



## 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).

## INDO-IRANICA

EDWIN W. FAY

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

### 1. Avestan *aēšasa-*, petens.

THE AVESTAN ROOT *aēš* means to seek; to (seek to) hear (Bartholomae, *AIr. Wbch.*, p. 29, 4); to attack, waylay, seize (*ib.* E); to obtain, acquire (*ib.* 6). The long word *aēšasa-* is from a primate *aisoskō-* (Av. *s* from *sk̂*), and the selfsame primate lies behind the Latin denominative verb *aeruscat*, begs (as a mendicant). Note *s* from *sk̂* also in the compound *vanθwyaēsa*, army-thief, waylayer. For further definitions of the root AIS or AIS, see *CQ* 9. 110.

### 2. Excursus on *ἔπαιστος*, seized, caught (taken in the act).

For Herodotean *ἔπαιστος* (wrongly accented in the books, in response to a wrong derivation, *ἐπάιστος*) a typical example is *ἔπαιστος ἐγένετο προδιδούς* = he was taken betraying, i. e. caught in the act of betraying. In Apollonius Rhodius *Arg.* 4. 366 we must read *ἐπ' αἴστον* (*ἐπὶ* as in *ἐπ' ἴσα*, equally), *ex improviso*.

### 3. Sanskrit *pada-vī* (foot-) way.

With Perrson (*Beitraege*, p. 512) I identify *-vī* in this compound with Lat. *via*. In the earlier masculine *padavīs*, guide, the posterius meant goer, while *pada-* seems almost prepositional = with, cf. *πεδά* in the Aeolic poets, and see on Skr. *pad-rathas*, footman (with the chariot) in *CQ* 8. 52, n. In *vī*, *ī* is a weak grade of the *ēi* of the root. Lat. *via* (and this remark is applicable to many Greek and Latin feminines in *ia*) is a synthetic form, combining the feminine ending in *ī* with the feminine in *ā*; in this case the root noun *wī* with a feminine suffixal *ā* attached to the weakest form of the root, i. e. w-ā. Perrson is in error in writing the root as *wēi* (but see § 10).

### 4. Indo-Iranian *ā-vīs*, obvious.

This is a compound of *ā* (i. e. the proethnic preverb *ē*: *ō* for which English here or there is too heavy a rendering; German *dar* suits better) plus the adverb *vis*, i. e. *vi* extended by the *s*

which seems to be joined quite ad libitum with prepositional adverbs. The Avesta preserves *viš* and we have it in the compound *viš-patha*, quasi *deviously, variously*. As will appear later *vi* comes right close in meaning to the German adverb *weg*.

5. Indo-Iranian *vī, vi*, asunder, apart; *weg* (cf. Ital. *via*).

I explain the adverb *vi* as a locative to a root noun *wē(i)*, with the verbal sense of to wind, whence to wend, wander. For this *wēi* see Walde's Lexicon s. v. *vieo* (from a secondary root *wy-ē*). As Eng. *wends, wanders* derive from the root of to *wind*, we may admit a like development of sense in the root *wē(1)*. Note that in English *went*, a past tense of to *wend*, serves as preterit to the verb to *go*, and has lost all trace of connection with to *wind*.

6. Excursus on (Sanskrit) doublet roots in *-an/-ā(y)*.

In *JAOS* 44. 341 I made, in part after Macdonnell, a list of these roots,<sup>1</sup> viz. *khā(y):khan, jā(y):jan, sā:san, tā(y):tan*. To these may be added the Indo-European pair *wā: wen, to wound* (see Fick, 1<sup>4</sup> p. 542 and p. 547, Boisacq, s. v. *μάσσω*).

<sup>1</sup>In that list I concluded *drā:drām* and *gā:gam*. I now note that the Sanskrit trio *drā drām dru*, to run, justifies the trio *gā gam gu*, to go. I am exploiting no theory of origins. I am quite willing to believe that the *-am* and *-ā* roots had an entirely unrelated origin, though later they came, must have come, together in speech consciousness in response to a classification as inevitable as it was unwilling. To state this extremely, it is altogether possible that in their prototypes *βαλvei*, goes (root *GWEM*), and *ξ-βη*, went (root *GWĀ*), fell into a systematic association only as Latin *fert* and *tulit* or as Eng. *goes* and *went* so fall. But after they once fell into this association they served as a source for analogies, and the analogy groups then formed, without the consciousness, or at least without the conscious will, of the speakers, a morphological system. Accordingly, when we find in Sanskrit a posterius *gu*, going, we may set it down at first as due to the analogy of Skr. *dru*, running: or we may place it at once, per saltum, in a morphological system with *gā gam*; cf. also *yu*, faring: *yā*, to go. There is neither rhyme nor reason in refusing *gā gam gu* if you admit *drā drām dru*, always, of course, upon evidence. Thus we escape the awkwardness of having to deal with Skr. *-gva-*, in *nāva-gva-*, as cow, instead of as going or gang, and we are left free to define *πέρσ-βυς* by fore-going and not by fore-bull (Bloomfield, *AJP* 17.424, 29.80; see the literature in Boisacq). The nominative *πέρσ-βέυς* will have originated after the vocative in *ev* (Sanskrit *o*). Thus the vocative was a common term in Greek in the *v* and in the *ev* stems. We owe *βυ* instead of the correct *γυ* to Homeric *πέρσ-βα*.

Here I add *wē(i)*, to wind (go): *wen-d*,<sup>2</sup> to wind, go. We may here note the special sense of to wither in Lat. *viescit*, correlative to Slavic *ven-d* to wither (see Miklosich, p. 380); cf. Eng. *gone off* = deteriorated, etc.

#### 7. Further on Indo-Iranian *āvis*, obvious.

The Slavic sept of O.Bulg. *avě*, manifeste (see Berneker *Slav. Etym. Wbch.* p. 34), reveals that the combination in *ā-vis* was Indo-European. Slavic *-vě* differs from Av. *-vi(š)* as Lat. *prae* differs from *pri*. In Greek, as I have pointed out before (see *AJP* 33. 391), we have a double of Skr. *āvis* in the compound *āv-ωιστί*, not on the road standing, not obvious, unexpected. Here belongs Skr. *āvīṣṭya-* (*ty* from *thy*, see *AJP* 34. 15, n.), obvious, visible. In the Avesta *āviš-ya* = coming on the road, whence obvious, visible. The Indo-European trio *wai wi wō* (cf. Lat. *prae pri prō*) exhibits its last member in Gāthie Avestan *vā-dāya*, to put away, push away, thrust away, cf. *ώ-θέω*.<sup>3</sup> Where Indo-Iranian *vī* connotes asunder, entzwei, there has been some influence from Indo-European *dwis*, in-two, apart. To put it otherwise, the word *dwis* in certain combinations lost its *d-* by dissimilation. The root *wi-dh* of Skr. *vidhyāti* and Lat. *di-vido*, e. g., will have come by dissimilation from original *dwi-dh-*. In passing I would explain Skr. *vyadh* (: *vidh*) as containing in *vya-* a correlate of *ḍá*, through. Given the doublet *dwi(s)/wi(s)*, we may also

<sup>2</sup> The unextended root *wen* is preserved in Germ. *wohnen*, to dwell, i. e. to wander in a nomadic preserve; cf. Eng. *dwells*, from O.Eng. *dwelian*, to go astray, err, tarry, dwell. Skr. *vānam*, forest, wood (wood before trees, trees was an interpretation of wood) applied at first to the ranges in which the nomads dwelt, or over which their cattle wandered.

<sup>3</sup> Despite the convenience of recognizing proethnic *wē*, *weg*, in Latin etymology, the words in which we have this *vē* seem to be best explained otherwise. It is not open to question, in my opinion, that Lat. *vehe-mens* is a compound with imperative prius *vehe-*, cf. Avestan *vazo-vañdwaya-*, (carrying away i. e.) robbing the army-stuff. Thus *vehementem* (acc.) = carrying away the mind (first of anger etc., for the usage in Plautus see *AJP* 24.71). The contracted form *vē-mens*, supported by the influence of *dēmens* and *amens*, became the pattern for *vē-cors*, *vē-sanus* etc., and the irradiation even went so far that we have *vē-grandis* as a negative of *grandis*. Lat. [s]*vescitur* I cannot bring myself to separate from Skr. *agni-ṣvātta-*, ignicomessus (see *TAPA* 44.110). In *vē(r)-labrum*, water-basin (see *AJP* 35.153) the prius = Skr. *vār*.

expect to find other proethnic forms, or their continuants, with *w-*, e. g. *vī-* in Lat. *vīginti*.

8. Excursus on *αἰσ-θάναται*, perceives; Lat. *audit*, hears.

In the whole range of 'orthodox' Indo-European etymology there is nothing more pretentious than the equation of *αἰσ-* with Skr. *ā-vīs*. For the treatment of *αἰς* as a dissyllable there is no particle of evidence. Of *ἐπαιστος* I have already disposed (§ 2), and *ἀίω*, I hear, is a plain denominative from a stem *AUSI-*, ear, in Lat. *auris*. The correct derivation of *αἰσθάναται* is from the root *ais*, to take (see § 1), as I have before pointed out in *CQ* 9. 110. Eng. *takes* (I take it), *apprehends*, *assumes*, and Lat. *cipio*, *accipio*, *percipio*, all show how the sense to perceive originates from to take. See also § 1 on Av. *aēš*, with the sense of to (seek to) hear. If the current derivation of *αἰσ-θάναται* is a caprice, the derivation of Lat. *audio* from *awisdio* is a phantasm. With *aus-cultat* (ear-lends or leans) before us, anything but *ausdit* is unthinkable. Of course the elaborately fanciful primate *awisdio* has been invented to turn a special phonetic trick for *oboedio*, but it involves far less of unsupported assumption to conclude that here posttonic *au* on its way to *u* or, in vulgar circles, on its way to *ō*, was subject to reenforced rounding from *ob* modified by anticipatory palatalization from *di*,—causes resulting in something other than \**obūdio*. But the analysis *o-boedit*, which means cognation with *πέποιθα* (*πειθεσθαι*), is always possible, cf. O.Lat. *con-foedusti*, and note that *foedus*, ugly, has held on to *oe*. Festus also gives us *amecus* (i. e. *amoecus*) for *amicus*, and we have *oe* in the second syllable of *amoenus*, lovely.

9. Semantic excursus; the meaning before the last.

In the classical tongues there is a wide range of turns such as to *walk with legs*, to *see with eyes*, to *talk with the mouth* (*ore loqui*). These are relics of the time when to *walk* and to *see* and to *speak* were not the original senses of their verbs, and when *ore loqui* e. g. meant something like to *crack* (Scottice *usurpatum*) *with the mouth*; when to *see* may have meant some such thing as to scan. The gradual ellipsis of the names of the organs participant, whereby the connotation was raised to the rank of definition, may be aptly illustrated by the comparison of Plautine *oculis rationem capio* with Terentian *rationem capio*

(see the great *Thesaurus*, iii. 321. 12); cf. also in Lucretius, *carmina auribus accipere* (4. 982) with *voces accipio* (4. 611). With *oculis* omitted *capio* was on the way to becoming a verb of perception.

10. Sanskrit (*vayā*) *vayī-a-*, attendant: *ā-īras*, wooer.

This Sanskrit word, not treated by Uhlenbeck, is from a locative *vay-i*, extended by suffixal *o*. Here we come back (see § 5) to the root *wē(i)* (*ē* certain in Lat. *vēnor*). I am not disposed to deny *ā outrance* the grade *wēi*; and those who refuse the gradation *ē : ē* will perhaps admit that *wēi*, by assimilation to *wēi*, was liable to appear as *wēi*. This is what we do accept in Greek for *θερός*. Or the grade *wēi* may have come by way of assimilation to the synonym root *ei*. Or [s]w-*ei* may be a compound root (on *sw-* see *TAPA* 44. 108 sq.). The additional sense of after (for, towards) in Skr. *vēti*, goes after (pursues, hunts, follows), and its cognates, will have come from the accusative regimen. So in the Rig Veda the participle of *ēti* (goes) means, with the accusative, seeking (begging, etc., cf. *ικέρης*, suppliant: *ικνεῖται*, comes to). By acknowledging interplay of the roots *wēi* and *ei* we may account for the *ai* (from *ei*) of the denominative *aitēi*, demands.

11. Joining an issue; Avestan *vī-naoiti*.

Av. *vī-naoiti* (only with *ava* and *frā*) means *necat* (Eng. slays, Germ. schlägt). We might derive from the root *wā* (§ 6) or, as we must then write it, *wā(i)*, to wound, injure (*nocere*). This root will hardly be different from Lat. *vae*; cf. Goth. *wai-dêdja*, malefactor (*homo nocens*). I take the Latin outcry *vae* to be (a continuant of) the 'root,' not a derivative from it. On the other hand, and this seems to me far more likely, *vī-* may be the preverb (=weg) and *nao* the verbal element, cognate with *nu-d* in Skr. *nudāti*, thrusts (see on this 'root' Walde, s. v. *nuo*). In its meanings *nudāti* combined with *vi* comes quite close to *vī-naoiti*, viz. to wound; to strike (Germ. schlagen) the lute. Given Skr. *nudāti*, then Av. *vīnaoiti*, slays: Goth. *naus*, slayer: O.Bulg. *nawī*, mortuus (cf. Goth. *b-nauan*, conficere) leave no room to challenge a root *NU* with the general sense of the root *τυ* (cf. Walde, s. vv. *tundo*, *stuprum*).