

Univerzita Karlova
Filozofická fakulta
Ústav starého Předního východu

Bakalářská práce

Nikita Salmin

**Imperativy třetí osoby ve starých
indoevropských jazycích**
**3rd person imperatives in old Indo-
European languages**

Praha, 2024

Vedoucí práce: Mgr. Jan Bičovský, Ph.D.

Chtěl bych zde poděkovat Mgr. Janu Bičovskému, Ph.D. za jeho odbornou pomoc a rady. Dále bych chtěl poděkovat Mgr. Dítě Frantíkové, Ph.D. za výuku chetitského jazyka a anatolských reálií. Rovněž bych chtěl poděkovat i všem ostatním učitelům, u nichž jsem měl příležitost studovat.

Prohlašuji, že jsem bakalářskou práci vypracoval samostatně, že jsem řádně citoval všechny použité prameny a literaturu a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

V Praze dne 01.08.2024

Abstrakt

Tato práce se zabývá tvary třetí osoby imperativu v několika starých indoevropských jazycích.

Imperativ patří k mezijazykově nejrozšířenějším slovesným způsobům a používá se k vyjadřování direktivů. Nejrozšířenějším tvarem imperativu v jazycích světa je tvar druhé osoby. Nicméně mnoho jazyků může vyjadřovat i jiné osoby, a to buď paradigmaticky, nebo pomocí perifrastických konstrukcí. Praindoevropština měla paradigmatické formy imperativu ve třetí osobě a mnoho jazyků, které se z ní vyvinuly, je zachovalo.

Tvarům imperativu ve třetí osobě se obvykle nevěnuje tolik pozornosti jako jejich protějškům ve druhé osobě. Tato práce se proto snaží zaplnit existující mezeru a podrobně analyzovat paradigmatické tvary třetí osoby imperativu ve vybraných starých indoevropských jazycích.

Analýzou a srovnáním zmíněných tvarů si tato práce klade za cíl osvětlit, jak imperativy třetí osoby zapadají do slovesného systému praindoevropštiny a jejich potomků, a najít společné rysy a rozdíly ve vývoji těchto tvarů ve vybraných jazycích.

Klíčová slova

Morfologie, imperativ, indoevropské jazyky

Abstract

This paper focuses on third-person imperative forms in several old Indo-European languages.

Imperative mood belongs to the most wide-spread mood cross-linguistically and is used to express directives. The most common form of imperative in the languages of the world is that of the second person. Nevertheless, many languages can express other persons as well, either paradigmatically or using periphrastic constructions. The Proto-Indo-European language had paradigmatic forms of third-person imperatives and many of its daughter languages preserved them.

Third-person imperative forms typically do not receive as much attention as their second-person counterparts. Thus, this paper tries to fill the existing gap and analyse in details paradigmatic third-person imperative forms in certain old Indo-European languages.

By analysing and comparing the mentioned forms, this work aims to shed light on how third-person imperatives fit into the verbal system of Proto-Indo-European and its daughter languages and find commonalities and divergences in the development of those forms in the selected languages.

Key words

Morphology, imperative, Indo-European languages

List of abbreviations

sg = singular
pl = plural
du = dual
1sg = first person singular
2sg = second person singular
3sg = third person singular
1pl = first person plural
2pl = second person plural
3pl = third person plural
2du = second person dual
3du = third person dual
inf = infinitive
ind = indicative
impv = imperative
subj = subjunctive
opt = optative
inj = injunctive
act = active
pass = passive
midd = middle
pres/prs = present
aor = aorist
fut = future
fut-perf = future perfect
perf = perfect
masc = masculine
fem = feminine
neut = neuter
NOM = nominative case
ACC = accusative case
VOC = vocative case
DAT = dative case
ABL = ablative case
INS = Instrumental case
LOC = locative case
=LOC = locative particle
OPT = optative particle
CONN = connector
QUOT = quotation particle

Table of contents

Introduction	9
The aim of this work	10
Choice of languages and texts	10
About the languages of the analysis	11
Methodology of analysis	12
The significance of this work	12
1. Proto-Indo-European verbal system	14
1.1 Eventive and stative, primary and secondary endings	15
1.2 Ablaut	15
1.3 Thematic and athematic verbs	15
1.4 Aspects	15
1.5 Tenses	16
1.6 Augment	16
1.7 Voice	16
1.8 Grammatical moods	17
1.8.1 Indicative	17
1.8.2 Optative	17
1.8.3 Subjunctive	17
1.8.4 Imperative	17
1.9 The relation of the Indo-European imperative to other grammatical categories and how imperatives are special	18
1.10 Summary	19
2. Analysis of the languages	20
2.1 Organisation of the language-specific chapters	20
2.2 Hittite	21
2.2.1 Introduction	21
2.2.2 Morphology	21
2.2.3 Etymology of the endings:	21
2.2.4 Use of imperatives	22
2.2.5 Syntax	23
2.2.6 Expression of grammatical categories	23
2.2.7 Negative imperatives	23
2.3 Luwian and Palaic	24
2.3.1 Introduction	24
2.3.2 Morphology	24

2.3.3 Negative imperatives	25
2.4 Conclusions to the Anatolian languages	25
2.5 Example sentences for the Anatolian languages	26
2.5.1 Texts in Hittite	26
2.5.2 Text in Palaic (KUB 35.165)	27
2.5.3 Texts in Luwian	27
2.6 Latin	28
2.6.1 Introduction	28
2.6.2 Morphology	28
2.6.3 Etymology of the endings	29
2.6.4 Use of imperatives	29
2.6.5 Syntax	31
2.6.6 Expression of grammatical categories	31
2.6.7 Negative imperatives	31
2.7 Oscan and Umbrian	33
2.7.1 Introduction	33
2.7.2 Morphology and etymology of the endings	33
2.8 Conclusions to the Italic languages	34
2.9 Example sentences for the Italic languages	35
2.9.1 Texts in Latin	35
2.9.2 Text in Umbrian – Iguvine tablet III	36
2.9.3 Text in Oscan – Tabula Bantina	36
2.10 Greek	36
2.10.1 Introduction	36
2.10.2 Morphology	36
2.10.3 Etymology of the endings	37
2.10.4 Use of imperatives	38
2.10.5 Syntax	38
2.10.6 Expression of grammatical categories	38
2.10.7 Negative imperatives	38
2.11 Conclusions to Greek	39
2.12 Example sentences for Greek	40
2.13 Vedic	41
2.13.1 Introduction	41
2.13.2 Morphology	41
2.13.3 Etymology of the endings	41

2.13.4 Use of imperatives	42
2.13.5 Syntax	42
2.13.6 Expression of grammatical categories	42
2.13.7 Negative imperatives	42
2.14 Conclusions to Vedic	43
2.15 Example sentences for Vedic	43
3. Final conclusions	45
Literature and resources	47
General work on imperatives:	47
General works on Proto-Indo-European:	47
Works on Anatolian languages:	47
Works on Greek and Italic languages	47
Works on Vedic	47
Online resources	47

Introduction

Grammatical mood is a linguistic feature that conveys the speaker's attitude towards an action or a state described by a verb using verbal inflection (or syntactically if the term of modality is used in a broader sense). Moods can indicate possibility, certainty, necessity, prohibition, wish etc. The most wide-spread moods cross-linguistically are the indicative, which expresses a statement of fact, interrogative, which expresses questions, the subjunctive, which usually expresses wishes, emotions, judgements etc, and the imperative forming commands and requests.

Cross-linguistically, imperative is a wide-spread grammatical mood and it is predominantly associated with the second person as, prototypically, commands are addressed to those who are expected to be able to hear them and thus carry them out:

- A. Parle français! – ‘Speak French!’ (French)
speak:impv;2sg **French**
- B. Zeige mir dieses Buch! – ‘Show me this book!’ (German)
show:impv;2sg **me:Dat** **this:ACC;neut** **book:ACC**
- C. Pojd' sem! – ‘Come here!’ (Czech)
go:impv;2sg **here**

In all the sentences above, the commands are addressed to someone who is present in the dialogue situation, therefore the second person forms, which express someone or something present in the same context as the speaker, are used.

However, the second person is not the only possible addressee of imperatives. The first and the third persons can be addressed by them as well, employing either paradigmatic forms or periphrastic constructions:

- A. *Tulkoot he tänne!* – ‘Let them come here!’ (Finnish)
come:imp;3pl **they** **here**
- B. *Hadd maradjon itthon!* – ‘Let him/her stay home!’ (Hungarian)
let **stay:imp;3sg** **at.home**
- C. *Пусть работают!* – ‘Let them work!’ (Russian)
let **work:ind;prs;3pl**

In the sentences (A) and (B) we can see that Finnish and Hungarian have special inflectional forms of verbs to convey a command, while Russian in the sentence (C) uses periphrastic construction with the word *пусть*, originating from the imperative form of the verb *пусть* ‘to let go’, and the indicative present form of a verb.

Among the languages of the world, paradigmatic third-person imperatives are not a rare phenomenon and can be found in various language families including Indo-European, Uralic, Nilo-Saharan, Karam, Tungusic and others.

- A. *Kale mab ud arlay!* – ‘Let them take the timber and go!’ (Kobon, Karam)

- B. *Várjon!* – ‘Let him/her wait!’ (Hungarian, Uralic)
- C. *Bakagin!* – ‘Let him/her find!’ (Evenki, Tungusic)
- D. *Tintíni!* – ‘Let him/her go!’ (Krongo, Nilo-Saharan)

Proto-Indo-European, the common ancestor of all Indo-European languages, also had paradigmatic third-person imperatives. These forms evolved differently in the daughter languages. Many of the Indo-European languages lost paradigmatic third-person imperative forms and developed new ways to express such speech acts. But, in some cases, languages preserved such forms and they can be traced directly back to the proto-language.

Third-person imperatives did not receive as much attention as their second-person counterparts. This thesis aims to fill that gap and examine how third-person imperative forms were formed and used and how they evolved in the old Indo-European languages such as Hittite, Latin, Ancient Greek and Vedic, as well as some minor Indo-European languages which will supplement the analysis.

The aim of this work

In this work, I will describe the imperative verbal paradigms of the above-mentioned old Indo-European languages with an emphasis on the third-person forms.

Nevertheless, although the third person is the main focus of the work, it would be impossible to analyse it without including the second and first persons. Doing so will allow us to see if third-person forms differ from their counterparts in other persons on any level and how the forms of all persons are related to each other.

By investigating pragmatic contexts, morphological markers and syntactic structures of these forms in the respective languages, this work aims to contribute to our understanding of Indo-European linguistics and provide insights into ancient command and request forms.

The ultimate goal of my thesis is to synthesize all the findings, draw parallels and highlight both common development tendencies and divergences between the languages studied.

Choice of languages and texts

This work will focus mainly on Hittite, Latin, Ancient Greek and Vedic and there are two reasons why. Firstly, these languages preserved paradigmatic third-person imperative forms that can be traced to the original Proto-Indo-European forms. And secondly, these languages are well-documented and have extensive corpora where the analysed forms occur with sufficient frequency.

To supplement these major languages, one or several minor languages of the respective branch will be introduced. Those minor languages' corpora are significantly smaller than those of the major languages, but nevertheless, they are important for the comparative analysis of imperative forms and their prehistory

within the respective branch. To supplement Hittite, Luwian and Palaic will be used, and Sabellian languages will supplement Latin.

As for the texts, imperative forms typically appear in the situations related to authority one way or another as commands are normally issued by an entity that is capable of ensuring their execution. Therefore, we have to focus on such genres as royal decrees and orders, laws, rules, ritual texts, prayers etc.

About the languages of the analysis

Vedic:

Vedic was an ancient Indo-Aryan language from the north-west of the Indian subcontinent. The language is attested in the Vedas and has a rich corpus. In this work, I will use the texts of Rigveda – one of the four Vedas and the oldest known text in Vedic. The text of Rigveda is rich in third-person imperative forms that express blessings and wishes addressed to the forces of nature and gods.

Latin:

Latin was language of the Italic branch that was initially spoken in the region of Latium and later became the language of the Roman Republic and the Roman Empire. The Latin corpus is extensive and covers various genres. For the purposes of this work, I will focus mainly on the legal texts as well as ritual ones. Both of these types of texts contain a significant number of directives addressed to an indefinite listener or reader and therefore use third-person imperatives to express them.

Sabellic:

Sabellic languages (also known as Osco-Umbrian languages) were a group of the Italic languages spoken in Central and Southern Italy before being replaced by Latin with the expansion of Rome. The languages are attested from the first millennium BC and their corpora mostly contain juridical and ritual texts.

Hittite:

Hittite was a language of the Anatolian branch spoken in the Hittite Empire in Bronze Age Anatolia in the second millennium BC. It has a corpus of considerable size covering various genres. Here, I will use the texts of royal decrees, descriptions of rituals and prayers.

Luwian:

Luwian in both its forms, cuneiform and hieroglyphs, was a language spoken in central and western Anatolia during the second and the first millennia BC and is thought to be the most widely spoken language of the Hittite Empire while the Hittite proper was a language of the aristocracy and officials. Luwian corpus mainly consists of ritual texts, but there are some letters and economical texts attested as well.

Palaic:

Palaic was apparently spoken in northern Anatolia. However, the language is only attested in Hittite texts of religious, ritual and mythological contexts where certain passages are written in Palaic.

Greek:

Greek is a separate branch of the Indo-European family. It was once a wide-spread language that was used across all the Greek Oecumene. The Greek corpus consists of a significant number of genres ranging from epic texts to letters. For the purpose of this work, I will use different texts of different genres since third-person imperatives are present in all genres.

Methodology of analysis

To thoroughly analyse third-person imperatives, this study will address several key questions:

- A. **Morphological marking:**
How are third-person imperatives marked? What morphological features (e.g. endings or affixes) are used?
- B. **Syntactic patterns:**
Do imperative clauses exhibit distinct syntactic structures compared to other types of clauses?
- C. **Expression of grammatical categories:**
How are person, aspect and tense represented in third-person imperatives? Are these categories expressed differently than in other verb forms?
- D. **Formation of negative imperatives:**
How are negative imperatives constructed? Are there morphological or syntactical distinctions between negative and non-negative imperatives?

The analysis will begin with an overview of Proto-Indo-European grammar, more accurately, the overview of its verbal system and imperative paradigms. This will establish the necessary foundation for understanding how third-person imperative forms developed in the daughter languages. Subsequent chapters will provide grammatical descriptions and historical developments of the analysed forms in the selected languages. And textual analysis will help us to identify patterns and contextual usages, contributing to our understanding of these forms.

The significance of this work

This thesis, as it was said above, aims to contribute to the field of the comparative linguistics by focusing on the relatively unexplored area of Indo-European third-person imperatives. The significance of the study lies in several areas:

- A. **Addressing a gap:**
While a lot of researches on the topic of imperative mood and forms have been already conducted, such as the work by Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (2010), Thorstein Fretheim (1993), F.R. Palmer (2001) and others, third-person imperatives never received the same amount of attention as the second-person forms. By concentrating on these specific grammatical forms, this work attempts to fill the gap and provide insights into the

formation of the analysed forms, their usage and development.

B. Comparative analysis:

The inclusion of both major and minor languages provides another comparative perspective and allows us to study the imperative forms in the broader context. Such an approach highlights both shared and unique features among these languages.

1. Proto-Indo-European verbal system

When speaking about imperatives in Indo-European languages, it is essential to delve into the grammatical foundation from which these imperative forms originated. Understanding the complexity of Proto-Indo-European verbal morphology is crucial, as it provides the necessary context for analysing how third-person imperatives were formed, used, and evolved in subsequent Indo-European languages. This section will outline the key features of Proto-Indo-European verbal morphology and describe the imperative mood in detail, laying the groundwork for our comparative analysis.

Proto-Indo-European verbal morphology was highly complex, featuring a rich array of inflectional categories.

Proto-Indo-European verbs were inflected to express various grammatical categories, including person, number, tense, aspect, mood, and voice. This intricate system allowed speakers to convey precise meanings and nuances through verb forms.

3 numbers	singular, dual, plural
3 persons	first, second, third
3 voices	active, middle, stative
4 moods	indicative, optative, subjunctive, imperative (+injunctive)
4 tenses	Present, imperfect, aorist, perfect

The above-mentioned categories were expressed through a combination of morphological markers. Since Proto-Indo-European was a fusional language, one affix could potentially express several categories such as number, person, and voice at the same time.

And to understand the Proto-Indo-European verbal system more comprehensively, it is essential to cover the following features:

1.1 Eventive and stative, primary and secondary endings

There were several sets of verbal endings in Proto-Indo-European: the so-called eventive endings that were used in all grammatical moods except for imperative and that were divided into primary and secondary ones both in active and middle voice; and stative endings that were used in perfect.

Over time, Proto-Indo-European developed to separate sets of eventive endings called primary and secondary. They had the same meaning but were in the complementary distribution to each other depending which tense, aspect or mood is used.

The primary endings differed from the secondary ones by the presence of the element **-i* in active voice and the element **-r* in middle in most endings.

1.2 Ablaut

One of the key features of the Proto-Indo-European morphology was the ablaut. It was a regular vowel variation in roots and affixes. What vowel is used at the moment in the root or the affix, if any, is called the grade of the ablaut. The grades of the ablaut were zero, e, ē, o, and ō.

Example of the ablaut: **léyk^wm* 'I left behind' vs **lik^wyéh₁m* 'I want to leave behind'. In the first form there is the e-grade of the ablaut while in the second one there is the zero-grade, which is why the glide y changed to the syllabic i.

1.3 Thematic and athematic verbs

Proto-Indo-European verbs were divided into two groups: athematic and thematic. The difference between them was in the presence of an ablauting vowel in the stem.

Originally all verbs in Proto-Indo-European were athematic, but at some point in time, there began to appear new verbs containing a thematic vowel. Over time more and more verbs became thematic since such verbs, in contrast to the athematic ones, had an accent that did not change its position and therefore were easier for speakers to use.

1.4 Aspects

Aspect was not an actual grammatical category in Proto-Indo-European, rather its morphology was sensitive to the aspect. Proto-Indo-European verbal roots were either perfective or imperfective and there were different ways to form an imperfective stem from a perfective root and vice versa depending on the structure of the root.

Perfective stems expressed a punctual action without any inner temporal structure while imperfective ones expressed the temporal structure and could describe if the action was continuous, iterative, habitual etc.

The category of the verbal aspect is also important for the imperatives, since changing the aspect of the verb changes the meaning of the command.

1.5 Tenses

Late Proto-Indo-European had 4 tenses. Present tense was marked with primary endings added to the stem of the imperfective root. Aorist was marked with secondary endings added to the perfective root, later aorist forms could be additionally marked with the so-called augment. Imperfective was marked with primary endings and the augment.

The perfect had its own set of endings. It was used to express states and such forms were tenseless, which means that there were no means in verbal morphology to express whether the state was applicable in the present moment or in the past or in the future. Presumably, such nuances were expressed syntactically.

1.6 Augment

In Late Proto-Indo-European, verbal forms expressing past events could be additionally marked with a morphological element **h₁e-* called „augment” that functioned as a prefix. It is attested in such languages as Greek, Phrygian, Armenian and Indo-Iranian. This element probably had a meaning like ‘*then, that time*’ and its use was rather facultative.

However, with the appearance of the augment in the Proto-Indo-European morphology imperfective and aorist forms could now be additionally marked with this new element. Thus, in the grammar there appeared a somewhat ‘leftover’ mood called injunctive that was marked with secondary endings but without the augment. Without the augment expressing the connection to the past, the augment-less aorist forms now expressed timeless statements like in Vedic *bhárt* ‘may he bear’ vs *ábharat* ‘he was bearing’. Another function of the injunctive was the negative imperative that was formed with a negative particle **meh₁* and an injunctive form.

1.7 Voice

Proto-Indo-European had two voices: active and middle, each with its own sets of endings, both thematic and athematic

Active was used when the subject of the verb was the agent of the verb’s designed action.

Middle had several meanings. It could express a reflexive action, an action performed in one’s own favour, a reciprocal action or passive. Also, there were so-called *media tantum* (e.g. Latin and Greek deponent verbs) – verbs that could be used exclusively in middle voice, although their meaning was rather active, e.g. **mer-* ‘to die’.

1.8 Grammatical moods

1.8.1 Indicative

Indicative was used for expressing simple statements of fact. Proto-Indo-European indicative had several sets of endings depending on tense, aspect, and voice. Primary endings were used to form present tense forms and secondary ones were used to form past tense or events which were not marked for tense. Later, past tense was also extended by the above-mentioned augment.

1.8.2 Optative

Optative was used for expressing wishes and hopes. It was formed by adding an ablauting suffix **-yeh₁-* ~ *-ih₁-* to a zero-grade of the stem with secondary endings.

1.8.3 Subjunctive

Subjunctive was used to express hypothetical events and sometimes future. Subjunctive was formed by adding a thematic vowel to the *e*-grade of the stem and using primary endings.

1.8.4 Imperative

Imperative was used for expressing commands. It had its own set of endings, which, nevertheless, is derived from indicative endings to a certain extent, and had forms of the second and third person in all numbers as follows:

Proto-Indo-European imperative endings										
	Szmerényi (1996)			Sihler (1995)			Beekes (2011)			
	Active		Medio-passive	Active		Medio-passive	Active		Medio-passive	
	Athematic	Thematic		Athematic	Thematic		Athematic	Thematic	Transitive	Intransitive
2sg	*-∅, <i>-dʰi</i>	*-e	*-so	*-∅, <i>*-dʰi</i>	*-e	*-so	*-∅, <i>*-dʰi</i>	*-e	*-swe?	-
3sg	*-tu	*-etu	*-to	*-tu, <i>*-u</i>	*-tu	*-to	*-tu	*-etu	*-to?	*-o?
2pl	*-te	*-ete	*-dʰwe	*-te	*-te	*-dʰwo	*-te	*-ete	*-dʰwe	-
3pl	*-entu	*-ontu	*-nto	*-entu	*-ntu	*-nto	*-entu	*-ontu	*-nto?	*-ro?

Endings somewhat differed in the paradigms of athematic and thematic verbs. 2sg used just the bare stem of a verb, in the case of the thematic verbs, the bare stem was extended by the vowel **-e* at the end.

Athematic verbs used either the bare stem (e.g. Latin *ī* ‘go’ < **h₁éi*) or a stem reinforced by (probably) an emphatic particle **-dʰi*. In the latter case the stem may have had full grade (e.g. Lithuanian *ei-k* ‘go’) or zero grade (e.g. Vedic *vid-dhi*).

2pl ending is identical to the ending of the indicative paradigm.

As for the third-person imperatives, their endings look as if they were composed of the secondary endings extended by the element **-u*.

Another interesting feature of the Proto-Indo-European grammar was co-existence of two types of imperatives: regular imperatives covered above and the so-called I

imperatives denoting futurity and formed by adding an element **-tōd* to an imperative verbal form (without the element **-u* in the third person). The reconstructed form is the same in the works of the authors mentioned above.

	Athematic	Thematic
2sg	<i>*-tōd</i>	<i>*-etōd</i>
3sg		
2pl		
3pl	<i>*-ntōd</i>	<i>*-ontōd</i>

The forms are the same for 2sg, 3sg and 2pl which indicates that older forms must have been (Szemerényi 1996: 249):

2sg **b^heretōd* < **b^here-tōd*
 3sg **b^heretōd* < **b^heret-tōd*
 2pl **b^heretōd* < **b^herete-tōd*
 3pl **b^herentōd* < **b^heront-tōd*

The ending **-tōd* could originate in an ablative form of the demonstrative **to-* in meaning ‘from then onwards’ or ‘from there, thereafter.’

This kind of imperative was used to express a command that is somewhat delayed in time. Sihler states that the term ‘sequential imperative’ is more appropriate since all imperatives are future in nature (Sihler 1995: 604). It can be clearly seen in the example from (Pl. Ps. 647):

tu epistulam hanc a me accipe atque illi
 you:NOM letter:ACCsg this:fem;ACCsg from me:ABL take:impv;pres;act;2sg and him/her:DAT

dato.

give:impv;fut;act;2sg

‘You take this letter from me and give it to him/her.’

Interestingly enough, imperative forms themselves could not be negated. Instead, Proto-Indo-European used a construction with a negative particle **meh₁* and an injunctive form of a verb.

1.9 The relation of the Indo-European imperative to other grammatical categories and how imperatives are special

Imperative is inevitably related to future since the action that a speaker commands is yet to happen. Thus, if languages have forms of e.g. aorist or past imperative, their meaning probably is something different than the actual command or there is an aspectual system in action. Furthermore, future tenses of the indicative mood can often be used to express commands instead of imperative in many languages:

Imperative has its own morphology: it does not use any suffixes to form a stem and it uses its own set of endings that are to a certain extent derived from those of the indicative mood.

Grammatical voice functions differently in imperative. Commands are given to those who are able or are expected to be able to carry them out, which means that

the receivers of commands are supposed to be agents of actions expressed by verbs, in other words, we could say imperative form implies controllability. Thus, using forms of other voices than indicative, e.g. Latin *amāre* ‘you be loved’, is somewhat contradictory because the receiver cannot be in control of an action that he is supposed to perform and mostly such forms have rather causative meaning.

Imperative mood is related to modality, or more accurately, imperatives fall under the umbrella of deontic modality which denotes necessity or obligation that comes from external factors. Thus, commands can be expressed by various modal constructions featuring verbs like ‘must’, ‘should’, ‘ought to’ etc. Furthermore, in many languages negative imperatives are expressed through specific modal constructions, e.g. Latin *nolite venire!* ‘Do not come!’ (literally ‘do not want to come!’).

Imperatives are often seen as too abrupt and are thus dis-preferred when speaking to a person with an equal or higher social status in many languages. Speakers often prefer to use indirect speech acts expressed by modal constructions or simply use longer imperative forms if there are any in a language.

1.10 Summary

The study of Proto-Indo-European grammar provides us with a foundational understanding of the linguistic features that later evolved into the various daughter languages. Through the analysis of verbal morphology, including primary and secondary endings, ablaut, and distinction thematic and athematic verbs, we can trace the development of imperative forms in subsequent Indo-European languages.

Proto-Indo-European featured a complex system of verbal inflection, including distinct imperative forms. The imperative mood, as reconstructed for Proto-Indo-European, included third-person imperatives, which evolved differently across various branches of the Indo-European family. Negative imperatives, formed using the prohibitive particle and injunctive mood, added another layer of complexity to the system.

By examining these Proto-Indo-European grammatical features, we can better understand how the descendant languages evolved. This sets the stage for a detailed exploration of individual Indo-European languages, focusing on how they preserved, modified, or lost these ancient grammatical forms.

Each language provides unique insights into the evolution of the imperative mood and other grammatical categories. By comparing these languages, we can identify both common trends and unique developments within the Indo-European family.

2. Analysis of the languages

2.1 Organisation of the language-specific chapters

In each of the following chapters, the analysis will be structured mostly around the key questions that I formed in the introduction chapter of this work to ensure a consistent and thorough examination of third-person imperatives. The structure of this section will look like as follows:

1. **Introduction:** This part will contain information about historical context and significance of the language for this work and for Indo-European studies.
2. **Morphology and etymology:** Here, I will demonstrate the imperative paradigms and cover the etymology of the endings.
3. **Use of imperatives:** This part describes when imperatives are used.
4. **Syntax:** This part is dedicated to differences between imperative and non-imperative clauses.
5. **Expression of grammatical categories:** Here, I will describe how categories like person or number are expressed in imperative forms and if they differ somehow from how other moods express those categories.
6. **Negative imperatives:** I will describe how imperatives are negated in the language and if negative and non-negative imperative differ somehow.

After the analysis, each chapter about the selected language and its supplementing minor languages will be concluded with a set of sentences accompanied by my grammatical analysis except for Vedic in case of which the analysis from the VedaWeb platform was used. Thus, the readers will be able to see the use of third-person imperatives in practice.

Finally, after all the chapters about the languages of this work are finished, I will draw the conclusion that we can come to based on the findings during the analysis.

2.2 Hittite

2.2.1 Introduction

Hittite is the member of the Anatolian branch and the oldest attested Indo-European language with its texts dating back to the seventeenth century BC and including various genres from ritual and mythological texts to legal documents and treaties. The decipherment of Hittite in 1917 made by Czech linguist Bedřich Hrozný was a groundbreaking event that shed light on what the early Proto-Indo-European language might have looked like.

In particular, the discovery of Hittite confirmed the laryngeal theory formulated by Ferdinand de Saussure as the reflexes of the laryngeal phonemes $*h_2$ and $*h_3$ occur in Hittite. Furthermore, Hittite demonstrates simpler verbal and nominal morphology indicating that, since the Anatolian languages were the first to split off Proto-Indo-European, the grammar of the proto-language was much simpler in its earlier stages of development.

2.2.2 Morphology

Hittite verbal system is relatively simple compared to other old Indo-European languages. There are two conjugational classes: the so-called mi-conjugation and hi-conjugation that only slightly differ in their singular endings in both indicative and imperative moods; two voices: active and middle; two moods: indicative and imperative; and two tenses: present and preterite.

	Hittite imperative endings		
	Active		middle
	mi-conjugation	hi-conjugation	
1sg	-(a)llu, (-lit, -lut)	-allu	-ḫaru, -ḫaḫaru
2sg	-Ø, -i, -t	-Ø, -i	-ḫut, -ḫuti
3sg	-d/tu	-u	-aru, -taru
1pl	-weni, -wani		-waštati
2pl	-ten		-tu(m)mat, -tumati
3pl	-and/tu		-antaru

Imperative paradigm has a distinct form for each person-number configuration. There is only one type of imperatives in Hittite and other Anatolian languages. It is unknown whether Anatolian languages do not have future imperatives due to the fact that they split off before such forms were created or they simply lost them.

2.2.3 Etymology of the endings:

2.2.3.1 Active

According to Kloekhorst (Kloekhorst: 2008, 529-530), the first-person singular ending originates from $lā-/l-$ 'to let'. The element -u could have been the same element as in the third-person forms, whereas -t may be regarded as the imperative second-person active singular ending $-t < *d^hi$.

The first-person plural ending is the same as the one in present tense of indicative mood. Nevertheless, this ending is not a cognate to the first-person plural ending in other non-Anatolian Indo-European languages and should rather be compared to the dual ending, e.g. Sanskrit. -vas, -va, Lithuanian -va etc. (Kloekhorst: 2008, 1000-1001).

In the second-person singular there is either a bare stem denoting imperative, or the ending -i or -t. The latter only occurs in the forms *īt* ‘go!’ and *tēt* ‘speak!’ as well as in the causatives in -nu-, e.g. *arnut* ‘transport!’ and it is generally accepted that the ending comes from Proto-Indo-European **-d^hi* (Kloekhorst:2008, 800), whereas the former’s origin is not clear and it occurs only in some forms.

The second-person plural is identical to the preterite ending of indicative mood and ultimately comes from **-th₁e* and **-te*. (Kloekhorst: 2008, 866).

The third-person singular ending of mi-conjugation is the regular continuation of the Proto-Indo-European ending **-tu* and it also has cognates in other Anatolian languages:

Hittite *ēšdu*, Palaic *āšdu*, Cuneiform Luwian *āšdu*, Hieroglyphic Luwian /a:stu/.

The ending -u of the *ḫi*-conjugation, according to (Kloekhorst:2008, 910), has no direct cognates in other Indo-European languages. However, the connection with the corresponding ending -d/tu is clear. There must have been an inner-Anatolian analogy with replacing the present tense element -i with the imperative element -u.

The third-plural ending -and/tu is a result of regular phonological development: -antu < Proto-Anatolian **-Vntu* < Proto-Indo-European **CC-éntu*.

2.2.3.2 Middle

The first-person singular ending is formed from the indicative ending -*ḫari* > *ḫaru* analogically to third-person imperative endings. The origin of the indicative ending is not clear.

Plural ending is identical to indicative mood and comes from Proto-Indo-European **-wos-d^hh₂(o)*. (Kloekhorst:2008, 986).

The second-person singular ending has unclear origin as well as the second-person plural.

The third-person singular endings are formed from indicative endings analogically to those of active voice -*ari*, -*tari* > -*aru*, -*taru*. The indicative endings come from Proto-Indo-European **-o(ri)* and **-to(ri)*.

Third-person plural ending is also formed analogically from the indicative morpheme -*antari* which comes from Proto-Indo-European **CC-énto(ri)* and **CéC-nto(ri)*.

2.2.4 Use of imperatives

Imperative mood in Hittite is used to expressed direct commands and requests:

nuṣwarṣaš *ēpten* *nuṣwarṣašmu* *parā* *p[ešten]*
CONN=QUOT=them **seize:impv;act;2pl** **CONN=QUOT=them=me:DAT** **forth** **bring:impv;act;2pl**
 ‘Arrest them and extradite them to me’ (KUB 14.15 i 14)

As for the third-person imperatives, they are generally used when the speaker expresses to a second party the wish that a third party may perform some action. Occasionally, there is either the implied seeking of the consent of the second party for the third party to do this or the implication that the second party joins the speaker in this wish (Melchert: 2008, 314).

nu_≠wa zaḥḥiyauwaštati nu_≠wa_≠nnaš ^dU BELI_≠YA DINAM
CONN=QUOT **battle:impv;mid;1pl** **CONN=QUOT=us** **Stormgod** **LORD=MINE** **case:acc;sg**

ḥannāu

judge:impv;act;3sg

‘Let us do battle, and may the Stormgod, my lord, decide our case’ (KBo 3.4 ii 13–14)

But, when a second party is not addressed, a strong wish for a third party’s action can be expressed by using the present tense and the (“speaker-”) optative particle *man* (Melchert: 2008, 314).

man_≠wa ^dUTU-ŠI TI-ešzi
OPT=QUOT **his.majesty** **recover:ind;pres;act;3sg**
‘I hope His Majesty recovers’ (KUB 15.30 iii 5)

2.2.5 Syntax

The functionally neuter word order in Hittite is SOV where a verb takes the clause-final position. There are no word-order differences between indicative and imperative clauses.

A. n_≠aš karū paizzi
CONN=he:NOM **already** **go:ind;act;3sg**
‘He has already gone’ – indicative clause

B. nu ANA DINGIR.MEŠ EN.MEŠ_≠YA ZI-anza namma
CONN **to** **gods** **lords=mine** **soul:NOMsg** **again**

waršdu

be.pure:impv;act;3sg

‘To the gods, my lords, may the mind again be gentle’ (KUB 14.14) – imperative clause

2.2.6 Expression of grammatical categories

Hittite imperative forms express grammatical categories mostly the same way as those of indicative do. There are distinct forms for each person-number configuration, both voices are distinguished as well. The only difference is that Hittite imperative does not distinguish present and preterite tenses, the imperative forms in Hittite by default express a future event.

2.2.7 Negative imperatives

Negative imperative forms are formed with the negative particle *lē* which is used together with an indicative form.

nu ^{LÚ}ḥippari ḥāppar lē [ku]iški iezzi
CONN **hippara.man:DATsg** **business:ACCsg** **not** **someone:NOMsg** **do:ind;act;3sg**
‘Let no one do business with a ḥippara-man’ (KBo 6.2 ii 49–50)

The use of actual imperative together with the particle *lē* is rare and all the examples are from the Old Hittite period.

nu₂tta LÚ.MEŠ ŠU.GI^{URU}KU.BABBAR-TI *lē* memiškandu
 CONN=you:DAT people old Hattusa not speak:impv;act;3pl
 'Let the elders of Hattuša not speak to you' (ibid. ii 60)

2.3 Luwian and Palaic

2.3.1 Introduction

Both languages, though differing in their levels of attestation and usage, share common characteristics with Hittite and provide additional perspectives on the development of Indo-European languages in Anatolia.

Luwian, with its dual representation in cuneiform and hieroglyphic scripts, offers a wealth of monumental inscriptions, religious texts, seals and some other less attested types of texts. It was spoken in the second and first millennia BC in the western and central Anatolia and continued to be used even after the fall of the Hittite Empire. Palaic, on the other hand, was spoken in the northern Anatolia and is known primarily through ritual and mythological passages attested in Hittite clay tablets.

2.3.2 Morphology

The verbal morphology of Luwian and Palaic has the same features as Hittite. There are three persons, two numbers – singular and plural, two tenses – present and preterite, two voices – active and middle and two moods – indicative and imperative.

In both languages, verbs are as well divided into *mi*-conjugation and *hi*-conjugation, although, in Palaic, the latter is attested only in the third-person singular present forms.

Due to the nature of the known Luwian and Palaic texts, not all possible imperative forms are attested with middle voice lacking its paradigm almost entirely.

Luwian and Palaic imperative endings						
	Active endings			Middle endings		
	Cuneiform Luwian	Hieroglyphic Luwian	Palaic	Cuneiform Luwian	Hieroglyphic Luwian	Palaic
1sg	-lu(?)	-	-	-	-	-
2sg	-∅	-∅	∅?	-	-	-
3sg	-d/tu	-d/tu	-du	-	-aru	-
1pl	-	-	-	-	-	-
2pl	-ttan	-ranu < * <i>tanu</i>	-ttan	-	-	-
3pl	-antu	-antu	-ndu	-	-antaru	-

The first-person singular form is limitedly attested and is found in the context of Hittite. Thus, the ending is probably Hittite, but the attested Luwian form *lilailu* might suggest that there is an actual Luwian equivalent to the Hittite ending.

Otherwise, all the other endings clearly are the cognates to the corresponding Hittite endings, except for the Hieroglyphic Luwian ending *-ranu* < **-tanu* that is formed

from the corresponding indicative ending by analogy with the third-person imperative endings (Morpurgo Davies: 1980, pp.86-108).

2.3.3 Negative imperatives

Prohibition is marked by the particle *nīš* in both Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luwian and either an imperative or indicative form of a verb.

A. abatti=ba=wa Halpawannis Tarhunzas ada patta nis
that:DATsg=but=QOUT halabean:NOMsg tarhunt:NOMsg ara.pata not

piyai ahha marnuna
give:ind;pres;act;3sg away destroy:inf
 'for him may Halabean Tarhunzas not grant ARA PATA to destroy.' (BABYLON 1: 7 § 15)

B. za=ba=wa Laramma alamanza nis wanahha lasi
this:neut;ACCsg=but=QUOT larama name:ACCsg not away take:impv;act;2sg
 'do not take this name (of) Laramas (Iskenderun: 5 § 6)

2.4 Conclusions to the Anatolian languages

Having examined third-person imperative forms, we can draw several conclusions:

- A. All three languages have preserved the original Proto-Indo-European third-person active imperatives **-tu* and **-ntu*.
- B. Third-person middle forms of these languages are formed analogically to the corresponding active forms, which is probably a common Anatolian innovation.
- C. Imperative endings of other persons either come from the proto-language or/and are identical to the indicative endings or, in case of the Hieroglyphic Luwian ending *-ranu*, are formed analogically to the third-person endings.
- D. Imperative clauses do not differ syntactically from indicative ones.
- E. Negative imperatives are formed with a special negative particle and an indicative form, although Luwian can use both imperative and indicative forms in this type of constructions.

2.5 Example sentences for the Anatolian languages

2.5.1 Texts in Hittite

The sentence (A) is from the Proclamation of Anittaš (KBo 3.22) and all other sentences are from the Proclamation of Telepinuš (KBo 3.1).

- A. *kuiš ammēl āppan LUGAL-uš kīšari nu ^{URU}Hattusan*
whoever me:GEN after king:NOMsg become:ind;prs;mid;3sg CONN Hattusa
- āppa asāsi n=an nēpišaš ^DIŠKUR-aš hazziyattu*
again settle:ind;prs;act;3sg CONN=it heaven:GENsg Stormgod:NOMsg smite:impv;act;3sg
 ‘Whoever becomes king after me and settles Hattusas again, may the Stormgod of Heaven smite him!’
- B. *n=uš=šmaš ÉN^{MEŠ} taggašta pāndu=wa=za*
CONN=he=they:DAT houses construct:ind;pret;act;3sg go:impv;act;3pl=QUOT=REFL
- ašandu*
be:impv;act;3pl
 ‘(Telepinus) constructed houses for them, (saying) “Let them go and remain (there)...’
- C. *nu=wa=za azzikkandu akkuškandu*
CONN=QUOT=REFL eat:impv;act;3pl drink:impv;act;3pl
 ‘...let them eat and drink...’
- D. *LUGAL-uš=šan hantezziyas=pat DUMU.LUGAL DUMURU*
king:NOMsg=LOC oldest:GENsg=EMPH prince son
- kikkištaru*
become:impv;mid;3sg
 ‘A son of the first rank, a prince, only should become king.’
- E. *takku DUMU.LUGAL hantezziš NU.GÁL nu kuiš tān pēdaš*
if prince oldest:NOMsg there.is.no CONN who.is of.the.second.rank
- DUMURU nu LUGAL=uš apāš kīšaru*
son CONN king:NOMsg that:NOMsg become:impv;mid;3sg
 ‘If there is no first-ranked prince, (then) let one who is of the second rank become king.’
- F. *mān DUMU.LUGAL=ma IBILA NU.GÁL nu kuiš DUMU.MUNUS*
if prince=but male.heir there.is.no CONN who.is daughter
- hantezziš n=uš=ši=ššan ^{LÚ}antiyantan appandu*
oldest:NOMsg CONN=him=her:DAT=LOC antiyant-man take:impv;act;3pl
- nu LUGAL-uš apāš kīšaru*
CONN king:NOMsg that:NOMsg become:impv;mid;3sg
- ‘If there is no royal male heir, let them take an antiyant-man for a first-ranked daughter, and let him become king.’
- G. *URRAM SERAM kuiš ammuk EGIR-anda LUGAL-uš*
in.the.future whoever me:DAT after king:NOMsg
- kīšari*

become:ind;pres;act;3sg

n=apa ŠEŠ^{MEŠ}-ŠU DUMU^{MEŠ}-ŠU LÚ.MEŠ gaenaš=šiš haššānnaš=šaš
CONN=LOC **his.brothers** **his.sons** **his.in-laws** **his.family**

Ù ERIN^{MEŠ}-ŠU taruppanteš ašandu
and **his.army** **united:NOMpl** **be:impv;act;3pl**

‘In the future, whoever becomes king after me, let his brothers, his sons, his relatives by marriage, the men of his family, and his army be united.’

2.5.2 Text in Palaic (KUB 35.165)

A. kuwāiš=a=tta halpūda takkuwānteš ašandu
cow:NOMpl=and=CONN **altar:LOCsg** **sacrificed:NOMpl** **be:impv;act;3pl**

a=anta kuwaniš tašūra takkuwanteš ašandu
and=also **dogs(?):NOMpl** **(place.of.offering):LOCsg** **sacrificed:NOMpl** **be:impv;act;3pl**

a=anta warlahiš kuwalima takkuwanteš ašandu
and=also **(animal):NOMpl** **(place.of.offering):LOCsg** **sacrificed:NOMpl** **be:impv;act;3pl**

ittin=anta tī tāzzu kartin=anta tī
(?):ACCsg=also **you:NOM** **lay(?):impv;2sg** **heart:ACCsg=also** **you:NOM**

tāzu

lay(?):impv;act;2sg

‘And the cows shall be sacrificed on the altar. Dogs(?) shall also be sacrificed on the (place of offering). (Animals) shall also be sacrificed on the (place of offering). You shall also place the (?) and the heart...’

2.5.3 Texts in Luwian

A. ...wa=mu arraya halli pibassattu Tarhunzas
QUOT=me:DAT **long:neut;ACCpl** **day:ACCpl** **grant:impv;act;3sg** **storm.god:NOMsg**
... and to me may he grant long days, Tarhunzas! (BOR: , §11)

B. a=wa=as Tarhunti POCULUM salis astu
CONN=QUOT=he:NOM **Tarhunt:DATsg** **poculum** **opponent:NOMsg** **be:impv;act;3sg**
,Let him, the Storm-god of the land POCULUM, be prosecutor! (KARAHÖYÜK (ELBİSTAN). §24)

C. a=wa zatti Astiwasussan tarudi za izziyadaranza
CONN=QUOT this:DATsg **astiwasu:DATsg** **statue:DATsg** **this:neut;NOMsg** **offering:NOMsg**

astu

be:impv;act;3sg

,To this statue of Astiwasus let there bet his performance’ (MARAŞ 14, §7)

D. sarli=ha=wa=as hantilis izziyararu tanimanza hantawattanza
highly=and=QUOT=he:NOM **foremost** **make:impv;mid;3sg** **every:DATpl** **king:DATpl**
,and let him be made highly preeminent over all kings’ (KARATEPE 1 Hu., § L 278-282)

E. abatti=wa=tta hantawatti tippasassinzi taskwarassinzi massaninzi
that:DATsg=QUOT=LOC **king:DATsg** **sky:NOMpl** **land:NOMpl** **god:NOMpl**

wala awintu

fatally **come:impv;act;3pl**

,against that king may the heaven’s and the earth’s gods come fatally’ (ANKARA, 3 § 9)

2.6 Latin

2.6.1 Introduction

Latin was an Italic language initially spoken in the region of Latium (modern day Lazio in Italy) and it was the language of the Roman Republic and Empire. It has left a profound impact on Western civilisation, influencing many European languages and serving as the foundation for the development of the Romance languages. Its extensive corpus covering a rich variety of genres, including comedies, legal texts, economical documents as well as everyday life texts and more, provides rich material for linguistic analysis.

2.6.2 Morphology

Latin verbal system is highly complex with its verbs conjugated to three persons – first, second and third, two numbers – singular and plural, two voices – active and passive, three moods – indicative, subjunctive and imperative, and six tenses – present, future, imperfect, perfect, future perfect and pluperfect with the former three forming the so-called infectum tenses and the latter three the so-called perfectum tenses).

Furthermore, on the contrary to Hittite, Latin preserved the distinction between two types of imperatives, as it was in the proto-language.

Two tables will be shown, one representing present imperatives and another one future imperatives. In each table, the verbs will be divided into 5 groups representing Latin conjugational classes.

Latin present imperative endings					
	I conjugation	II conjugation	III conjugation	III-iō conjugation	IV conjugation
infinitive	amāre	vidēre	dūcere	capere	audīre
Active					
2sg	amā	vidē	dūc	cape	audī
2pl	amāte	vidēte	dūcte	capite	audīte
Passive					
2sg	amāre	vidēre	dūcere	capere	audīre
2pl	amāminī	vidēminī	dūciminī	capiminī	audīminī

*The 2sg form of dūcere does not have -e due to apocope.

Latin future imperative endings					
	I conjugation	II conjugation	III conjugation	III-iō conjugation	IV conjugation
infinitive	amāre	vidēre	dūcere	capere	audīre
Active					
2sg/3sg	amātō	vidētō	dūcitō	capitō	audītō
2pl	amātōte	vidētōte	dūcitōte	capitōte	audītōte
3pl	amantō	videntō	dūcuntō	capiuntō	audiuntō

passive					
2sg/3sg	amātor	vidētor	dūcitor	capitor	audītor
2pl/3pl	amantor/ amāminō	videntor/ vidēminō	dūcuntor/ dūciminō	capiuntor/ capiminō	audiuntor/ audīminō

The only possible person in present imperative is the second one, only future imperatives can express the third-person forms.

In present imperative paradigm, each person-number configuration has its distinctive form while in the future imperative paradigm there is syncretism between second- and third-person forms in singular active and in both numbers in passive.

2.6.3 Etymology of the endings

2.6.3.1 Present imperatives

The second-person singular form uses the bare stem of the verb.

The second-person plural ending *-te* is the continuation of the Proto-Indo-European **-te* ending.

As for the passive voice, the second-person singular ending *-re* comes from the Proto-Indo-European ending **-so* through regular phonological development while the second-person plural ending *-minī* is the corresponding indicative form whose etymology is not yet defined for sure.

2.6.3.2 Future imperatives

The second- and third-person singular active ending *-tō* is the continuation of the Proto-Indo-European **-tōd*.

The second-plural ending *-tōte* is the Latin innovation made analogically to the present imperative forms using the element *-te*.

The third-person plural ending *-ntō* comes from the Proto-Indo-European **-ntōd*.

All the passive forms are the results of analogy to the indicative present passive forms marked by the passive marker *-r* or *-ō* in the case of the ending *-minō*.

2.6.4 Use of imperatives

The most typical imperative sentences function as an invitation, advice, or a request to an addressee to bring about, continue, or stop a certain state of affairs if a negative form is used. In such a situation the speaker/writer presupposes that the addressee has control over that state of affairs (Pinkster: 2015, 348). Such commands are usually to be executed in immediate future.

A. Aperite aliquis.
open:impv;pres;act;2pl **someone:masc;NOMsg**
 'Open up, someone' (Pl. Mer. 131)

B. I, sequere illos
go:impv;pres;act;2sg **follow:impv;pres;pass;3sg** **that:masc;ACCpl**
 'Go, follow them!' (Pl. Mil. 1361)

But as it was written above, present imperatives have only forms of the second person. Instead of third-person imperatives proper, Latin uses constructions with

subjunctive. Furthermore, present subjunctive is more common in binding directives and prohibitives.

A. Dixitque Deus fiat lux
Say:ind;perf;act;3sg=and God:NOMsg be:subj;prs;act;3sg light:nomsg
 ‚And God said: be light made‘ (Genesis 1:3)

B. Nemo de nobis unus excellat
nobody:NOMsg from us:abl one:NOMsg;masc excel:subj;prs;act;3sg
 ‚Let no single man among us distinguish himself above the rest‘ (Cic. Off. 1.26)

As for the future imperatives, they do not express a command that has to be performed immediately but rather a command somewhat delayed in time or a command that is to be performed if certain conditions are met:

A. Prius audite paucis. Quod quom dixero,
Before listen:impv;prs;act;2pl a.few what after say:ind;fut-perf;act;1sg

si placuerit, facitote
if appeal:ind;fut-perf;act;3sg do:impv;fut;act;2pl
 ‚Listen to me a minute first. If you like what I say, do it.‘

B. Ergo mox auferto tecum (sc. pallam), quando
therefore soon take.away:impv;fut;act2sg with.you cloak:ACCsg when

abibis.
leave:ind;fut;act;2sg
 ‚Therefore, soon take the cloak with you when you leave.‘ (Pl. Men. 430)

C. Principio, si id te mordet... /
first.of.all if it you:ACC bother:ind;pres;act3sg

...quaeso hoc facito tecum
ask:ind;pres;act;1sg this make.sure:impv;fut;act;2sg with.you

cogites
consider:subj;pres;act;2sg
 ‚First of all, if that troubles you... / ...please make sure you consider this.‘ (Ter. Ad. 807–8).

Future imperatives are used more or less freely in Old Latin and in certain types of texts. Third-person forms are found in legal statutes and prayers, since the instructions in such types of texts are addressed to an indefinite addressee and are to be carried out in some point in future under certain conditions.

Literary authors also sometimes used the future imperative forms to achieve the effect of solemnity (Pinkster: 2015, 517).

Passive forms are extremely rare because using imperative form implies the controllability of an action by the addressee of the command. Therefore, passive forms are rather causative in their meaning. Future passive imperatives are even rarer but there is one of several examples of a sentence containing a true passive form.

Regio imperio duo sunto, iique praeundo, iudicando,
royal:ABLsg authority:ABLsg two be:impv;fut;act3pl and.they leading:ABLsg judging:ABLsg

consulendo praetores, iudices, consules appellamino.
consulting:ABLsg **praetor**:ACCpl **judge**:ACCpl **consul**:ACCpl **call**:impv;fut;pass;3pl
 ‘There shall be two magistrates with royal powers. Since they lead, judge, and confer, from these functions they shall be called praetors, judges, and consuls.’ (Cic. Leg. 3.8)

2.6.5 Syntax

The third-person imperatives almost exclusively occur in the sentences with indefinite subjects, otherwise the subjunctive forms are required.

- A. Praetor utei interroget.
Praetor:NOMsg **so.that** **interrogate**:subj;prs;act;3sg
 ‘The praetor must hold an interrogation.’ (definite subject)
- B. Si in ius vocat, ito. Ni it,
if in court:ACCsg **call**:ind;prs;act;3sg, **go**:impv;fut;act;3sg **if.not** **go**:ind;prs;act;3sg
 antestamino. Igitur em capito
call.witness:impv;fut;act;3pl **then** **EMPHATIC** **seize**:impv;fut;act;3sg
 ‘If plaintiff summons defendant to court, he shall go. If he does not go, plaintiff shall call witness thereto. Then only shall he take defendant by force.’ (indefinite subject)
- C. Nocturna mulierum sacrificia ne sunt...
night(adj):NOMpl;neut **woman**:GENpl **sacrifice**:NOMpl **not be**:impv;fut;act;3pl
 ‘No sacrifices shall be performed by women at night... (rare exception)

The most common Latin word order is SOV. Nevertheless, since the word order was free and each sentence constituent could take any position in the clause regardless of its syntactic functions the Latin word order depends rather on pragmatic factors. Thus, even imperative forms can be found in any position in the Latin sentence.

2.6.6 Expression of grammatical categories

In contrast to Hittite, Latin imperative forms differ from those of indicative mood in how they express grammatical categories:

- Both types of Latin imperatives do not have forms for the first person.
- Present imperatives do not have forms for the third person. Only future imperatives can express the third person.
- Although present imperatives have a separate form for each possible person-number configuration, future imperative forms are mostly syncretic in the second and third person.
- Although imperatives have passive forms, their meaning is mostly causative. True passives are rare in Latin.
- Although there is distinction between present and future imperatives, they both express a different type of directives that are to be carried out at some point in future. As it was written before in this chapter, the term ‘future imperative’ is misleading and the better term for it, according to Sihler, would be a ‘sequential imperative.’

2.6.7 Negative imperatives

In Early and Classical Latin, the negator was the particle *ne* which, however, was mostly used with subjunctive forms, the use of actual imperative forms with this particle was relatively rare.

- A. Verum postremo impetravi ut ne quid ei
still finally accomplish:ind;perf;act;1sg so.that not what this:masc;DATsg

suscenseat.

be.angry:subj;pres;act;3sg

'Well, in the end I got him to agree not to be angry with him.' (Pl. Bac. 533)

- B. Ne male loquere a presenti amico.
not badly speak:impv;pres;pass;2sg absent:ABLsg friend:ABLsg
 'Stop insulting a friend in his absence.' (Pl. Trin. 926)

Another way to negate present imperative was using the imperative form of the verb *nolle* 'to not want', which already encodes the negation, and an infinitive of the main verb.

- Noli sis tu illi adversari.
not.want:impv;pres;act;2sg if.you.want you:NOM that:DATsg oppose:inf;pres;pass
 'Just don't oppose him.' Pl. (Cas. 204-5)

The use of the future imperative in prohibitions is rare except for the legal texts. The expression *nolito* and *nolitote* with an infinitive are rare as well. Originally, in respect of their meaning, they constituted an explicit appeal to the goodwill of the addressee. They are absent from ecclesiastical authors. (Pinkster: 2015, 519)

- A. Hominem mortuum in urbe ne sepelito neve
man:ACCsg dead:ACCsg in city:ABLsg not bury:impv;fut;act2sg nor

urito.

cremate:impv;fut;act2sg

'You shall not bury or cremate a dead man within the city.'

- B. Heus tu, si quid per iocum / dixi,
hey you if anything in.jest say:ind;perf;act;1sg (Lex XII 10.1)

nolito in serium convertere.

not.want:impv;fut;act;2sg into seriousness turn:inf;pres;act

'Hey you, if I said anything in jest, don't turn it into earnest.' (Pl. Poen. 1320-1)

- C. Neu quisquam posthac prohibeto adulescentem
and.not anyone hereafter prevent:impv;fut;act3sg young:ACCsg
 filium / quin amet et scortum ducat,
son:ACCsg from love:subj;pres;act;3sg and courtesan:ACCsg lead:subj;pres;act3sg

quod bono fiat modo.

provided.that good:ABLsg happen:subj;pres;act;3sg manner:ABLsg

'And let no one hereafter prevent a young son from loving and leading a courtesan, provided that it is done in a proper manner.' (Pl. Mer. 1021-2)

2.7 Oscan and Umbrian

2.7.1 Introduction

Oscan and Umbrian belonged to the Sabellian branch of the Italic languages. Before the spread of Latin in the Apennine peninsula, these two languages were widely spoken in their respective regions and left behind a corpus of inscriptions that are crucial for understanding of historical development of the Italic languages.

Oscan was a language spoken by several tribes in southern Italy. Its inscriptions date back as far as the fifth century BC. The most important of them are Tabula Bantina, Tabula Osca and Cippus Abellanus.

Umbrian was spoken in central Italy and the most important and extensive inscriptions in this language are the Iguvine Tablets, seven bronze tablets containing instructions for priests on how to conduct certain ritual ceremonies.

Both these languages share common grammatical features with Latin, nevertheless, at the same time they possess unique features as well.

2.7.2 Morphology and etymology of the endings

Oscan and Umbrian verbal systems are basically the same as that of Latin. They have the same system of tenses, moods and grammatical voices, although not all potential forms are attested in the inscriptions.

These two languages also distinguished between present and future imperatives, but, as I have written above, not all forms are attested and therefore, the whole paradigm cannot be shown.

Sabellic present imperative endings				
	Active		Passive	
	Oscan	Umbrian	Oscan	Umbrian
2sg	-	Ø, -f	-	-
3sg	-	-	-	-
2pl	-	-	-	-
3pl	-	-	-	-
Sabellic future imperative endings				
	Active		Passive	
	Oscan	Umbrian	Oscan	Umbrian
2sg	-tud	-tu	-mur	-mu
3sg	-tud	-tu	-mur	-mu
2pl	-	-tuto	-	-mumo
3pl	-	-tuto	-	-mumo

The known examples of present imperatives are e.g. Umbrian *anserio* ‘observe!’, *stiplo* ‘draw up a law!’ (the letter o here represents -ā) and *ef* ‘go!’, where the former two represent an uninflected stem and the verb ‘to go’ has a special ending -f of uncertain origin. All other forms discussed are of future imperative.

The ending of the second and third singular active forms are -tud in Oscan (all Oscan forms found with this ending are of the third person (Buck:1904, 176)) and -tu in Umbrian, both these endings correspond to Latin -tō.

Examples: Umbrian *enetu* 'begin'(2sg), *eetu* 'let him go' and Oscan *likitud* 'let it be permitted'

The second- and third-person plural was formed with the ending *-tuto* where the element *-to* (representing *-tā*) is of uncertain origin. Examples Umbrian: *ambretuto* 'circumambulate!'(plural), *habituto* 'let them hold'.

All plural forms in Oscan are questioned (Buck:1904, 176).

As for the passive endings, the second-, as well as the third-person, singular was formed with *-mu* in Umbrian and *-mur* in Oscan originating from Osco-umbrian **-mōd* and modelled after **-tōd* in the active paradigm. The element *-d* was lost in Umbrian, in Oscan it was replaced with the element *-r*, which copies the development of the corresponding form in Latin. Examples: Umbrian *persnimu* 'pray'/'let him pray' and Oscan *censamur* 'let him be assessed'

The second- and third-person plural passive imperative was formed with *-mumo* in Umbrian, the pluralising element *-mo* (representing *-mā*) is modelled analogically to the element *-to* of the active paradigm. Examples: *pesnimumo* 'pray'/'let them pray'.

2.8 Conclusions to the Italic languages

After examining the imperative forms in Latin, Oscan and Umbrian, we can draw several conclusions:

- A. Latin did not preserve Proto-Indo-European present imperative forms in **-tu* and **-ntu*. Whether Oscan and Umbrian followed the same path as Latin is unknown due to the limitedness of the attested texts in these languages.
- B. Future imperative forms are syncretic due to the fact that these forms already were mostly the same in the proto-language. Nevertheless, Latin and Umbrian (and presumably Oscan) developed new plural forms, e.g. Latin *-tote* or Umbrian *-mumo* and *-tuto*.
- C. Passive future imperative forms in Latin and Oscan were formed analogically to the corresponding indicative forms using the passive element *-r*.
- D. Latin imperative clauses did not differ from indicative ones syntactically since the word order was free.
- E. With negators, Latin used rather subjunctive mood but using actual imperative forms was possible as well.

2.9 Example sentences for the Italic languages

2.9.1 Texts in Latin

A. Quaestor moram nei facito (CIL I².583.69 (Lex Acilia, 122 BC))
Quaestor:NOMsg **delay**:ACCsg **not** **make**:impv;fut;act;3sg
 'Let the quaestor not cause a delay.'

B. nepotisque tum eiei filio gnateis ceivis romanei
and.grandson:NOMpl **then of.his son**:DATsg **son**:NOMpl **citizen**:NOMpl **Roman**:NOMpl

iustei sunt... sufragium ferunto inque
by.right **be**:impv;fut;act;3pl **right.to.vote**:ACCsg **bear**:impv;fut;act;3pl **and.in**

eam tribum censento, militiaeque eis
that:fem;ACCsg **tribe**:ACCsg **register**:impv;fut;act;3pl **and.military.service**:Datsg **they**:DATpl

vocatio esto
calling:NOMsg **be**:impv;fut;act;3sg

'And let the grandsons and the sons of his son be Roman citizens by right... let them have the right to vote and be registered in that tribe, and let there be a call to military service for them.' (CIL I.583.77 (Lex Acilia, 122 BC).

C. Is eum agrum nei habeto nive fruimino
he t his:ACCsg **field**:ACCsg **not** **have**:impv;fut;act;3sg **nor** **enjoy**:impv;fut;act;3pl
 'Let him not have this field nor let them enjoy it' (CIL I.584.32 (Sent. Minuc., Genoa, 118 BC))

D. Belli gerendi ius Antiocho ne esto
war:GENsg **waging**:GENsg **right**:NOMsg **Antiochus**:DATsg **not** **be**:impv;fut;act;3sg

cum illis qui insulas colunt, neve in Europam
with that:ABLpl **who island**:ACCpl **inhabit**:ind;pres;act;3pl **nor** **in Europe**:ACCsg

transeundi. Excedito urbibus agris vicis castellis
crossing:GENsg **depart**:impv;fut;act;3sg **city**:ABLpl **field**:ABLpl **village**:ABLpl **fortress**:ABLpl

cis Taurum montem usque ad Tanaim amnem,
on.this.side.of **taurus**:ACCsg **mountain**:ACCsg **up.to** **to** **tanais**:ACCsg **river**:ACCsg

et ea valle Tauri usque ad iuga
and that:ABLsg **valley**:ABLsg **taurus**:GENsg **up.to** **to** **ridge**:ACCpl

qua in Lycaoniam vergit. Ne qua arma
which in **Lycaonia**:ACCsg **verge**:ind;pres;act;3sg **not any** **arm**:ACCpl

efferto ex iis oppidis agris castellisque
take.away:impv;fut;act;3sg **from that**:ABLpl **city**:ABLpl **field**:ABLpl **and.fortress**:ABLpl

quibus excedat. Si qua extulit, quo
from.which **depart**:subj;pres;act;3sg **if any** **take.away**:ind;perf;act;3sg **to.where**

quaque oportebit recte restituito.
each **ought.to.be**:ind;fut;act;3sg **properly** **restore**:impv;fut;act;3sg

Let there be no right for Antiochus to wage war with those who inhabit the islands, nor to cross into Europe. Let him depart from the cities, fields, villages, and fortresses on this side of Mount Taurus up to the Tanais River, and from that valley of Taurus up to the ridges which verge into Lycaonia. Let him not take any arms from those towns, fields, and fortresses from which he departs. If he takes

any, let him properly restore each to where it is necessary. (Liv. 38.38.3–5).

E. Duc nigras pecudes. Ea prima
lead:impv;pres;act;2sg **black:fem;ACCsg** **animal:ACCpl** **this:neut;ACCpl** **first:neut;ACCpl**

piacula sunt
offering:ACCpl **be:impv;fut;act;3pl**

'Lead the black animals. Let them be the first offerings.' (Verg. A. 6.153)

2.9.2 Text in Umbrian – Iguvine tablet III

A. huntak vuke prumu pehatu inuk uhturu urtes puntis frater **ustentatu** puře fratra
mersus fust kumnakle inuk uhtur vapeře kumnakle **sistu**
'First, purify the earthen (jar) in the grove; then, (by?) rising in groups of five, the **brothers must elect** an *actor* in the assembly of brothers; then, the **actor must sit** on the stone in the assembly.'

B. sakre uvem uhtur **teitu** puntēs terkantur inumek sakre uvem urtas putes fratrum
upetuta inumek via meruva arvamen **etuta**
'The **actor shall designate** a piglet (or victim) and a sheep; the groups of five must inspect them; when the groups of five have accepted the piglet and sheep (by?) rising, **they shall** then **go** along the accustomed way to the field.'

2.9.3 Text in Oscan – Tabula Bantina

A. **deiuatud** sipus comenei, perum dolum malum, siom ioc comono mais egmas
touti- (line 5)
'**he shall swear** wittingly in the assembly without guile, that he prevents this assembly rather for the sake of the public welfare...'

B. ...**factud** pous touto deiuatuns tanginom deicans, siom dateizasc idic tangineis...
(line 9)
'**let him make** the people pronounce judgment, after having sworn that they will such judgment...'

C. ...Suae pis contrud exeic fefacust auti comono hipust, molto etanto **estud**:
n. ① ①.(lines 11-12)
'...If anyone shall act or hold a council contrary to this, **let the fine be** 2000 sesterces.'

2.10 Greek

2.10.1 Introduction

Ancient Greek is one of the most studied and well-documented languages of the Indo-European family. It was spoken across the eastern Mediterranean and the Black Sea region from the early first millennium BC and developed into several dialects. The extensive and varied corpus of Ancient Greek texts, ranging from epic poetry and drama to philosophy and historical records, provides a rich source of data for linguistic analysis.

Ancient Greek has preserved many archaic features of Proto-Indo-European, making it a one of the key languages for its reconstruction. Greek's complex verb system, with its well-differentiated moods, voices, and tenses, provides valuable evidence for understanding the development of the Indo-European verbal morphology.

2.10.2 Morphology

As it is written above, Greek verbal morphology is complex, even more than that of Latin. Greek verbs are conjugated to three persons – first, second, third, three

numbers – singular, dual and plural, three voices – active, middle and passive, four moods – indicative, subjunctive, optative and imperative and seven tenses – present, imperfect, future, aorist, perfect, pluperfect and future perfect.

The Ancient Greek language has imperative forms for almost all possible number-person configurations, lacking only the forms for the first person. There is no distinction between present and future imperatives like in Latin, but Greek third-person forms do originate from the future imperative forms.

In the table below the endings are divided into two columns with the first representing the endings of the active forms and the second representing both middle and passive voice which are identical in imperative.

There are three types of imperatives – present, aorist and perfect. These forms do not express the tenses but the aspectual differences and are formed from the corresponding verb stems using the same ending.

Greek imperative endings		
	active	middle-passive
2sg	∅; -θι; -ς	-σο
	sigmatic aorist: - (σ)οῦν	sigmatic aorist: - (σ)αι
3sg	-τω	-σθω
2du	-τοῦν	-σθοῦν
3du	-τωνν	-σθωνν
2pl	-τε	-σθε
3pl	-τωνν, -τωνν, -τωνν, -τωσανν	-σθωνν, -(ν)σθω, -(ν)σθωνν, -σθωσανν

2.10.3 Etymology of the endings

2.10.3.1 Active

The second-person singular endings either use the bare stem or the endings -θι and -ς. The former comes from the Proto-Indo-European **-d^{hi}i* that, just like in the proto-language, is used with athematic verbs. The latter is limited only to certain root aorist forms and does not have generally accepted etymology. The origin of the ending -(σ)οῦν is obscure (Sihler: 1995, 603).

The third-person singular ending comes from the Proto-Indo-European **-tōd*, as it was written above.

The second-person dual ending is the same as indicative one which comes from the Proto-Indo-European **-tom*.

The third-person dual is made analogically to the third-person singular ending.

As for the third-plural ending, there are several options based on which dialect is used. The ending

-τωνν is formed by analogy from the third-person singular ending (Sihler: 1995, 604) and is used Doric and Northwest Greek. The form -τωνν is extended by the secondary ending -ν, found in Attic and Ionic.

The ending *-ντων* has double marking, found in Attic and Ionic. The form *-τωσαν* is extended by the aorist ending and is found in late Attic.

2.10.3.2 Middle and passive

The ending of the second person comes from the Proto-Indo-European ending **-so*. The sigmatic aorist ending is identical to the indicative ending which comes from the Proto-Indo-European ending **-th₂or* but has the vowel *a* instead of the expected *o*.

The third-person singular as well as the third-person dual and plural and the second-person plural endings are analogical to their active counterparts.

The second-person dual ending is identical to the indicative one that, according to Sihler (1995: 471) could come from the Proto-Indo-European ending **-Htoh₁*.

2.10.4 Use of imperatives

In Greek, imperatives are typically used as commands, permissions, and assumptions.

A. ἄγετε, ὦ ἄνδρες, δειπνήσατε μὲν ἅπερ
come.on oh man:VOCpl make.meal:impv;aor;act;2pl indeed that:fem;NOMsg
 καὶ ὡς ἐμέλλετε:
and that:masc;ACCpl be.destined:impv;pres;act;2pl
 ‘Come, my men, get dinner, just as you were intending to do anyway’ (Xen. Hell. 5.1.18)

B. οὐδὲ γὰρ εἰ πάνυ χρηστός ἐσθ', ὡς ἐμοῦ
but.not for if altogether good:masc;NOMsg until so mine:masc;GENsg
 γ' ἔνεκ' ἔστω...
at.least on.account.of be:impv;pres;act;3sg
 ‘For even if he is a really good man—and he may be...’ (Dem. 20 14)

2.10.5 Syntax

Just as in Latin, imperatives in Greek can occupy any position in a clause depending on various pragmatic factors the same way as other verbal forms.

2.10.6 Expression of grammatical categories

1. The same as in Latin, the first person cannot be expressed in the imperative paradigm and subjunctive is used instead.
2. Each person-number configuration has its own distinctive form, but the third-person dual and plural can have the same form depending on a dialect.
3. All imperative forms are future in meaning. Different tense forms of imperatives change their aspectual meaning.

2.10.7 Negative imperatives

To express prohibitions, the negative particle *μή* is used, or another negator. It requires a verb in either a subjunctive or an imperative form. As long as the verb is in the second or third person, either present imperative or aorist subjunctive has to be used, the form of aorist imperative is possible as well but it is rare (Weir Smyth: 1920, 409).

A. καὶ μηδεὶς γε ὑμῶν ἔχων
and no.one:masc;NOMsg at.any.rate of.you bearing:pres;act;masc;NOMsg

ταῦτα νομισάτω ἀλλότρια
this:neut;ACCpl **acknowledge**:impv;aor;act;3sg **belonging.to.another**:neut;ACCpl

ἔχειν:

bear:inf;pres;act

‘And let not one of you think that in having these things he has what does not belong to him.’ (Xen. Cyrop. 7.5.73)

B. μηδεὶς διδασκέτω
no.one:masc:NOMsg **tell**:impv;pres;act;3sg
‘let no one tell’ (Thuc. 1.86)

2.11 Conclusions to Greek

Now, we can draw certain conclusions about how imperatives work in Greek.

1. Imperative forms lack forms of the first person.
2. The Proto-Indo-European system of two imperatives was not preserved, but the original future imperative ending **-tōd* was repurposed for the third person singular form.
3. The third-person singular ending is the source to analogically create the forms of other person-number configurations.
4. The negative imperative forms can use both subjunctive and imperative proper in combination with the negative particle μή.
5. Although Greek imperatives distinguish several tenses, each form is still future in meaning, and the tenses here actually serve as aspects.

2.12 Example sentences for Greek

A. λεγέτω εἴ τι ἔχει
say:3sg,imp,act,prs if something:NOM-ACC,neut have:3sg,ind,act,prs

τοιούτου:

such:NOM-ACC,neut,sg

‘Let him say if he has something of that nature’ (Plat. Euthyph. 34a)

B. Ἔστω τὸ δοθὲν τρίγωνον
be:imp;prs;act;3sg the:neut;NOMsg given:neut;NOMsg triangle:NOMsg

τὸ ΑΒΓ· δεῖ δὴ εἰς
the:neut;NOMsg abc be.necessary:ind;prs;act;3sg indeed into

τὸ ΑΒΓ τρίγωνον κύκλον ἐγγράψαι:
the:neut;NOMsg abc triangle:NOMsg circle:ACCsg inscribe:inf;aor;act

‘Let ABC be the given triangle. So it is required to inscribe a circle in triangle ABC.’ (Euc, 4:4)

C. Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς
father:VOCsg we:GEN who:NOM in the:masc;DATpl heaven:DATpl

ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου
hallow:imp;aor;pass;3sg the:neut;NOMsg name:NOMsg you:GEN

‘Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name.’ (lord’s prayer)

D. οὕτως λαμψάτω τὸ φῶς ὑμῶν
thus shine:impv;aor;act;3sg the:neut;NOMsg light:NOMsg of.you

ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων
before the:masc;GENpl men:GENpl

‘Let your light so shine before men’ (Matthew 5:16)

E. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ, ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς,
answer:part;aor;pass;masc;NOMsg now say:ind;imp;act;3sg they:masc;DATsg

Ὁ ἔχων δύο χιτῶνας,
the:masc;NOMsg have:part;pres;act;masc;NOMsg two:masc;ACCpl tunic:ACCpl

μεταδότω τῷ μὴ ἔχοντι
impart:impv;aor;act;3sg the:masc;DATsg none have:part;pres;act;masc;DATsg

‘He answereth and saith unto them, He that hath two coats, let him impart to him that hath none’ (Luke 3:11)

2.13 Vedic

2.13.1 Introduction

Vedic was the ancient language of the Indian subcontinent and the language of the Vedas – the oldest sacred texts of Hinduism. The Vedas composed mostly in the second millennium BC provide us valuable material for linguistic analysis.

Retaining many features from Proto-Indo-European, Vedic is as well crucial for reconstruction of the proto-language and understanding the evolution of the Indo-European languages in general.

2.13.2 Morphology

Vedic verbal system is highly complex and similarly to Greek preserved some grammatical features that other sister languages did not, e.g. dual number. The categories that Vedic verbs are conjugated to are mostly similar to Greek. There are three persons – first, second, and third, three numbers – single, dual, and plural, 2 voices – active, middle, and passive, 5 tenses – present, imperfect, perfect, aorist, and future, and 5 moods – indicative, optative, subjunctive, injunctive and imperative.

In the following table the endings are divided into two columns by voice. The middle and passive share the same column since passive in Vedic is not formed by a separate set of endings, but with the special suffix attached before the middle endings.

Vedic imperative endings		
	Active	Middle-passive
2sg	Ø, tāt, dhi, hi	sva
3sg	tu	tām, ām
2du	tam	ethām, athām
3du	tām	etām, atām
2pl	ta, tana	dhvām
3pl	(a)-ntu	ntām, atām

2.13.3 Etymology of the endings

2.13.3.1 Active

In the second person, thematic verbs use bare stem, while athematic ones use endings dhi and hi that both come from the Proto-Indo-European **-d^hi*. The ending -tāt comes from **-tōd*.

In later stages, the ending -tāt could be used for other person-number forms as well, making its use similar to Latin, although Vedic did not innovate distinct forms for other person-number configurations like Latin did.

The third-person singular and plural are the continuation of the forms from the proto-language.

The dual endings come from the secondary Proto-Indo-European endings **-tom* and **-tām*.

The second-person plural ending -ta reflects *-te. The ending -tana is found only in some verbs, but the element -na could have something in common with the Hittite -n in the second-person plural ending -ten(i).

2.13.3.2 Middle

The second-person singular ending reflects original *-so with added -v-.

The dual endings are identical to those of indicative imperfect.

The third-person singular and both second- and third-person plural forms reflect the Proto-Indo-European *-to, *-d^hwo, and *-nto respectively. The vowel a in the third-person ending -a^ham comes from syllabic n.

The origin of the element -m in these ending is the subject of scholarly debates.

2.13.4 Use of imperatives

The imperative mood in Vedic is used to express commands and desires in the widest sense.

- A. áheḷamāno varuṇehá bodhi-
not.being.angry:masc;NOMsg **varuna.here** **be:impv;aor;act;2sg**
 ‘Varuṇa, stay thou here and be not angry’ (01.024.11)

- B. prá vām aśnotu suṣṭutír
forth **you:ACCdu** **reach:impv;pres;act;3sg** **hymn.of.praise:NOMsg**

índrāvaruṇa yām huvé
indra.varuna:VOCdu **that:fem;ACCsg** **call.out:ind;pres;mid;1sg**

yām ṛdháthe sadhástim
that:fem;ACCsg **dignify:subj;aor;mid;2du** **praise:ACCsg**
 ‘O Indra-Varuṇa, to you may fair praise which I offer come, joint eulogy which ye dignify.’ (01.017.09)

2.13.5 Syntax

The functionally neuter word order in Vedic is SOV where the verb takes the clause-final position. Nevertheless, similarly to the above-discussed languages, the verb can take any position depending on the pragmatic factors, even in the imperative mood.

2.13.6 Expression of grammatical categories

- The first person is absent in the imperative paradigm.
- Each person-number configuration has its own distinct form. Only third-person dual and plural can be identical in some cases.
- The same as in the languages from the previous parts of the work, all imperative forms imply futurity.

2.13.7 Negative imperatives

The Vedic imperative forms cannot be negated. Instead, Vedic uses the construction with the negative particle má (cognate of the Greek μή) and forms of the injunctive mood (the mood that comes from the corresponding mood in Proto-Indo-European).

- A. má na indra párá vṛṇag
not **we:ACC** **indra:VOCsg** **away** **turn:inj;pres;act;2sg**

'O Indra, turn us not away' (08.097.07)

- B. viśváyan mā na ā gan
swell:part;pres;act;neut;NOMsg **not we**:ACCpl **from come**:inj;aor;act;3sg
'let not any swelling thing come near us' (07.050.01)

2.14 Conclusions to Vedic

Having covered the imperative forms in Vedic, we can now draw the conclusions to the last language analysed in this work.

- Vedic preserved the original third-person active forms in **-tu* and **-ntu*.
- The future imperative ending **-tōd* was preserved in the form of *-tāt*, but its usage initially was limited to the second person.
- Imperatives cannot be negated in Vedic. Injunctive forms in combination with the negative particle are used instead.

2.15 Example sentences for Vedic

- A. sástu mātā sástu pitā
sleep:impv;prs;act;3sg **mother**:NOMsg **sleep**:impv;prs;act;3sg **father**:NOMsg
- sástu śvā sástu viśpātiḥ
sleep:impv;prs;act;3sg **dog**:NOMsg **sleep**:impv;prs;act;3sg **master.of.house**:NOMsg
- śasántu sárve jñātáyaḥ
sleep:impv;prs;act;3pl **all**:masc;NOMpl **kinsman**:NOMpl
- sástu ayám abhíto jánaḥ
sleep:impv;prs;act;3sg **this**:masc;NOMsg **all.around** **people**:NOMsg
'sleep mother, let the father sleep, sleep dog and master of the house. let all the kinsmen sleep, sleep all the people who are round about.' (07.055.05)
- B. éndro barhíḥ sídatu pínvatām
indra:NOMsg **sacred.grass**:ACCsg **sit.down**:impv;prs;act;3sg **swell.up**:impv;prs;mid;3sg
- ílā bṛhaspātiḥ sāmabhir ṛkvó
libation:NOMsg **Bṛhaspati**:NOMsg **song**:INSpl **singing**:masc;NOMpl
- arcatu supraketām jīváse mánma
praise:impv;prs;act;3sg **auspicious**:neut;ACCsg **live**:inf;Datsg **thought**:ACCsg
- dhīmahi tát devānām ávo adyā
put:opt;aor;mid;1pl **that**:neut;ACCsg **god**:GENpl **favour**:ACCsg **today**
- vṛṇīmahe
choose:ind;prs;mid;1pl
'Full flow libations; on our grass let Indra sit; Bṛhaspati the singer laud with Sâma hymns! Wise be our hearts' imaginings that we may live. We crave this gracious favour of the Gods to-day.' (10.036.05)
- C. índraḥ sutrāmā svávāṃś ávobhiḥ
indra:NOMsg **good.protector**:NOMsg **helpful**:masc;NOMsg **aid**:INSpl

sumṛlīkó bhavatu viśvāvedāḥ
gracious:masc;NOMsg **be:imp;prs;act;3sg** **all.knowing:masc;ACCsg**

bádhatām dvéṣo ábhayaṁ kṛnotu
oppose:imp;prs;mid;3sg **hatred:NOMsg** **fearlessness:ACCsg** **make:impv;prs;act;3sg**

suvíryasya pátayaḥ syāma
herokind:GENsg **lord:NOMpl** **be:opt;prs;act;1pl**

‘Indra is strong to save, rich in assistance may he, possessing all, be kind and gracious. May he disperse our foes and give us safety, and may we be the lords of hero vigour.’ (10.131.06)

D. mātṛa pūṣann āghṛṇa irasyo
not.here **pushan:VOCsg** **radiant:masc;VOCsg** **be.angry:inj;prs;act;2sg**

várūtrī yád rātiśācaś ca rāsan
varutri:NOMsg **who:ACCsg** **gift:NOMpl** **and** **give:subj;aor;act;3pl**

mayobhúvo no árvanto ní pāntu
bringing.joy:NOMpl **we:ACC** **horse:NOMpl** **protect:imp;prs;act;3pl**

vṛṣṭím párijmā vāto dadātu
rain:ACCsg **wandering.around:NOMsg** **vata** **give:imp;prs;act;3sg**

‘Be not thou angry here, O glowing Pūshan, for what Varūtrī and the Bounteous gave us. May the swift-moving Gods protect and bless us, and Vāta send us rain, wha wanders round us.’ (07.040.06)

E. viśám gávām yātudhānāḥ pibantu-
poison:ACCsg **cow:GENpl** **fiend:NOMpl** **drink:imp;prs;act;3pl**

á vṛścyantām áditaye durévāḥ
from split.up:imp;prs;pass;3pl **aditi:DATsg** **evildoer:NOMpl**

párainān devāḥ savitā dadātu
away.they:ACC **god:NOMsg** **savitar:NOMsg** **give:imp;prs;act;3sg**

pārā bhāgám óśadhīnām jayantām
away part:ACCsg **plant:GENpl** **lose:imp;prs;mid;3pl**

‘Let the fiends drink the poison of the cattle; may Aditi cast off the evildoers. May the God Savitar give them up to ruin, and be their share of plants and herbs denied them.’ (10.087.18)

F. ucchváñcamānā pṛthivī sú tiṣṭhatu
opening.self:NOMsg **earth:NOMsg** **properly** **stand:imp;prs;act;3sg**

sahásram míta úpa hí śráyantām
thousand:NOMsg **pillar:NOMpl** **here** **indeed** **above.lean:imp;prs;mid;3pl**

té gṛhāso gṛtaścúto bhavantu
that:masc;NOMpl **house:NOMpl** **dripping.with.lipid:NOMpl** **be:imp;prs;act;3pl**

viśvāhāsmāi śaraṇāḥ santu átra
always.this:masc;DATsg **defending:masc;NOMpl** **be:imp;prs;act;3pl** **here**

‘Now let the heaving earth be free from motion: yea,– let a thousand clods remain above him. Be they to him a home distilling fatness, here let them ever be his place of refuge.’ (10.018.12)

Now, with all the selected languages described, analysed and compared, we can turn to drawing the final conclusions, generalising the findings, highlighting the commonalities and differences between how the languages developed, and then define the shortcomings of the analysis conducted as well as the potential for future research.

3. Final conclusions

This thesis set out to explore the third-person imperative forms across several old Indo-European languages, with the goal of uncovering the similarities, differences, and unique developments within each language's verbal system.

Our analysis revealed that while third-person imperatives are a common feature across Indo-European languages, their forms and usages exhibit significant diversity. Based on the research conducted above, we can come to the following relevant conclusions about the third-person imperatives in the analysed languages.

1. While not all the selected languages preserved the original third-person active forms in **-tu* and **-ntu*. Such languages employed either future imperative ending **-tōd*, like in the case of Greek *-τω*, or another verbal mood, like Latin with its subjunctive.
2. Third-person active ending can serve as a source of analogical change to other voices and even person. We could see it in the Anatolian middle endings *-aru/-taru* and *-antaru*, and in the Luwian second-person active ending *-ranu* where the element *-u* is analogical to the third person. Another instance of such process is in Greek, where the third-person singular active was a source for analogical change in the third-person dual active ending *-των* and third-person plural active *-ντων*, *-των*, *-ντων*, *-τωσαν*. Middle-passive third-person singular, dual, and plural, as well as the second-person plural, are analogical as well, but ultimately come from the third-person singular active.
3. Third-person imperative form can use other person-number forms as a source of analogical change as well. The Umbrian pluralising marker *-mo* in the third-person passive imperative forms modelled after the corresponding active plural marker *-to* is the example.
4. Third-person imperatives do not behave differently from their counterparts in other persons on syntactic level. The only slight difference is in Latin where the future imperatives of the third person are preferred in clauses with indefinite subjects.
5. Only Vedic preserved the original third-person middle endings **-to* and **-nto*. Hittite preserved them as well, but extended them with the element *-r*

and then, by analogy to active forms, with the element-u.

6. Latin and Oscan share the same innovation of forming the third-person future imperative form adding a passive-marker -r to the ending.

These findings contribute to our understanding of the linguistic diversity within the Indo-European family. By examining how different languages adapted and transformed imperative forms, this thesis sheds light on the broader processes of language change.

While this study has provided a detailed analysis of third-person imperatives in selected languages, there are limitations to the scope of this work. Future research could expand on this study by exploring third-person imperatives in other Indo-European languages, such as Tocharian, Gothic or Celtic, or by conducting a more detailed analysis of negative imperatives. Additionally, comparative studies with non-Indo-European languages could offer new perspectives on the universality and variation of imperative forms and their development.

In conclusion, this thesis has highlighted the rich tapestry of linguistic forms and structures that characterize the Indo-European language family. By focusing on a specific grammatical feature—the third-person imperative—this research deepens our understanding of the development of the Indo-European languages.

Literature and resources

General work on imperatives:

Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (2010). *Imperatives and Commands*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

General works on Proto-Indo-European:

Oswald J.L. Szemerényi (1996). *Introduction to Indo-European linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Robert S.P. Beekes (2011). *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics. An Introduction*.

Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company

Works on Anatolian languages:

Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. and H. Craig Melchert (2008). *A grammar of the Hittite Language. Part 1: Reference Grammar*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns

H. Craig Melchert (2003). *The Luwians*. Leiden: Brill

Anna Morpurgo Davies. *The personal endings of the Hieroglyphic Luwian verb*. Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung 94. Bd., 1./2. H. (1980), pp. 86-108.

Onofrio Carruba (1970). *Das Palaische Texte, Grammatik, Lexikon*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrsowitz.

John David Hawkins (2000). *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions, Volume 1, Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Works on Greek and Italic languages

Harm Pinkster (2015). *Oxford Latin Syntax, Volume 1, The Simple Clause*. USA: Oxford University Press.

Carl Darling Buck (1904). *A grammar of Oscan and Umbrian with a collection of inscriptions and a glossary*. USA: Ginn and Company.

Andrew L. Sihler (1995). *New comparative grammar of Greek and Latin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Herbert Weir Smyth (1920). *Greek Grammar for colleges*. University of Michigan Library

Works on Vedic

Arthur Anthony Macdonell (1916). *A Vedic grammar for students*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.

Online resources

VedaWeb: [VedaWeb \(uni-koeln.de\)](http://uni-koeln.de)

Perseus Digital Library: [Perseus Digital Library \(tufts.edu\)](http://tufts.edu)

Hethitologie Portal Mainz: [HPM Hethitologie-Portal Mainz \(uni-wuerzburg.de\)](http://uni-wuerzburg.de)

eDiAna. Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of the Minor Ancient Anatolian
Corpus Languages: [eDiAna – Home \(uni-muenchen.de\)](http://uni-muenchen.de)