

A NOTE ON THE ANCIENT INDIAN OATH (2)  
Use of the Periphrastic Future \*

It is remarked by A. Holzmann<sup>1</sup>, V. S. Sukthankar<sup>2</sup> and others<sup>3</sup> that the two forms of future in Sanskrit, namely the simple future (-sya-) and the periphrastic future (-tr-), are used in the Mahābhārata and in classical Sanskrit literature without significant difference. Both appear alternatively, sometimes for metrical and sometimes for stylistic reasons<sup>4</sup>. The following two examples may suffice to illustrate the situation.

*aham duryodhanam hantā karṇam hantā dhananjayah  
śakunim cākṣa-kitavam sahadevo haniṣyati* (MBh.2.68.26)  
*antam adya karisyāmi tasya duḥkhasya pāṛṣata  
hantā vāsmi rāye karṇam sa vā māṁ nihaniṣyati*  
(MBh.8.34.8ad)

---

\* This is a part of a more comprehensive study on the Epic periphrastic future, which I was able to pursue with the help of the Spalding Visiting Fellowship, Oxford 1987. Here I would like to express my thanks to Professor B. K. Matilal, the Spalding Professor of Eastern Religions and Ethics, Oxford, who recommended me to the Fellowship. Thanks are also due to Dr. J. B. Katz, the Librarian of Indian Institute, Oxford, who kindly took trouble to read my original manuscript and corrected my English.

1. HOLZMANN (1884), p. 35 § 949 (« Beiden Futura stehen im Mahābhārata häufig neben einander, ohne dass irgend ein Unterschied der Bedeutung sich aufstellen liesse »).

2. SUKTHANKAR (1933) p. LXXVII («... One of the variants may be a trifle more suitable than the other; for instance, in the discrimination between the simple and the periphrastic future, or the parasmaipada and the ātma-nepada »).

3. Cf. SPEIJER 1886, p. 260 § 341 and (1896), p. 55 § 184.

4. Cf. HOLZMANN (1884), p. 35 and (1894), pp. 83-87.

Yet, those who have made a study of the Epic oath-passages may have an impression that these passages are characterized by the construction of the periphrastic future. This is especially the case with the revenge-oath, where the Epic hero swears to visit revenge upon a particular person while setting a certain limit of time.

However, this comparatively frequent occurrence of the periphrastic future in the oath-passages is understandable when we make a brief survey of the syntactical features of this category of future, which have been investigated by the scholars of eminence in the past. B. Delbrück's remarks on the periphrastic future have often been noted: « es wird gebraucht, wenn man sagen will, dass etwas in einem bestimmten Zeitpunkt der Zukunft eintreten wird<sup>5</sup> », and « das Futurum auf -tár auf den sicheren Eintritt eines Ereignisses in der Zukunft hinweist, und zwar ganz objectiv, ohne dass dabei eine Absicht oder Hoffnung des Subjectes hevortráte<sup>6</sup> ». J. S. Speijer also remarked: « (dass) dem *tř*-Futur der Begriff der Zuversichtlichkeit und objectiven Gewissheit innewohnt<sup>7</sup> ». As has been noted also by other scholars, it is *un futur de certitude*<sup>8</sup> and of *definiteness*<sup>9</sup>, often accompanied by such temporal adverbs as denote a definite length of time as counted from the present, i.e., *prātaḥ* (in the morning, tomorrow morning), *śvah* (tomorrow<sup>10</sup>). It tends to appear in direct speech<sup>11</sup>, indicating *prédition*, *menace*<sup>12</sup>, *promesse*, *serment*, and *malédiction*<sup>13</sup>. The certain conviction on the part of the speaker naturally adds a nuance to this category of future of emphasis and emotion, which is also peculiar to the nominal sentence construction in the Sanskrit language (*dātā*, *hantā*, etc.)<sup>14</sup>.

5. DELBRÜCK (1888), p. 295 § 168.

6. DELBRÜCK (1878), p. 8.

7. SPEIJER (1896), p. 55 § 184.

8. Cf. BENVENISTE (1948), p. 17 and RENOU (1938), pp. 111-112 and 128.

9. Cf. GONDA (1971), pp. 5-6.

10. Cf. DELBRÜCK (1878) p. 11 (« genaue Datierung ») and (1888) p. 295 § 168 and RENOU (1938) p. 127.

11. Cf. KÖLVER (1982), p. 144.

12. Cf. BENVENISTE (1948), p. 17 and RENOU (1938) p. 127.

13. Cf. RENOU (1962), p. 493 § 364.

14. Cf. GONDA (1957), pp. 163-166.

In the light of those characteristic features of periphrastic future<sup>15</sup>, that is, definiteness, certitude, emphasis, emotiveness and accompaniment of temporal adverbs (*prātah*, *śvāk*), it might be an interesting task to examine its usages in the Epic oath-passages, because the concept of oath itself is imbued with certitude, conviction, and emphasis; and the revenge-oath carries particularly strong emotion<sup>16</sup>. Furthermore, the oath-passages are often characterized by temporal adverbs, because the action sworn by the Epic heroes is expected to be accomplished within certain limits of time (by tomorrow, before the sun-set, etc.).

Below are listed in alphabetical order the forms of periphrastic future as used in the oath-passages that I have been able to collect from the Mahābhārata. However, as will be revealed in the notes, counter-examples of the simple future (-sya-) are equally found in oath-passages<sup>17</sup>. The following discussion, then, does not exclude the possibility of the simple future. The result of our investigation, therefore, is not a conclusive one, but the

15. Cf. also THUMB-HAUSCHILD (1959), p. 329 (« zum Ausdruck einer beabsichtigten oder gewollten Handlung, eines Wunsches, der Möglichkeit, der Erwartung, Hoffnung, Befürchtung, Wahrscheinlichkeit, der Meinung des Sprechenden, des Befehls »).

As for other studies on the periphrastic future in the Indo-Aryan languages the followings are worthy of reference. E. H. JOHNSTON, *The Buddha-carita, or Act of the Buddha*, Part II, Lahore, 1936, p. 14 (note on I.64). F. EDGERTON, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar*, New Haven, 1953, p. 152 (31.36). J. BROCKINGTON, *The verbal system of the Rāmāyaṇa*, in JOIB, 19 (1969), pp. 13-15. R. TSUCHIDA, *On the usage of Hindi nomen agentis—välā as periphrastic future*, in A. Hirakawa's Volume (in Japanese), Tokyo, 1985, pp. 611-626. O. von HINÜBER, *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick*, Wien, 1986, p. 192 § 475.

16. Possibly, *hantāham arjunam* (MBh.8.34.26) should be construed: « I am the killer with respect to, or specifically of, Arjuna » (Accusative of respect, or of specification). Note the emphatic value attached to the nominal sentence (cf. BENVENISTE [1948], p. 17: *dātā asmi*, « je suis voué à donner, je suis-à-donner, je vais (ou dois) donner »).

17. For example, in a series of revenge-oaths taken by Aśvatthāman (MBh.10.3), all but two instances (*gantāsmi* [24] and *labdhāsmi* [28]) are in the simple future: *kariṣyāmi* (26), *sūdayiṣyāmi* (27,28), *cariṣyāmi* (29), *ar-dayiṣyāmi* (30), *bhaviṣyāmi* (31 and 35), *gamiṣyāmi* (32), *pramatiṣyāmi* (33,34). Also, in the well-known vows taken by Devavrata (Bhiṣma), we note the simple future in use (*evam etat kariṣyāmi yathā tvam anubhāṣe* [1.94.79], *adya-prabhṛti me dāśa brahmacyaṇi bhaviṣyati* [1.94.88]).

present writer is content to show the state of affairs as objectively as possible<sup>18</sup>.

1. *bhaṅktā-*

*pratijñā-pāraṇam dharmaḥ kṣatriyasyeti vettīha hi  
suyodhanasya-gadayā bhaṅktāsy ūrū mahāhave  
iti pūrvam pratijñātaṁ bhīmena hi sabhā-tale* (MBh.9.59.14)

(Krṣṇa reminds Balarāma of the vow that Bhīma formerly made)

« You know that it is the duty of a Kṣatriya to accomplish the vow he has taken. Formerly, Bhīma vowed in the midst of the assembly that he would in the great battle break (*bhañj-*) with his mace the thighs of Duryodhana »<sup>19</sup>.

2. *bhavitā-*

*adyāham anṛṇas tasya kopasya bhavitā rāne  
amarśitāyāḥ krṣṇāyāḥ kāṅkṣitasya ca me pituḥ* (MBh.7.39.7)  
(Abhimanyu's address to Duḥṣasana)

« Today, I shall in battle disburden myself of that wrath (I had cherished for a long time against you). I shall also free myself of the debt I owe to the indignant Draupadī and my sire who has been looking for (the encounter with) you »<sup>20</sup>.

3. *chettārah* (+ *ud-*) (plural, second person)

*yena yūyāṁ sudurvṛttā nr̄śamsā jāta-manyavaḥ  
ucchetārah kulam kr̄tsnam ṛte rāma-janārdanau* (MBh.16.2.9)  
(Sages' curse upon the Vṛṣṇy-andhakas)

« Since you acted very wrongly (against us), you, cruel and

18. It is not always easy to draw a sharp line of demarcation between oath (*śapatha*) and promise (*pratijñā*), because these two terms are used often synonymously, the former being a vow for one's self and the latter for the other. Equally difficult it is to distinguish sharply oath (*śapatha*) and curse (*śāpa*), for the Hindu oath is nothing but a curse upon oneself (*Selbstverfluchung*) (cf. HOPKINS [1932] p. 330 and LÜDERS [1959] pp. 656-658).

19. Though the verb-root itself alternates (*bhid-* instead of *bhañj-*), the simple future (*bhetṣya-*) is used in the same utterance of the revenge-oath.  
*ūrū bhetsyāmi te pāpa gadayā vajra-kalpayā* (MBh.3.46.29ab).

*ūrū bhetsyāmi te saṃkhye gadayeti suyodhanam* (MBh.9.57.6cd).

Cf. also MBh.9.59.15 (*ūrū bhetsyati te bhīmo gadayeti*).

20. Cf. MBh.7.39.8 (*adya kauravya bhīmasya bravītāsmī vṛṇo yudhi*).  
MBh.8.52.16 (*ye vai ṣaṇḍha-tilās tatra bhavitāro 'dya te tilāḥ*).

For *ṣaṇḍha-tila*, reference is to be made to MBh.2.68.8, 13-14 and 9.58.11.

puffed with haughtiness, will exterminate whole the family with the exception of Balarāma and Kṛṣṇa ».

4. *draṣṭā-*

*nāhatvā tam nivartīṣye purīṁ dvāravatīṁ prati  
saśālvarṇī saubha-nagarāṇī hatvā draṣṭāsmi vah punaḥ  
trisāmā hanyatām eṣā dundubhiḥ śatru-bhīṣāṇī* (MBh.3.21.9)  
(Kṛṣṇa swears slaughter of Śālva)

« I shall never return to the city of Dvāravatī unless I have killed him. I shall see you again only after I have destroyed the Saubha city and Śālva. Beat the kettledrum with its three tunes, so that it may terrify the enemy »<sup>21</sup>.

5. *gantā-*

*dhārtarāṣṭrāṇī rāṇe hatvā miṣatāmī sarva-dhanvinām  
śamam gantāsmi nacirāt satyam etad bravīmi vah*  
(MBh.2.68.22)

(Bhīma's oath at the harsh words of Duḥśāsana)

« Only after I have killed the Dhṛtarāṣṭra's sons in battle in full view of all the bowmen, shall I soon go to my peace. This I swear to you as the truth »<sup>22</sup>.

6. *grahitā- (+ prati-)*

*bhaviṣyati ca yā kā cid bhaikṣavat svayam udyatā  
pratigrahitā tām asmi na bhareyam ca yām aham*  
(MBh.1.42.7)

(Jarakāru's promise to his ancestors in distress)

« If ever I find a virgin, who would be prepared (to marry me) by her own accord, come to me as gratuitous alms, I shall

21. Cf. MBh.3.120.28 (*draṣṭāsmi bhūyāḥ sukhināḥ sametānī*).

MBh.3.252.20 (*tenādyā satyena vaśīkṛtam tvāmī draṣṭāsmi pārthaiḥ parikṛṣyamānam*).

MBh.7.53.37 (*tathāpi bāṇair nihatām śvo draṣṭāsmi rāṇe mayā*).

MBh.7.166.26 (*tasyānubandhaṇī sa draṣṭā dhṛṣṭadyumnaḥ sudāruṇam*).

22. Cf. MBh.5.54.45 (*drona-drauṇi-kṛpaiś caiva gantā pārtho yama-kṣayam*).

MBh.7.125.25 (*śāntim labdhāsmi teṣāmī vā rāṇe gantā salokatām*).

MBh.9.55.22 (*adyāntam eṣāmī duḥkhānāmī gantā bharata-sattama*).

MBh.10.3.24 (*gantāsmi padavīmī rājñāḥ pituś cāpi mahādyuteḥ*).

In Damayanti's well known lament, *gantā* in the second person implies an action that would be possible (*katham utsṛjya gantāsmi vaśyāmī bhāryām anuvratām*: MBh.3.60.5).

certainly accept her as my wife, on condition that I need not support her ».

7. *hantā-*

*suyodhanam imam pāpam hantāsmi gadayā yudhi  
śirah pādena cāsyāham adhiṣṭhāsyāmi bhū-tale* (MBh.2.68.28)

(Bhīma's oath at the departure from the assembly-hall)

« I shall kill this Suyodhana with my club in the fight, and I shall push his head into earth with my foot »<sup>23</sup>.

8. *hartā-* (+ *abhi-*)

*yadi viśati rasātalam tad agryam  
viyad api deva-puram diteḥ puram vā  
tad api śara-śatair aham prabhāte*

*bhṛśam abhipatyā ripoḥ śiro 'bhīhartā* (MBh.7.51.39)

(Arjuna's revenge-oath against Jayadratha, who killed his son Abhimanyu)

« If he (Jayadratha) enters the abode of the nether region, or ascends to the firmament, or repairs to the celestials, or the realm of the Daityas, I shall certainly on the expiration of this night strike the head of my foe with hundreds of arrows ».

9. *kartā-*

*nideśād dharmarājasya draupadyāḥ padavīm caran  
nirdhārtarāśtrām prthivīm kartāsmi nacirād iva*

(MBh.2.68.45)

23. Cf. MBh.2.68.26 (*aham duryodhanam hantā karṇam hantā dhāraṇijayaḥ*).

MBh.2.68.32 (*bhīmasena niyogāt te hantāhaṁ karṇam āhave*).

MBh.2.68.33 (*karṇam karṇānugāṇś caiva rāne hantāsmi patribhīḥ*).

MBh.2.68.41 (*hantāsmi tarasā yuddhe tvāṁ vikramya sabāndhavam*).

MBh.3.268.15 (*hantāsmai tvāṁ sahāmātyaṁ yudhyasva paruṣo bhava*).

MBh.5.73.13 (*hantāhaṁ gadayābh�etya duryodhanam amarṣaṇam*).

MBh.7.51.20-22 (*śvo 'smi hantā jayadratham*).

MBh.7.166.28 (*dhṛṣṭadyumnaḥ ca samare hantāhaṁ pāpakāriṇam*).

MBh.8.52.18 (*hantāhaṁ pāṇḍavān sarvān saputrān iti yo 'bravītam adya karṇam hantāsmi miṣatām sarva-dhanvinām*).

MBh.10.4.4 (*āvābhīyām sahitāḥ śatrūn śvo 'si hantā samāgame*).

(Nakula's revenge-oath at the departure from the assembly-hall)

« At the King Dharma's (= Yudhiṣṭhira's) command and walking in the foot-steps of Draupadī, I shall soon make the earth devoid of all Dhārtarāṣṭras »<sup>24</sup>.

10. *labdhā-*

*nihatya tān rāṇe sarvān pāñcālān pāñḍavaiḥ saha  
śāntiṁ labdhāsmi teṣāṁ vā rāṇe gantā solokatām*  
(MBh.7.125.25)

(Duryodhana's revenge-oath at the death of Jayadratha)

« (I swear by my good deeds, my prowess and by my sons that) only after having slain all the Pāñcalas with the Pāñdavas shall I obtain peace of mind, or, slain by them in battle-field, repair to those regions whither those allies of mine have gone »<sup>25</sup>.

11. *netā-*

*ye cānye pratiyotsyanti buddhi-mohena mām nṛpāḥ  
tāṇś ca sarvān śitair bāṇair netāsmi yama-sādanam*  
(MBh.2.68.34)

(Arjuna's revenge-oath at the departure from the assembly-hall)

« And whatever other kings will fight with me in their folly,

24. Cf. MBh.1.126.38 (*prabṛūhi rāja-śārdūla kartā hy asmi tathā nṛpa*).

MBh.2.68.40 (*kartāham karmaṇas tasya kuru kāryāṇi sarvaśāḥ*).

MBh.3.268.16 (*arākṣasam imāṇi lokāṇi kartāsmi niśītaih śaraiḥ* = R.6.31.56).

MBh.5.178.34 (*tatrāham api hatvā tvāṇi śaucaṇi kartāsmi bhārgava*).

MBh.5.193.39 (*kartāsmi nigrahaṇi tasyety uvāca sa punaḥ punaḥ*).

MBh.7.2.20 (*kartāsmi etat satpuruṣāryakarma tyaktvā prāṇān anuyāsyāmi bhiṣman*).

MBh.7.126.32 (*kartāsmi samare karma dhārtarāṣṭra hitāṇi tava*).

MBh.8.28.26 (*kartāsmi miṣatāṇi vo 'dyo tato drakṣyatha me baṭam*).

MBh.10.4.13 (*tataḥ kartāsi śatruṇāṇi yudhyatāṇi kadaṇāṇi mahat*).

MBh.15.13.3 (*kartāsmi etan mahipāla nirvṛto bhava bhārata*).

25. Cf. MBh.3.12.35 (*śāntiṁ labdhāsmi paramāṇi hatvā rākṣasa-kāṇṭakam*).

MBh.7.166.29 (*pāñcālāṇi vadham kṛtvā śāntiṁ labdhāsmi kau-rava*).

MBh.10.3.28 (*nihatya caiva pāñcālāṇi śāntim labdhāsmi sattama*).

I shall with my sharp arrows dispatch them all to Yama's abode »<sup>26</sup>.

12. *pātā-*

*vākyā-śūrasya caivāsyā paruṣasya durātmanah*

*duḥśāsanasya rudhiram pātāsmi mṛgarāḍ-iva* (MBh.2.68.29)

(Bhīma's revenge-oath at the departure from the assembly-hall)

« Of this hero-in-words-alone, this harsh-speaking and evil-minded Duḥśāsana, I shall drink the blood like a lion ».

13. *pātayitā-*

*sūryodaye yukta-senāḥ pratikṣya*

*dhvajī rathī rakṣa ca satyasamṛdham*

*aham hi vah paśyatāṁ dvīpam enām*

*rathād bhīṣmaṇ pātayitāsmi bāṇaiḥ* (MBh.5.160.13)

(Arjuna's address to Duryodhana, vowing the slaughter of Bhīṣma)

« At sun-rise (tomorrow), furnished with army, banner and car, protect watchfully Bhīṣma, your refuge, who is firm in his promise, for I shall throw him down from his chariot with my arrows in full view of you all ».

14. *śayitā-*

*aham tu tān kuru-vṛṣabhaṇ ajihmagaiḥ*

*praverayan yamasādanam rāne caran*

*yaśaḥ param jagati vibhāvya vartitā*

*parair hato vudhi śayitātha vā punaḥ* (MBh.7.2.15).

(Karṇa's revenge-oath on the fall of Bhīṣma)

« Coursing on the battle-field, I shall despatch those bulls of Kuru's race (Pāṇḍavas) to Yama's abode by means of my straight shafts. Regarding fame as the highest object in the world, I shall conduct myself (as a honourable Kṣatriya, despatching them to Yama's abode), or slain by the foes (in the battle) shall I sleep on the battle-field ».

15. *śāsitā-*

*sadyaś cogram adharmasya phalaṇ prāpnuhi durmate*

26. Note the use of the simple future in the similar context: *neṣyāmi yama-sādanam* (MBh.2.68.18) and *darśayiṣyāmi bhūyiṣṭham aham vaivasvata-kṣayam* (MBh.2.68.44).

*śāsitāsmi adya te bānaiḥ sarva-sainyasya paśyataḥ*

(MBh.7.39.6)

(Abhimanyu's vow to Duhśāsana)

« O you of wicked thought, obtain forthwith the frightful fruit of wickedness. I shall today chastise you with my arrows in the full view of the whole army ».

16. *smārayitā-*

*yathā tudasi marmāṇi vāk-śarair iha no bhṛśam*

*tathā smārayitā te 'ham kṛntan marmāṇi samyuge*

(MBh.2.68.17)

(Bhīma's revenge-oath upon the harsh words of Duhśāsana)

« Just as you sorely strike at our weak points with the arrows of words, just so I shall make you remember (them), when I strike yours in battle ».

17. *śramitā-* (+ *vi-*)

*aham tu kadānam kṛtvā śatruṇām adya sauptike*

*tato viśramitā caiva svaptā ca vigata-jvaraḥ* (MBh.10.4.33)

(Aśvatthāman's vow to perform the night-slaughter)

« Having caused tonight a slaughter of my enemies during their sleep, I shall then take rest and sleep with no anxiety ».

18. *svaptā-*

See above 17 (MBh.10.4.33)

19. *vartitā-*

See above 14 (MBh.7.2.15)

20. *vestā* (+ *pra-*) (singular, third person)

*adyāsyā śatadhā dehaṁ bhinadmi gadayānayā*

*nāyam praveṣṭā nagaram punar vāraṇasāhvayam*

(MBh.9.55.19)

(Bhīma's determination as addressed to Yudhiṣṭhira)

« I shall today break his body into a hundred pieces with this mace (of mine). He (Duryodhana) will never enter again the city called after the elephant (Hastināpura) »<sup>27</sup>.

27. One may compare this with the verse in Buddhacarita (5.84):

*janana-marāṇayor adr̥ṣṭa-pāro na puram aham kapilāhvayam praveṣṭā.*

However, we have the use of simple future in the revenge-oath made by Draupadi, where the agent is given in the third person plural:

*evaṁ kṛtoddakā nāryaḥ pravekṣyanti gajāhvayam* (MBh.2.71.20).

21. *veṣṭā-* (+ *samprā-*)

*yady asminn ahate pāpe sūryo 'stam upayāsyati  
ihaiva sampraveṣṭāham jvalitaṇi jātavedasam* (MBh.7.51.37cf)  
(Arjuna's vow to kill Jayadratha on the fall of Abhimanyu)  
« If the sun set without him, the wretch, being killed (by me),  
then in this very place shall I enter the blazing fire ».

A few remarks may be made on those examples.

First, we note that such verb-forms as *gantā-*, *hantā-*, *kartā-*, *draṣṭā-*, and *bhavitā-* appear most frequently. Among these, the frequent occurrence of *hantā-* is understandable, because the contexts themselves are those of war and revenge. The same can also be said in the case of the verbs of destruction (*bhañj-*, *pātaya-*, and *chid-*) and relief (*śi-*, *svap-*, and *śāntim labh-*). But apart from these, the verbs used in the oath-passages are unremarkedly of common roots (*kr-*, *bhū-*, *gam-*, *nī-*, *dṛś-*, *grah-*, *hṛ-*, *viś-* and *pā-*). It should be noted, then, that the highly technical and complicated verb-roots of rare occurrence are apparently avoided in the emotional and emphatic revenge-oath, while simple and common verb-roots are often employed.

Second, as is expected in oath-passages, the agent in most of the cases cited above is the first person singular, accompanied often by an agent-indicator (*kartāham*, *hantāsmi*, etc.). Even in two exceptional cases (nos. 3 and 20), where the second person plural (*yūyam ... ucchetārah*) and the third person singular (*nāyām praveṣṭā*) appear, the strong will on the part of the speaker is evident<sup>28</sup>. We could perhaps better classify these examples of second and third persons as agent of curse, rather than oaths.

Third, from the syntactical point of view, we note that there is an example in which the verb-form governs genitive instead of accusative (*kartāham karmanas tasya*: MBh.2.68.40). This is a remnant of the old *nomen agentis* (-tár-)<sup>29</sup>, that is also retained in Pali<sup>30</sup>.

As is remarked above the periphrastic future is often accompanied by a temporal adverb such as *śvah*, *prātah* and others.

28. Cf. KÖLVER (1982), p. 143 ff.

29. Cf. SPEIJER (1886), p. 259 (§ 340, Remark 3).

30. Cf. HENDRIKSEN (1944), pp. 81-85 § 29.

This is also the case with the revenge-oath, in which the Epic hero sets the time-limit for the accomplishment of his revenge. We shall list below those adverbs of time<sup>31</sup>.

*śvah*

*satyam vah pratijānāmi śvo 'smi hantā jayadratham*  
(MBh.7.51.20ab) <sup>32</sup>

*prabhāte*

*tathā prabhāte kartāsmi yathā kṛṣṇa suyodhanah*  
*nānyam dhanurdharām loke māṃsyate mat-samam yudhi*  
(MBh.7.53.49) <sup>33</sup>

*nacirāt*

*śamam gantāsmi nacirāt satyam etad bravīmi vah*  
(MBh.2.68.22cd) <sup>34</sup>

*bhūyah*

*dharme 'pramādaṁ kurutāprameyā*  
*draṣṭāsmi bhūyah sukhinah sametān* (MBh.3.120.28cd)

*punah*

*saśālvam saubha-nagaram hatvā draṣṭāsmi vah punah*  
(MBh.3.21.9cd) <sup>35</sup>

*adya*

*so 'ham adya yathā-kāmaṁ kṣatra-dharmam upāsya tam*  
*gantāsmi padavīm rājñah pituś cāpi mahādyuteḥ*  
(MBh.10.3.24) <sup>36</sup>

The last example (*adya*) apparently contravenes the rule of the grammarians (*anadyatane luṭ*: Pāṇini 3.3.15), but the construction is not rare in the Epic<sup>37</sup>.

31. The syntactical difference between simple future (*adya*) and periphrastic future (*śvah*), which is best illustrated in the oft-quoted Vedic passage (*adya varṣiyati...śvō vrāṣṭā*: MS.2.1.8, DELBRÜCK [1888] p. 296, SPEIJER [1896] p. 55, RENOU [1938] p. 127, KÖLVER [1982] p. 143), seems to be retained in the following Epic passage,

*idam adya kariṣyāmi śvah kartāsmīti vādinam*  
*kālo harati saṃprāpto nadī-vega iwoḍupam* (MBh.12.220.98).

32. Cf. MBh.3.171.16, 6.94.18, 7.51.21-22, 7.53.13, 7.53.37, 7.53.40, 7.57.10, 7.57.17, 9.28.91, 10.4.4, 12.220.98.

33. Cf. MBh.7.51.39.

34. Cf. MBh.2.68.45.

35. Cf. MBh.3.21.9, 7.2.15.

36. Cf. MBh.7.39.6-7. Cf. also GONDA (1957) p. 161 and KÖLVER (1982) p. 143.

37. Cf. SPEIJER (1886), p. 259, note 1.

Not only these temporal adverbs are used in the revenge-oath, but also some time-indicating phrases. Below are listed some examples in which time-limits (before sun-set, before sun-rise, etc.) are indicated.

*anastām-gata āditye*

*anastām-gata āditye hantā saindhavam arjunah*

(MBh.7.95.10cd)

*sūryo 'stam upayāsyati*

*imām cāpy aparām bhūyah pratijñām me nibodhata*

*yady asminn ahate pāpe sūryo 'stam upayāsyati*

*ihaiva sampraveṣṭāham jvalitam jātavedasam* (MBh.7.51.37)

*sūryodaye*

*sūryodaye yukta-senaḥ pratikṣya*

*dhvajī rathī rakṣa ca satya-samdhama*

*ahaṇ hi vaḥ paśyatām dvipam enām*

*rathād bhiṣmaṇ pātayitāsmi bāṇaiḥ* (MBh.5.160.13) <sup>38</sup>

Even such a « remote future » <sup>39</sup> as « fourteen years from now » (*itaś caturdaše varṣe*) can be construed with periphrastic future, although counter-examples can also be cited <sup>40</sup>.

*naiva vācā vyavasitam bhīma vijñāyate satām*

*itaś caturdaše varṣe draṣṭāro yad bhaviṣyati* (MBh.2.68.30)

However, the examples quoted above do not exclude the possibility for forms other than the periphrastic future to be construed with time-indicative phrases. Counter-examples can be equally quoted, in which simple future (*sameṣyāmi*, *pāsyāmi*,

38. Though not an oath in the strict sense of the term, a similar phrase appears in Kṛpa's promise to Aśvatthāman.

*tvam punah sūrya-saṅkāśāḥ śvobhūta udite ravau  
prakāśe sarva-bhūtānām vijetā yudhi sātravān* (MBh.10.5.14).

39. Cf. SPEIJER (1886), p. 259 § 341.

40. Cf. for example,

*yat-kṛte 'ham imām prāptā teṣām varṣe caturdaše  
hata-patyo hata-sutā hata-bandhu-jana-priyāḥ* (19)  
*bandhu-śorita-digdhaṇīgyo mukta-kesyo rajasvalaḥ*

*evāṁ kṛtodakā nāryāḥ pravekṣyanti gajāhvayam* (MBh.2.71.20).

*itaś caturdaše varṣe vinaṅkṣyatiḥ kauravāḥ* (MBh.2.71.30ab).

*itaś caturdaše varṣe mahat prāpsyatha vaiśasam* (MBh.2.71.44cd).

*nihaniṣyāmi, drakṣyase*), optative (*hanyām, hanyāt, brūyām*), and even present indicative (*nihanmi*) are accompanied with temporal adverbs and time-indicating phrases.

*anastam-ita āditye*

*kaccit tīrṇa-pratijñām hi vāsudevena rakṣitam*

*anastam-ita āditye sameṣyāmy aham arjunam* (MBh.7.103.43)

*anastam-gata āditye*

*katham jīvati durdharse tvayi rādheya phalgunah*

*anastam-gata āditye hanyāt saindhavakanī nṛpam*

(MBh.7.120.18)

*ravir astam iyād*

*rākṣase jīvamāne 'dyā ravir astam iyād yadi*

*nāham brūyām punar jātu kṣatriyo 'smitti bhārata*

(MBh.3.154.26)

*ādityaḥ prātar abhyudayiṣyati*

*taṁ cej jīvantam ādityaḥ prātar abhyudayiṣyati*

*viṣam ālodya pāsyāmi mā kīcaka-vaśam gamam*

*sreyo hi maraṇam mahyam bhimasena tavāgrataḥ*

(MBh.4.20.33)

*anatītām imām rātrīm*

*śape sātvata putrābhyaṁ iṣṭena sukṛtena ca*

*anatītām imām rātrīm yadi tvām vīra-māninam* (6)

*arakṣyamāṇam pārthena jiṣṇunā sasutānujām*

*na hanyām niraye ghore pateyām vṛṣṇi-pāṁsana* (MBh.7.131.7)

*prabhātāyām rajanyām*

*te vayaṁ parīvīśrāntā vinidrā vigata-jvarāḥ*

*prabhātāyām rajanyām vai nihaniṣyāma śātravān* (MBh.10.4.9)

*imām rājanīm vyuṣṭam*

*mā sma yajña-kṛtām prītiṁ prāpnuyām saj-janocitām*

*yadīmām rājanīm vyuṣṭām na nihaniṣyāma parān rāṇe*

(MBh.9.29.20)

*acirāt*

*satyām te pratijānāmi kṛṣṇe bāspo nigṛhyatām*

*hatāmitrāñ ūriyā yuktān acirād drakṣyase patīn* (MBh.5.80.49)

*adya*

*iṣṭāpūrtena dānena satyena ca jaṭena ca*

*śape rājan yathā hy adya nihaniṣyāmi somakān* (MBh.9.29.19)

## BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS

- Benveniste 1948  
 E. BENVENISTE, *Noms d'agent et noms d'action en indo-européen*, Paris.
- Delbrück 1878  
 B. DELBRÜCK, *Die altindische Wortfolge aus dem Catapathabrahmana*, Halle.
- Delbrück 1888  
 B. DELBRÜCK, *Altindische Syntax*, Halle.
- Gonda 1957  
 J. GONDA, *A Critical Survey of the Publications on the Periphrastic Future in Sanskrit*, in *Lingua*, 6 (1957), pp. 158-179 (= *Selected Studies III* [Leiden 1975] pp. 69-90).
- Gonda 1971  
 J. GONDA, *Old Indian*, Leiden.
- Hendrikse 1944  
 H. HENDRIKSEN, *Syntax of the Infinite Verb-forms of Pali*, Copenhagen.
- Holzmann 1884  
 A. HOLZMANN, *Grammatisches aus dem Mahābhārata*, Leipzig.
- Holzmann 1894  
 A. HOLZMANN, *Das Mahābhārata und seine Theile III*, Kiel.
- Hopkins 1932  
 E. W. HOPKINS, *The Oath in Hindu Epic Literature*, in *JAOS*, 52 (1932).
- Kölver 1982  
 B. KÖLVER, « On Periphrastic Futures in Sanskrit (Summary) », in *IT*, 10 (1982).
- Lüders 1959  
 H. LÜDERS, « Der indische Eid », *Varuṇa II*, Göttingen.
- Renou 1938  
 L. RENOU, *Le suffixe védique -t̪- et les origines du futur périphrastique*, in *BSL*, 39 (1938).
- Renou 1962  
 L. RENOU, *Grammaire sanscrite*, Paris, deuxième éd.
- Speijer 1886  
 J. S. SPEIJER, *Sanskrit Syntax*, Leiden.
- Speijer 1896  
 J. S. SPEIJER, *Vedische- und Sanskrit-Syntax*, Strassburg.
- Sukthankar 1933  
 V. S. SUKTHANKAR, *Prolegomena to the Mahābhārata for the first time critically edited*, Poona.
- Thumb-Hauschild 1959  
 A. THUMB und R. HAUSCHILD, *Handbuch des Sanskrit II*, Heidelberg.

*MBh*: *The Mahābhārata* (Poona Critical Edition, Poona 1933-1967).  
*R.*: *The Rāmāyaṇa* (Baroda Critical Edition, Baroda 1960-1975).