



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.

REJOINDER TO PROFESSOR EDGERTON*

EDWIN W. FAY

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

1. TO MAKE an Irish reply to Professor Edgerton's hypothetical question (p. 87), what I wish to know is whether the author or editor of the *Vikramacarita* and the late users of the verb *lāti* employed Sanskrit as a vernacular and mother-tongue, whether they thought in Sanskrit (I do not mean to the exclusion of a Prakritic or Hindi dialect). If these authors had received Sanskrit *viva voce vivisque auribus* it is entirely possible that they introduced into Sanskrit literature words not written into our record but, in point of origin, of hoary antiquity. Grammatical citations apart, *parut* (: *πέρυσσι*) is not of record. This shows the possibility of a most ancient word never being included in the literary record (supposing us to have it all!), and leaves us to infer that Pāṇini took the example from the speech of his own time. The IE. character of *parut* would have guaranteed its authenticity even if, without Pāṇini's citation, it had emerged as late as *lāti*. Again, the history of the root *stigh*, long known only through the questionable medium of Dhātupāṭha, shows us how a word of most certain IE. origin was restricted, not (so far as I know) to a definitely ascertainable locality, but to the canticles of a restricted Vedic sect. The relation of literary Sanskrit to the genuine vernaculars is a thorny problem. From the time of the great Epics on, Sanskrit was not, in the narrow sense, a vernacular. But the language was imparted *viva voce* and received *vivis auribus*, so that it actually functioned as a standardized class or caste dialect, and its speakers were bilingual. In a genuine, if restricted, sense, this dialect must have begun as speech, so that the question arises at what time, in which century (sorites-wise) from 200 B. C. (shall I say?) down to 1500 A. D., the colloquial founts dried up. For *lāti* and *ādeśa* there is also the other question of a possible bookish source (see § 9, note). If a word of good IE. stamp appeared first in the learned Epic of Apollonius or in Callimachos I should not question its genuineness as Greek, even

* Revised by the author after reading Edgerton's following 'Counter-Rejoinder.'

though the vernacular of these authors was Hellenistic. I cannot think the lateness of *lāti* substantially different from the lateness of *sthaḡayati* (covers): Lat. *tegīt*; or of *hadati* which, exception made of Epic *-hāda*, is classical only, but surely of IE. provenance. Also note *itar*, primary derivative of *i*, but not found till Vāsavadattā, see Gray's edition, pp. 202, 214.

The vocalism of *lāti*.

2. I could not think, because of the conflict of vowels in Sk. *lāti* and Hindi *le-nā*, that the lexicon of Monier Williams meant to assert the express derivation of the one from the other; nor did I feel sure—though I am compelled to speak without due lexical aids—that the contracted Hindi form *lāna* < *le-ānā* was earlier than the emergence of *lāti*. [And now exactly so for the Bengali root *lā*.] On the other hand, the morphological relation between *lāti* and *labhati* has so many analogues to confirm it in IE. grammar that a theory of late emergence, but early origin, for *lāti* is not to be put out of court till something like philological proof of origin from an Indic vernacular is assured. In brief, a colloquial option between *lāti* and *labhati* may always have existed in that Primary Prākṛit from which Sanskrit came, without one of the terms having emerged till a late period. Even what one takes for the commonest words may emerge relatively late into the written record, for instance Eng. *leg die bull* (see Royster in *Studies in Philology*, 14. 235).

[2a. In my original critique I failed to mention—because I did not know it then—that Wackernagel (*Ai. Gram.* § 80) had tentatively proposed the correlation of *lāti* (root *lāu*) with Lat. *lucrum* (gain, takings). The very dialect forms cited by Professor Edgerton, however, make for the root *lēi*—perhaps from (*t*)*lēi*, cf. my explanation of Lat. *clē-mens*: *καλαί-φρων* as toyed with by Walde on p. 868 and then on p. xx. There is an undoubted Prākṛit root *le* and, whatever Pischel may have thought when he was translating Hemacandra, he categorically correlates the absolutives *levi lēppīnu levīnu* with Sk. *lā* in his Prākṛit Grammar § 588. Then Pk. *le* is from *lēi* (: *lēi* : : Av. *pai* : *pāi*, see Bartholomae's *Grammar*, § 122. 10). We actually have Pk. *lenti* in the Karpūra-mañjarī 1. 13, as follows:

lenti na taha aṅgami (loc. sg.) *kuppāsaam*
and do not put on a bodice (Lanman).

After Plautus Amphitruo 999, *capiam coronam mi in caput*, I feel free to render our sentence by

capiant non tum (for neque, postponed) <sibi> in membra uesticulam.

How a proper sense for *lenti* here—and I have gone over the usage of *lī* carefully in the Petersburg lexica—can be arrived at from Sk. *lī* (cling) I cannot divine.—In Sanskrit the flexion of the root *k'ēi* (to lie)—so Brugmann correctly writes it in *IF* 6. 98; cf. Bartholomae, *Lex.* 1571—generalizes the midgrade *k'ai* (*séte*, accent abnormal). In Greek *keírai* *k'ēi* is generalized. In Sk. *lā[i]ti* : Pk. *lenti* we have the alternation *ē[i]/ai*. That *lī* would be a legitimate form of *lā[i]* in Sanskrit is true enough, and we might in fact derive Pk. *levi* from **lītvī*, cf. Sk. *pītvī* : *pāti* (root *pōi*). An Indic root *lāi* | *lāi* is recognized by Franke, *BB* 23. 177, in Pāli *layati* (harvests). Now this is the root of *lāti*. For the sense of *reaps* (i. e. harvests, gathers) from *takes* (seizes) cf. Cicero, *Sen.* 70, *tempora demetendis fructibus et percipiendis*, with Cato's more generalized usage (*Agr.* 4. 1) in the turn *fructi plus capies*. Further note Skt. √ *grabh* (: Eng. *grabs*), cognate with Germ. *Garbe* (sheaf of the reapers).]

i. Whether 1 *ādeśa* (indicium) came to mean salutation.

3. If a sage could utter a benediction to a Hindu king in response to a merely mental salutation (an assumed glum silence, one suspects, to intensify the test of the sage's prescience) our sage might well have acknowledged the same king's intimation (cf. Lat. *indicat*) or signal (to proceed, of attention; look of recognition),¹ and that quite duly. When a king of England 'commands' a singer or other artist, what remains formally a command is in fact a great courtesy, with all the effect of a salutation. Note that in Latin, by way of ellipsis, but ellipsis is one of the standing elements in semantic development, *iubeo* (sc. *saluere*) means *saluto*.—I still think that one who said *diṣṭyā* (*salue*; lit. with homage) might have turned for its cases to *ādeśa*, a flexional word in being. In Iranian the correspondent of *ādeśa* is Av. *ādišti*, whence the semantic proportion Indo-Iran. *ā-dišti* (*indicium*) : Sk. *ā-deśa* : : *diṣṭyā* (with

¹ The closest synonym of *ādeśa* is *ājñā*, which means not only command but also, as I here assume for *ādeśa*, permission.

homage): (2) *ādeśa* (if = salutation). In Latin, *salus* (greeting) was adopted as the flexional form of the word of greeting, impv. *salve* (be whole). What I have in mind is a semantic correlation such as we employ when we use *appurtenance* as the noun corresponding to the technical adjective phrase *pertaining to*, in the formulae of derivation and definition. The correlation *appurtenance* x *pertaining to* is desk English, not the vernacular. Cognate words do interchange their meanings as when, to employ a standard example, *to execute a man* is developed out of the *execution of a sentence*. It is perfectly legitimate to suppose that from *diṣṭyā* (*salve*) *diś* + *ā*, or derivatives thereof, might have gathered up the force of *salutem dico* (*saluto*); it is quite legitimate, as a question of genesis, to say that *ā-deśa* does not derive from *ā* + 1 *diś*, but rather from *ā* + *dās* (do homage, acclaim), in alternation with *ā* + *diś*. For another example of the gradation *ā* : *i* in interior position—at root ends nothing is commoner—cf. *khād* : *khid*, with intermediate *e* in *khédā* (not secondary, *pace* Wackernagel *Al. Gram.* § 15), Av. *sās* : *siš*, see Bartholomae's *Grammar* § 122. 8.

ii. The etymology of 2 *ādeśa* (? salutation).

4. If in a formula of politeness such as *ādeśam dattvā*—formulae may be very old—*ādeśa* meant salutation, it may well have come by its meaning through honest descent. The equation of *δέικνυται* (greet) with *dāśnóti* (does homage) has not been responsibly questioned for 40 years (see literature in Brugmann-Thumb, *Gr. Gram.* § 342), nor do I understand Professor Edgerton now to question it; and we are now devising, to satisfy our craving for system, a fit gradation diagram with a place for the root *dē(i)k¹*, a place for its derivative *ā-deśa* (of IE. type); with a place for Lat. *dignus*,² a place for *dicat* (consecrates), and a place for *decus*.—On the late development of 2 *ādeśa* from *ādiś* see § 9 fn.

² Be it said in passing that *dignus* has certainly for its nearest of kin (morphologically and semantically, I mean) ONorse *tíginn* (eminent <*digito monstratus*, see the lexicon of Falk-Torp, p. 1251). I call particular attention to the Umbrian perfect stem *pur-dins*' (see *AJP* 32. 414), with the sacral sense of offered. Here we have a nasal variety of the root of *dicat*; cf. Sk. *puro-dāśam* (acc.), offering.

iii. Hindi *ādes*: *ādeśa* (*ādeśam dattvā*).

5. I assume that *ādes* came from *ādeśa* (*indicium*) and that, excluding the temporary expedient of 2 *ādeśa*, its alleged sense of salutation, so far as we may list a contextual shading for a definition, was at some time and place developed by way of connotation (a polite signal to proceed is a salutation) or by way of ellipsis. A situation apt for the development of the connotation lies in fact before us, where *tasya ādeśam dattvā* etc. = *ei intimatione* <? *sui*> *facta* (*rex ipse a sapiente salutatus est*). Or, if we inform ourselves that Lat. *indicium* means not only *testimony* but also *leave to testify*, we may grant that, by a like shift of usage, *ādeśa* might mean, not only *announcement*, but *leave to announce* (? himself, the sage): *ei indicatione* <*ipsius*> *facta*.

iv. The meaning of *ā + dīś*.

6. In support of my substantially correct version of RV 6. 56. 1 (p. 83) I go on to demonstrate that this verb means pretty nearly what Lat. *inclamare* means, both in its good sense of *invoke* and in the bad sense of *jeer at, abuse*. Why should one who recalls Lat. *facinus* or *valetudo* or *inclamare* or *acclamatio* object to the exhibition by a word of both bad and good senses? As a *vox media* Eng. *challenge* is a good rendering of *ā + dīś*; or Lat. *provocare* (but with all the range between *salutare* and *laccessere*, or even *imprecari*). In 9. 70. 5, *ādēdīśānaḥ śaryahēva śurūdhaḥ* = *inclamans ut sagittarius³ iaculatores* (*śuru-* : Sabine Lat. *curis*, spear), and in 10. 61. 3, *āśrīṇīta ādīśam* = *paravit* (lit. *coxit*, cf. *coquere iras, verba*) *inclamationem* (*imprecationem*). One thinks of the 'brag' of Homeric combatants before beginning to fight. The reader may easily go through the ensuing examples from Professor Edgerton's list and substitute due forms of *inclamo* or of *challenge*.

7. In the three next passages also *ādīś* has the nominal sense of *inclamatio*, but varying, like *acclamatio*, between cheers (*laus, honor*) and jeers (*inrisio, minae*). The passages are as follows: (1) 8. 60. 12^b, *tāranto aryá ādīśaḥ* = *superantes hostis inclamationes* (*minas*). For the situation cf. again the brag and threats of any pair of Homeric warriors, e. g. Tlepolemos and Sarpe-

³The archer and spearmen, typically taken, may have belonged either to hostile armies or, as rival arms of the service, to the same army.

don in E 633 sq. (2) In 6. 4 Agni is besought to fetch the other gods to the sacrifice (st. 1), and in st. 5 (text of Aufrecht) we read, *turyáma yás ta ādísām árātīr = superemus <eum> qui tibi invocationum (laudum) invidus <est>* (cf. 9. 21. 5, below).

(3) I render 8. 93. 11 as follows:

yásya te nú cid ādísām ná minānte svarājyam | ná devó nádhriḡur jānaḥ
 cuius illi quidem laudem non impediunt eius <ve> imperium
 neque deus <alius, see § 9> neque semperfestinans (?) gens.

8. In 9. 21. 5 (and likewise for the next stanza), *āsmīn . . dādhatā venám ādīse* etc. = *apud nos facite voluntatem inclamare (eum qui nobis invidus est)*, i. e. confirm in (or unto) us our desire, viz. to rebuke him who is stingy toward us.

9.—6. 56. 1. To give a hostile sense to *ādīse* here involves taking *karambhād* (Pultiphagus), the title of Pūṣan, as defamatory. This seems to me a grave literary error in the interpretation maintained by Roth and Grassmann. Inasmuch as *karambhá* was the special food of Pūṣan it would be strange to summon his worshippers in the first stanza of a hymn by recounting a jeer of the ‘pagans’ (in this case ‘cits’) that honored him not. Professor Edgerton will have it that the first stanza of a Pūṣan hymn says ‘whosoever shall aim at Pūṣan (our god) with the taunt of “Porridge-eater,” the god is not his to aim at.’ To me the stanza can only mean what Sāyaṇa thought it meant—and he rendered *ādīdesati* by *abhiṣṭāuti* (praises)—‘Whosoever shall invoke (praise) Pūṣan (our god) by his favorite title need invoke no other god.’⁴ As for *karambhá*, it was mixed-with-the-food (*karambhín*) of Indra, but besides (shade of Dr. Samuel Johnson!) it was also shared [and not only in ‘porridge-punch’] by Indra—unless we mean to disqualify the evidence of Ait. Br. 2. 24—and Indra was no weak-

⁴ Among the Vedic clerks and priors, the scholars and men of letters, before and after his time (say 1350 A. D.), Sāyaṇa would not have been alone in holding and teaching the equation *ādīdesati = abhiṣṭāuti* (*laudat, celebrat*). I confess I am casual enough to believe, even in the face of Professor Edgerton’s ordered genealogical and chronological criteria, that among these scholars many, one or another, even the redactor of the *Vikramacarita*, seeking to vary the monotony of *namas* (*salus, laudatio, honor*), might have hit upon *ādesam dattvā* (*laudationem dans*) as a fit substitute for *namaskṛtya*, so giving to *ādeśa*, a word in being, the sense of *ādīdesati*.

ling, nor yet a hind.⁵ The real vocative *karambhád* (here turned to a nominative before *íti*) is a virtual invitation to Pūṣan to come and eat *karambhá*; and the Vedic poet said in effect, to make a slight change in my previous version,

qui hunc inlclamat (invocat) Pultiphagum nomine Pūṣanam,
non ab eo deus invocando <est>.

This version leaves the ambiguity of the original. If, to begin with the less probable, *deus* = Pūṣan, the apodosis means that Pūṣan will not wait for a second invitation, but accept instantly the call to his favorite food. If *deus* is not Pūṣan the apodosis means : not a god is to be invoked by the worshipper, for Pūṣan alone is sufficient. In my first version I supplied, after Ludwig, *alius*; but neither Ludwig (I will suppose) nor I actually supplied *anyás* to the original (see also for *ná* <*anyó*> *devó* 8. 93. 11 in § 7). We have here a partitive relation, and Pūṣan is tacitly excluded from the other gods. [In passing I will state that I think Ludwig was entirely right in interpreting *priyád* . . . *préyo* in 1. 140. 11 by dearer than <any other, or the typical> dear.] One thinks of Corinthians 15. 27: But when he saith, All things are put in subjection, it is evident that he is excepted who did subject all things unto him. Cf. on *véiatos áλλων* *Class. Rev.* 8. 456, and the colloquialism, He runs faster than anybody (for anybody else); or, none such = no other like. On the other hand, there have been grammatical sticklers who, in respect to Milton's famous line, 'the fairest of her daughters, Eve,' objected to the inclusion of Eve; cf. *Odyssey* 5. 262, where Calypso includes herself with Ulysses (those two, and no others) in the words *τοῖς ἄρα μύθων ἦρχε*.—The omission of 'other' is common enough, though lists of examples lack. Note, with consideration of the context (*δῶματα* in 1. 299 = *δῶμος* in 1. 302), *Odys.* 6. 301, *οὐ μὲν . . . δῶματα Φαίηκων* = no <other> residence of the Phaeacians.

10.—6. 48. 14. Omitting the unessential and accepting (without reserve as to the metre) Ludwig's disposition of the adjective complement of Viṣṇu, I would thus render :

⁵ I am not unaware that Pūṣan was a Pan among the gods. To Professor W. Schulze he is Pan, and the sectarian character of Pūṣan, of which note is made below (§ 12), reminds us again of the difficulty of getting recognition for Pan throughout Greece.

tám (sc. *Pūṣānam*, again!) . . . | *srprábhōjasam̐ víṣṇum ná stuṣa ādīse*
eum ut Vishnum adipicibum <habentem> laudo invocando.

But for *ādīse* (invocando) we must supply a subject like *us* or *you* (the worshippers), which yields the meaning *ut invocemus* (*invocetis*); cf. 1. 52. 8, *ádhārayo divy á sūryam drśé = posuisti in caelo solem videndo* i. e. *ut videremus* (*ut homines viderent*). Also see excellent examples for subjectless infinitives in Monro's *Homeric Grammar*, § 231. It were possible, but harsher, to render *ādīse* by the imperative, *invocate*. Or *stuṣa ādīse* = I (re)commend to (be) invoke(d).

11. The evidence for *ā + dīś* = inclamare has been submitted. The definition recognizes derivation from the root *dēik*¹. I doubt not that Professor Edgerton admits the propriety of trying, so far as may be, to utilize IE. derivation and etymology in the effort to fix the definition of Vedic words. To know the approximately original meaning of a word certainly helps in fixing the sense of its further ramifications, as in the case of *diṣṭyā* (with homage) § 3.

12. In conclusion I suggest that the two *Pūṣan* stanzas I have interpreted seem to constitute a sectarian recommendation of *Pūṣan* as the equal or superior of other gods. It is because of this sectarian quality that *karambhād* cannot be a jeer (*ādīś*), but must be a word of praise (*ādīś*), see § 9.

COUNTER-REJOINDER TO PROFESSOR FAY

FRANKLIN EDGERTON
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

PROFESSOR FAY (§ 3) seems to miss the point of the story of the 'mental salutation,' which appears to me to prove absolutely that, to the feeling of its author, no sage would bless a king without first receiving a salutation. There was no 'assumed glum silence'—except perhaps to an ignorant bystander who lacked the sage's omniscience; certainly the sage, if he had assumed a glum silence (that is, lack of salutation), would not have blessed the king. That is the whole point of the story. The silence was only tech-