



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.

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.¹

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^{cd} and 10. 61. 3^{cd}. 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

¹ 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.

to the sphere of hostile attacks that they require no discussion. Thus, 10. 134. 2^{cd}:

adhāspadām tām im kṛdhi yó asmān ādīdeśati.

‘Put him down underfoot who aims against us.’ The same or a closely similar locution is found 9. 52. 4^c, 10. 133. 4^{a-c}, 1. 42. 2^{a-c}. Equally simple and obvious is 6. 44. 17^{cd}, *abhiṣeṇān abhy ādēdīśānān pārāca indra prā mṛṇā jahī ca*. The only remaining occurrence of a finite verb form from *ā-diś* is 6. 56. 1:

yá enam ādīdeśati karambhād iti pūśāṇam, ná téna devá ādīse.

In the light of the otherwise universal use of the verb, it seems to me clear that it should be understood here too in a hostile sense. I therefore would render, nearly (tho not precisely) with Roth, Grassmann, and Oldenberg (*Noten*, on 9. 21. 5), and at variance with Fay (who follows Ludwig essentially), ‘He who aims (malignantly) at Pūśan, saying “he is a porridge-eater (hind, weakling)” —the god is not a mark for him (literally, not is the god for aiming at by him).’ Aside from the superior consistency with other occurrences of the verb, we hereby avoid the bold assumption of an understood *anyáh*, which Ludwig and Fay are compelled to make. What parallel is there for the omission of *anyá* in such a case? In other words, how can *ná . . . deváh* mean ‘no other god’? It means nearly the opposite of that: ‘not the god (just mentioned).’ It is mere casuistry for Ludwig to refer to 1. 140. 11 *priyád . . . préyo*, ‘dearer than a dear one’; obviously this is not in the least parallel.

The noun *ādīś*, naturally, follows the verb in usage. In addition to the passages already quoted, it occurs in 8. 60. 12^{ab}: *yéna vánsāma pṛtanāsu śardhatas tārānto aryá ādīśah*. Again the sphere is conflict (*pṛtanāsu*); ‘crossing over (escaping) the aims of the foe.’ On the difficult, and pretty certainly corrupt, passage 6. 4. 5 see Oldenberg, places quoted. Oldenberg is evidently not prejudiced in favor of the view I hold, for he specifically refers to 8. 93. 11 as showing *ādīś* without hostile meaning. Yet he holds, I think rightly, that in 6. 4. 5 (as well as in 8. 92. 31, for which see his note on that passage in *Rgveda Noten*) it refers to ‘feindliche Anschläge’; the fraseology of the passage (*turyáma*, cf. *tārānto* 8. 60. 12, *árātir*, etc.) bears this out, whatever may be the true reading and interpretation of the text. The passage 8. 93. 11, which Oldenberg seems to think shows

ādīśam in a different sense, is inconclusiv, and can as easily be interpreted in my way as in any other: *yásya te ná cid ādīśam ná minánti svarájyam, ná devó nádhrigur jánaḥ*. 'Verily they do not at all obstruct (impede) thy aim, thy imperium.' Of course there is nothing in the context which definitely proves that Indra's 'aim' is directed against his enemies; yet it would be only his enemies that would wish to 'obstruct' it, and Indra's general character, as well as the usual meaning of *ādīś* (not to speak of *svarájyam*, parallel to it) suggest this.

In two or three passages an *ādīś* is attributed to Soma. It occurs twice in the consecutiv stanzas 9. 21. 5 and 6, in closely parallel locutions:

āsmīn piśāṅgam indavo dádhātā venám ādīše,
yó asmábhyam árāvā. 5.
ṛbhúr ná ráthyam návam dádhātā kētam ādīše,
śukráḥ pavadhvam árṇasā. 6.

The key to *ādīše* is *yó asmábhyam árāvā*. The soma-drops are to fix their *vená* 'for aiming at him who is stingy towards us.' In the next stanza *pāda b* is repeated with *kēta* for *vená*; obviously 5^c is to be understood also with 6^b. Oldenberg (*Noten*) seems to me wrong on these stanzas, tho he is right to the extent of taking *ādīše* in a hostile sense. It seems to me that both *piśāṅga vená* and *kēta* must pertain to the soma, not to the stingy man (proleptically). The locativ *asmīn* causes no difficulty; it depends in sense, at least, on *ādīše* (perhaps also in literal construction, since we need not expect with the verbal noun the accusativ which would be found with a finite verb-form of *ā-dīś*; but it may also depend on *ā-dhā*, 'fix . . . upon him for aiming' = 'fix for aiming at him'). The exact meaning of *vená* in this place is a problem which I have not solved to my own satisfaction; *kēta* at least is clearly 'purpose, Absicht,' nearly synonymous with *ādīś* except that the latter is distinctly a hostile word; and I incline to the opinion that *vená*, which exchanges with *kēta* in these two stanzas, is to be taken in some sense which amounts to the same thing in the final outcome.

The sound of the soma is *dūrāādīśam* in 1. 139. 10; the context is colorless and gives no clue to the meaning; 'aiming afar off' fits as well as any other meaning.

I come finally to the last occurrence of *ādīś*, which Professor

Fay might hav quoted against me, since it is the one and only occurrence of a derivativ of this root in the entire Rigveda which, taken by itself, might plausibly be interpreted in the sense of 'salutation' or the like. It is 6. 48. 14:

*tám va índram ná sukrátum várūnam iva māyīnam
aryamānam ná mandrām srprábhōjasam viṣṇum ná stuṣa
ādīse.*

Pūṣan is praised, and is declared to be like unto various other gods in their special sferes. Simple as the language of the stanza seems at first sight, there ar difficulties about it. For instance, we need a qualifying epithet to go with *viṣṇum ná* in pāda d. It is very lame to translate with Grassmann 'den meinend preis' wie Vischnu ich'; for *ná* implies that Pūṣan is '(so-and-so) like Viṣṇu,' just as he is 'powerful like Indra' etc. Ludwig sees this and construes *srprábhōjasam*, in the preceding pāda, with *viṣṇum ná*. The pāda division and the order of words ar against this, tho I regard it as superior to Grassmann's rendering. But is it not at least possible that *ādīse* is the complement to *viṣṇum ná*—'like Viṣṇu for aiming (against enemies?)'? It is tru that, so far as I am able to discover, the Vedic accounts of Viṣṇu furnish no clue for explaining this as particularly appropriate to Viṣṇu. But the Rigveda tells us so little about Viṣṇu anyhow, that we can not be sure that there may not be som allusion here to a feature of the god not otherwise made clear.—If, however, this is not acceptable, then Ludwig's interpretation of the passage is clearly the right one. Ludwig renders *ādīse* 'für meine Absicht,' and the like is implied by Grassmann's 'den meinend.' Barring the possibility (which I freely admit is only a possibility) that my new interpretation is correct, we should hav in *ādīse* at this point one clear case of the meaning 'aim' without hostile intent. There would, after all, be nothing very startling in this; it is not a very remote departure from the customary (and I believ otherwise universal) meaning of the word. It would stil be a very far cry to 'salutation,' which, as I said, might be conjectured for this passage if we knew nothing about the word otherwise, but which, in view of its constant occurrence in a very different sense, can surely not be adopted here. No interpreter, so far as I kno, has adopted it; not even Ludwig, altho in his interpretation of 6. 56. 1 he coms quite close to Professor Fay's idea.