can still be traced back to the parent language, as, for instance, such dative forms as jiv-ase = viv-ere; *sah-adhyai = έχεσϴαι; dâ -*

*mane = δόμεναι; dâ-vane = δόύναι.* Further, ji-she, “to conquer,” for *ji-si,* apparently an aorist infinitive with the dative ending (parallel to the radical forms, such as *yudh-i,* “ to fight,” *dris'-e,* “ to see”), thus corresponding to the Greek aorist infinitive λυσαι (but *cf.* also Latin *da-re,* for *dase, es-se,* &c.). The classical Sanskrit, on the other hand, practically uses only one infinitive form, viz., the accusative of a verbal noun in *tu, e.g., sthatum, etum,* correspond­ing to the Latin supinum *datum, Hum.* But, as in Latin another case, the ablative *(datu),* of the same abstract noun is utilized for a similar purpose, so the Vedic language makes two other cases do duty as infinitives, viz., the dative in *lave (e.g., datave,* and the anomalous é*tavai),* and the gen.-abl. in *tos (datos).* A prominent featuro of the later Sanskrit syntax is the so-called gerund or inde- clinable participle in *tvâ,* apparently the instrumental of a stem in *tva* (probably a derivative from that in *tu),* as well as the gerund in *ya* (or *tya* after a final short radical vowel) made from compound verbs. The old language knows not only such gerunds in *tvA,* using them, however, very sparingly, but also corresponding dative forms in *tvâya (yuktvdya),* and the curious contracted forms in *tvî (kritvi,* “ to do ”). And, besides those in *ya* and *tya,* it frequently uses forms with a final long vowel, as *bhid-yd, i-tyd,* thus show- ing the former to be shortened instrumentals of abstract nouns in *i* and *ti.*

The Sanskrit verb, like the Greek, has two voices, active and middle, called, after their pamary functions, *parasmâi-pacla,* “ word for another,” and *âtmane-pada,* “ word for one’s self. ” While in Greek the middle forms have to do duty also for the passive in all tenses except the aorist and future, the Sanskrit, on the other hand, has developed for the passive a special present-stem in *ya,* the other tenses being supplied by the corresponding middle forms, with the exception of the third person singular aorist, for which a special form in *i* is usually assigned to the passive.

The present-stem system is by far the most important part of the whole verb system, both on account of frequency of actual occur- rence and of its excellent state of preservation. It is with regard to the different ways of present-stem formation that the entire stock of assumed roots has been grouped by the native grammarians under ten different classes. These classes again naturally fall under two divisions or “ conjugations,” with this characteristic difference that the one (the second) retains the same stem (ending in *a)* through- out the present and imperfect, only lengthening the final vowel before terminations beginning with *v* or *m* (not final) ; while the other shows two different forms of the stem, a strong and a weak form, according as the accent falls on the stem-syllable or on the personal ending: *e.g.,* 3 sing, *bhára-ti, ϕϵρϵι—*2 pl. *bhára-tha, ϕϵρϵτϵ* ; but e*-ti, eicri—i-tha,* ire (for ίτέ); 1 sing, *strno-mi, στόρ- νυμι—*1 pl. *strnu-mas (στόρνυϵς ).*

As several of the personal endings show a decided similarity to personal or demonstrative pronouns, it is highly probable that, as might indeed be *a priori* expected, all or most of them are of pronominal origin,—though, owing to their exposed position and consequent decay, their original form and identity cannot now be determined with certainty. The active singular terminations, with the exception of the second person of the imperative, are unaccented and of comparatively light appearance ; while those of the dual and plural, as well as the middle terminations, have the accent, being apparently too heavy to be supported by the stem-accent, either because, as Schleicher supposed, they are composed of two different pronominal elements, or otherwise. The treatment of the personal endings in the first, and presumably older, conjuga- tion may thus be said somewhat to resemble that of enclitics in Greek.

In the imperfect, the present-stem is increased by the augment, consisting of a prefixed a. Here, as in the other tenses in which it appears, it has invariably the accent, as being the distinctive element (originally probably an independent demonstrative adverb “ then ”) for the expression of past time. This shifting of the word-accent seems to have contributed to the further reduction of the personal endings, and thus caused the formation of a new, or secondary, set of terminations which came to be appropriated for secondary tenses and moods generally. As in Greek poetry, the augment is frequently omitted in Sanskrit.

The mood-sign of the subjunctive is *a,* added to (the strong form of) the tense-stem. If the stem ends already in *a,* the latter be­comes lengthened. As regard the personal terminations, some persons take the primary, others the secondary forms, while others again may take either the one or the other. The first singular active, however, takes *ni* instead of *mi,* to distinguish it from the indicative. But besides these forms, showing the mood-sign *a,* the subjunctive (both present and aorist) may take another form, without any distinctive modal sign, and with the secondary endings, being thus identical with the augmentless form of the preterite.

The optative invariably takes the secondary endings, with some peculiar variations. In the active of the first conjugation, its mood- sign is *yA,* affixed to the weak form of the stem : *e.g.,* root *as,—*

*syâm* = Lat. *siem, sîm;* while in the second conjugation and throughout the middle it is f, probably a contraction of *yâ : e.g., bhares = ϕepois.*

Besides the ordinary perfect, made from a reduplicated stem, with distinction between strong (active singular) and weak forms, and a partly peculiar set of endings, the later language makes large use of a periphrastic perfect, consisting of the accusative of a feminine abstract noun in *A (-Am)* with the reduplicated perfect forms of the auxiliary verbs *kar,* “to do,” or *as* (and occasionally bhû), “to be.” Though more particularly resorted to for the derivative forms of conjugation—viz., the causative (including the so-called tenth conjugational class), the desiderative, intensive, and denominative—this perfect-form is also commonly used with roots beginning with prosodically long vowels, as well as with a few other isolated roots. In the Rigveda this formation is quite unknown, and the Atharvan offers a single instance of it, from a causative verb, with the auxiliary *kar.* In the Vedic prose, on the other hand, it is rather frequent, @@1 and it is quite common in the later language.

In addition to the ordinary participles, active and middle, of the reduplicated perfect,—*e.g., jajan-van, yeyov-ds ; bubudh-âná, πεπυσ-μένο,—*there is a secondary participial formation, obtained by affixing the possessive suffix *vat (rant)* to the passive past participle: *e.g., krita-vant,* lit. “having (that which is) done.” A secondary participle of this kind occurs once in the Atharvaveda, and it is occasionally met with in the Brahmanas. In the later language, however, it not only is of rather frequent occurrence, but has assumed quite a new function, viz., that of a finite perfect- form ; thus *kritavdn, kritavantas,* without any auxiliary verb, mean, not “ having done, but “ he has done,” “ they have done.”

The original Indo-Germanic future-stem formation in *sya,* with primary endings,—*e.g., dasyati = δώσει* (for *δώσετι),—*is the ordinary tense-form both in Vedic and classical Sanskrit,—a preterite of it, with a conditional force attached to it *(adasyat),* being also common to all periods of the language.

Side by side with this future, however, an analytic tense-form makes its appearance in the Brahmanas, obtaining wider currency in the later language. This periphrastic future is made by means of the nominative singular of a *nomen agentis* in *tar (datar,* nom. data=Lat. *dator),* followed by the corresponding present forms of *as,* “ to be ” *(dâtâ-smi,* as it were, *daturus sum),* with the excep- tion of the third persons, which need no auxiliary, but take the respective nominative of the noun.

The aorist system is somewhat complicated, including as it does augment-preterites of various formations, viz., a radical aorist, sometimes with reduplicated stem,—*e.g., ásthâm= έστην ; srudhi = κλυθ ; ádudrot;* an a-aorist (or thematic aorist) with or without reduplication,—*e.g., aricas=enres ; dpaptam, cf. ϵπϕνον;* and several different forms of a sibilant-aorist. In the older Vedic language the radical aorist is far more common than the a-aorist, which becomes more frequently used later on. Of the different kinds of sibilant-aorists, the most common is the one which makes its stem by the addition of *s* to the root, either with or without a connecting vowel *i* in different roots: *e.g.,* root *ji—* 1 sing, *djdisham,* 1 pl. *Ajdishma; dkramisham, dkramishma.* A limited number of roots take a double aorist-sign with inserted connecting vowel *(sish* for *sis),—e.g., aydsisham (cf. scrip-sis-ti);* whilst others—very rarely in the older but more numerously in the later language—make their aorist-stem by the addition of *sa,—e.g., ádikshas= ϵδϵιξας.*

As regards the syntactic functions of the three preterites,—the imperfect, perfect, and aorist,—the classical writers make virtually no distinction between them, but use them quite indiscriminately. In the older language, on the other hand, the imperfect is chiefly used as a narrative tense, while the other two generally refer to a past action which is now complete,—the aorist, however, more frequently to that which is only just done or completed. The perfect, owing doubtless to its reduplicative form, has also not infrequently the force of an iterative, or intensive, present.

The Sanskrit, like the Greek, shows at all times a considerable power and facility of noun-composition. But, while in the older language, as well as in the earlier literary products of the classical period, such combinations rarely exceed the limits compatible with the general economy of inflexional speech, during the later, arti- ficial period of the language they gradually become more and more excessive, both in size and frequency of use, till at last they, absorb almost the entire range of syntactic construction.

One of the most striking features of Sanskrit word-formation is that regular interchange of light and strong vowel-sounds, usually designated by the native terms of *guna* (quality) and *vriddhi* (increase). The phonetic process implied in these terms consists in the raising, under certain conditions, of a radical or thematic light vowel *i, u, r, l,* by means of an inserted a-sound, to the diphthongal (guna) sounds *di* (Sanskr. ê*), ău* (Sariskr. *ô),* and the

@@@1 It also shows occasionally other tense-forms than the perfect of the same periphrastic formation with ***kar.***