

ON M. MAYRHOFFER'S *ETYMOLOGISCHES WÖRTERBUCH DES ALTINDOARISCHEN*¹

By PAUL THIEME
University of Tübingen

Immediately after finishing his *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen (KEWA)*, M. Mayrhofer had the very commendable courage to start work on an *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen (EWA)*, of which the first 11 fascicles now (Autumn 1992) lie before us. It is not, as the author rightly insists, 'a new (and improved) edition' of *KEWA*, but a renewed attempt in its own rights. It is an attempt to produce 'an etymological dictionary' of 'a big corpus language (i.e. of Sanskrit) in 'a practicable and finishable form', that is: an etymological dictionary such as could be brought to completion 'by a single scholar within his life time',—provided this scholar would have the industry and tenacious dedication of a Mayrhofer, we should like to add. Even in the close atmosphere of such a somewhat constraining qualification, Mayrhofer aims high: he thinks of 'an etymological dictionary approaching the fulfilment of demands of an ideal order'.

The differences between the former work and the one recently begun, already clearly recognizable, are many and conspicuous. The changes introduced are mostly—not always, as is only to be expected—distinct improvements. One of the most important changes is highly welcome: the conscientious reference to the first occurrence of each word in Sanskrit literature.

The attribute 'kurzgefaßt' does not appear in the title. Even the *KEWA* was not actually 'concise': it was so in comparison only with the planned *Vergleichendes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen* by W. Wüst. Of this only the first fascicle (parts I and II) was published (Heidelberg, 1935), containing beside other items a Vorrede of no less than 123 pages (against *KEWA*, 1st fasc. 1951: 5 pages), constituting quite a monument to what indigenous Sanskrit grammarians would call an *ativistara*.

While 'Altindisch' (thus in the title of *KEWA*) is not an ideal designation for the sacred language of India, it must be admitted that it is, at least, unequivocal: it is the oldest literary language traditionally handed down and developed, generation by generation, in India and the only one that was not geographically limited to a certain part of India but spread, in the course of time, over the whole Indian subcontinent, though understood and spoken only by a well-defined minority of educated people—and that, in ever growing degree and eventually exclusively, side-by-side with a local dialect or language.

The clumsy expression 'Altindoarisch' in the title of *EWA*, which echoes the linguistic usage of W. Wüst (see above), is hardly preferable: without having received some explanation, most scholars, inclusive of myself, would understand it as referring to Vedic Sanskrit (and, possibly, to old popular Indo-Aryan languages, which can be shown to have lent words and/or ways of pronunciation to Sanskrit even as early as in Rigvedic times).²

¹ Indogermanische Bibliothek, II. Reihe: Wörterbücher. I. Bd. (Lieferungen 1–10), 1986–92), liv, 812 pp. II. Bd., Lieferung 1, 1–80 pp. (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1992). Lieferungen 1–6 were reviewed by J. C. Wright, *BSOAS*, LIII, 3, 1990, 534–6.

² Examples, certain at least according to my conviction, though partly suspect to Mayrhofer, are: *akkhalī-kr* (**akṣarī-kr*), *salīla-* '(salt) water' (**sar-īla*, cf. *sarsapa-* *EWA*, III, 448, 'mustard'), *śakāṭa-* 'cart' ('[fitted] with a tilt': **sa-kaṭa*), *kāla-* 'point/span of time' (RV also *kāra-*), etc. I have chosen intentionally words distinctly pointing to a common source: the mother of later Māgadhī.

Sanskrit/Sanscrit is a word that has long since entered the vocabulary of every European language of culture, a word found in each representative European dictionary. I confess to seeing absolutely no reason why philologists or linguists should pretend ignorance of the name—sacred to millions in India, venerable to humanists all over the world—the language gave to itself.

Are not 'Vedic Sanskrit', 'Classical Sanskrit' ('old', 'middle', 'modern') apt and clear designations, unquestionably superior to 'older' and 'younger' 'Old-Indo-Aryan' (*EWA* 1, 2f.³)? Who would talk of present-day German as 'younger Old High German'? 'Mittelindisch', 'Middle Indic', 'Middle Indo-Aryan' (*EWA*) are, of course, just as unsatisfactory as 'Old-Indo-Aryan', etc. They support the naïve supposition that a language is only as old as its earliest literary attestation. The difference between Sanskrit and popular Indo-Aryan (Aśokan Prakrit, Classical Prakrit, modern Indo-Aryan languages) is not one of age, but of social, sometimes literary dignity or, in certain cases, of the role they play as vehicles of the literature of particular religions or sects.

A distinctive feature of the *EWA* is the downright interminable number of abbreviations, rankly growing with each new fascicle. Abbreviations of proper names ought to be, at least, evocative: 'Tu' for Turner, 'Schm' for 'Schmitt', 'Thi' for Thieme, etc. are unrecognizable mutilations, forcing the reader again and again to consult the list of abbreviations (containing almost a thousand items).

Etymology as a part of a scientific grammar is concerned with units—not of speech (*parole*) but—of the system of language (*langue*); roots and suffixes. It is a pleasure to find that Mayrhofer has taken leave of his *horror abstractionis* and is dealing no longer with nominatives of the singular and third persons of the present singular (as in *KEWA*), but with roots and nominal stems.

It is difficult, though, not to doubt the wisdom of creating a new way of naming a Sanskrit root.⁴ Why not adopt the manner introduced by Pāṇini, familiar to all Indologists and Indo-Europeanists (among these the greatest experts of Sanskrit grammar and history: W. D. Whitney, J. Wackernagel, K. Hoffmann, etc.)? Valuable space is wasted by innumerable references from the one traditionally and generally accepted form (like *cit* 'recognize') to the Mayrhofer form (like *cet*). Are Indologists supposed to rehearse for each new dictionary a new way of looking for the lemmata? Pāṇini's 'roots' (*dhātu-bases*) are simple formulae for rather complicated and changeable units of language: they are chosen as the shortest evocative names (*tud* against *svap*, *i* against *ad*, *iṣ* against *yaj*, etc.), they have nothing to do with linguistic history, they are items of a purely synchronic description. Mayrhofer's 'roots' are partly synchronical, partly historical. A Mayrhofer root *cet*, for example, must be called a sorry bastard: the *k* in *keta-* is 'older' than *c* in *cit*, the 'ḡṇa-grade' is 'older', admittedly, if looked at from the point of view of a Proto-Indo-Europeanist, but the ḡṇa-form of the vowel *i* (*e*) is quite young, not even Indo-Iranian.

Besides, no Indo-Europeanist—not even Mayrhofer (*EWA*, 1, 454)—will persuade me to consider the root form *khed* (Mayrhofer) 'press, oppress, crush' to be 'older' than the root form *khid*, which is nothing but the weak grade of root *khād*.

Already Pāṇini has observed correctly (6.1.51), that the 'ḡṇa form' of his

³ Mayrhofer studiously avoids the expression 'older/younger Old-Indo-Aryan', using 'ältere/neuere Sprache': the fact remains that the 'Sprache' he is talking of is called by him 'Altindoarisch'.

⁴ I am glad to find myself in perfect agreement on this point with J. C. Wright in his review of fascicles 1–6 of the *EWA* in this Journal (see n. 1).

root *khid* may be *khād* in Vedic language. The *Kāśikā* opposes *cakhāda* (possible in the Vedas only) to *cikheda* (possible only in classical Sanskrit). The comparatively recent *guṇa* form *khed* appears already in the RV: *kheda* (2 ×) '[heavy] pressure (in particular (RV 8.77[66].3) by an instrument)'. Possibly it is a loan from popular speech—the *takṣan-* (Greek *τέκτων*) is one of the oldest workmen.

To an Indologist—the great majority of the users of the *EWA* will be Indologists—it is a somewhat **saddening thought that by throwing aside the name 'Sanskrit' and by replacing Pāṇini's sigla for the verbal roots for no cogent,⁵ even poor reasons, a further step is being taken to deliver up to oblivion the superb achievements of Indian grammarians.** Why should we, by forgetting them, give the wrong impression that **scientific linguistics** started in Europe and only in the beginning of last century? They **did start with** Franz Bopp in Europe all right, but with **the Padapāthas and Pāṇini in India.** After all, what Franz Bopp proudly calls 'meine Zergliederungskunst'—and what is the mainstay of all Indo-European comparative grammar—is in reality the analysis of the words of Sanskrit into their abstract functional elements, invented and taught by Pāṇini and learnt by Bopp, if I may say so, at the feet of Indian grammarians (like Vopadeva).⁶

It is of course true that 'etymology' (*nirvacana-* n.) as established by Yāska is the weakest spot in the indigenous endeavour to solve the riddles of India's sacred language. We should, however, make distinctions and bear in mind that Yāska felt himself to be in opposition to the soberly careful method of Pāṇini: *na saṃskāram ādriyeta* '[an explainer of Vedic words] should not care [too much] for the regular word formation (*saṃskāra-*) [as taught by Pāṇini]', he exclaims (Nirukta 2.1).

Modern scholars, sometimes overbusy in quoting each other, are often not aware of older scholars, interesting not only historically, but occasionally helpful in showing the right way. Indian grammarians of all descriptions are shrewd observers and sharp thinkers. Let us look at a few examples.

stoka- 'drop' was explained by F. de Saussure, often quoted and praised for it, as standing for **skota-* (from root *ścut* 'to drip'). He was not aware—and no Indo-Europeanist seems to be—that Yāska gave the self-same explanation more than two thousand years ago (*Nir.* 2.1).

Patañjali (2nd century B.C.) teaches (ed. Kielhorn, I, 31) *śimha-* 'lion' as a transposition of **himsra-* 'the hurting one'.⁷ Without mentioning him I did the same, adding only a conjecture concerning a probable motive: an intentional tabooistic rearrangement of the sounds to make the word unrecognizable to the dangerous animal, which might feel invited by it to come.

The RV uses *mṛgās ... bhīmās* 'fearsome wild (in the sense of: untamed) animal' for 'lion', *mṛga-* being used ordinarily in India for 'antelopes', and *mārēga-* in Iran for 'birds', i.e. animals that harm the crops and fruits, but are not dangerous threats to life. Our servants in India when talking among themselves after sundown about their adventures with snakes, as they much liked to do, did not use the common Hindi word for snake (*sāp*), but the vague expression *duṣman* 'enemy'. In old Greek *ἔχιδ* seems a similar intentional

⁵ In certain cases a replacement (e.g. *dā* 'cut' for *do*, *u* 'weave' for *ve*, *dhā* 'suckle' for *dhe*) is of course fully justified.

⁶ In actual fact Bopp learned of it through Charles Wilkins's grammar (1808).

⁷ *himsra-* adj. 'noxious, hurtful' is taught as a synonym of *ghātuka-* 'murderous' by the *Amarakośa* and used in contrast to *mṛga-* 'deer, antelope' as a designation of beast of prey (e.g. *Kīrātārjuniya* 10.5 ... *himsraiḥ saḥacaritānyamṛgāni kānanāni* 'forests in which other animals, [namely] deer, are [peacefully] accompanied by beasts of prey...').

bowdlerization (by ‘palatalization’) for the inherited $\alpha\phi\iota\varsigma$ (O. Iran. *aži-*, Sanskrit *ahi-*).

sarpa- m. ‘snake’ is, of course, originally an analogous attempt to avoid a direct and unequivocal designation: ‘creeping’ (*srp*) is a characteristic, but not directly aggressive, trait of a snake’s behaviour.

vyāghra- m. ‘tiger’ is according to Patañjali⁸ ‘he who *vyā* + *jighrati*’ = ‘he who smells scents (*ā* + *ghrā*) by opening [his jaws] (**[mukham] vivṛtyājighrati*)’ or ‘who smells scents in a particular way (**viśiṣṭena prakāreṇājighrati*)’: a characteristic trait of tigers (and of other cats),⁹ but, like the creeping of a snake, not directly aggressive. Mayrhofer (*KEWA*) is not decided: **the word might be, he thinks, a loan from Dravidian. Unquestionably our applause should go to Patañjali.**

vāra-/vāla- n. ‘tail [consisting of hair], hair (in a collective as well as an individual sense)’ is left unexplained by *KEWA*; again, **a loan from Dravidian is considered. Without difficulty, rather entirely convincing, is Yāska’s explanation (*Nir.* 11.31): a derivation from root *vr* ‘to ward off’: *vāra-* ‘warding off [flies]’. The formation would be perfectly correct: the suffix $-\pm\acute{a}-$ (Pāṇ. 3.2.1—with *vṛddhi* of the preceding root when containing an *a* in an open syllable) designating the agent of a transitive verb construed with a special object, which is either explicitly named (type: *kumbhakāra-* m. ‘pot maker’) or else easily supplied (*vāra-* for **makṣikāvāra-*). The later form *vāla-* was already noted and correctly connected with analogous cases by Kātyāyana (*vārt.* 2 on Pāṇini 3.2.18).**

II

Long ago¹⁰ Wilhelm Schulze posed the question whether Sanskrit *anala-* ‘fire’ was etymologically related to Homeric $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\lambda\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (1 ×) ‘insatiable’—the formations corresponding to one another like Skt. *amara-* to *amṛta-*. This means that *anala-* designates fire as ‘the insatiable one’. In support Schulze quoted Boehtlingk, *Indische Sprüche* (2nd ed.), 3547, and *Proverbs* 30.16.¹¹

Unfortunately, W. Schulze was not aware of the fact that an adjective *anala-* ‘insatiable’ need not be reconstructed, but does exist. As pointed out by F. O. Schrader (1929)¹² immediately afterwards, it may be identified in *BhagG.* 3.39 (*Mahābhārata*, Poona 6.25.39). Mayrhofer gives it only with an asterisk (**unersättlich*), impressed, it seems, by Kuiper’s (1959) dictum: ‘Durch *duspūreṇānalena ca BhagG.* 3.39 ist die Bedeutung “unersättlich” alles andere als gesichert!’. Pali *anala-* ‘insatiable’, however, is **a fact that cannot be removed by specious arguments¹³ nor by an asterisk or by an exclamation mark:** see *Critical Pali dictionary* s.v. *anala-* m.f.n. ‘not to be satisfied, insatiable’, and note that *anala-* (a qualification of *pāvaka-* ‘fire’ also in *Jāt.* V.63,18)

⁸ On Pān. 3.1.137 (*Mahābhāṣya*, II, 92.)

⁹ *jimbha singha* ‘yawn, lion!’ orders Dusyanta’s young son—every inch a future hero—the lion cub he is playing with (*Sak.*, act VII, after verse 14).

¹⁰ KZ (= ZvS) 54, 1929, 306 [= *Kleine Schriften*, 215 ff.].

¹¹ One might add Boehtlingk, op. cit., 6831 = *Sārng. Paddh.* 1456:

saptaitāni na pūryante pūryamānāni nityaśah |
agnir vipro yamo rājā samudra udaram grham ||

Both Sanskrit epigrams, as given by Boehtlingk, name fire, as the most obvious member of their series, first and finish it, as is customary in Indian epigrams, with the least expected, most surprising item: ‘the lovely one’ (*manoramā*) and the *grham*, i.e. ‘the housewife’ (see *Kāśikā* on Pān. 3.1.144), who is looked upon here as pestering her husband with ever new and renewed wishes. The sixth item has its equivalent in Homeric $\gamma\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho$ ’ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\lambda\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (Od. 17.28) and in *Sng. Paddh.* 773 *duspūrodara-* of the *vādava* fire.

¹² In the following I quote the secondary literature discussed by Mayrhofer s.v. *anala-* only by the author’s name and the year of publication.

¹³ Such as Edgerton’s (1959).

is explained by the commentators by *atitta-* (Sanskrit *atrpta-*). It may be remarked that not only the Pali commentator (of course) but also the authors of the *CPD* knew nothing of W. Schulze's explanation.¹⁴

Mayrhofer is, of course, right, when not wanting to separate Pali *anala-* adj. and Pali *analamkata-* 'dissatisfied' from *alam* 'enough'. Yet he did not ask himself the question, presenting itself with urgency at this stage of investigation, whether *āram/alam* in the sense of 'enough' is not itself a derivation from a root *ar/al* 'to feed, nourish, satiate, satisfy'—this *āram/alam* having anyway to be separated from *āram/alam* 'fitting, fittingly'.¹⁵

There is then good reason to offer, in an etymological dictionary of Sanskrit, a root *ar/al* 'to feed, nourish, satiate, satisfy'. Positing it permits us to treat *anala-* m. 'fire' no longer as 'problematic' (Mayrhofer), and to give a sober answer as to the use of *anala-* adj. 'insatiable' in Pali and in the *BhagG.*; it helps us to understand the different meanings *āram/alam* seems to have in Vedic (and classical) Sanskrit as the meanings of two homonyms.

The attempt to discover it in other Sanskrit words cannot be suspect any more, as it still is to Mayrhofer.

In *Language*, 31, 1955, 441 f., and *MSS*, 44, 1985, 251, I tried to establish it. Today I am able to support my findings:

*alalābhāvantī*s (RV 4.18.6),

said of the liberated waters, was explained as an adjective formed from an intensive stem *alal-* meaning 'becoming well-fed, big, high'. Edgerton (1959) retorts that such an intensive stem 'of course' does not exist. Anyway, it must be admitted as possible (*kram* : *caṅkram*, *caṅkrama-* adj.). It may even be traced:

RV 8.1.7 *alarsi* 'you (Indra) are growing/grow exceedingly (violently)',
RV 8.48.8cd *ālartī dākṣa utā manyūr* 'there is growing (or: [if] there is ...) excessively the capacity and the furious will [to hurt] (on the part of the stranger) ...'

To my mind superior to both possibilities considered by Mayrhofer s.v. *ar*¹ and *ar*². Or is it 'of course' not?

śimśumāra- m. 'Platanista gangetica (a river dolphin)'

was explained as *śi(m)śumāra-* from **śi(m)śumārā-* 'feeding one's young one' with nominalizing retraction of the accent. There is only one valid objection thinkable: that *śi(m)śumāra-* did not originally name this particular cetacean (sea-mammal). It was offered by Edgerton (1959). Obviously he did not know of Lüders's investigation of the name *śi(m)śumāra-* in *ZDMG*, N.F. 21, 1942, 61 ff. [= *Kl. Schriften*, Wiesbaden, 1973, 528 ff.].¹⁶

The hapax *śiśūla-* is generally explained as 'small child' and derived from

¹⁴ Since my former remark (*Language*, 31) was, perhaps, too short to be properly understood and hence remained unheeded, I draw attention again to the following interesting parallelism:

Jātaka II, 326 *anālā mudusambhāsā duppārā tā ...*

'these [women] are insatiable, softspoken, difficult to be filled (~ to be made content)' and *BhagG.* 3.39 ...*tena ... kāmarūpeṇa duspūreṇānalena ca*

'by this [evil] that takes the shape of desire [and] is difficult to be filled and insatiable.'

The difference is that the two adjectives, actually constituting a hendiadys are separated in the Pali *gāthā* by *mudusambhāsā*, which refers, of course, to the fact that women—anyhow in the opinion of the misogynist speaking—are wont to hide their greed behind softspokenness.

¹⁵ Contrast for example RV 7.86.7 *āram dāsō nā mīdhūse karāny ahām devāya ...* 'Let me do ('offer') satisfaction to the heavenly one (Varuṇa) like a slave to a gracious one (a gracious master)', and RV 1.173.6 ... *āram rōdasi kaks(i)ye nāsmāi ...* 'fittingness are to him heaven and earth ('they fit him') like two belts ('belt halves')'; RV 8.72 (81).24 *āram ... ta indra kuksāye sōmo bhavatu ...* 'Let Soma be a satisfaction to your belly ...', and RV 8.15.13 *āram ksayāya no mahē* 'fittingness (suitable conditions) for our big (extended in space and time) [peaceful] living ...'.

¹⁶ In a letter dated 9 August 1959, F. Edgerton, my most distinguished predecessor at Yale University and highly admired friend, frankly admitted this. The reason was that Lüders's study

śīśu- with the diminutive suffix *-la*. R. L. Turner, however, thinks¹⁷ that it is rather a designation of the dolphin. This would fit excellently in the context where the stones that are used in pressing the Soma are praised in a series of most bizarre comparisons. Turner's opinion can be confirmed linguistically by analysing: *śīśu* + *la-* (originally *-Hla*, hence the long *ū*¹⁸ 'feeding its young': **śīśulā-* adj. from which, again with nominalizing retraction of the accent, *śīśūla-* m. 'dolphin'.

RV 10.78.6c *śīśūlā nā krīlāyaḥ sumātārah* ' [the stones used in pressing soma jump] like dolphins/porpoises of good mothers (well fed by their mothers when babies and hence strong when grown up), given to [sportive] play¹⁹'.

aṅgāra- '[glowing] charcoal'

can be analysed as *aṅga-* + *ara-* 'whose food is its [own] body'.

Old Slavonic *ogŭlŭ* (*Russian ugol'*) would be—not an identical, but—a related formation: **ong-Hli* (second member: root adjective, with extension by *i*.)

mrgāra- 'deer/antelope hunter',

beside *mīnāla-* 'fisherman', *kulāla-* 'potter', was explained (*MSS* 44, 257, nn. 48–50) as 'whose nourishment are deer/antelopes', etc.

caṇḍāla- m., the name of a member of a rather despised caste, may go back to an adjective **caṇḍa-* + *ala-* 'of horrible food'. The courtesan Vasantasenā is impolitely referred to by the uneducated 'śākāra-' as *macchāsīkā-* 'fish-eater' (*Mṛcchak.* act I, verse 23), most likely an allusion to her caste and its eating habits.

Avestan *daēvōdātō araskō* 'demon-created *araska-*'

occurs *Yasna* 9.5 in company of 'age' (*zauruuā*) and 'death' (*mərəθiuiš*). It seems obvious that a translation 'envy' (Bartholomae: 'Neid') cannot possibly meet the case. Let us analyse:

ara + *ska-* 'making run dry, letting become exhausted (*ska-* from Vedic root *sac*) the food (*ara* = Vedic *āra-*)' = 'drought, famine'.

Vedic *saśc-*: reduplicated present, rather aorist (see Homeric *εσκετο φωνη*)²⁰ and *śakra-* 'not ceasing to flow, not drying up' have a relation in classical Sanskrit *asakta-* adj. (and adverb) 'not ceasing to flow, not drying up', which ought to be separated—despite the dictionaries—from *asakta-* adj. (and adverb) 'not attached, unimpeded; without hesitation' (belonging to the root *sañj/saj* 'to be attached, to hand on to');

was published during the war and hence not available at the Yale Sterling Library. The same is the case with my own article on *śi(m)śumāra-* (*ZDMG*, N.F. 21, 1942, 418 (f. [= *Kl. Schriften*, 54 ff.]). Edgerton (1959) knew only the few lines I wrote in *Language*, 31, where out of modesty I did not refer to my own article.

¹⁷ *Comp. Dict. of Indo-Aryan languages*, s.v. *śimśumāra-*.

¹⁸ All Indo-European roots or root nouns seemingly starting with a short vowel, originally began with a so-called 'laryngeal' (*H*)—as now is generally accepted: **Hok* 'see', **Hap* 'water', **Hal* 'feed'. While totally disappearing when initial, this **H* lengthened a preceding vowel when disappearing as initial vowel of a second member of a compound in Sanskrit: hence *pratīka-* 'face' < **prati-Hka-*, *ulūka-* 'owl' < **uru-Hka-* ('the broad-faced one'); *dvīpa-* 'island' < **dvi-Hpa*; *pratīpa-* 'against the water' ('opposite, reverse') < **prati-Hpa-*; *śīśūla-* < **śīśu-Hla-* 'feeding its young'. —Before the diminutive or magnifying *taddhita-* suffix Indo-European *-lo-*, Sanskrit *-ra-/la-*, a preceding short vowel is, of course, not lengthened: *śīśūla-* allegedly 'Kindchen' (Wackernagel/Debrunner, Ai, Gr. II, 2, § 954) does not fit together with *bahu-lā-* (Greek *παχυρός*), *kapi-lā-*, etc., as Wackernagel/Debrunner (and of course others) do not mind assuming.

¹⁹ See Th. Oberlies, *Historische Sprachforschung* (= *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* [KZ, ZvS], 105 1992, 17).

²⁰ W. Schulze, *Kl. Schriften*, 368 f.

Bhāravi, *Kirāt*. 4.31 ... *asaktam ūdhāmsi payaḥ kṣaranti* 'without drying up the udders drip milk'; 1.11;

Māgha, *Śiś*. 7.6 *caranayugam asusruvat padeṣu | svarasam asaktam alaktakacchalena* 'in the guise of [liquid] lacquer [the women's] feet were letting flow without ceasing their own sap into their footsteps/tracks'; 8.10 ... *niḥśvāsaśvasanam asaktam* ...

Vedic *arāmati-*, Avestan *ārmaiti-*²¹ f.

is, as the Vedic accent shows, a bahuvrīhi (having *arā-* 'satisfying' as first member), which I tentatively translate: 'of satisfying thinking/intention'. If nominalized as a feminine, as always in the Avesta: '[attitude] of satisfying thinking'.

If said of a lord or ruler: '[morally due] care, solicitude [for his subjects]';²² if of a subject: 'loyalty, devotion', an attitude, if you want, that rests on a contention, expressed in RV 7.88.7ab *āram dāsó ná mīlḥuṣe karāni* ... (see above p. 325 n. 15).

In RV 2.38.4d *arāmati-* is used as an attribute of god Savitr: *arāmatih savitā devā āgāt* 'the heavenly one, who will impel/prompt ('the god of good beginnings', in this context identified with the rising sun), has arrived with satisfying intention.' See RV 7.66.14 *úd u tād darśatām vāpur divā eti pratihvaré ... sárvasmai cákṣase āram* 'there rises this beautiful appearance (the morning sun) on the slope of the sky ... a satisfaction to everybody, to [everybody's] sight (partitive 'apposition')'.

ity alam ativistarena

III

Already in the later fascicles of the *KEWA* one could observe a considerable decrease of zeal for hunting up Dravidian loans in Sanskrit. In the *EWA* this tendency appears to continue. There are, however, still quite a number of suggestions pointing in this direction. It is, of course, in principle quite legitimate to consider the possibility of Sanskrit borrowing from any non-Aryan Indian language. **Yet, if a word can be explained easily from material extant in Sanskrit itself, there is little chance for such a hypothesis.** I think of cases like *anala-* m. 'fire' (above p. 324); *vāra-* n. 'hairy tail' (above p. 324); *vyāghra-* m. 'tiger' (above p. 324).

The same would apply to positing onomatopoeical designations: *akkhalikṛtya* (see *EWA* s.v.), *alalābhāvanti-* (above p. 325);²³ *cakravāka-* (in classical Sanskrit also: *rathānganāman-* m.) 'brahmin duck, *Tadorna ferruginea*'—which does not, as Mayrhofer appears to think, say '*ca*' and '*kra*', but whose call appears melancholy to the Indian ear and reminds it of the sounds of a more or less badly fitted cart wheel,²⁴ sounds an inhabitant of a modern European capital may never have heard; *ulūka-* m. 'owl' (see *EWA* s.v.), and others.

²¹ *ārmaiti-* is an erroneous (late) spelling for a linguistically expected and metrically postulated **arāmaiti-*. The orthography obviously presupposes a younger pronunciation of an old vocative **spantārāmaitē*: see the Armenian loanword *spandaramat/sandaramet* (A. Meillet, *BSL*, xxii, 68).

²² Yasna 47.3 cd says—according to my understanding—'... giving (or creating) peace (peaceful living) you (= Ahura Mazda) formed (created) care (*ārmaiti-*) for the cow, for her pasture'. In Yasna 43.3 *Arāmaiti*—as an *amāša-spanta-*, is associated with pasture (*vāstra-*) for the cow; in Yasna 48.5 and 6 *Arāmaiti* is addressed in a context dealing with the care for the cow (5) and the food the cow gives to man (6).

²³ It is difficult, anyway, to believe in onomatopoeic formations that 'symbolically render visual impressions'.

²⁴ RV 10.75.13 *cakrān ná krandaḍ adhyē śivāyai* 'he [the newly born child] cries like a cartwheel for loving [motherly] care ...'. Here and verse 12 b *cakran na* is a correct, but misleading sandhi form for *cakraṃ na*, K. Hoffmann MSS, 8, 5, and *Injunktiv im Veda* (1967), 205 ff. Already the *Padapāṭha* dissolves wrongly *cakran na*.

There are in Mayrhofer's discussions quite a number of unnecessary hesitations due to considering possibilities, especially loans and onomatopoeic formations, that in reality do not exist.

Bibliographical references, based on an extensive knowledge of European and North-American secondary literature, which already were a feature of *KEWA* and were recognized by such a stern reviewer as P. Tedesco as 'superb', are even more copious in *EWA*. There is, perhaps, some danger that research, in particular linguistic research, will end in discussing earlier opinions only instead of investigating the facts themselves afresh. It is, moreover, a banal truth that by far not everything printed is actually worth it. Yet, the advantage of an extended survey of the work already done does by far outweigh the discomfort such fears might cause.

The *EWA* is not a handbook, not a work of easy information; Mayrhofer is not a man of pat answers, but a pensively brooding scholar. His work provokes thought, invites discussion, challenges criticism. We cordially wish him strength and energy for finishing his enterprise. We thank him warmly for a most valuable *instrument de travail* that, but for him and his enthusiasm, we should not have at our disposal.