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)syntetically 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’.\(^1\)

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 as much as they cannot be incorporated in a discontinuous constituent of the ‘main’ clause nor can their interpropositional 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 āśva* ‘sit/keep playing it’ ≠ *ullikhann imam āśva* ‘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

---

\(^1\) For an analysis of the various degrees of formal and prosodic ‘conexity’ in parataxis and hypotaxis, see Bednarczuk (1971, p. 34).
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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). 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. On the other hand, symmetrical relations can be expressed by hypotactic structures, but this entails thematic asymmetry, i.e. topological 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

---

2 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].

3 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.
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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)\(^4\), 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’): ru, 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, ṣamul, etc.
- description of participant (‘A which is P’): yā- (ca-)
- (* ) comparison (‘P like Q’): iva, -vat

**Propositional setting or implication:**
- place of event (‘P at Q’): yatra (tatāra), loc.
- *time of event (‘P when/after/before Q’): yad(ā), yāvat, pple, loc.
- *accompaniment (‘P with Q’): pres. pple, ṣamul, instr.
- *cause-effect (‘P because of Q’): yad (tasāt), 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.

---

\(^4\) For a descriptive and diachronic study of these particles in the Rgveda, see Klein (1974; 1978).
The brief glosses of the interpropositional relations\textsuperscript{5} 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
\begin{quote}
tataḥ praviṣati suptotthitah kaṇvasisyah\end{quote}

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

It does not appear that suptotthitah 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

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{5} The terminology is mainly Halliday's, but draws also on Nida (1975) and Berry (1971, p. 170ff.).
\end{quote}
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3.2.A). Like the gerund, the perfect participle expresses a preceding or completed action and by inference a resulting state (e.g. tāṭhivas-/sthitvā ‘standing’ < ‘having stood up’, cf. sthita- = ‘standing’), with or without further logical implicatures (cf. VS 17.22 vāyṛdhanah ‘having grown’ = MS 2.20.2 vardhānena ‘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 susupvāmsa ṛbhavas tād aprçchatā ‘Having slept, O Ṛbhus, you asked thus’ vs. AV 10.3.6a svāpnam suptvā yādi pāśyāsi pāpām ‘If, having fallen asleep, you shall see an evil dream’ and TS 5.2.2.6 tāsmāt suptvā prajāḥ prá 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 aprçchatā...
‘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 vah kṛtvy ēmasi
‘Having made (kṛtvy = kṛtvī) those things, brother, we shall come after you.’

(583) RV 8.14.5-6
yajñā indram avardhayaḥ yād bhūmima vyāvartayat cakṛañā opaśām divi vāyṛdhanasya te vayām visvā dhānāni jigyūṣah utim ēndrā vṛnimeh
‘The sacrifice made Indra grow, when he rolled asunder the earth, having made (cakṛañā = 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 abībhyuṣir asmin ghosṭhe kariṣṭīh
bibhratiḥ somyām mādhv anamivrā upētāna
‘Having come together (samjagmānā = samgatya), unaffrighted, rich in manure, in this stall, bearing the sweet of Soma, come hither, free from disease.’
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(585) AV 11.1.16cd (cf. also 3.4.7, 9.4.15, 11.6.21, 18.2.26)
ærseyá daivá abhisamgátya bhágám imám tápiśthá rtóhhus tapantu
‘Let those of the seers, those of the gods, having come together unto (abhisam-
gátya) 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)
útá brahmáno maruto me asyéndráh sómasya súṣutasya peyáḥ
ńád dhi hávyám mánuśe gá ávindad áhann áhím papivá ámb 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 (papivá ámb = pítvá, cf. 590) of it.’

(587) RV 1.108.13ab
evendragñi papivámsá sutásya visvásmabhyam sám āyatām dhánāni
‘So having drunk (papivámsá = pítvá, cf. 590) of the pressed (Soma), O Indra
and Agni, conquer for us all the riches!’

(588) RV 3.50.3cd
mandánāh sómaḿ papiváṁ jñísin sám ásmabhyaṃ puruhá gá īśānya
‘Intoxicated having drunk (papivá ámb = pítvá, cf. 590) Soma, gather for us, O
lofty one, cows in plenty!’

(589) RV 10.94.9cd (= 109)
tébhîr dugdhám papivân somyám mádhv indro vardhate
‘Having drunk (papivân = pítvá) 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 pítvá mádānām indro vṛtrāh aprati
jaghāna jaghānac ca nū
‘Having drunk (pítvá) 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
vádhibhú vṛtrām maruta indriyéna svéna bhámena tavisó babhúván
‘I slew Vṛtra, O Maruts, with my Indric power, having become (babhúván =
bhútvá, cf. 592) fierce in my wrath.’

(592) RV 10.145.5 (= AV 3.18.5: bhútvá)
ahám asmi sáhamânátha tvá ámb asi sáshahih
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ubhë sàhasvati bhùtvì sapàtnìm me sahàvahai
'I am a conqueror and you are victorious. Having both become (= being: bhùtvì) mighty, let us overpower my rival!'

(593) MS 1.8.6 (123, 18)
yó vâi bahú dadiùvàn bahv ìjä3nó 'agnìm utsâdâyate
'He who having given (dadiùvàn = dattvā) much, having offered (ìjä3nó = ìśt?vā) much, removes the fire.'

(594) RV 7.70.5ab
susruvâmsa cid aśvinâ purùny abhi brâhmâni caâsâthe ṃśinâm
'Though having heard (susruvâmsa = srutvā, cf. below) so many songs of praise, O Asvins, pay attention to those of our Rṣis!'

(595) RV 6.50.5cd
srutvâ hávam maruto yàd dha yàthá bhùmâ rejante ádhvâni pràvikte
'Having heard (srutvā) 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 yâtâram kâm apasya indra hṛdí yât te jaghnùso bhîr ágacchat
'Whom did you see as the pursuer of the dragon, Indra, when fear came into your heart, having slain (jaghnùso = hatvā, cf. 4.2.A) (him)'

(598) AB 3.47.1 (= 148)
chandâmsi vai devebhyo havyam üdhvâ srântâni jaghanárdhe
yajñasya tishtanti yathâsvo vâśvataro vohivâms tiṣṭhed evam
'The metres stand having carried (üdhvâ) the libation to the gods exhausted at the rear of the sacrifice, like a horse or a mule would stand, having carried (vohivâms) its load.'

(599) SB 1.6.4.21 (= 149)
...átha vṛtrām hatvâ yàthá mahârâjó vijigyañâ evâm mahendrō 'bhavat
tâsmâni mahendrâyêtì... indro vâ esâ purâ vṛtrásya vadhâd indro vṛtrâm
ejagnivâms
'...but after slaying (hatvā, cf. jaghnivâms) Vṛtra, just like a Mahârâja having conquered all (vijigyañâ), he became Mahendra, and so "To M."... since Indra he is before the killing of Vṛtra and I. (he is) having slain (jaghnivâms = hatvâ) V.'
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(600) JB 2.409 (1)

prajàpatih praûh saûrjanaû sa vyasramûtsa
‘Prajàpati having (sasrjanaû = sûtvæ) created the creatures, he fell asunder.’
Cf. SB 7.1.2.1 prajàpatih praûh asûjata sà praûh sûtvæ sàrvam àjìm itvà
vyasramûtsa ‘Prajàpati created the creatures. Having created the creatures and run
the whole race, he fell asunder’.

(601) KU 1.1.11

yathã ðhavita pratiûta aûddãlakir arùnir matprãsraûtha
sukham ràûthi sayita vitamanûs tvàm dadrsivân mûtyumukhàt
pramuktam
‘Just as before Aûddãlakî, son of Arûnà, will recognize you, through my favor.6
Peacefully he will sleep his nights, with his anger gone, having seen (dadrsivân =
dûtvæ) 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

tvàm apô yàd dha vûtràm jaghanûm átyàûh iva pràsrjàh sàrtavàjàù
sàyànam indra càrata vadhåna vavûvànsam pàri devir àdevam
‘When having slain Vûtra you released the waters to run like runners on a course,
with the nimble weapon, O Indra, the godless one who lay (sàyànam = sayitvà)
having encompassed (vavûvànsam = vûtvæ) the godly ones.’

(603) RV 1.52.6

pârùm ghûnà càrati titvisë sàvo ‘pò vûtvì ràjasa budhnam âsàyat l
vûtràsyà yàt pravañë durgrîbhisvano niçåghàntha hàñvor indra tanyatùm
‘Around him heat moves, the power was stirred up. Having encompassed (vûtvì =
vavûvàn) the waters he lay over the bottom of the earthly region, when you, Indra,
struck the thunderbolt between Vûtra’s jaws, who was hard to grasp in the
waterfall.’

6 Radhakrishnan (1953, p. 599) proposed the emendation matprãsraûta ‘(when) set free by me’ in
accordance with tvatprãsraûta ‘set free by you’ in the previous stanza.
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(604) TS 2.5.3.1-2

indraṁ vṛtram jaghnivāṁsāṁ mēdho 'bhi prāvepanta... indro vṛtram hatvā devātābhīḥ cendriyēṇa ca vyārdhyata... indrasya vṛtram jaghnūṣa indriyām vīryām prthivīm ānu vyārchat

‘Indra (obj.), who (= because he) had slain (jaghnivāṁsāṁ ≠ 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 (jaghnūṣa ≠ hatvā) Vṛtra, went down into the earth.’

(605) AB 3.42.1

deva vā asurāṁ vijigyāṇāṁ ērdhvāṁ svargāṁ lokāṁ āyan

‘The gods having been conquered (vijigyāṇā ≠ 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’, taṭṛṣāna- (cf. ṭṛṣīta-) ‘thirsty’. cikitvas- ‘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 -tā/-nā- 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 participle, 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) SB 6.1.1.8 (cf. 1.6.4.2)

bhūyānt syām prājāyeyēti sō 'srāmyat sā tápo 'tāpyata sā śrāntās tepāno brāhmaivā prathamām āṣjata

‘May I become more numerous, let me procreate myself, thus (thinking) he exerted himself and performed austerity. Exhausted (srāntās), having performed austerity (tepāno = taptvā), he then first created Brahman.’
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(607) RV 8.2.40

itthã dhívantam adrivãh kãnvãm médhyãtithim
mësó bhûtô 'bhi yán náyãh
‘O master of the pressing stone, having become (bhútô = bhûtvã) a ram, when you led the pious Kãnvic Medhyãtithi’

Cf. Sb 1.1.15 médhãtithim ha kãnvãyãyanãm mësó bhûtvã jañãra; Sáyãna: svargãm nínãya (cf. Geldner, Rigveda II, p. 285.)

(608) RV 10.85.29cd

kûtváśã padvãtã bhûtvy ã jãyã visate pâtim
‘This witchcraft, having become (bhûtvy) provided with feet, enters the man as his wife.’

(609) RV 7.56.18ab

ã vo hûtã johavitã sattãh satrãcãm rãtim maruto grãñãnãh
‘The Hoqr-priest calls aloud upon you, seated (sattãh = niñádyã), praising your joint gift, O Maruts!’

(610) Bhradd. 5.20

niñãnãh sa tayã sãrdham ásandyãm kañipãv api
tãm upãmantrayãm cakre kam etãm tvaµ iti tv ṛcã
‘Seated (niñãnãh = niñadyã) together with her upon a stool on a cushion, he addressed her with the verse: “Whom do you here...?”’

(611) Sb 1.6.2.3

ét purodãsãm évã kûrmãm bhûtvã sárpantam
‘Look, the sacrificial cookie crawling away having become (bhûtvã = bhûtam) 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 bahuvrihi-compound or construed absolutely. E.g. :

(612) AB 7.2.1

ya áhitãgnir upavasathe mriyeta katham asya yajñãh syãt
‘If one who has established the fires (áhitãgnir = agnim ádhãya) dies on the fast day, how is it with his sacrifice?’
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(613) AiU 2.1.4
athāsyāyam 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) Kaut. 3.14.5
karmāniśṭhāpāne bhartur anyatra gṛhitavetano nāsakāmah kuryāt
‘(If) having received wages (gṛhitavetano = vetanam gṛhītā) from another than the employer, he is not to work against his will upon the completion of his (former) assignment.’

(615) Kaut. 2.27.20
bhogam gṛhītvā dvīsatyā bhogadviguno dandaḥ
‘The penalty for a woman having received (payment for) enjoyment (but then) changed her mind is twice the (payment for) enjoyment .’

(616) Sak. 7.24 (p. 103)
[rājā:] uddhṛtaviśādasalyah kathayāmi
‘[The king:] I shall tell you, having first pulled out the dart of grief.’
(uddhṛtaviśādasalyah = viśādasalyam 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 pitā úd iyarti vācam
‘This (Soma), (when) drunk (pitā ≠ pītvā), stirs up my song.’

(618) RV 10.34.4cd
pitā 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 kitavāsyā hīnā mātā putrāsyā cārataḥ kvā svit
‘The wife of the gambler grieves, forsaken (hīnā ≠ hitvā), the mother (too) of the son, who wanders god knows where.’
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(620) TS 2.4.12.1
\[\text{tvāśṭā hatāputro vīndram sōram ā harat}\]
'Tvaśṭa, whose son had been slain (hatāputro ≠ putram hatvā), offered Soma to others than Indra.'

(621) TS 2.6.3.3
\[\text{apisyan purodāsam kūrmām bhūtām sārpanām}\]
'They saw the sacrificial cookie crawling away having become (bhūtām ≠ bhūtvā) a tortoise.'

(Contrast with 611, where the the acc. log. subject is governed by the particle ād.)

(622) TS 5.5.1.6-7
\[\text{yāthā samvatsarām āptvā ā kālā āgatē vijāyate}\]
'As one having spent a year (āptvā), when the time has come (kālā āgatē ≠ āgatyam), propagates.'

(623) SB 7.1.2.1
\[\text{prajāpatih prajā asṛjata sā prajāh sṛṣṭvā sārvam ājim itvā vyāsrasmāsata tāsmād visrastāt prāno mādhyata ād akrāmad āthāsdāt viryām ād akrāmat tāsmīnaḥ utkrānte 'padyata tāsmāt pannād ānman asravat}\]
'Prajāpati created the beings and having created (sṛṣṭvā ≠ sṛṣṭāh) the beings and gone (ājim = ātāh) to every contest, he collapsed, and from him collapsed (visrastāt ≠ visramṣya) the breaths departed from the middle, and so also his manly potency departed from him. When it had departed (utkrānte ≠ utkramya), he fell down. From him thus fallen down (panṇād ≠ patītvā), food flowed forth.'

(624) SB 10.6.5.6
\[\text{tāsya srāntāsyā taptāsyā yāśo viryām ād akrāmat}\]
'From him, thus wearied (srāntāsyā ≠ srāmitvā) and heated (taptāsyā ≠ taptvā), glory and vigour departed.'

(625) ŚvU 1.6cd
\[\text{sarvajīve sarvāsasmin the bṛhante asmin haṁso bhrāmyate brahma-cakre śṛthag ātmānāṁ preritāram ca matvā juṣṭas tatas tenāṁṛtatvam eti}\]
'In this all-enlivening, all-settling vast Brahma-wheel the goose (= soul) flutters about, having perceived (matvā ≠ matāh) itself and the instigator as different. When favored (juṣṭas ≠ juṣṭvā) by him, he goes to immortality.'
(626) ChU 2.23.2
praśāpatir lokāna abhyatapat tebhāyo abhitaptebhāyas trayā vidyā samprā-
śravat tām abhyatapat tasyā abhitaptāyā etany aksarāni samprāśravanta
bhūr bhuvah śvar iti
‘Praśāpati brooded on the worlds. From them, thus brooded upon (abhita-
taptebhāyas ≠ abhitapya), the three-fold wisdom issued forth. He brooded on this and
from it, thus brooded upon (abhitaptāyā ≠ abhitapya), issued forth these
syllables: bhūḥ, bhuvah and svaḥ.’

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 sūdhē jale mṛdādbhiḥ pādau hastau ca dhāvayitvācāmyā-
ṅāni samāsodhāyāpaḥ punantv iti jale nīmajjed ācānto vaisānavair
mantrair viṣṇum hiraṇyaśrūgam iti varuṇam ca preṇaṃyāghamaraṇa-
sūktanāghamaraṇaṁ kṛtvedam āpaḥ śivā iti snāyād...
‘At midday, having washed his feet and hands in clean water with clay and water
and, after having sipped water (ācāmya) 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 aghamaraṇa-hymn perform aghamaraṇa,
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 particle-based bahuvrhi-compounds)
overlap with both gerundial and finite coordinate clauses also in additive-sequential linkage:

(628) Pañc. 1.18
atha tathānusūṭhitē sa mattagajō makṣikāgeyasyaśkhān nimilītanetaḥ
kāṣṭhakūtāpaḥtacaksur madhyāhna-samaye tṛṣārto bhraman maṇḍūka-
sabdānusārī gacchan maḥaṭīṁ gartām āsādyā patito mṛtasa ca
‘Then this having been arranged (anusūṭhitē ≠ anūṣṭhāya), that rutting elephant,
who had closed his eyes (nimilītanetaḥ = netre nimilya) in his rapture at the
singing of the fly, got his eyes knocked out by the woodpecker (kāṣṭhakūtāpaḥ-
tacaksur ≠ kāṣṭhakena caksur apahṛtya) and, roaming at midday tormented by
thirst, following the sound of the frogs, reached the big pit and fell into it and died.’
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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 perfection 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. \( \sqrt{\text{bhi}} \) ‘fear, become frightened’: \( \text{bhiyānā} \) (aor, pple) ‘having become frightened’ (≠ 'while getting frightened’) = \( \text{bhita} \) (past pple) ‘scared’ ≠ \( \text{bhayamāna} \) (pres. pple) ‘while fearing’. (Note that there is no gerund *\( \text{bhītvā} \) ‘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)

\[ \text{ayāṁ te āstu ṭaryatāḥ sōma ā ĥāribhīḥ sutāḥ} \]
\[ \text{juṣānā īndra ĥāribhir na ā gahya ā tiṣṭha hāritāṁ rātham} \]

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

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

\[ \text{ā vāṁ rātham yuvatīs tiṣṭhad ātra juṣṭvī nāra duhitā sūryasya} \]

‘May the young lady ascend your chariot here, pleased (juṣṭvī) 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

\[ \text{āsoci āgniḥ samidhānō asmē ṛpo aḍrāraṁ tāmaścas cid āntāḥ} \]

‘The lightened (samidhānō = sāmiddha) 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
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on the part of the Agent, e.g. sayānāh bhūjate yavanāh ‘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. pasyantāṃ devadattaṃ 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
ud gā ājad āṅgirabhya āviś kṛnvān gūhā satīḥ
‘He drove out the cows for the Āṅgirases, revealing (āviś kṛnvān ≠ kṛtvā) the concealed ones.’

(633) RV 1.67.3ab
hāste dādhāno nṛṃṇā visvāny āme devān dhād gūhā niṣīdan
‘Holding all his potencies in his hand, he put all the gods in confusion, sitting down (niṣīdan ≠ niṣadya) in secret.’

(634) AV 13.1.43
ārōhan dyām amṛtāh práva me vācaḥ
ut tvā yajñā brāhmaṇaṁ vahānti adhvacatō 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
yēdām pūrvāgan raśanāyāmānā praṣām asyāi drāvīnaṁ cēhā 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
tē dyām udītīyāvidanta lokāṁ nākasya pṛśtē ādhi dīdhyaṁ
‘They, having risen (udītīyā ≠ udītyā) to heaven, have found a place, shining (dīdhyaṁ) upon the back of the firmament.’

(637) TS 5.6.6.1
tāṁ devā bibhyato nōpāyan
‘Him the gods, fearing (bibhyato = bhītāḥ = bhīyānāḥ), did not approach.’
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(638) Manu 2.195
pratiravanasaṃbhāse sayāno na samācaret
nāsino na ca bhujāno na tiṣṭhan na paraṃmukhaḥ

‘One should engage in conversation neither while lying (sayāno, cf. sayitvā ‘having lain [down]’), nor sitting (āsino ≠ āsitvā), nor eating (bhujāno ≠ bhuktvā), nor standing (tiṣṭhan, cf. sthitvā ‘having stood [up > standing]’) nor with averted face (paraṃmukhaḥ).’

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 sārma vārma chardir asmābhyaṁ yamsat

‘Holding (bibhrad = gṛhitvā ‘having taken’) > “holding”) cures and treasures in his hand, may he confer us shelter, shield, protection!’

(640) RV 3.29.10
ayām te yónir ṛtvīyo yāto jātō arocathāḥ
tām jānān agna ā sidāthā no vardhayā giraḥ

‘This is your regular womb, from whence you shone forth having been born. “Knowing (jānān, 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 tigmāni bhrāśayān bhrāsyāni 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 ूṛdhvāmāyur gṛhyā gṛhnāṅo bahudhā vi ca kṣva

“Wholly conquering (saṃjāyan ≠ saṃjītya) the fighters, shrill-crying, do thou, seizing (gṛhnāṅo, cf. gṛhitvā ‘having grasped’ > ‘holding’) those that are to be seized, look abroad on many sides” (Whitney 1905, p. 255)
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(643) SvU 5.3

\[ \text{ekai} \text{ka} \text{m j} \text{al} \text{a} \text{m bahudh} \text{a} \text{ vik} \text{ur} \text{van as} \text{mi} \text{n k} \text{set} \text{re sa} \text{m} \text{harat} \text{y} \text{e} \text{sa d} \text{eva} \text{h} \text{ bh} \text{u} \text{y} \text{a} \text{h} \text{ s} \text{r} \text{t} \text{v} \text{a} \text{ yat} \text{ay} \text{as ta} \text{the} \text{a} \text{s sa} \text{rva} \text{dhi} \text{p} \text{a} \text{t} \text{y} \text{a} \text{m} \text{ ku} \text{r} \text{ute} \text{ mah} \text{a} \text{t} \text{m} \text{a} \]

‘Having spread (lit. ‘spreading’: vikurvan = vikṛtya) out one net after the other manifolds, this god pulls it all together in this field. Having again created the disposers (yātis) the great self exercises his lordship over all.’

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

\[ \text{path} \text{an r} \text{ām} \text{ya} \text{n} \text{a} \text{m n} \text{ara} \text{h pre} \text{ty} \text{a s} \text{va} \text{r} \text{g} \text{e m} \text{ai} \text{йте} \]

‘(By) reading (pathan = pathitvā) the Rāmāyaṇa, a man enjoys bliss in heaven upon dying.’

(645) Tantr. 1.3

\[ \text{t} \text{a} \text{t} \text{ra ca ma} \text{ra} \text{ka} \text{ta} \text{sada} \text{r} \text{sā} \text{n} \text{ī s} \text{a} \text{s} \text{pā} \text{grā} \text{nī bh} \text{a} \text{k} \text{s} \text{a} \text{yan} \text{a} \text{k} \text{a} \text{t} \text{i} \text{p} \text{a} \text{y} \text{a} \text{i} \text{r a} \text{ho} \text{b} \text{hir h} \text{a} \text{r} \text{a} \text{v} \text{ṛ} \text{s} \text{a} \text{b} \text{ha iva p} \text{ī} \text{n} \text{a} \text{k} \text{a} \text{k} \text{u} \text{d} \text{a} \text{d} \text{ā} \text{rī bala} \text{v} \text{ān sa} \text{m} \text{v} \text{ṛ} \text{t} \text{a} \text{ḥ} \]

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

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

(646) Pañc. 1.27 (ed. Hertel, p. 111)

\[ \text{s} \text{a ca b} \text{k} \text{a} \text{b} \text{ā} \text{l} \text{a} \text{k} \text{ā} \text{n} \text{y} \text{a} \text{j} \text{a} \text{t} \text{a} \text{p} \text{a} \text{k} \text{ś} \text{ā} \text{n} \text{y} \text{e} \text{v} \text{a} \text{s} \text{a} \text{d} \text{ai} \text{va bh} \text{a} \text{k} \text{ṣ} \text{a} \text{yan k} \text{ā} \text{l} \text{ā} \text{m n} \text{ay} \text{a} \text{ti} \]

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

(647) Kath. 9.76

\[ \text{tatah sa } \text{s} \text{a} \text{v} \text{a} \text{r} \text{a } \text{vād} \text{īj j} \text{i} \text{vi} \text{k} \text{e} \text{y} \text{a} \text{m m} \text{a} \text{ma pr} \text{a} \text{b} \text{ho k} \text{ṛ} \text{p} \text{a} \text{n} \text{o } \text{h} \text{a} \text{m hi j} \text{i} \text{vā} \text{mī b} \text{h} \text{u} \text{j} \text{a} \text{g} \text{a} \text{m k} \text{h} \text{e} \text{l} \text{a} \text{y} \text{a} \text{n s} \text{a} \text{d} \text{ā} \]

‘Then that Sabara 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)

\[ \text{sa k} \text{halu n} \text{p} \text{at} \text{i} \text{r } \text{t} \text{a} \text{d} \text{r} \text{a} \text{j} \text{ya} \text{s} \text{u} \text{k} \text{ham a} \text{n} \text{u} \text{b} \text{h} \text{a} \text{van k} \text{ā} \text{l} \text{ā} \text{m n} \text{a} \text{y} \text{a} \text{n a} \text{v} \text{a} \text{ti} \text{s} \text{ṭ} \text{h} \text{at} \text{e} \text{c} \]

‘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
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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) Vēt. 1 (ed. Emeneau, p. 20f.)

tataś taṁ nihatyā kālaṁ 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) SB 12.8.3.14
dvāu dvau samāsaṁ hurtvā sāte sāmsṛavānt samāva nayati

‘Having offered each pair while joining them (samāsaṁ ≠ 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 SB 2.6.1.31 uṇottāya... juhoti ‘offers having stepped up’, SB 2.6.1.32 uṇottomyaṁ... juhoti ‘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], KapŚ 31.10 & 12)
yād ekadhō 'padadhyaṁ ekam ṛtūṁ varṣed anuparīhāram sādayati
tasmāt sārvān ṛtūn varṣati yāt prāṇabhīṣṭa uṇadhāya vṛṣṭisāṁiṁ
uṇadhāhī tasmād vāyupracyutā dīvō 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 (anuparīhāram); therefore it rains in all the season. Since having put down (uṇadhāya) 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.)
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(652) KS 11.4 (148, 8)

sarvā imāḥ prajā adhiśādām adyād

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

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

upāriśtād vā asā ādityā imāḥ prajā adhiśādyātti...

‘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+gṛhya) 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

agnir hōtā hastagṛhyānānāya

‘Agni as Hir-_priest brought (her) here, having taken (her) hand (hastagṛhya = hastagṛham ‘while holding her hand’ = hastam gṛhitvā ‘having taken...’).’

(655) MS 2.4.6 (45, 13)

yāthā vā idām nāmagrahām āsā āsā iti hāyati

‘Just like one here calls out “Hey you over there!”, mentioning (a person’s) name (nāmagrahām = nāmagrahya).’

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’ (upasaṃgṛhya upasaṃgṛhya; 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

āthābravid vṛtram indro haniṣyān

‘Then Indra said intending to slay (haniṣyān ≠ hatvā) Vṛtra’
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(657) MS 1.8.5 (122, 11)
\[\text{yát púrvān āhutām hutvōttarām hosyān pratikṣate}\]
When having offered (hutvā ≠ hosyān) the first āhuti while going to offer (= before offering: hosyān ≠ hutvā) the second, he waits.'

(658) TS 2.5.1.4
\[\text{vṛknāt} \parallel \text{parābhavisyānto manyāmahe}\]
“We deem that we shall be overcome through pruning (parābhavisyānto ≠ parābhūya).” (Keith 1914, p. 189)

(659) SB 5.1.3.13
\[\text{ātha yát purā pracāred yāthā yām ādhvānām esyat syāt tām gatvā sā kvā tataḥ syād evām tāt}\]
‘And if he should go on ahead, then it would be just as if he were going to go (esyat ≠ itvā) the same way already having gone it (gatvā ≠ gamisyaṇ), so where would he then be?’

(670) Megh. 45c
\[\text{vyālambethāḥ ... mānayiṣyaṇ ... (comm. pūjayitum)}\]
‘...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. 3.3.8, 4.7.8.). E.g.:

(671) RV 1.55.2c (cf. 1.16.3, 3.42.4, 8.17.15, 9.2.5, 9.97.20, etc.)
\[\text{indrāḥ sōmasya pīṭāye vṛṣāyate}\]
‘Indra gets to feel like a bull for the drinking (pīṭāye ≠ pītvā, cf. 672) of Soma.’

(672) RV 9.108.2a
\[\text{yāsyā te pītvā vṛṣabhō vṛṣāyate}\]
‘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
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construction with the infinitive (Speijer 1886, p. 302 § 384 Rem. 1):

(673) Mṛcch. 3.6 (= ex. 401)
(Cārūdatta:) alam supṭajanaṃ prabodhayitum
(Cārūdatta:) ‘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) SB 3.2.1.13 (Cf. AB 3.17.3 = 245)
   tāsmāt stūkāsārgam śrṣṭā 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
   nākīr devā mīnīmaṇī nākīr ā yopāyāmaṇī mantraśrūtyaṃ carāmaṇī
   pāksēbhı́r api kākṣēbhı́r ātrābhı́ sām raṃbāmahe
   ‘Wir versäumen nichts, o Götter, wir vertuschen nichts, wir halten darauf, (deinen)
   Rat zu hören (mantraśrūtyaṃ carāmaṇī). 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+srútya- 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 mantumah voc. ‘rich in advice’). Being an optional complement to a verb of motion, mantrašrútyaṁ 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+srutyā/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 sámi taraṇitvēṇa vāghāto mārtāsah sānto aṁṛtatvām ānasuh
‘Having labored (viṣṭvī) with diligence (sámi) and dexterity (taraṇitvēṇa), the oblation-pourers (? singers), being mortal, achieved immortality.’

(677) RV 8.23.14
śrūṣṭy āgna nāvasya me stōmasya viṁṣate
nī māyinas tāpuṣā rakṣaso dāha
‘In willing hearing (śrūṣṭi) 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
śaivasā hy āsi sruto vṛtraḥātyena vṛtraḥ
‘For through your prowess you are known, through the slaying of Vṛtra (vṛtraḥātyena), (you are known as) the Vṛtraslayer.’

(679) RV 4.36.4
ēkaṁ vi cakra camsām cāturvayaṁ nis cārmano gām ariṇīta dhitibhiḥ
dhāḥ deveśv aṁṛtatvām ānasā srūṣṭi vājā ṛbhavas tād va ukhyāṁ
‘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 (śrūṣṭi), O Vājas and Ṛbhus. That is something for you to talk about!’
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.:


\[\text{tasya sakāṣāṃ gatvā bhrāṭṛsnehenaikatra bhakṣaṇapānāviharaṇakriyābhīr ekasthānāśrayeṇa kālo neyāḥ} \]

“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 ālam + gerund/instrumental, see 3.3.C, 4.4.C. Cf. also astu ‘let be’, kṛtām ‘(be) done (with)’ + instrumental: ālam ākranditeṇa ‘enough of (your) crying!’; athavā kṛtām samdehena ‘well, enough of hesitation!’; but Mahāv. II (p. 25) astu durāsadena tapāṣa ‘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)

\[\text{sākha sākhye apacat tūyam agnir asyā krātvā mahiṣā tīrī satānī}
\text{tīrī sākāṃ indro mānuṣaḥ sārāmī suīm pibad vṛtahātyāya sōmam} \]

‘The friend Agni cooked snappily for his friend at his wish three hundred buffaloes with dexterity. Indra drank for the slaying of Vṛtra (vṛtahātyāya) 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 ūrdhvām, 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) SvU 1.11
jnātva devam sarvāsāpahāniḥ kṣinaḥ klesair janmamṛtyuprahāniḥ tasyābhidhyanāt triyam dehabhede visvāsvaryam kevala āptakāmah
'By [one’s] coming to know (jnātva, ger.) god there is a falling off of all [one’s] fetters; when the sufferings are destroyed (kṣinaḥ klesair, 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
yasya te pītvā vṛṣabhō vṛṣayate 'syā pītā svarvidah
sā suprāketo abhy ākramid iso 'chā vājam nātasaḥ
'Of whose (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 ūrdhvām, prabhṛti, param 'after, upon', pruṣā '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) SB 10.1.4.11

\[ \text{samcítē'gniḥ prāṇīyate prāṇitād ārdhvām samidha āhutaya iti hūyante} \]

‘When the (fire-altar) has been fully constructed (samcítē, absolute locative), Agni is brought forward. After the bringing forward (prāṇitād ārdhvām \( \approx \) prāṇite = prāṇīya), 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

\[ \text{abhivādāt param vipro jyāyāmsam abhivādayan} \]

\[ \text{asau nāmāham asmiti svām nāma parikirtayet} \]

‘After the salutation (abhivādāt param \( \approx \) abhivādaya), the brahmin saluting the older one, should announce his name “I am called so and so”.’

(686) AiU 2.1.6

\[ \text{sa evam vidvan asmac charirabhedād ārdhvam utkramyāmuḥsmin} \]

\[ \text{svarge loke sarvān kāmān āptvāmṛtaḥ samabhatvat samabhavat} \]

‘Knowing thus, having risen upwards upon the destruction of this body (charirabhedād ārdhvam \( \approx \) sarirah bhittvā), and having enjoyed all the pleasures in yonder world, he became immortal, became immortal.’

(687) TS 6.1.3.8

\[ \text{nā purā dākṣinābhyo nētoh kṛṣṇavīśāṅām āva cṛtved} \]

‘He should not let go of the horn of the black antelope before the bringing of the fees (purā dākṣinābhyo nētoh \( \neq \) dākṣinā nītvā).’

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

\[ \text{yādī purā samsthanād dīryetādyā varśīyatīti brūyād yādī samsthitē} \]

\[ \text{svō vṛṣṭēti brūyād yādī cīrām iva dīryetā nāḍḍhā vidmēti brūyāt} \]

‘If (the vessel) should break before the completion (of the sacrifice) (purā samsthanād \( \neq \) samsthyāya), 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!”.’
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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 = al-a-m ‘sufficiently, suitably, enough’ (< √ṛ ‘go’), káma-m ‘at will’ (< káma- ‘love’), oṣ-ā-m ‘promptly’ (< √us ‘burn’), vi+srab-dha-m (< vi + √srambh) ‘confidently’, gūh-ā ‘secretly’ (< √gūh ‘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)
svārmīlhe yān māda indra hársyāhan vṛtrām nir apām aubjo aṇavām
‘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
yād indrāhan prathamajām áhinām án māyān āmināḥ próta 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) SB 4.1.2.4
yātra vai sōmah svām puróhitam bhūsparthām jījyau tāsmai pūnar dadau
‘When/After Soma had subdued his own Purohita-priest, B., he returned it to him.’

(692) SB 4.1.4.8
tām yātra devā āghnāms tām mitrām abruvāms
‘When/After the gods had killed him, they said to Mitra’
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(693) RV 1.38.9

dívā cít támaḥ kr̥ṇavanti parjanyenodavāhena yát prthivīm vyundánti
‘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 dharūneṣv ácyutaḥ sahásramūtis táviśiṣu vāvädhe indro
yad vr̥tr̥m ávadhīṁ nādićtam ubjāṁ árṇāmsi jār̥ṣāno 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)

vṛtr̥m yād indra sāvasāvadhīṁ āhim ād it sūryāṁ divy ārohayo dṛṣe
‘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 interpropositional 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) SB 2.1.1.8-9

sá yátra devān upajagāma II tād dhócuh
‘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 interpropositional relation, informationally weighty or focalized adverbial clauses thus remain largely finite in all genres and periods (cf. 6.3.).
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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 backgronding 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

\[ \text{hiṁ karoti sāmaivākar} \]

'He says hiṁ, so he has produced the Sāman.'

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

"er macht hín 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 hiṁ 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-Saṁhitāic narrative discourse (especially in and after the Brāhmaṇas and ritual Śūtras). In the following early Vedic examples, finite paratactic and gerundial clauses seem to be more or less interchangeable:
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(698) RV 4.28.1 (cf. RV 2.12.3 = ex. 72)

> tvā yujā táva tá tāma sakhyā indro ápó mānave sasrūtas kāh
> dhann áhim áriṇāt saptā sindhūn 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

> tvāṣṭā yād vájram sükṛtam hiranyāyām sahāsrabṛśṭim svápa śāvarataya dhattá indro náry ápāmsi kārtvé 'han vṛ́trām nir apām abjat arnavām

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)

> avamāśe dyām astabhāyad bhāntam á rōdasi aprṇad antārikṣam
> sā dhārayad pṛthivīm paprāthac ca sōmasya tā māda 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 skabhityy ápa á cakur ójasā yajñām janītvī tanvī ni māmpjuh '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

> ápaṁa sómam amētā abhumāganma jyōtir 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 sauhvanāso amṛṭatvām ērire viṣṭví śāmibhiḥ... 'The sons of Sudhanvan attained immortality by having labored diligently...'; not the instrumental implication.)

(702) TS 2.1.2.1

> sō 'bravid váraṁ vṛṇiśvātha me pūnar dehitī

He said: “Choose a boon and then give (them) back to me!”

(703) TS 5.4.9.1

> tám devā abruvann úpa na á vartasva havyām no vahēti

The gods said to him: “Turn back to us, carry the oblation for us!”
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(704) TS 6.1.6.1
kadrūṣ ca vái suparnī cātmāripāyor aspardhetām sā kadrūḥ suparnīm ajayaat sābravīt tṛṭiyasyām itó divi sōmas tām ā hara tēnātmānaṁ niś-
kṛīṅśvēti

‘Kadrū and Suparnī quarreled for the stake of each other’s shape. Now Kadrū defeated Suparnī. 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
...sā nilāyata sō ‘pāḥ prāvīsat tām devātāḥ prāṣam aicchan tām mátsyāḥ prābravīt tām asapad dhiyādhiyā tvā vadhyāsur yō mā prāvoca iti tāsmān mátsyāṁ dhiyādhiyā ghnanti saptāḥ || hi tām ānvavindan tām abrūvann ūpa na ā vartasva havyām no vahē ’ti sō ‘bravid vārāṁ vṛṇai yād eva grhitasyāhutasya bahihparidhi skāndāt tān me bhṛatṛṇāṁ bhāgadhēyam 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
ājyāhutim juhavāma tayainām jījīśāmeti

‘Let us offer with clarified butter, try to offer this by that!’

(707) AB 7.14-15
sa ha nety uktvā dhanur ādāya āranyam apātasthau sa saṁvatsaram aranye cacāra || atha hāiksāvakāṁ varuṇo jagrāha tasya hodaram 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 Varuna seized Aikṣvāka and he got a belly.’

(708) SB 3.1.2.9-10
sā yadā keśāmasṛū vápāty ī atha snāti

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

(709) Bṛhadā. 6.23
tathetyuktvā jagāmāśu āpaṇān sa sarasvatim
sā caināṁ pratijagrāha duduhe ca payo ghrātam
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‘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 opera-
tional 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 ten̄āsau vyāghreṇa vyāpāditah khāditaś 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 pañcaratnām avalokya paraṁ prītim avāpa vyājahāra ca
‘Then the king, having seen five priceless jewels rolling out all over from inside it,
atained 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 madoddhatasya karṇe sabdam kuru yena tvacchabda-
sravaṇasukhān nimīlitākṣo bhavati. tatasca kāṣṭhakūṭacauṇcuspōṭita-
nayanaḥ pipāsārto gartātāsamsritasya mama sabdam ākarnya 
jalāsayaṁ matvā samagacchan gartām āsādyā patītvā 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).’
5. COMPETING AND CONTRASTIVE STRUCTURES

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

tato gartam āsāyā patisyati pañcatvam āyasyati 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

visvā dvēsāmsi jahi cāvā cā kṛdhī
‘Slay all enemies and ward them off!’

(713) AB 7.28.1

yatrendram devatāḥ paryavrājan viśvāparām tvāśtram abhyamanāmaṁstā
vṛtram astṛta yatint sālāvykebhyāḥ prādād arurmaghān avadhīd
ṛhaspateḥ pratī avadhīd iti tatrendrah somaṁithaṁ vyārdhyat[...]
‘When the gods excluded Indra (saying): “He has misused Viśvāpara, son of Tvaṣṭṛ, he has overthrown Vṛtra, he has given the Yātūs to the hyenas, he has killed the Arurmaghas, 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 maksikoddīya gatā param tena sitadhāreṇāsīnaṁ rājāo vakṣo
dvidhā jātaṁ rājā mṛtas ca
‘Then the fly flew away, whereas the king’s chest was severed by that sharpedged 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 kāvyā style, participial constructions (especially bahuvrīhis) are more common than gerundial constructions, cf.: 244
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(715) Kâm. 1.4.5

śa prātaṁ uthāya kṛtaniyatakṣtyah grhitadantadhāvanaḥ mātrayānu-
lepanam dhūpam srajam iti ca grhitvā dattvā sikthakam alaktakaṁ ca
dṛṣṭvādarṣe mukham grhitamukhavāsānāṁ kāryān anutiṣṭhit

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 develop-
ment, 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.