



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.

V.—SOBRIQUET AND STEM.

I. COMPOSITION AND SUFFIXATION: $\check{d}k^w$ - 'eye', $\check{a}no$ - 'face'. The preconceived idea of suffixation has often made for blindness. But we now generally recognize that Lat. *ferōx* and *atrōx* are compounds with the posterius $-\check{d}k^w$ - 'looking, seeing; eye'; and that, even though the sense of the posterius is quite in the way of vanishing; cf. also *velox celox* (see § 2; and cf. Kretschmer, Einl., p. 160). The same posterius is quite transparent in Greek $\omega\pi(o)$ - in words like $\omicron\iota\nu\psi$ ($\omicron\iota\nu\acute{\omega}\psi$, $\omicron\iota\nu\omega\acute{\rho}\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$), $\gamma\omicron\rho\gamma\acute{\omega}\psi$ ($\gamma\omicron\rho\gamma\omega\acute{\rho}\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$), $\pi\alpha\rho\theta\epsilon\nu\omega\acute{\rho}\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ and, with adverbial prius, in $\tau\eta\lambda\omega\acute{\rho}\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ 'far-seen > distant'. Like *ferus*: *ferox* is $\delta\epsilon\iota\nu\acute{\omega}\varsigma$: $\delta\epsilon\iota\nu\acute{\omega}\psi$ ($\delta\epsilon\iota\nu\omega\acute{\rho}\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$), and the evanescence of the posterius is even greater in Hom. $\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\nu\omega\acute{\rho}\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$: $\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\nu\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ (cf. $\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\rho\omega\acute{\rho}\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, $\kappa\omicron\iota\lambda\omega\acute{\rho}\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$). Again, many scholars recognize in $\pi\rho$ - $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ $\pi\rho\sigma\omicron\eta\gamma\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\gamma\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ a posterius $-\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\eta}\varsigma$: Skr. $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}$ - 'face',¹ and so they ought, cf. Lat. *prōnus* (<*pro-ānos*). Further note Skr. *sam-ānā-s* 'similis' (and almost 'aequos') <'uno-ore' (= *sam-ānana-*): Lat. (*s*)*m-ānos* 'aequos > benignus'; *imm-āni-s* 'atrox' (prius *ismo-*: Skr. *iṣmīn-* 'rapidus; turbulentus', see IF. 26, 41): *aiānēs* 'atrox' (prius *aīso-*: Av. *aēša-sa*-² 'petens, adoriens'); $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ (used of cloth), from *es(w)-* (: $\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\varsigma$ 'bonus') + $\acute{\alpha}no$ - = 'bona-facie'. Skr. *sahasānā-s* (1), with evanescent posterius, amounts to a long form of *śāhas* 'violentus' and *arçasānās*³ (2) 'iniuriosus' belongs with

¹ Boisacq's objection that $\acute{\alpha}$ is "gunated" (he means vriddhied) $\acute{\alpha}$ is puerile. What is $\acute{\alpha}$ in *ambāges*, pray? His defense of the complicated derivation of $-\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ from $-\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ - has no other purpose than to find an etymon for Goth. *ansis* 'gnadengabe'—which he ought to look for in Lat. <*h*>*onos* (with <*h*> as in <*h*>*umerus*), in the plural = 'gifts of honor' and *honestus*; also in $\delta\nu\acute{\iota}$ - $\nu\eta$ - $\mu\iota$ (not δ - $\nu\acute{\iota}$ - $\nu\eta$ - $\mu\iota$), as Uhlenbeck has seen.

² IE. *aīsōk(h)o-*, in Lat. *aeruscator* 'mendicis impudens', see CQ. 9, III, where *u* is wrongly explained as original.

³ Macdonnell, Ved. Gr. § 527, lists twelve other such forms as *s*-aor. participles. If we bear in mind that *sāhas* 'violens' also means (as a noun) 'vis', we find for over half of our list nouns in *as*, e. g. (3) $\acute{\omicron}\eta\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ 'expectatio', (4) $\acute{\iota}\rho\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\varsigma$ 'extensio, spatium', (5) $\acute{\nu}\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\varsigma$ 'honor', (6)

**arças* 'iniuria'. Has *véos* a similar long form in *ve-avías* (posterius **āniyā*- like Skr. *āsīya-m*: Lat. *ōs* 'mouth, face')? cf. Skr. *kalyāṇī* (fem.) = 'lovely': *kalya-s*, *καλός* (on *ṛ* see Wackernagel, ai. gr. I, § 173).

2. There is another group of *-āna-* compounds in the Rig-Veda, the analysis of which yields astounding results. Of the proper names, omitting *Āpnavāna-s* with its obscure prius, *Cyāv-āna-s* (one raised from the dead by the Aṅvins) and *Cyāvāt-āna-s* seem to mean 'mobili-ore', and the priora *cyó-* and *cyāvāt-* are either adjective and participial (Grundriss, 2. I, § 313 γ) or *cyó-* is an imperative (ibid., 2. I. 64), and *cyāvāt-* a transitive participle governing the posterius (ibid. γ). Of the mere adjectives, *tákav-ānas* 'velox' serves as a long form to *táku-*; *vásav-āna-s* 'dives' to *vásu-* 'benignus' (*vásu-* also = 'opes', cf. *optimus*); *bhṛgav-āna-s* 'splendidus' to *Bhṛgu-* 'Splendens'. Latin *Dī-āna*, the moon goddess, may be from *dīyo-āno-* 'of shining face' or, if Varro's *Divi-āna-* is not an invention, from *divi-yāna-* 'in caelo iens', cf. Skr. *divi-gamana-s* 'planet.'

3. But it is from the proper name *Pṛthav-ānas* that we can derive most instruction, and I will make bold to say at the beginning, but deprecating any charge of insolence, that I do not write for readers who, on account of looking at the forest, refuse to look at the trees. To learn, we must seize the individual thing that seems to be true and if, tested with and by other things of its kind, it still rings true, true it must be. So I will start from the truth that seems to glare from the proper name,

Pṛthav-āna-s. Vocative origin of sobriquet compounds.

4. The vocative *Pṛthav Āna* = (O) Broad Face. Its prius, *pṛthav*,¹ is the legitimate prevocalic samdhi form of *pṛtho*,

bhiyás 'fear', (7) *rábhas* 'vis', (8) *çávas* 'vis'. For the others, *-as* nouns, though not of record, are perfectly legitimate formations; and *ṛñjas-āná-s* 'celer' is no less apt to contain *-āna-* 'face' than Lat. *velōx* to contain *-ōkw-*. For *yama-sānás* 'reined up', I can but think we have a compound of *yāma-* 'rein'+ *sāna-s* 'vinctus' (: *Vsā*, in infin. *sātum*).

¹ The objection that in secondary derivation before vowel suffixes *u* stems show *av* in Sanskrit will not lie. If we may not claim the spread of *av* from cases like *Pṛthav-ānas* and *tákav-ānas* (§ 2), still in derivatives like *hanaviya-* 'genuinus' (spelled *hanaviyā-*), the stem *hanavi-*

vocative to *pṛthú-s* 'broad' (see Whitney, Gr². § 134, a); the second vocative *āna* is properly enclitic (ibid. § 314, d). The vocative *Pṛthavāna*, after being used as a nominative (cf. Lat. *Jū-piter* and its likes), picked up the nominative *-s*; and thence *pṛthav-* was carried through the paradigm. Starting from a case like *Pṛthav-āna-s*, where the vocative prius has the look of being an inexpugnable fact, we may infer that such compounds as *ugrá-bāhu-s* 'stout-armed' will also have started as *úgra-bāho* (O) Stout Arm; and will contain in their *ā* (< *o*) an IE. *-e*, deflected in the post tonic syllable to IE. *o*. The final accentuation of *ugrábāhu-* will be due to uncompounded *ugrám bāhúm* (acc.), cf. *urúh kákṣah* 'Broad Shoulder', to be cited presently; Lat. *os durum* (Terence, Eun. 806).

5. The notion that the Indo-European proper name represents a predominant early type of compound has often been advanced. As soon as we let such sobriquet compounds start in the vocative, where it seems that they certainly must have started, the figment of the composition stem or pre-flexional word, or *casus indefinitus* (!) in *-o* yields to the sane conviction that the *o*-stem, for all its wide subsequent development in composition, originated in a genuine and isolable word form, viz. the vocative in *-e* (deflected to *-o*). As for the typical name Broad Face (Latine, Bronze Beard), we have somehow failed¹ adequately to realize its actual vitality in our own tongue; in "Granddaddy Long Legs"; in our Texas sobriquet of "Big Foot Wallace"; in "Flat Head Mountain"; in "Faint heart ne'er won fair lady"; in Shakespeare's vocative instance, "O you hard hearts, you cruel men of Rome". This style of nomenclature has also been pointed out in the Rig Veda, as in *urúh kákṣah . . . gāṅgyāh* 'Latus Humerus

will lend itself to explanation as a locative (v. Macdonnell, Ved. Gr., § 296), cf. Lith. *danguje-jis* 'heavenly' from loc. *dangujè* (ex. ap. Brugmann, Gr. 2. 1, § 66, 3). [I now realize that in Homeric *ταναύ-πους* (and *τανα-ήκης*?) we have a vocative prius, while in (voc.) *τχθῷ ῥ* may come from *ῥu*. So *ταναν-* comes from voc. *τη-νηu*, cf. Skr. nom. *tanū-s*, allocated to the feminine; note *ῥ* in *δεικνυμι*. Likewise *ταναφός* is from *τη-νηw<o>-*; cf. the suffix *-ῥwo-*, set up by Brugmann-Thumb, p. 213³.]

¹ But now cf. W. Petersen in IF. 34, 262, § 14. with a splendid list of examples.

. . Gangeticus', (see Wackernagel, ai. Gram. II, 1, § 112 b, 3). We need not involve our explanation in the *pars pro toto* figure: *barefoot*, *hard heart*, and the like are more primitive than rhetoric;¹ nor limit it to names of persons (cf. Flat Head, name of a mountain).

6. A word may be added on the rôle of the nominative in making compounds. In RV. I. 32. 6 d, the problematic *rujānās* was long ago correctly interpreted for the thought by Professor Bloomfield. Morphologically, I would compare Eng. *hump-back* and Germ. *spaltfuss*, analyzing as *rujā* 'cleft' (: $\rho\acute{\omega}\xi^2$ < IE. $w\bar{r}g-$ | *rug-*, see Grundriss I § 539, 3) + *nās* (: Lat. *nāres*) 'nose' (or + *ānes-* 'face', § 1). Leaving out *rujānāh*, our pada states that "Indra's enemy was crushed to pieces", and we may insert *rujānās* parenthetically as "a cleft his nose".³ In *ūrdhva* < *s* > *ānā-s* (hapax in a line with *arḥsasānā-s*,

¹ An overwhelming number of sobriquet compounds, exhibiting in the posterius the name of a part of the body, might doubtless be turned up in the various tongues, such words as Av. *darəgō-bāzu-* long-arm(ed), *-angušta-* 'long-thumbed', *-gava-* 'longi-manus'; *pərəθu-varah-* 'broad-chested', *-safa-* 'broad-hoofed', *-sraoni-* 'broad-hipped'. In Greek we have like compounds in *-χειρ* (*κρατερό-χειρ*), *-πους* (*κραταιπους*), *-φρην* (*ταλαίφρων*). As for the *-αι* of *ταλαίφρων* (vocative) and the *-α* of *ταλάφρων* 'stout-heart', they furnish evidence of an Indo-European vocative to *-ā* stems in *-αι* | *-ā*; the former due before consonants, the latter before vowels, but confused. This vocative prius we have in *κλυται-μήστρα* = (O) Famous Contriver; perhaps in *μιαί-φονε* = (O) Pollution, (O) murderer |; in *κραται-πους* = (O) hard foot (*κραται-* a vocative to the <? nom. masc. > adverbial form *κάρτα*?); in *ταλασι-φρων* the prius will be the vocative feminine of a participle **iļl-ŋt-i* 'ferens'. The explanations of the handbooks, as of *κραται-* from *κραταιός* and the like, are entirely artificial and have not been made even algebraically convincing.

² The river *rujānā* mentioned by the commentator on this passage may well have existed, cf. *ἀπο-ρρῶξ*, of a branch of the Styx.

³ We also have in Sanskrit *ṛjū-nas-* = (O) Straight Nose, compounded of the *-ū* vocative **ṛju* (*ū* lengthened in composition to avoid the rhythmic succession $\cup\cup\cup$) + the vocative *nas*; cf. in Greek *Σιλᾶνός* (*-νο-*: Skr. fem. *nās-* 'nose':: Skr. *-dā-*: *-dās-*; cf. the *o*-stem *ἄγγελος*: Skr. *āṅgīrās*, *es*-stem; and Skr. compounds with posterius in *-stha-s*: *sthā-s*; also Wackernagel, ai. gram. II, 1, p. 96 a). Not Solmsen in IF. 30, 13, but Fay in CR. 18, 208, was the first to define *Σιλανός* by Snub-nose. If in the name of this Bacchic deity we are to recognize a derivative from Thracian *ζιλα* 'wine' (Kretschmer, Glotta, IV, 351 sq.), he must owe his traditional facial character to what appeared to be the meaning of his name, in short to "Disease of Language."

and so liable to explanation, <*s*> and all, by momentaneous irradiation), the <*s*> may also imply a parenthesis ("upwards <was> his face"); or *-āna-* may have stood to *ūrdhvās* in a relation of "specification" (in Greek the accusative; the IĒ. instrumental, see Grundriss, 2. 2. p. 543 f.). Out of the instrumental of attendant circumstance, as e. g. in Latin *mulier formâ honestâ*, the possessive (Bahuvrihi) type of compound might also have developed; cf. in reversed order Skr. *jānv-āknā-* (with) 'knee-bent'. The two lines of development would have converged. The course of the development from the sobriquet compound can be very simply comprehended by looking at a few Sanskrit compounds with prius *ugrā-*: (1) *ugrā-bāhu-* Strong Arm; (2) *ugra-dhanvan-* 'strong-bowed', *ugrā-yudha-* 'strong-weaponed'; (3) *ugrā-sena-* 'strong-armed', *ugrā-vīra-* 'strong-heroed', *ugrā-putra-* 'strong-sonned'; (4) *ugratejas-* 'strong-energiéd'.

7. In the Avesta, the prius of similar compounds is often in the nominative: does that point to the fact that the nominative, and not the vocative, was the generalized form, at least in *a*-stems? For Sanskrit *ugrā-bāhus*, the vocative *ugra bāho* has dictated the form of the prius; but in the Avesta we have in *darāgo-bāzu-* the type of the Skr. nominative *ugró bāhús* (like *urúh kakšáh*, § 5).

8. The arguments advanced above seem to me to have made it abundantly probable that the non-isolable stem which serves as the prius of composition originated in the vocative—or also to a much less degree in some other case form—of a sobriquet group. If this be true, while the developed facts of grammar as regards composition remain untouched, our conception of the fabric of the word must be profoundly modified. Thus we may no longer speak of the vocative of the *o* and *ā* declensions as the unmodified stem, but say contrariwise that the stem is the vocative. And the source of the vocative *-ē* seems a thing we can come upon. As the augment, *ē-* is an almost isolable word, and meant 'there'! (? or 'here'; cf. Drewitt, CQ. VI, 44 sq.; *ē-θέλω*). The same exclamatory adverb *-ē* makes an ideal vocative indicator, as anybody knows who has ever sung out "*you-there!*" to the man of unknown name whose attention is wanted quickly from the next tennis court. This *ē* (in the long form *ē*) is also used as a preposition; and when

Brugmann (Gr. 2. 2. § 634) explains it as instrumental of the demonstrative stem *e* he is confounding an original local adverb (without case) with that much subsequent thing a case form¹: and it really is this *-ē* that becomes the casual suffix of the Indo-Iranian instrumental in *-ā*. In the pair *ὄψέ | ὄψι-* the same *-ē* competes with *-i* (cf. *ῥψι*) as an adverb determinant.—For the identification of vocative *ē* with *-ē* in the imperative see e. g. AJPh. 15, 413; and on *ei* ‘there’! Bull. Univ. Texas, no. 263, § 99 sq. On *-ē*¹ as the instrumental case ending cf. AJPh. 37, 167²; as the locative, 170, § 28.

EDWIN W. FAY.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, Nov. 8, 1915.

¹He who thinks that IE. *ē* ‘there’ is a merely glottogonic inference and instrum. *ē* something less glottogonic—has never thought!

ADDENDA.

§ 1. The Latin pair *vetus: veter-ānus* conforms precisely with the type of Skr. *sahas-: sahas-ānā-*.

§ 1, fn. 3. Cf. *ṛṣi-ṣāna-* (RV.), attached to a seer.

P. 85, fn. 1. In the Vedic proper names and epithets *Hāray-āna-*, Tawny Face (quasi Atrox); *Tūrva-āna-*, Mighty Face (quasi Ferox); and *Āhray-āna-*, Unabashed Face, *ay* in the priora is the samdhi form of the *e* (= IE. *ei/oi*) vocative of *hāri- tūrvi- ā-hri-*.

§ 8. Thus Lat. *puer-e* may be conceived as like our outcry “boy there!”