



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

In Homer the root  $dēik^1$  is of social rather than sacral import:  $δείκνυται$  (salutes, welcomes, pledges with a cup); and in the same sense  $δεικανόωντο$   $δειδίσκετο$  (:  $δειδισκόμενος$ ). Nor must we any longer, under the spell of the phonetic system that obtained prior to the elucidation of the long diphthong series, follow Wackernagel (*BB* 4. 269) in the mischievous correction to  $δήκνυται$ . In Latin, the  $i$  of the diphthong has been lost altogether in *decus*, honor (: Skr. *daśasyāti*); but *dicat* (consecrates) and *dignus* (honored, honorable > worthy) contain it; cf.  $ἀρι-δείκετος$  and see *AJP* 31. 415. A secondary root  $dek^1s$  remains in RV. in impv. *dakṣatā* (do homage), construed (as sometimes  $dās$ ) with dative of receiver.

9. That the root  $dēik^1$  (acclaim) is anything but a specialized aspect of the root written  $deik^1$  (to point out, show, in Skr.  $dīs$ ), or conversely, I cannot believe. Clue enough to the special sense is furnished by the Aeschylean compound  $δακτυλό-δεικτος$  (= *digitis monstratus* > honored, conspicuous). I also compare our Biblical *shew-bread*. Personally I think that in the sept of  $dāsati$  the long diphthong series is archaic in the sacral and social word, and is older than the short diphthong series of *dico*,  $δείκνυμι$ . The reduplication of  $δειδίσκετο$  is the intensive reduplication of Skr. *dēdīṣṭe* (displays), formally\* allocated to  $dīs$  instead of  $dās$ . Again, we should not correct to  $δηδίσκετο$ .

## HINDIISMS IN SANSKRIT AGAIN: A REPLY TO PROFESSOR FAY

FRANKLIN EDGERTON

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

MY DERIVATION of *ādeśa*, 'salutation,' from Hindi (or some related dialect) *ādes* evidently goes very much against the grain with Professor Fay; for he thinks of at least three distinct and alternative ways of avoiding it. It puzzles me to discover why the suggestion should seem to him *a priori* so improbable, as apparently it does. But of that later. Let me first consider his alternative suggestions.

1. He thinks *ādeśam dattvā* need not mean 'giving a saluta-

tion,' but may mean simply 'giving a signal (to proceed).' The sage's response to the king's *ādeśa* is a benediction, *sukhī bhava*. The like of this is regularly delivered by a saint to anyone (king or other person) whom he may meet, *in response to a respectful salutation*. The salutation is represented as a necessary preliminary to the blessing. If occasionally in such cases no prior salutation is specifically mentioned, that only means that it is taken for granted, because the idea of its necessity is so commonplace and familiar. In another recension of the Vikramacarita the same king tests the omniscience of another saint by saluting him only *mentally* (that is, without words or other outward sign); when the sage offers a benediction, the king says 'Why do you bless me *when I have not greeted you?*' To this the sage replies that by means of his omniscience he perceived the *mental* greeting of the king. (This incident is found in *Indische Studien*, 15. 285.) The royal permission is not needed for a religious person to address the king; on the contrary, the saint ranks higher than the king, and it is the king's duty to salute him first. This is commonplace throughout all Hindu literature. Professor Fay's suggested interpretation of *ādeśa* is therefore un-Hindu.

2. Granting the meaning 'salutation,' Professor Fay thinks this meaning of *ādeśa* may be derived from Sanskrit uses of the root (*ā*)*diś*. Two of his suggestions may be grouped here.

(a) He calls to mind the phrase *diṣṭyā* (*vardhase*), a form of congratulation (not of salutation). The literal meaning of this phrase is not entirely clear. But certainly *diṣṭi* does not mean anything like salutation; and indeed Professor Fay's suggestion implies a very violent transfer of meaning based on a very vague psychological connexion. Another objection is that *diṣṭi* is not *ādiṣṭi*, and that in semantics you cannot jump from a simple base to one of its compounds without hesitation.

(b) Deserving of much more serious consideration is the claim that *ādideśati* in RV. 6. 56. 1 means 'salutes.' If this were so, or if any form or derivative of *ādiś* in Sanskrit could be shown to have such a meaning, then Professor Fay would have some apparent ground for questioning my etymology. I shall endeavor to show in the paper which follows this that he is wrong about *ādideśati*, and that in the Rigveda at least no such meaning attaches to any form or derivative of *ādiś*. Even if I were wrong

in this (and after reading Professor Fay's Rejoinder I am still fully convinced that I am right), I do not think that the question of *ādeśa* would be seriously affected thereby. The power of the counter-argument would be more apparent than real. Professor Fay has not been able to show any trace of the meaning 'salute' in any derivative of *ādiś* later than the Rigveda. Yet the word and its derivatives are very common in later Sanskrit. I should hesitate long before jumping from the Rigveda to more than a thousand years A. D., with no intervening link, on a point concerning the meaning of a word which is very commonly used in other meanings throughout the whole of the intervening period. It is not unimportant, either, that the actual form *ādeśa* does not occur in the Rigveda at all. So far as we know, *ādeśa* means, in all periods of Sanskrit where it occurs, 'command, instruction' or the like; until suddenly, like a bolt out of the clear sky, in a single occurrence in a work composed more than a thousand years A. D., we find it meaning 'salutation.' And then we find that Hindi *ādes* means, very commonly though not invariably, the same thing. To refuse to accept the obvious inference requires more self-denial than I have.

3. Professor Fay's third line of attack involves a series of interesting and ingenious etymological suggestions by which he seeks to link *ādeśa* in particular, and the root *diś* in general, with a number of other words in Sanskrit and related languages which mean 'honor, respect' and the like. His language in this part of his paper is not always quite clear to me. For instance, he says '*ādeśa* (greeting) may belong by honest descent to the sept of *dāśati* (does homage).' If he means by this that *ādeśa* may be directly connected with *dāś*, and only more remotely (if at all) with *ā-diś*, then I cannot follow him. Indeed, I cannot even argue with him on that point; for it implies the non-recognition of what to me are axiomatic principles. To my mind *ādeśa* 'greeting' is either a Sanskrit word by 'honest descent' (or derivation) from *ā-diś*, or it is not a Sanskrit word at all. A third alternative seems to me to be entertainable only by an act of faith. My own view is that it is not a Sanskrit word at all, but a Hindi (or other modern) word.

On the other hand, if Professor Fay only means that *diś*, 'indicate, show,' belongs to a group of Indo-European words some of which have developed such meanings as 'honor, revere,

salute'; then, if his etymologies are sound (they seem to me pretty bold), they would indeed be of use in explaining the origin of this meaning of the Hindi *ādes*. For they would furnish interesting semantic parallels for the development of this word from Sanskrit *ādeśa* 'direction, prescription, aim' or the like (but not 'salutation').

The only point at issue would then be whether the meaning 'salutation' for *ādeśa* developed in Sanskrit, or whether it developed in a modern dialect and came into Sanskrit as a back-formation. Now, it is of course well-known to all that Sanskrit—even much older Sanskrit than the Vikramacarita—is 'chuck full' of back-formations from the Middle Indic dialects, that is from popular speech. Buddhist Sanskrit is the prize example of this; a large part of it is only rudely and imperfectly Sanskritized Pāli (or some related dialect). But all periods of the language are sufficiently full of the same sort of thing. Now then, if the very common Sanskrit word *ādeśa* never shows any meaning like 'salutation,' except in the one passage discovered by me; and if the verb *ā-diś* and its other derivatives are equally negative; and if we find that, in Hindi, *ādes* is an extremely familiar and commonplace word in this meaning; then—I do not see what *dignus*, *decus*, or even *dās*, can have to do with the question (except, as aforesaid, perhaps as semantic parallels). *Hier stehe ich; ich kann nicht anders.*

Let me put a hypothetical question to Professor Fay. Let us assume that in a scholastic Latin treatise written in Bologna in the fourteenth century we find a common Latin word—say *dictio*—used in a sense in which it is otherwise unknown, even in medieval Latin, but in which its Italian equivalent is very well known and common. Would Professor Fay look to Old Persian and Lithuanian relatives of the original Latin root to find the explanation of the isolated usage? Would he even trouble himself to go far afield among Plautine or Ciceronian cognates of the root in question—particularly among supposed cognates whose relationship is at best doubtful, and certainly cannot have been apparent to the users of the language (as *dās*: *diś*)? The parallel seems to me perfect.

The same considerations apply to *lāti*. No Hindi scholar, so far as appears, doubts the fact that Hindi *le-nā* (*nā* is the infinitive ending, the 'root' is *le*) is derived from Prakritic forms of

*labh*. (See Platts, *Hindustani Dictionary*, s. v.; Hoernle, *Comp. Gram. of the Gaudian Languages*, p. 70.) In Bengali the root is *la* (infinitiv *la-ite*), and Hindi dialects hav *lainā* (Platts, *l. c.*). The late appearance of *lāti*, plus its correspondence with these words, is to my mind sufficient evidence that it is from a popular dialect, and that all attempts to connect it with IE. elements *le* or *la* ar useless and misleading. The only question open to discussion is whether it is a Prakritism or coms from a more modern dialect. In favor of the latter alternativ may be mentiond the following facts. There is no Prakrit base *lā*, so far as I can find. There is indeed a Prakrit *le* (Hemacandra, 4. 238; see reff. there quoted in Pischel's translation), which Pischel thinks probably connected with *lāti*, but which I think more likely belongs with Sanskrit *lī* (as Pischel also considers possible); cf. Karpūramañjarī, ed. Konow (*HOS* 4), 1. 13. At any rate *lāti* could with difficulty be derived from Prakrit *le*. It apparently coms from a dialect in which the vowel was *ǎ*. Cf. the Hindi dialect form *lainā*, and Bengali *la*; the standard Hindi *le* is apparently not to be connected with Prakrit *le* (even if the latter belongs in this group at all), but its *e* is a contraction of *a-i*, in which the original vowel of the root appears. The compound *lānā* (for *le-ānā*), 'to bring,' may possibly, but in my opinion not probably, be the origin of *lāti*.

Again, the disappearance of medial intervocalic *h* is a familiar (tho not exactly common) fenomenon in the modern dialects (cf. Hoernle, *l. c.*; Kellogg, *Grammar of the Hindi Language*, p. 54). In Prakrit, on the other hand, it is rare. Indeed, Pischel (*BB* 3. 246 f., *Grammatik der Prakrit Sprachen*, p. 184) categorically and dogmatically denies that it ever occurs; but I think this is too sweeping, cf. Weber, *Hāla*<sup>1</sup> (*AKM* 5. 3), p. 29; *Hāla*<sup>2</sup> (*AKM* 7. 4), on strofes 4, 410, 584, especially on strofe 4. This is an additional reason for not connecting Prakrit *le* with *labh* (*lā*), besides its meaning ('to lay on'), which does not seem to fit the latter easily. If we bar out *le*, there ar no Prakritic forms of *labh* except those containing an *h* as representativ of the Skt. *bh*.

For these reasons it seems to me fair to assume that *lāti* coms from a modern, post-Prakritic dialect. This is certainly what Monier Williams intended to suggest in his *Sanskrit Dictionary*, s. v. Whether the suggestion has also been made elsewhere I

am not sure. It seems to me so obvious that I feel sure it would hav becom commonplace ere now, but for the facts that (1) *lāti* is so rare and late a word in Sanskrit, and (2) comparatively few Sanskritists, unhappily, kno anything about the modern dialects.

## STUDIES IN THE VEDA

FRANKLIN EDGERTON

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

### 8. *Ā-diś* IN THE RIGVEDA.<sup>1</sup>

NO CAREFUL STUDY of *ā-diś* and its derivativs in the Rigveda has yet been made. The nearest approach to one is found in Oldenberg's remarks, *ZDMG* 55. 292, and *Rgveda Noten* on 6. 4. 5. Oldenberg finds that *ādīś* as a noun usually refers to 'feindliche Anschläge.' This I believ to be tru; but I think that both the noun and the verb can be more accurately defined.

My belief is that the verb *ā-diś* (always in RV a reduplicating present, *ādīdeśati*, or intensiv, *ādēdiṣṭe*) means invariably 'to aim at' (with hostil intent), nearly always in the literal sense, 'to aim with a wepon at' (with accusativ of the person or thing aimd at). The noun *ādīś* likewise always means 'aim,' and in evry case except possibly one or two it also implies hostil intent.

Fundamental ar the two passages 9. 70. 5<sup>cd</sup> and 10. 61. 3<sup>cd</sup>. The first reads:

*vīṣū śuśmeṇa bādhatē vī durmatīr ādēdiśānaḥ śaryahēva  
śurūdhah.*

'The viril (Indra) overcoms the evil-disposed by his furious energy, aiming at them as an archer at opposing warriors (? *śurūdhah* of uncertain meaning, but cannot affect the question).—The second reads:

*ā yāḥ śaryābhis tuvinṛmno asyāsrīṇītādīśam gābhastāu.*

'Who with vigorous strength prepares his aim with arrows in the hand.'

Most of the occurrences of *ā-diś* as a verb belong so obviously

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Fay, above, page 83. For the first seven Studies in this series, see *AJP* 35. 435 ff., *JAOS* 35. 240 ff., *AJP* 40. 175 ff.