānaḿ niṣ-  
krīṇīṣvétī**

'Kadrū and Suparṇī quarreled for the stake of each other's shape. Now Kadrū defeated Suparṇī. She said: "In the third heaven from here is the Soma, bring it here and by means of it buy yourself free!"'

(705) TS 2.6.6.1-2

**...sá nīlāyata sò 'páḥ práviṣat táḿ devātāḥ práiṣam aicchan táḿ  
mátsyaḥ prábravīt́ táḿ asapad dhiyādhiyā́ tvā vadhyāsur yó mā  
prāvoca iti tásmān mátsyaḿ dhiyādhiyā́ ghnanti śaptāḥ || hí táḿ  
ánvavindan táḿ abruvann úpa na á vartasva havyaḿ no vahé 'ti sò  
'bravīd váraḿ vṛṇai yád evá gṛhītásyā́hutasya bahiḥparidhí skāndāt  
tán me bhrātṛṇāḿ bhāgadhéyaḿ asad iti...**

'He hid himself and entered the waters. But the gods went searching for him. Then the fish gave him away and he cursed him: "At every whim may they kill you, who gave me away!". That's why they kill the fish at every whim, (for he is) cursed. So they found him out and said to him: "Return to us and carry the oblation for us!". But he said: "Let me choose a wish: whatever should fall outside the enclosure of the oblation when it has been taken, may that be my brothers' share."'

(706) JB 1.12.1

**ājyāhutīḿ juhavāma tayaināḿ jigīṣāmeti**

'Let us offer with clarified butter, try to win this by that!'

(707) AB 7.14-15

**sa ha nety uktvā dhanur ādāya āraṇyaḿ apātasthau sa samvatsaraḿ  
araṇye cacāra || atha haikṣvākaḿ varuṇo jagrāha tasya hodaraḿ jajñe**

"No!", he said and having taken his bow he set out for the forest and walked around in the jungle for a year. Then Varuṇa seized Aikṣvāka and he got a belly.'

(708) ŚB 3.1.2.9-10

**sá yadā keśasmasrú vápaty || átha snāti**

'When he has shaven (lit. shaves) his hair and beard, then he bathes.'

(709) Bṛhadd. 6.23

**tathetyuktvā jagāmāśu āpagāḿ sa sarasvatīḿ**

**sā caināḿ pratijagrāha duduhe ca payo gṛtam**

‘Having said “All right!”, he quickly went to the river Sarasvatī. And she received him and milked for him milk and clarified butter.’

What with the enhanced potential of gerundial clauses to present non-backgrounded and propositionally non-restrictive information in modally marked sentences (implying operational dependence on the main clause), paratactic finite structures are being increasingly replaced by gerundial structures in additive-sequential linkage in and after the middle Vedic period, first in procedural then also in narrative discourse.

Finite structures remain, however, complementary with gerundial structures in expressions of coordinate questions and negation and when there is a switch of referent. Even late Classical Sanskrit makes sporadic use of finite sequenced clauses or verb phrases instead of gerundial or participial clauses in narrative discourse in the climax of an episode:

(708) Hit. 1.2

...iti cintayann eva tenāsau vyāghreṇa vyāpāditaḥ khāditaḥ ca  
‘...and just while contemplating that, he was killed and eaten by that tiger.’

(709) Vet. Introductory story (ed. Emeneau, p. 6)

tato narapatir api tanmadhyād amūlyāny itas tato galitāni pañca-  
ratnāni avalokya parām prītim avāpa vyājahāra ca  
‘Then the king, having seen five priceless jewels rolling out all over from inside it, attained supreme delight and exclaimed’

In the following episode, the next to final gerund (710) corresponds to a coordinate finite verb in a variant reading (711), which differs only in its tense:

(710) Pañc. 1.18 (ed. Hertel, p. 91; cf. ex. 628)

tvam gatvā tasya madodhdhatasya karṇe śabdaṁ kuru yena tvacchabda-  
śravaṇasukhān nimīlitākṣo bhavati. tataśca kāṣṭhakūṭacañcuspoṭita-  
nayanah pipāsārto gartātatasamśritasya mama śabdaṁ ākarṇya  
jalāśayam matvā samāgacchan gartām āśādyā patitvā pañcatvam yāti.  
‘Go you and sing in that rutting one’s ear so that he closes his eyes in his rapture at listening to your sound. And then having got his eyes cracked by the bill of the woodpecker and coming along afflicted by thirst on hearing the sound of me waiting at the edge of the pit, taking it to be a pond of water, having reached the pit and fallen into it, he is resolved into the five elements (= dies).’



(711) Pañc. 1.15 (ed. Kielhorn, cited in Stenzler 1965, p. 84, l. 8-9)

**tato gartam āsādyā paṭisyati pañcatvaṃ yāsyati ca...**

‘Then having reached the pit he will fall into it and be resolved into the five elements.’

Finite paratactic clauses are syntactically complementary with gerundial clauses when there is a switch of Actor or topical Undergoer and when there is no actional sequence:

(712) RV 8.53.4a

**viśvā dvēṣāmsi jahī cāva cā kṛdhi**

‘Slay all enemies and ward them off!’

(713) AB 7.28.1

**yatrendraṃ devatāḥ paryavṛñjan viśvarūpaṃ tvāṣtram abhyamaṃsta  
vṛtram aśṛta yatīnt sālāvṛkebhyaḥ prādād arurmaghān avadhīd  
bṛhaspateḥ praty avadhīd iti tatrendraḥ somapīthena vyārdhyat[e...]**

‘When the gods excluded Indra (saying): “He has misused Viśvarūpa, son of Tvāṣṭṛ, he has overthrown Vṛtra, he has given the Yaūś to the hyenas, he has killed the Arurmaghās, he has fought against Bṛhaspati!”, then Indra was deprived of the Soma drinking’

(714) Pañc. 1.22 (ed. Kielhorn, p. 91, l. 14f.; quoted from Stenzler 1965, p. 81, l. 32f.)

**tato makṣikoḍḍīya gatā param tena śitadhāreṇāsīnā rājño vakṣo  
dvidhā jātam rājā mṛtas ca**

‘Then the flie flew away, whereas the king’s chest was severed by that sharpened sword and the king died.’

## 5.2.B. PARTICIPIAL VS. GERUNDIAL CLAUSE

As seen in (710) participial and gerundial clauses may appear as syntactically and semantically complementary in additive-sequential linkage in narrative and procedural discourse, competing also with finite clause chains. Unlike gerundial clauses, participial clauses (incl. *bahuvrīhis* based on participles) are not normally used thus in modally marked contexts except in artificial literary style. This can only be explained by assuming that they are operationally more constrained than gerundial clauses. On the other hand, especially in the elaborate classical *kāvya* style, participial constructions (especially *bahuvrīhis*) are more common than gerundial constructions, cf.:

(715) Kām. 1.4.5

**sa prātar utthāya kṛtaniyatakr̥tyaḥ gṛhīdadantadhāvanaḥ mātrayānu-  
lepanam dhūpaṁ srajam iti ca gṛhītvā dattvā sikthakam alaktakam ca  
dṛṣṭvādarse mukhaṁ gṛhītamukhavāsatāmbūlaḥ kāryāny anuṭiṣṭhet**  
'Having risen in the morning and performed the daily routines and taken his  
toothpick, he should take a moderate amount of ointment, incense and garland, put  
on beeswax and red lac, study his face in the mirror and take mouthperfume and  
betel and then go on with his daily missions.'

The general structure of (710) and (715) is typical of late Vedic procedural and post-Vedic narrative and expository discourse: a sentence has only one (quasi-)finite verb which is placed at the end, while non-final clauses expressing preceding or variously overlapping episodes or predications are expressed by gerundial, participial, infinitival and nominal (incl. compound) structures. Typologically there has thus been a switch from mainly co-ranking structures to mainly chaining structures in clause linkage (cf. 1.2.B).

### 5.3. DIACHRONIC ROLE OF THE GERUND IN CLAUSE LINKAGE

It is clear even from the above cursory comparative-contrastive analysis that the functional potential and frequency of the past gerund have been on the increase all the time from early Vedic down to late Classical Sanskrit (cf. 6.3.B).

In the Saṁhitās, the gerund appeared mostly in narrative, procedural and hortatory discourse as a means for expressing mainly textually backgrounded or weakly restrictive qualifications of circumstance, time, manner, cause, or condition. In this discourse function it competed with and partly supplanted the conjunctive perfect and past participle, to a lesser extent temporal and causal finite subordinate clauses (cf. 4.7.A). On the other hand, it was syntactically and semantically complementary with absolute and conjunctive participial and finite subordinate clauses and adverbial and adpositional phrases.

In the Brāhmaṇas and ritual Sūtras, the frequency of the gerund increased remarkably (cf. 2.2.C), especially in additive-sequential linkage, where the gerund came gradually to oust finite clauses sharing Actor or topical Undergoer and mood and tense. This development, which implied or entailed increased operational integratability of the gerund, started in Vedic procedural discourse as anticipated in the later (portions of the) Saṁhitās and was then extended to narrative and hortatory discourse as well, while the backgrounding and pregnantly restrictive function remained side by side with the additive-sequential function.

In Classical Sanskrit there emerged another competing non-finite construction in

additive-sequential linkage, viz participle-based *bahuvrīhis* (cf. 710-711, 715). Some complementariness between finite and non-finite constructions remained, since the last-mentioned construction was extremely literary and usually not suited to modally and operationally marked contexts, as e.g. (colloquial) procedural and hortatory discourse.

After the Vedic period, the gerund came in addition to overlap with and in the Middle Indo-Aryan period gradually supplant non-preterital forms in core-layer manner adjuncts and complements, and, idiomatically, in prohibitive constructions. It appeared quite early also in periphrastic expressions of stative, in late Classical Sanskrit also perfective, aspect (cf. 714). Most of these later Vedic and especially post-Vedic developments appear more prominently in Middle Indo-Aryan, which is why they may be regarded as Prakritisms in Sanskrit (cf. 3.3, 6.3.B).

As a result of this development, which was furthered by the gradual relaxation of the coreferentiality constraint and relative past tense, the past gerund became by the later Vedic period the most important and versatile non-finite category of the language. But its role in complex sentence formation was also a function of genre: neither the elaborate Classical *kāvya* style nor the succinct Classical technical *sūtra* style (used mainly for expository discourse) favored gerundial structures over *other* non-finite structures in any type of linkage (cf. 710-711, 715). Thus it may be assumed that the gerund was from the start a colloquial rather than learned formation.

On the other hand, the general tendency to substitute non-finite clauses for finite ones in all kinds of discourse led to a change of syntactic typology in conformity with most other (modern) Indian languages. Typologically there has thus been a switch from mainly co-ranking structures to mainly chaining structures in clause linkage (cf. 1.2.B). The role of the gerund has been more crucial than that of any other non-finite category in this development. The fact that the morphosyntactic category of the gerund is not inherited in Sanskrit, while it is paralleled by analogous categories in most South Asian languages, forces us to consider the possibility of external linguistic influence behind this development.