

STEPHAN HILLYER LEVITT

SKT. *ĪNDRA*: GRASSMANN'S CONNECTION  
WITH  $\sqrt{INDH}$  AGAIN

1. *Introduction*

In a passage of the *Aitareyopaniṣad*, which *Upaniṣad* is of course *Aitareyāranyaka* 2.4-6, there occurs the word Skt. *idandra* (*idaṃdra*)<sup>1</sup>. In the specific passage in question (*AitUp* 1.3.13-14 = end

---

1. This paper was first penned in 1977-81 as part of a larger essay titled, *Sanskrit - ndr- and Dravidian*. Notes for revision for a separate paper on the etymology of *īndra* alone were made at that time as well. The paper was turned to again in 1995-96, and revisions were made at that time. Since then, the paper has been revised and updated on several occasions. I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Chlodwig H. Werba of the Institute for South Asian, Tibetan and Buddhist Studies, South Asian Studies Section, University of Vienna, for his comments on and criticism of an earlier version of this paper. The argument herein, however, is not to be understood to reflect this scholar's opinion. For this, I take full responsibility. I have held off from publishing my material on Skt. *īndra* since it requires a re-dating of the early Indian tradition, which I did not think I should be attempting till I had a number of other very sober academic articles published. Such a paper, titled "The Dating of the Indian Tradition", has now been prepared and has appeared in *Anthropos* 98.2 ([September] 2003): 341-59. See References. In the present paper, the following abbreviations have been used: *EWA* = M. Mayrhofer (1992-2001), *KEWA* = M. Mayrhofer (1956-1980), *DEDR* = T. Burrow and M. B. Emeneau (1984), *DED* = T. Burrow and M. B. Emeneau (1961), *DEDS* = T. Burrow and M. B. Emeneau (1968), *DEN* = T. Burrow and M. B. Emeneau (1972). Abbreviations of Indo-European languages are English equivalents of J. Pokorny (1959-69). However, Skt. = Sanskrit, Pa. = Pali, Pkt. = Prakrit, IA = Indo-Aryan, MIA = Middle Indo-Aryan, NIA = New Indo-Aryan, Ir = Indo-Iranian, IE = Indo-European, PIE = Proto-Indo-European. Abbreviations of Dravidian languages are those of *DEDR*. Also, Drav = Dravidian, PDr = Proto-Dravidian, PCDr = Proto-Central Dravidian. C = consonant. Abbreviations of

of *AitĀr* 2.4.3) the *ātmán* sees *bráhmaṇ* and says, “*idam adarśam*”, “I have seen this.” “Therefore he was *Idamdra* by name, he was indeed *Idamdra* by name. Him who is *Idamdra* they call *Indra* mysteriously. For the gods love mystery” (A. B. Keith 1909:231-232). The form is obviously contrived for purpose of folk etymology for Skt. *índra*.

One ought not dismiss the statement made as nonsense too readily, though. The same explanation for an etymology of *Indra* is given in *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* 6.1.1.2 and in *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* 14.6.11.2 (= *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 4.2.2) where it is said that *Indha* is called *Indra* mysteriously since the gods love mystery. This latter, which by coincidence involves the explanation of *Indra* given by H. Grassmann, and supported by A. Bergaigne, F. Bollensen, J. Hertel, and V. M. Apte, is provided with linguistic support in the present discussion.

To be considered with regard to an explanation of the form *idandra* (*idamdra*) is the opinion of A. B. Keith (1909:40) that the *Upaniṣad*-s “were no doubt originally accompanied in the Vedic schools by explanations which might, had they been preserved, have shown how much we now misinterpret them.” To be especially emphasized with regard to Skt. *idandra* is that even in late Vedic India the etymology of Skt. *índra* was considered to be cryptic. Indicating the veracity of this, *Yāska* has been noted by V. M. Apte (1950:13) to have offered fifteen different etymologies for Skt. *índra*. E. D. Perry (1878-84:123), followed by V. Machek (1937:261), notes that *Yāska* gives “no less than thirteen” etymologies for the name, *Indra*. Apte lists these etymologies, although without citation to passage, which is *Nirukta* 10.8. *Sāyaṇa* quotes this passage in his commentary on *RV* 1.3.4.

## 2. Previous Western Etymological Attempts

Modern Western interest in the etymology of the name similarly has produced a large number of divergent etymologies. These may be categorized into six groups, plus four suggestions that stand off by themselves.

---

Sanskrit works or of periods of Sanskrit literature, when used, are those of W. D. Whitney (1885).

The first goes back to a suggestion made by T. Benfey (1848: Glossar, 25a and 1862-[66]:1.49n.) that E. D. Perry (1878-84:123-124) characterized as “Middletown out of Moses, or mango out of Jeremiah King.” This obtains *indra* < *sind-r-a* < *sind-ar-a* < *syand-ar-a* < *syand-an* < *syand-ant*. Skt. *índra* was seen to be connected to Skt. *índu*. This etymology was accepted by J. Muir (1874:5.119) who, together with Benfey, characterized *indra* as a dialectical variation of *sindra* that came from √*syand* “to drip, to run” and that spread with the worship. J. Wackernagel (1896-1964:1.263) noted parallel instances of possible dwindling of initial sounds in Sanskrit together with this suggestion.

M. Müller (1875:2.449n.) cautiously held off from embracing the theory in full noting only that Skt. *índra* and Skt. *índu* “drop, sap” must by necessity come from the same root, whatever that might be, and that it must have meant originally “the giver of rain”. To be noted is that the first volume of M. Müller (1875) was originally published in 1861, with a second series published as vol. 2 in 1864. Between 1861 and 1875 *Lectures* had seen at least 31 printings, with five editions of vol. 1 and two editions of vol. 2, second series by 1866-68, and eight editions of both by 1875. This note is not in all the editions. And it is not clear from the editions available to me in which of these the note was introduced. It was introduced, however, before J. Muir (1874), which perhaps indicates its introduction in the second edition of the second series in 1868.

In general, this suggestion has not received much attention otherwise. In with it, however, fall such suggestions as those by W. Foy (1897: Anz. 8, 27) that derived *indra* < *indu-ra* with the syncopation of its *u* being owed to a popular pronunciation which has its analog in the syncopation of Middle Indic speech, J. Kirste (1907:405) that derived *indra* < *indr-a* < *indr* ~ *indu*, J. Lowenthal (1926:177) that sees Indra as a god of the thunderstorm and connects his name with Thracian, Phrygian and Gallic river names and Eng. *well*, and the suggestion of H. Petersson that is noted below in our sixth group of etymologies. Regarding Foy's suggestion, A. Debrunner in J. Wackernagel (1896-1964:1[Suppl.].38) noted Buddhist Skt. *poṣadha* = *upoṣadha*. Regarding the connection with Skt. *índu* in general, and specifically with regard to Foy's derivation of *indra* < *indu-ra*, E. C.

Polomé (1985:382) noted such a connection was fashionable when all major deities were being given astral interpretation, and Indra was claimed to be a moon god. Skt. *indu* refers not only to a drop of *sóma*, and a bright spark, but also to the moon. For recent argument that Indra is originally a moon god, see G. von Simson (1991-92).

The second group goes back to a suggestion made by R. Roth that in its basis Roth took from among the proposed etymologies in his edition of Yāska's *Nirukta*. See O. Böhtlingk and R. Roth (1855-75:1.804), under *indra*. This suggestion derives Skt. *indra* from  $\sqrt{in}$  or  $\sqrt{inv}$  "press, urge, have power over". With the suffix *-ra* a euphonic *d* is inserted, as in Gk. *ἀν-δ-ροῦς, μεσημ-β-ρία*, etc. The insertion of a euphonic *d* between *n* and *r* is, of course, an IE phenomenon which H. Jacobi (1891-92a:315-316) pointed out can be seen also in Ger. Heinērich and Heindērich, Fähnerich and Fähnderich. Dr. Ernest Bender has also referred to Eng. Henry and Hendrikson.

What has come to be the billing of this suggestion as the native Indian etymology for Skt. *indra* is misleading. See, for example, *KEWA* 1.89 and V. Machek (1941:146, 147). How this came about is not clear from the literature available to me, as O. Böhtlingk and R. Roth (1855-75) clearly state that all of Yāska's etymologies are insufficient. In part, the phrase is to be attributed to consultation of Roth's work on the *Nirukta*. Skt.  $\sqrt{in}$  is involved in only three of Yāska's fifteen suggestions, however, and in these Skt. *indra* is derived by the addition to  $\sqrt{in}$  of  $\sqrt{dr}$ ,  $\sqrt{dru}$  or  $\bar{a}\sqrt{dr}$ . Also,  $\sqrt{in}$  is involved in these etymologies in Sāyaṇa's text of Yāska's *Nirukta* and in R. Roth's early edition of the text only. L. Sarup's critical edition has restored the reference on the basis of manuscript evidence to  $\sqrt{ind}$ . See L. Sarup (1921: text, 174-176; transl., 155-156) and R. Roth (1852).

Roth's association of  $\sqrt{in}$  or  $\sqrt{inv}$  with Skt. *indra*, however, has stood the test of time, and is cited by *KEWA* 1.89, for instance, as a possible etymology. U. Chakravarty (1995) also supports such a suggestion, though *EWA* 1.192-193 appears to step away from it.

Criticizing this etymology, E. C. Polomé (1985:383) noted that the IIR verb is rather isolated. Apart from the related Skt. *inā* "lord, master; strong, mighty", the root occurs only in the full-grade form *énaś* "crime, sin, misfortune" and, perhaps, in the zero-grade *īti* "plague, distress". He noted further that F. B. J. Kuiper (1973:179-

190, especially 184-185) had split the group by deriving *iná* and *īti* (and *énas*) together with a few other terms from a root \**yā* “to injure, harm”, or “to attack violently”, separating Vedic *inóti* for semantic reasons. *EWA* 1.193 notes that connection of Skt. *índra* with the epithet of Indra *iná*, and with *énas*, is morphologically difficult. See in this regard, and with regard to the form *īti*, *EWA* 1.268 under *énas*.

The third group goes back to H. Jacobi (1891-92b:316-317) who, on the basis of Roth's suggestion, speculated that the *i-* of Skt. *índra* represented an original IE *ǵ-*. Thereby, through the use of Greek cognates, he connected the form with Skt. *nṛ́* and *nára* “man, hero” as in his connection between Skt. *sūnára* and Skt. *sundara* (1891-92a).

P. Kretschmer (1928:78-79) accepted Jacobi's suggestion, and combining it with the previously focused on connection of Indra with rain, found Jacobi's suggestion in the name of the Hittite weather-god Inar/Inaras. This he viewed to be the direct origin of Skt. *índra*. For criticism of Kretschmer's argument, see W. Neisser (1924-30:2.39-40). Also see A. Walde and J. B. Hofmann (1938-56:2.164-165) and G. Ivănescu (1960:117-118), both of which sources point out that the Hittite Inar/Inaras was a female deity. G. Ivănescu criticized Kretschmer's argument on historical grounds as well.

A. Walde and J. B. Hofmann (1938-56:2.164-165) considered both Jacobi's suggestion and Kretschmer's expansion of it to be unlikely. Of Jacobi's suggestion, they noted “phonetically questionable.” See as well G. Ivănescu (1960:117) regarding this. J. Tischler (1977-2001:1.361) also mentioned these connections. H. W. Bailey (1953:106-107, 1960:80, 1975a:1.9-10, including n. 21) supported Jacobi's connection. According to the last of these references, *índra* in the context of the household social structure celestified is glossed *śakrá* “able, strong”, which in Buddhist Pali literature, as Pa. *sakka*, even comes to replace the name *índra*. The term *tuvi-nṛmṇá* “strong in acts of skill or power” is used to characterize Indra in *RV* 5.33.6. As Iranian *nar-* in Parāčī *nar-* “be able”, Av. *hunarə-tāt* “skill” corresponds in meaning to Skt. *śak-* “be able” in the adjective *śakrá*, Skt. *índra* is seen to be related to *nar-* “be able” and its cognates such as Gk. *ἀνήρ*, *ἀνδρός*, etc., developing with shifted accent side-by-side with Skt. *indriyá* “faculty” from an adjective \**indrá*. He explained the *d* of *índra* as did Jacobi. Support for Jacobi's suggestion also comes

from K. R. Norman (1979:392-393) who suggested a connection between Pa. *indagũ* “man” and Skt. *\*indra-ka*, which thereby would suggest an etymology for Skt. *índra* that connects it with Gk. *ἀνῆρ* “man”. And support for this etymology comes from E. C. Polomé (1985:383-385), who however noted that there are possible phonological problems with this etymology in that the initial *\*ə* from IE *\*ənró-* is usually lost in Old Indic in this root, as in Skt. *nṛ́, nára* “man, hero”. E. C. Polomé (1987:208), however, again supported this etymology, as he did in (1989:56) where he noted that Indra provides an example of a deity named after his function: the term reflects IE *\*ənró-*, meaning “the heroic”. In this he was following G. Dumézil (1969:230, 1970:1.207) who also supported this etymology. For Dumézil, Indra is the canonical deity of what he viewed to be the second function in Indo-European society, force and the use of force in combat. Of this etymology, *EWA* 1.193 notes that it contradicts the recognized rules of syllabification.

To be criticized in both Roth’s suggestion and Jacobi’s suggestion is that the few other instances in IA of a euphonic *d* being inserted between *n* and *r* strictly are not parallel. These involve the formal maintenance of a vowel between *n* and *r*. H. W. Bailey (1975a:1.10, n. 21) recognized this problem, and argued that the occasional trisyllabic metrical pronunciation of *índra* in the *Ṛgveda* indicates that at this stage *\*indara* was pronounced. Further, the other instances of a euphonic *d* being inserted between *n* and *r* are either NIA or must be attributed to MIA. H. Jacobi (1891-92a) located these other instances. Jacobi, apparently, saw the need for parallel examples of this in IA. The forms located were Hindi, Marathi *bandar*, Punjabi *bāndar*, etc. as against Skt. *vānara* and, from Prakrit, inscriptional Skt. *vaiśvāndara* for Skt. *vaiśvānara*. It was on this basis that he proposed his identification of Skt. *sūnāra* and Skt. *sundara*, this latter being derived from a hypothetical Prakrit form *\*sundra*. Also proposed as an example of the insertion of a euphonic *d*, but admitted to be questionable, was Skt. *sāndra*. This material is mentioned as well in J. Wackernagel (1896-1964:1.181). Although a connection between *sūnāra* and *sundara* has been supported by both *KEWA* 3.483, 3.493 and *EWA* 2.740, it remains problematic: the considerable difference in the semantic spreads of *sūnāra* and *sundara* ought not be glossed over readily, and

the separation of *sundara* from the Sanskrit names Sunda, Upasunda and Nisunda is premature.

The fourth group is represented by the suggestion of H. Grassmann (1873:213) that *Skt. índra* is to be connected with  $\sqrt{indh}$  “to kindle (the sacrificial fire)”. Grassmann considered the identification to be the most obvious. He accounted for the loss of aspiration in *Skt. índra* on the basis of a suggestion of his that Sanskrit forms sometimes lost aspiration after a nasal. This latter suggestion has not held up through time. That *índra* was to be connected to  $\sqrt{indh}$  was also considered by A. Bergaigne (1878-97:2.166) to be the most reasonable. It was supported by F. Bollensen (1887:505-506). And it was supported by J. Hertel (1925:185b, 187a) who, in his index noted simply  $\sqrt{indh} = \sqrt{ind}$ , and defined *Skt. índra* as “the personification of heavenly fire”.

More recently V. M. Apte (1950) has argued for this derivation. It is supported, he noted, by derivations of *Skt. índra* not only in Yāska but also in *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* 6.1.1.2, and in *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* 14.6.11.2 (= *Brhadāranyakopaniṣad* 4.2.2) where the deity of the right eye is given as Indha instead of the more usual Indra. See also in this regard N. Verma (1991:284-285) and M. Deeg (1995:213, 366-367). Apte further argued that the name Indra is found as the subject of verbs synonymous with *Skt. √indh*, and once as the subject of  $\sqrt{indh}$ . The above are but two of his arguments. Regarding the problem of deaspiration that this etymology entails he cited, as did Grassmann, couplets of forms in Sanskrit that have aspiration in one instance and no aspiration in another. There is perhaps less reason for this today than in Grassmann's day as most of these couplets or seeming couplets have now been explained if not by re-analysis, then by other means. The primary argument for this derivation has always been that it is the most reasonable and obvious from the vantage of the Sanskrit sources.

The fifth group goes back to a suggestion of A. Bezenberger (1877:342), in a list of etymologies, that *Skt. índra* is to be connected with OG. *ent* “giant”, OHG. *entisc*, *andisc*. The point of departure here was the Avestan variant form *andra* for Av. *indra*. A connection to *Skt. índra* was found in *Skt. √nad* “to roar, bellow”. This was accepted by E. Lidén (1897:58), who expanded the IE form so as to connect it also to *Skt. √am* which, in one of its main Vedic Sanskrit

derivatives means “impetuosity, strength, power”. This, of course, is congruent with Skt. *indriyá* “bodily power, power, force ...”, just as in Skt. *√in*. A. Hillebrandt (1891-1902:3.168) noted Bezenberger’s suggestion to be in his opinion the best connection, though he later backed away from this opinion (1927-29:2.148, 1980-81:2.99). It is clearly in this group that Jacobi’s suggestion also belongs by dint of its emphasis on “manly” as the meaning of Skt. *índra*.

The sixth group goes back to a suggestion of A. Ludwig (1875:33) that Skt. *índra* is to be connected with OChSl. *jędro* “rapid, swift”. This was picked up by E. D. Perry (1878-84:123-124) who supported it, along with acceptance at the same time of the etymology proposed by R. Roth. V. Machek (1937:262) later followed Perry word for word.

It was also picked up by H. Petersson (1921:82-83, 248) who connected Skt. *índu*, the primary meaning of which he took to be “drop”, with Balto-Slavonic cognates to OChSl. *jędro* meaning “kernel, token, testicles, full, strong, fresh” and with a previously established reconstructed IE root *\*oid-* “to swell”. The nasal was accounted for by having it moved forward from the genitive declension. Skt. *indriyá* in its meaning “strong” was viewed to support his argument. Focus of the argument was then extended to Gk. *οἶδμα* “surf, breakers, swelling of the ocean” and various Balto-Slavonic river, brook and sea names such as Indura, Indrajà, Indrica. He thus built an argument in accord with the set established by T. Benfey that emphasized connection with Skt. *índu* in its meaning “drop”, and in accord with the mythological allusions of Müller’s argument (rain and storm), A. Bezenberger’s argument (strength) and H. Jacobi’s modification of Roth’s argument (strength).

H. Güntert (1923:13-14) supported Petersson’s argument. Also see the detailed explanation of W. Wüst quoted by J. Schnetz (1941:214-215) that related Skt. *índra*, and also Skt. *índu*, to IE *\*oid-*. For parallel examples to the moving forward of the nasal from a following syllable, see J. Schnetz (1941:212-213).

J. Pokorny (1959-69:1.774) has accepted this proposal as the etymology of Skt. *índra*. KEWA 1.88-89 also accepts it, along with the argument of R. Roth, as the possible etymology. And see M. Vasmer (1953-58:3.483-484) and EWA 1.192-193 for support for this argu-



ment. E. C. Polomé (1985:382-383) mentioned the proposed connection of Serbo-Croatian *jédar* “full, mighty, strong” < OChSl. \**jědro*, but criticized the etymology on the grounds that the further root connections of IE \**oyd-* “to swell” (including a “rather weakly established” connection of this root with Skt. *índu*) are questionable.

There is as well the suggestion of P. Thieme (1978:43n., 1985:243) that he offered originally for comparison to an etymology of his for Skt. *rudrá* < \**dru-dra*. This would derive Skt. *índra* < \**rim-dra* “cleaving wealth”, with dissimilation already in Proto-IA times.

And standing off by themselves in addition are the suggestions of L. A. Waddell (1929:79) and M. J. Shendge (1996:101-102). L. A. Waddell suggested that the name Indra goes back to Sumerian In-Dar, or In-Duru or In-Dur, King Dar, or King Dur or Tur, which he construed to be the name of the first Sumerian king. He also connected this name to the Nordic Thor. Very similar is the suggestion of M. J. Shendge that would derive Skt. *índra* from Sumerian *en-* “high lord” and *dār* “leader, lord”. “\*En-dār > Indār just as en-gar > ikkaru (Akk.), farmer and ellag = illag. The interchange e/i is effected during its borrowing into Akkadian or as in the second example such an alternation existed and is not difficult to explain” (101). M. J. Shendge, however, does not connect this with the same quasi-historical figure as did L. A. Waddell. She does, though, take Indra to have been the name of an historical person who was chief of the Aryans, and who only in later mythology became deified (M. J. Shendge 1996:29-31).

Also standing off by itself is the opinion of G. Ivănescu (1960:119-123) that Skt. *índra* and such Slavic forms as Serbo-Croatian *jédar* and OChSl. *jědro* are borrowings from pre-IE languages of Europe and Asia Minor, such as from Basque *indar* “strength, effort”. Further connected, he argued, are Etruscan Tina, Tinia (Jupiter), pre-Gk. Tindar, Gk. Tyndareos (as a name for Zeus), and the Celtic and Germanic god-names Taranos (< \*Tanaros), Donar, Thor, and such words as Eng. *thunder*. The disappearance of t- in Skt. *índra* he suggested was perhaps a feature of the Pre-IE languages. He also argued that the *d* in Skt. *índra* and in Gk. Tyndareos and Eng. *thunder* was a euphonic addition between *n* and *r*, as R. Roth and H. Jacobi had each argued regarding Skt. *índra* earlier.

Of note is that W. Niesser (1924-30:1.160-161) viewed Skt.

*indriyá* to be primary, and not to be derived from the name of the god. Similarly, in discussing one of the Ṛgvedic hymns to the Viśve Devās, L. Renou (1958:122) noted that two usages of *indriyá* elsewhere (in *RV* 9.48.5 and *RV* 10.36.8) provided an appellative value for the name Indra. Also, as noted above, H. W. Bailey (1953:106-107, 1975a:1.9-10, including n. 21) viewed Skt. *indriyá* not to have developed from the name of the god, but rather to have developed along with the name of the god from an adjective \**indrá*.

None of these arguments, it is to be noted, has demonstrated sufficient basis to inspire general support.

Further, their value from a mythological standpoint has been questioned. H. Oldenberg (1917:132-169, 1988:74-90) completely ignored etymology in his discussion of Indra. A. Hillebrandt (1891-1902:3.168, 1927-29:2.148, 1980-81:2.99) expressed the opinion that “the many attempts that were made to interpret Indra’s name etymologically did not contribute anything to mythology.” He added in the 1927-29 edition (see also 1980-81) that they had “little value from the mythological viewpoint.” Similarly, E. C. Polomé (1985:382, 385) opined that etymology was useless in throwing light on the significance of a deity and in specifying its functional role. When these have been fairly well established from textual sources, recourse to etymology proves disappointing. This was confirmed, he suggested, by the various attempts at etymologizing Indra’s name as an instance.

### 3. *The Historical Status of the Name within Indo-Iranian*

Nor has it been possible so far to determine the historical status of Skt. *índra* within IIr.

On the basis of the occurrence of a form *indra/andra* in the *Avesta* the form has been claimed to have a shared IIr status. See, for example, T. Burrow (1955:4-5) and A. B. Keith (1925:1.133). This was countered with the argument that the ‘in passing’ occurrence in the *Avesta* and the meager information regarding this name in later Parsi books did not provide sufficient information to determine anything. See J. Muir (1874:5.121), which cited private communication with and the writings of F. von Spiegel. More recently G. Gnoli

(1980:73-74, 79-80, 83), following T. Burrow (1973b:128), has argued that Indra is a Proto-IA deity whose name is a borrowing in the *Avesta* and Iranian.

Similarly, the occurrence of the name Indara in the treaty between the Hittite king Suppiluliuma and the Mitanni king Matiwāza (*circa* 1350 B.C.), and the occurrence of the name Indarota for a ruler of a principality neighboring the Mitanni kingdom, have been interpreted to indicate for the form possible shared IIr status (T. Burrow 1955: 29-30). The Mitanni treaty, however, which at first had been declared to indicate neither specifically IA nor specifically Iranian developments, has been shown to contain forms which are specifically IA (T. Burrow 1973a:vii, 29-30, 1973b:123-124). The theory, advanced by T. Burrow (1973a:30, 1973b:123-128), that IIr was already divided in IA and Iranian groups before the Indo-Aryans entered the Indian sub-continent, and that a group of IA invaders settled in eastern Iran and western Afghanistan from which area some went south to the Near East while the remainder went east to India, is clearly a cosmetic device intended to preserve the concept that the date of entry of the Indo-Aryans into India can be gauged by the date of entry of the Mitanni into the Near East and must be gauged by the disappearance of Indus Valley civilization. It counters what is otherwise a logical geographically engendered division between IA and Iranian, and it relies on too great a degree to the chance that all specifically IA groups would have been absorbed by Iranian groups or would have chosen to leave the Iranian area, and that all specifically Iranian groups would have chosen to remain. Regarding recent opinions on the Mitanni, and for further literature on this, see G. Gnoli (1980:72n.), J. P. Mallory (1989:37-43, 131-132, 229) and H. H. Hock (1999:2-3, especially n. 3).

Certainly, the presence in the former Soviet Union (C. I. S.) of such a possible Iranian group as the Cimmerians, and of such Iranian groups as the Sarmatians and Scythians, does not argue for a split at the time of the IA entry into India either. For brief but sound discussions of the Cimmerians, Sarmatians and Scythians see E. H. Minns (1910, 1911a, 1911b), S. R. Tokhtas'ev (1992), *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 15<sup>th</sup> ed. (1974:3.321b, 10.455ab, 10.576c-577a). Such a split may have been engendered by the entrance into India itself, and by the isolation in India of IA from the main body of IIr. There is no indication of native

IA and Iranian groups existing side by side in the C. I. S., though modern Russian scholars would identify the Andronovo culture with Indo-Iranians, and argue that these are the ancestors of the Indo-Aryans. Regarding what is seen to be the first migration wave of Indo-Iranians to the south, it is “not clear whether they spoke a common Indo-Iranian language or whether their forefathers were already divided into Nuristani, Indo-Aryans and Proto-Iranians” (E. E. Kuzmina 2001:28-29). Further, our earliest literary records of such native C. I. S. groups as the Cimmerians, Sarmatians and Scythians – Homer and Herodotus – are late from the vantage of the IA entry into India. This allows ample period of time from the entry into India to our first literary records of these groups for the split to have been engendered.

In final analysis, we simply cannot say anything about the split between IA and Iranian with certainty so as to argue one way or the other with regard to the Mitanni material. Rather, we must go back to the earlier theories which speculated that the Mitanni were a western movement of an Indic group out of the sub-continent and decide in favor of the conservative and non-committal argument advanced by M. Winternitz (1927-33:1.205-306) that the grouping of the gods Varuṇa and Mitra, Indra and Nāsatya in the Hittite-Mitanni treaty is reflective of the Vedic grouping for which there is no independent testimony outside the Vedic material. With regard to westward migration out of India, attested to at a later date by the Gypsies, note the occurrence of signs from Indus Valley script on Etruscan utensils and monumental remains and in sequence in Etruscan inscriptions, for which see G. Piccoli (1933). Interpretation of this Etruscan data is still not clear. H. H. Hock (1996:33, 1999:12) pointed out as well three additional instances of Indo-Aryan languages moving out of India aside from Romani with the Gypsies. These are Gandhari Prakrit in medieval Khotan and further east, and Parya in modern Uzbekistan, both of which have been transplanted out of India through migration, and Dumaki close to present day Shina that has moved to the outer northwestern edge of South Asia.

In regard to the specific linguistic affinities of the Sanskrit name Indra, therefore, the present data allows us neither the ability to demonstrate an extra-Indian origin for the name, nor the certainty that we might assume a specifically Indian origin for the name.

#### 4. The Present Proposal

In 1977-81 I examined Skt. *índra* in the context of the small number of other forms in Sanskrit that contain the C-cluster *-ndr-*, and examined these forms in the context of Drav. I hope to revise and update this material in the future. To date, two short papers have resulted from this investigation, S. H. Levitt (1980, 2003a). Regarding Skt. *índra* in this context, no viable etymology was turned up. A specific linguistic development in geographically southern Drav, however, does suggest that perhaps certain associations may have been made with the form Skt. *índra* in historical times within Tamil which may possibly have facilitated the spread of Buddhism in the Tamil-speaking region, which at that time would have included Kerala. A variant interpretation of the data regarding the supposed linguistic development in question by the native Tamil linguist G. Devaneyan would leave open the possibility that the associations referred to may have also been made with related Drav forms in late Vedic times. Should this have been the case such associations may have fueled doubt regarding Indra. These considerations, though, are at present merely conjectural and are, nevertheless, another topic. They will be spelt out more fully in the revision and updating of my work on the conjunct *-ndr-* in Sanskrit.

A defensible etymology for Skt. *índra* does not appear to involve the data collected regarding Skt. *-ndr-*, however. This form, and related forms such as Skt. *índu* and Skt. *indirā* are to be related here to Skt. *√indh* – as previously suggested by H. Grassmann, A. Bergaigne, F. Bollensen, J. Hertel, and V. M. Apte.

Firm support for a connection of Skt. *índra* and *√indh* is the cogent argument of V. M. Apte, referred to above, that Yāska in his *Nirukta* gives fifteen etymologies for Skt. *índra* with two of these being from Skt. *√indh*, and that in pre-*Nirukta* Vedic literature *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* 6.1.1.2 and *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* 14.6.11.2 (=Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad 4.2.2) connect Skt. *índra* with *√indh*. Further, as Apte argued, the name Indra is found as the subject of verbs synonymous with Skt. *√indh*, and is found once as the subject of *√indh*. Apte argued that *√indh* was the etymology of Skt. *índra* held by the Vedic poets.

The argument from the vantage of the literature is, of course, strong. It is so strong that H. Grassmann, A. Bergaigne, F. Bollensen,

and J. Hertel, as was pointed out above, considered the connection to be the most obvious. I might note a few points briefly. In the following argument I will usually give only one reference from the *Rgveda* for each point when such references are deemed necessary. There are in many instances more than one reference that might have been cited.

1. As a derivative of  $\sqrt{\text{indh}}$ , Skt. *índra* would be the kindling spark or combustion (perhaps specifically, the kindling spark from both wood and rock). The name would be therefore the transparent name of a phenomenon, as is most often the case with Vedic deities. A. B. Keith (1925:1.155) noted,

Agni [fire] ... is brought into existence by Indra or Indra and Viṣṇu, or by the Dawn, and is the son of Iḍā, the personification of the sacrificial food. ... More important is the birth from the two fire sticks, the upper being deemed the male, the lower the female, and in mythical form being described as Purūravas and Urvaçī from that famous pair of lovers. They are also called the two mothers, and many plays on the curious infant and his mothers occur. As friction is engendered by the action of the hands in turning one stick in the other, he is credited with ten mothers, the ten fingers. As force is needed for his production, Agni is the son of strength. ... As Agni springs from the wood, it is repeatedly stated that he dwells in plants.

T. Oberlies (1998-99:1.72, n. 337) notes that the fingers, which through rubbing produce fire, are called Agni's "young wives" (*RV* 1.71.1, *RV* 4.6.8). Keith (1925:1.155n.) in addition notes, "The long period of gestation (*RV*. v. 2) is probably an allusion to the long latency of fire in the wood, ere evoked by friction. ..." The parallelism between the onset of fire from the kindling sticks and the onset of lightning would be in general terms, perhaps, the basis for the often observed association of Indra with lightning. See, for example, A. B. Keith (1925:1.124, 1.125, 1.129).

2. As Indra is figured to be an atmospheric god, this would be considered to be an atmospheric form of fire. We hereby can find an atmospheric form of fire as one of the three steps of Viṣṇu, the third step being alternately in the bright region of heaven (*RV* 1.155.3) or like an eye in the sky (*RV* 1.22.20). Such is in accord

with Indra and Agni having the same father, but their mother being in different regions (*RV* 6.59.2). It is also in accord with both Indra and Agni being given the epithet, “son of strength” (*RV* 4.24.1, *RV* 1.27.2). As noted, A. B. Keith (1925:1.155) credits this epithet as applied to Agni as being due to the necessity of using force in the production of fire from the fire sticks. Further, it is in accord with the Nairukta reduction of the Vedic pantheon, recorded by Yāska, into three gods – Agni, Indra or Vāyu, and Sūrya (A. B. Keith 1925:1.86-87, 1.139). A. B. Keith (1925:1.156-157) relates this reduction to the three births of Agni, although Keith (1925:1.86-87) fails to see clearly why Indra is included here. We hereby have a naturalistic explanation of the Nairukta reduction.

This reduction of the Vedic pantheon, it ought to be mentioned in passing, is most certainly the origin of the later Hindu *trimūrti* of Brahmā, Śiva and Viṣṇu. Agni develops historically in the *Ṛgveda* to Bṛhaspati or Brahmanaspati, and is at times in the *Ṛgveda* closely identified with this deity (*RV* 1.38.13, *RV* 3.26.2). See A. B. Keith (1925:1.66, 1.162-164) regarding this. As Keith (1925:1.164) noted, “The chief importance of Bṛhaspati lies in the fact that he is in the earlier Vedic period the root from which sprung the god Brahman [=Brahmā], who appears first in the later stratum of the Brāhmaṇa texts.” For more recent work on Bṛhaspati, see T. Oberlies (1998-99:1.204, n. 270). These names, Bṛhaspati and Brahmanaspati, share with Brahmā a common etymological origin. Skt. *śivá* is in the *Ṛgveda* the characteristic par excellence of friends and friendship, the friend par excellence of the Vedic Indian being Indra. And Viṣṇu in all but a small number of references in the *Ṛgveda* is closely associated with the sun, Sūrya. Regarding this generation of the *trimūrti*, see A. A. MacDonell (1900:95-96) and M. Monier-Williams (1919:25-26). Regarding *śivá* as the characteristic of friends and friendship, see the predominant association of Skt. *śivá* with *sákhi* in H. Grassmann (1873:1395-1396) under *śivá*. Regarding *sakhyá* as a characteristic par excellence of Indra, see H. Grassmann (1873:1442) under *sakhyá*.

3. Indra's close association with Vāyu would be, perhaps, the association between the kindling and wafts of air in the production of fire.
4. Indra is born from his mother's side (*RV* 4.18.1-2). By the proposed identification of Skt. *índra* with  $\sqrt{\text{indh}}$ , this would be a reference to the side of the lower fire stick.
5. In order to obtain *sóma*, Indra seized his father by the foot and slew him (*RV* 4.18.12, *RV* 3.48.4). By this interpretation, Indra's father is the upper fire stick that he would consume at birth. Alternately, both Indra and Agni are noted to slay their parents (*RV* 6.59.1).
6. Indra is said to spring with Agni from the mouth of Puruṣa (*RV* 10.90.13).
7. As noted, Agni is said to be brought into existence by Indra (*RV* 2.12.3), or by the dawn, Uṣas (*RV* 3.17.3). T. Oberlies (1998-99:1.250, n. 491) interprets *RV* 2.12.3 as indicating that the deed of bringing fire is attributed to Indra. Regarding this verse, see also below under the discussion of Skt. *śilindhra*. A. B. Keith (1925:1.155) as well refers to a reference in which it is Indra and Viṣṇu together who bring Agni into existence. The imagery here would appear to refer to the kindling of the morning sacrificial fire that was timed with the rising of the sun. In the same vein, Indra is frequently referred to as the maker of the dawn (*RV* 3.44.2) and the finder of the sun (*RV* 3.39.5).
8. By the interpretation of T. Oberlies (1998-99:1.237, n. 430, 1.265-266), Indra is the brother of the dawn, Uṣas. Also, Indra destroys Uṣas' cart, regarding the interpretation of which see T. Oberlies (1998-99:1.225-226, n. 363).
9. With regard to the usage of Skt.  $\sqrt{\text{mad}}$ /*1.mand* and *mandrá* discussed by S. H. Levitt (1980), an interesting situation exists in which 50 out of 79 occurrences in the *R̥gveda* of  $\sqrt{\text{1.mand}}$  refer unambiguously to either Soma as the subject or Indra as the



object. In 44 out of 69 occurrences in the *R̥gveda* of the related form *mandrá*, however, *mandrá* is used to describe Agni (S. H. Levitt 1980:53). In this we can find perhaps an indication that Indra's being pleased or intoxicated by *sóma* was never disassociated to a great extent from the sacrificial fire. Indra becomes intoxicated: Agni becomes charming and in figurative terms speaks pleasantly.

10. O. Böhtlingk and R. Roth (1855-75:3.164), followed by M. Monier-Williams (1899:427c), list light ( *jyótis*) as the source of intelligence and the divine principle of life, citing *RV* 6.9.6 (see *AV* 10.2.31, *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* 10.6.3.2), *Vājasaneyīsaṃhitā* 24.3, *AV* 16.2.5, and *Bhagavadgītā* 13.17 and 5.24. Compare this with, for example, *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 4.2.1-4 and *Maitryupaniṣad* 7.11 regarding Indra (Indha) and his spouse in the context of the signification of Skt. *índra* argued for in this paper, as the persons of the right and left eyes and their relationship with the heart which is traditionally in Indic literature the locus of the individual soul.

Such, of course, is only a brief treatment of the subject and does not explain all the main characteristics of Indra. He is, however, as I argue in S. H. Levitt (2003b) from the very beginning of our records of him a composite deity who incorporates characteristics which are to be connected with Ancient Mesopotamia – specifically with the god En-lil. Thus, he is chief of the pantheon just as En-lil is chief of the pantheon. He supersedes a higher moral god just as En-lil supersedes a higher moral god. He separated heaven from earth, just as En-lil separated heaven from earth. He is a god of storm, both literally and figuratively, just as En-lil is a god of storm literally and figuratively. He conquers the enemies of the Aryans, just as En-lil similarly conquers enemies. Regarding En-lil, see T. Jacobsen (1949:153-156) and S. N. Kramer (1961:96). (I realize that Jacobsen's essay has been criticized as being prescriptive rather than descriptive. While it has been amplified, however, nothing supersedes it.) Viṣṇu, who is noted to stride widely to the side in the battle against Vṛtra (*RV* 4.18.11), is referred to as Indra's younger brother (E+), while Enki, who represents fresh

water and fertile earth, is referred to as the younger brother of En-lil (T. Jacobsen 1949:161). Indra uses a net as a snare (AV 8.8.8), he shakes ripe fruit from trees as if with a hook (RV 3.45.4), and he cannot be stopped by bird-catchers (RV 3.45.1). En-lil catches both birds and fish with nets (T. Jacobsen 1949:157). The point here is that similar specific imagery is shared. And in a myth the possible non-IE nature of which has been pointed out, Indra slays the demon Vṛtra (A. L. Basham 1954:234, 400; W. N. Brown 1961:286). Similarly, T. Jacobsen has argued that behind the parallel to this myth in the *Enuma Elish* is an older form in which it was En-lil who fought the monster, though such a myth in which En-lil is the central character has not come to light. (See T. Jacobsen 1949:155-156. For other parallel myths, see T. H. Gaster 1961:137-149. The Sumerian myth that has come to light does not refer to En-lil. T. Jacobsen 1976:167-168, 183-191 has therefore for now revised his view.)

Note that regarding this latter myth E. Benveniste, in E. Benveniste and L. Renou (1934:182-188), has argued that there are in it three basic themes, (1) a religious motif, the exploits of a victorious god; (2) an epic motif, the struggle of the hero with a usually reptilian monster; (3) a mythical motif, the freeing of the waters. For him (1) is an IIr warrior god; (2) is a universal theme worked and reworked on a traditional canvas both within and outside the IE world; and (3), the releasing of the pent-up waters, is a properly IIr myth hardly represented elsewhere, unique to the IIr tradition, linked with the importance and scarcity of water in Aryan lands. To be emphasized here is that Benveniste was writing when Mesopotamian studies was still in its infancy. Much of the material that has come to light was unknown or was not well known at that time. More recently, C. Watkins (1995:298-299) has argued that the themes, as outlined by Benveniste, are in fact intertwined. Further, he argued that Benveniste, and to a lesser extent Renou, failed to focus on the verbal formulas and ignored the conservatism of the verb phrases. Watkins' main discussion focuses on the verbal formulas in the myth that he argued can be called distinctly IE. We might note in this place that the application of IE verbal formulas to the narration of a myth does not necessarily argue for an IE origin for that myth.

The basis of the discussion here is the origin of aspirates in IIr

from a non-aspirate + laryngeal, and the arguments of F. B. J. Kuiper and T. Burrow with regard to the etymologies for Skt. *sadhásthā* and Skt. *síndhu*. F. B. J. Kuiper (1946-48, 1957) connected Skt. *sadhásthā* with Skt.  $\sqrt{sad}$ , analyzing it as *sad-H-as-thā*. And T. Burrow connected Skt. *síndhu* with Skt. *syandrā* and Skt.  $\sqrt{sic}$ . He suggested that  $\sqrt{syand/syad}$  is a collateral form of  $\sqrt{sic}$  derived by the accretion of a stem formative suffix *-d* in combination with *n* after dropping *-c*. This root in a weak grade was connected to Skt. *síndhu* through the addition of a suffix containing a laryngeal. Skt. *síndhu* was thus analyzed as *sind-H-u*. See T. Burrow (1949:59, 1955:291, 71, 87, 179, 196, 1973a:292, 72, 88, 180, 197). P. Thieme (1970) would connect Skt. *síndhu* with  $\sqrt{sedh/sidh}$  “to ward off, keep away”, which root he would separate formally and semantically from  $\sqrt{sādh/sidh}$  “to reach successfully”. Thus, *síndhu* would mean “he/she who wards off, keeps away”, that is, “a natural frontier” formed by a big river like the Indus. Regarding this connection, C. H. Werba (personal communication) points to the usage of *siṣedhe* from  $\sqrt{sidh}$  “to drive away” in *RV* 1.32.13 following mention of the Síndhu in *RV* 1.32.12. This form in this location, though, is usually connected to  $\sqrt{sādh/sidh}$  “to succeed, to reach successfully”. See H. Grassmann (1873:1517-1518) and M. Monier-Williams (1899:1215a). H. W. Bailey (1975a:6n., 1975b) objected to the meaning “boundary” given the form by Thieme, and derived it from the same root but with the meaning “to be raised” regarding which meaning he pointed to the form *utsedhá* “elevation, height” in *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* 13.2.2.9. He argued that *síndhu* referred to “enclosing high banks” as in other nouns for “river” elsewhere. These etymologies contradict Burrow’s suggestion. *EWA* 2.729-730 notes of the etymology for this word, “not settled.”

The argument here, though, works the other way around and explains a loss of aspiration. The argument here is a different twist on Grassmann’s Law. The forms used to prove the point made here may be considered to be obscure either because of their infrequent occurrence, or their frequent occurrence but anomalous nature. Enough of these forms are explained by what is proposed, though, that they may be considered to be examples of a rule.

Grassmann’s Law is a rule in Indic, operative in Vedic and classical Sanskrit (J. Schindler 1976:625; H. Scharfe 1996:375). A similar

rule applies to Greek as well, which fact has posed problems for IE dialectology (S. R. Anderson 1970:387). This rule is in two parts.

The first part states that “given a root with a final aspirate and an initial consonant capable of aspiration, and given also that the final element loses aspiration (by some separate sound law), then that feature is retracted to the initial element.” The second part states that “given two consonant-groups in a word, separated by a vowel and themselves aspirated, and provided that they are within the same root, then one (and *normally* the first) is deprived of its breath feature” (N. E. Collinge 1985:47). Stated differently, in roots with an abstract shape with two aspirates, when the root appears in an environment in which the final stop would lose its aspiration, aspiration appears in the initial. In such roots, the root normally undergoes deaspiration of the initial if the root-final aspiration is not lost by some other process (S. R. Anderson 1970:387). The separate sound law involved here is the deaspiration of a stop before an obstruent (such as *s*, *dh* and *bh*) or word boundary. This process may be collapsed with a rule that devoices finals and performs other sandhi operations (S. R. Anderson 1970:388, 390).

The situation is further complicated by Bartholomae’s Law, which was a rule already in Proto-Ir (J. Schindler 1976:623n.; H. Scharfe 1996:375). According to this law, a cluster consisting of a voiced aspirate stop followed by a voiceless stop becomes a voiced unaspirate followed by a voiced aspirate. This rule applies when the root ends in a voiced aspirate and is followed by one of the endings in *ta* (past participle), *tas* (3<sup>rd</sup> du. act.), *tum* (inf.), *tvā* (gerund), *tha* (2<sup>nd</sup> pl. act.), and *thas*, among others. “If Bartholomae’s Law did not apply in these forms, we would expect the final stop of the root to be deaspirated ..., and the voicing assimilation rule to devoice the final, yielding clusters like *-tt-*, *-tth-*, and *-pt-*, instead of the observed *-ddh-* and *-bdh-*” (S. R. Anderson 1970:388).

For further discussion of Grassmann’s Law and Bartholomae’s Law, see N. E. Collinge (1985:47-61, 7-11), S. R. Anderson (1970), E. Phelps (1975), and J. Schindler (1976).

The proposal here, as stated, is a different twist on this situation.

It is to be noted that the treatment of roots containing aspirates in Sanskrit is not uniform. Thus, with specific reference to  $\sqrt{idh/indh}$ , in

the 3<sup>rd</sup> sing., pres. ind. mid., *indh-te* > *indhe* for *inddhe*. Also, O. Böhtlingk and R. Roth (1855-75:1.799), and A. Debrunner in J. Wackernagel (1896-1964:2,2.858), judged °*idh-tra* > °*idhra* for °*iddhra*, which form occurs only in *ágnīdhra* and *agnīdhra*. Compare *abandh-tra* > *abandhra* for *abanddhra*, *randh-dhi* > *randhi* for *randdhi*. In *Taittirīyāranyaka* 4.41.1-3, 5, 6 we also have a form with an atypical treatment of aspiration for √*idh/indh* which treatment can be cited for approximately 110 other forms as well, *indh-tām* > *inttām*: compare *dadh-tam* > *dhattām*, *dagh-tam* > *dhaktam*, as against *budh-ta* > *buddhá*, *dah-ta* > *dagdha*, *rundh-tas* > *runddhas*. See J. Wackernagel (1896-1964:1.131-132). Strictly, the form as it appears in *Taittirīyāranyaka* 4.41.1-3, 5, 6 is *samintām*. As previous citations to it by J. Wackernagel and W. D. Whitney have been to *inttām*, however, the form routinely is cited here in this way. Such regressive assimilation followed in the instance of several roots by what appears from the vantage of Sanskrit to be the throwing back of aspiration to an initial voiced unaspirate, is of course the rule – but in instances of euphonic combination other than those in which a final voiced aspirate of a root is followed by *t* or *th* of an ending. See immediately above regarding Grassmann's Law and Bartholomae's Law, and see W. D. Whitney (1889:53-54) for the rule. Whitney gave as examples the later desiderative *jighr̥kṣa* for √*grah*, and the later desiderative *dhīpsa* for √*dabh*. See also the future *dhroksyati* for √*druh*, and the future *bhotsyati* and the desiderative *bubhutsati* for √*budh*. And see W. D. Whitney (1889:49). We thus have for √*idh/indh* three forms with atypical treatment of aspiration. This can be considered to 'mark' this root as one the treatment of which – for whatever reasons – posed problems.

Regarding the form *inttām*, analysis by J. Narten (1964:90n.) has regarded it as an analogical formation due to the 2<sup>nd</sup> sing. imper. \**intsva*. E. Phelps (1975:451) would explain *inttām*, and *dhaktam*, both of which are noted to occur in the earlier texts, on the basis of dialectical variation that did not have Bartholomae's Law. Regarding such a form as *dhattam* < *dadh-tam*, Phelps notes various analyses. J. Schindler (1976:635) explains the forms *inttām* and *dhaktam* as nonce forms, noting that *inttām* may perhaps be due to the 2<sup>nd</sup> sing. imper. \**intsva*. Schindler (1976:636) further notes that the present paradigm of *dhā* (628-629), and the 2<sup>nd</sup> sing. perf. *āttha* (624-625), are excep-

tions to the rule ordering that he has set up for late Vedic and classical Sanskrit and must be handled by special rules. H. Scharfe (1996) does not treat *inttām*, but argues a geographically engendered dialectical explanation for other formations of such a type for PIE \**dhagh* in Vedic Sanskrit, treating in this fashion such variations in Bartholomae's Law and Grassmann's Law.

With Skt. *indra* and related forms, however, it does not appear to be euphonic combination that is involved. And while there are Sanskrit forms in which aspiration has been lost from IE, in most cases this is initial aspiration lost on account of a following aspirate within the root by Grassmann's Law. According to J. Wackernagel (1896-1964:1.126) in the instance of a small number of roots, however, we have aspiration preserved in the initial and lost in the root final:  $\sqrt{chad}$ ,  $\sqrt{chid}$ ,  $\sqrt{dhraj}$ ,  $\sqrt{bhuj}$ . Not all these examples have held up through time, as in the instances of  $\sqrt{chad}$  and  $\sqrt{chid}$ . See J. Pokorny (1959-69:1.919, 1.920-921) and *EWA* 1.554-555 and 1.561. Regarding  $\sqrt{dhraj}$ , *KEWA* 2.115 and 3.741, and *EWA* 1.798, have argued that the connections with material in other IE languages are unsatisfactory. For the standard connections see J. Pokorny (1959-69:1.273) who cross-references this form, PIE form reconstructed with initial aspirate but without final aspirate, with a PIE form reconstructed without initial aspirate but with final aspirate. See J. Pokorny (1959-69:1.1089). It is forms in this latter entry that J. Wackernagel (1896-1964:1.126) had pointed to as indicating original root final aspiration for  $\sqrt{dhraj}$ . Regarding  $\sqrt{bhuj}$ , *EWA* 2.274-275 notes that the form reconstructed for IIr with initial aspiration but without final aspiration is not to be separated from the Germanic words that indicate a reconstructed form with both initial aspiration and final aspiration. J. Pokorny (1959-69:1.152-153) lists these two forms as alternate roots, noting that the form with both initial and final aspiration occurs in Germanic. It is a Germanic form that J. Wackernagel (1896-1964:1.126) pointed to as indicating both initial and final aspiration of the reconstructed root to which  $\sqrt{bhuj}$  went back. For forms in Sanskrit in which initial aspiration has been lost from IE on account of a following aspirate within the root, see for example  $\sqrt{dabh}$ ,  $\sqrt{dih}$ ,  $\sqrt{drāgh}$ ,  $\sqrt{bañh}$ ,  $\sqrt{bandh}$ ,  $\sqrt{bādih}$ ,  $\sqrt{budh}$  (J. Pokorny 1959-69:1.240, 1.244-245, 1.273-274, 1.127-128, 1.127, 1.112, 1.150-152; *EWA*

1.694-696, 1.746-747, 2.204-205, 2.220-221, 2.208, 2.222, 2.233-235). Also see, for example, *kumbhá*, *duhitár*, *bāhú*, *budhná* (J. Pokorny 1959-69: 1.592, 1.277, 1.108, 1.174; EWA 1.370, 1.737-738, 2.223-224, 2.228-229). I mention this material because it is herein that lays the primary factor in the proposed relationship between Skt. *índra* and √*indh*. The root is behaving as if there were initial aspiration in some instances, although this aspiration is not graphically present. Such a situation in which the aspiration cannot be seen graphically is in evidence in Skt. *inttām*, referred to above. The seeming throwing back of aspiration to the initial is not visible, but is certain on the basis of parallel examples. To be emphasized, though, is that we do not have here an actual throwing back of aspiration as in Aśokan inscriptions *hida* < Proto-Ir \**idha* (Skt. *ihá*). Rather, an initial laryngeal of the original form by the argument here was at one point perceived and has had an effect.

That such is a viable possibility is to be seen in cognate IE forms of √*idh/indh*. Thus, for example:

Gk. *αἶθω*, *αἶθων*. o St.: Gk. *αἶθος*, OHG. and MHG. *eit*, Norw. and Swed. *id*, NHG. dial *aitel*; u St.: Gall. *Aedui*, OIr. *áed*; Lat. *aedēs*.

With -t- suffix: Lat. *aestās*, *-ātis*; *aestus*, *-ūs*; *aestuāre*; OG. *āst*, Eng. *oast*.

With r- formative: Gk. *αἰθήρ*, *αἶθρα*. *αἶθριος*.

With l- formative: Gk. *αἰθαλή*, *αἶθαλος*; OG. *īdel*, OHG. *ītal*, NHG. *aitel*; OG. *ǣlan*, *ǣled*, OIs. *eldr*.

With s- formative: Gk. *αἶθος*; OIs. *eisa*, OHG. *essa*; Av. *aēsma*; Lith. *iesmò*, *aistrà*; OCz. *niestějě* (*n-* through false word separation), Slav. *istěje*, *stěje*.

Also Alb. Geg. *idhunε*, Tosk. *idhëtë*, Tosk. *idherim*, *hīdhitë*.

(Data abstracted from J. Pokorny 1959-69:1.11-12.)

The initial *h-* of the Alb. form is non-organic according to N. Jokl (1911:29). Of the four such forms given by Jokl, two others as well, Alb. *hurđë* and Alb. *hut*, similarly go back to forms with IE diphthongs the first member of which was \**a-*. One, Alb. *herdhe*, goes back to an IE reconstructed form beginning with \**o-*. See J. Pokorny (1959-69:1.80, 1.73, 1.782). The weight of the data from the vantage of

laryngeal theory would appear to indicate that the initial h- is indeed organic. See E. P. Hamp (1965:126, 127, 129) regarding this.

Suggested by this data is that:

1. There was a perception on the part of some Vedic writers, at least, of the initial IE \*e-. The initial, of course, had been lost in the simplification of IE diphthongs the first member of which was normal grade that had occurred systematically in Sanskrit and only partially in Ir (T. Burrow 1955:33, 108, 1973a:33, 109-110; W. S. Allen 1953:62-64). See also W. F. Wyatt Jr. (1970:26-28) regarding such alternation as Skt. *édhaḥ* “fuel”, Gk. *αῖθος* “fire”: Skt. *inddhé* “sets on fire”, and Skt. *éṣati* “seeks”, Arm. *aiç* “enquête”: Skt. *icchāti*. Wyatt argued that IE \*/a/- > Iir Ø in initial position before /u/ and /i/ when IE \*/au/- and \*/ai/- are unaccented, save certain deictic words in Sanskrit (*etát* “this”, *evá* “so, exactly”, *eṣá* “this”) have unaccented /e/. But these latter were explained as secondary forms. Note that W. S. Allen (1953:63) related that the *Pāṇinīyaśikṣā* appears to preserve in Sanskrit the tradition of a diphthongal pronunciation for *e* and *o* (distinct from that of *ai* and *au*).
2. The initial IE \*e- was perceived, as laryngeal theory would have us perceive it, as reflecting an undifferentiated vowel which was shaded by contact with a laryngeal. See, for example, T. Burrow (1955:87-88, 1973a:88-89) and W. F. Wyatt Jr. (1970:3-4, 6-7).
3. The initial was seen to have consonantal value. Therefore, as J. Kuryłowicz has suggested for reconstructed PIE roots containing an initial vowel, the initial must have been a laryngeal. See, for example, W. F. Wyatt Jr. (1970:7) and F. O. Lindeman (1977:41-58).

It is only in this fashion that we can explain Skt. *inttām* < √*idh/indh* in *Taittirīyāraṇyaka* 4.41.1-3, 5, 6 as being ‘regular’.

We thus have a situation in which, by the rules which developed for Sanskrit regarding aspiration in roots which inherited two aspirates from IE, preservation of the initial would have resulted in loss of aspiration at the end of the inherited Sanskrit root for Skt. *índra* (< \**indrá*) and



related forms. Thus, hypothetically, we have  $*H_2eindhra$  ( $=*aindhra$ )  $>$   $*H_2eindra$  ( $=*aindra$ ). Such argues for antiquity for the name.

To be observed is that T. Burrow (1955:107, 1973a:108) noted that the second element of the IE diphthong was consonantal. Further, from the vantage of phonotactics it would seem that for  $*H_2eindh-$  we should obtain  $*H_2eyndh-$ , or  $*H_2eiṅdh-$ , as explained by J. Schindler (1977:56). J. Schindler noted in that place, however, that there are exceptions to the overall rule. He mentioned that when the  $n$  is a verbal infix from the nasal present, as here,  $n$  stands instead of becoming  $ṅ$ .

Whether the preservation of the initial in such an instance was due to conservatism applied to particularly sacred names and words, or was due to other specific historical circumstances which might have exerted pressure on the C-cluster  $-ndhr-$  is problematic.

Such preservation would have been at variance with the more general treatment of the root itself ( $\sqrt{indh/indh}$ ), which maintained aspiration in its final. The situation thus would be roughly of the same sort as we find in *Skt. majmánā* against *Skt. √mah* in which we have evidence of the same IE root both with and without aspiration, the difference here being that *Skt. √mah* represents generalization from a form to which a suffix has been added. It might also be considered to be analogous to the alternate Vedic realizations of  $\sqrt{ramb/lamb}$  “to hang down” in *anārambaṇá* and *anārambhaṇá*. Here, however, while the alternation may in its basis be due to possible effects of the nature of  $r$  and  $l$  in IE, there is reconstructed for PIE on the basis of comparative evidence a nasalized root  $*lemb(h)$ . Also perhaps due to the possible effects of the nature of  $r$  and  $l$  in IE is a possible connection between *Skt. rándhra* and *Skt. √rad* as suggested by O. Böhtlingk and R. Roth (1855-75:6.265). The semantic spread for these two forms is similar, as has been noted by *KEWA* 3.40. Regarding an up-to-date thoroughgoing IE etymology for *rándhra*, see T. Gotō (1985). The semantic spread for *Skt. rándhra*, it can be noted, is not comparable to any semantic spread in Drav. Should there be a connection between *Skt. rándhra* and *Skt. √rad*, the process at play may be very old. It is to be emphasized that there exist to date no viable arguments connecting *Skt. rándhra* and *Skt. √rad*. Not to be entirely disregarded is the possibility of dialectics being involved. Compare, for example, the connection made between *Skt. √mad/l.mand* and *Skt. badhyatás* (v.l. *madhy-*

atás) and Skt. *madhú* in some of its infrequent significations through Drav in S. H. Levitt (1980:35-36, 37-38, 57-58).

The initial for Skt. *índra* and related forms subsequently would have been lost in the general simplification of IE diphthongs in Sanskrit referred to above. Thus, hypothetically, we have  $*H_2eindra$  ( $=*aindra$ )  $> *indrá >$  Skt. *índra*. This would have had the effect of creating a religious mystery. Argument for the purposeful creation of such a mystery in Pre-Sanskrit, while intriguing, lacks historical support.

Such an explanation is consonant with the frequent metrical pronunciation of Skt. *índra* as  $*indara$  in the *R̥gveda*. Regarding this pronunciation, see J. Wackernagel (1896-1964:1.55). Siever's Law would make Skt. *índra* phonologically peculiar, since *índira* (or *índura*) from  $*indrro-$  is the only form that the law would allow. See A. Sihler (1931:60) regarding the application of Siever's Law to the form of Skt. *índra*. Edgerton (1934:259) in fact opined, "The god-name *indra*-often has three syllables, as the meter clearly shows." If we leave aside Siever's Law, the application of which to Skt. *índra* has been questioned by A. Sihler (1971:60-64), for instance, we alternately can suggest that what appears as an interposed vocalic element not graphically represented would be due to lost aspiration. This perhaps may be considered to be parallel to the disyllabic pronunciation of the Vedic ending *-ia* when this goes back to a suffix with an intervocalic laryngeal that has been dropped. See T. Burrow (1955:86-87, 1973a:87-88). The loss is perceived and evidence of it remains.

I purposely refrain here from discussing the theoretical aspects of this from the vantage of laryngeal theory and schwa. Certainly, what appears to be implied in the instance of Skt. *índra* being pronounced as  $*indara$  is that aspiration is not simply lost, but results in  $\varnothing$  which, perhaps in instances of distinct pronunciation, is enunciated and thereby can be used metrically. The theory that  $\varnothing$  is a vocalic version of the laryngeals is suggested, of course. The metrical pronunciation of  $*indara$  for Skt. *índra* would be an instance in which  $\varnothing$  is preserved as  $\varnothing$  in Sanskrit,  $\varnothing > \emptyset$  otherwise as has been argued by T. Burrow (1949, 1955:88, 104-106, 1973a:89, 106-107), for example. See, however, below with regard to Skt. *indirā*, *indambara* and *indīvāra*.

To be noted in this regard is that E. V. Arnold (1905:105-106) considers the form  $*rudara$  for Skt. *rudrá*, which is the second most

frequent example of such pronunciation in Vedic Sanskrit, to be imitative of \**indara* for Skt. *índra*. Other forms in *-ra*, *-rā*, *-rī* so pronounced are truly few, and a number of these are open to question. Most of these latter forms, though, like \**indara* for Skt. *índra* but unlike \**rudara* for Skt. *rudrá*, follow a heavy syllable (E. V. Arnold 1905:98-99). Nevertheless, it is not inconceivable that they too are imitative of the occurrence of \**indara* for Skt. *índra* in the later periods.

A. Sihler (1971:60-62) supports Arnold's method of limiting his tentative data regarding trisyllabic pronunciation of *índra* to lines where trisyllabic *índra* is the only device that will yield a well-formed line. According to Arnold's analysis the extreme rarity of trisyllabic *índra*, in spite of the great number of Indra hymns in dimeter and lyric meter in the first two groups of his chronological arrangement of the *Ṛgveda*, "seems to shew clearly that the word was always a disyllable to the poets of those groups" (E. V. Arnold 1905:98).

The variant Avestan form *andra* standing beside Av. *indra* would seem to preserve a form in which the treatment of IE diphthongs in Iranian maintained the initial \**a-*. The existence of such a variant certainly argues for a shared IIr status for the form from which Skt. *índra* developed. Such a resolution of the IE diphthong in Iranian, however, would be unusual. For the treatment of IE diphthongs in Avestan, see K. Hoffmann and B. Forssman (1996:67-72). Perhaps, it is to be viewed from the vantage of the dynamics behind such alternations as represented by such reconstructed PIE forms as \**a(i)ǵh-*: \**ǵh-* or \**sē[i]dh-*: \**sǵdh-* and \**sadh-*. Because of the general loss of aspiration in Iranian, of course, nothing can be told with regard to whether the form lost aspiration in the final of the root at a time before the separation of IIr. K. F. Geldner (1886-93:3.82 and 82n. [*Vendīdād* 10.9]), perhaps correctly, viewed this alternation to be due to graphemics. He thereby reconstructed a form *in̄dra*. Such a reconstruction would appear not to have been original with Geldner. Similarly, H. W. Bailey (1960:80) noted that the form with *a-* might be only a late scribal variant. It is only A. Bezenberger's suggestion, H. Jacobi's variation on R. Roth's suggestion, and H. Petersson's suggestion that might otherwise account for Av. *andra*. And it is only Bezenberger and Jacobi who addressed the problem posed by this form. H. Petersson did not bring up the problem, perhaps on the basis of

Geldner's reconstruction. R. Roth's suggestion from Skt.  $\sqrt{in}$  cannot account for this variant Avestan form.

From an IE vantage, once we remove Skt. *índra* and related forms from the set established by H. Petersson, placing it instead in the previously established set of etyma which contains Skt.  $\sqrt{idh/indh}$  with only a minor paradigmatic expansion of the hypothetical PIE forms reconstructed from this set, there is no longer any need to maintain in Petersson's set a form with a nasal generated by the moving forward of a nasal from the genitive declension. This was postulated solely to explain Skt. *índra*. See J. Pokorny (1959-69:1.774).

The Balto-Slavonic river, brook and sea names, and also the three village names which Petersson associated with Skt. *índra*, which are not associated with any meanings and which were included on account of their striking resemblance to Skt. *índra*, similarly ought to be transferred. I mention this material here because J. Pokorny (1959-69:1.774) includes detailed reference to it together with his stated etymology for Skt. *índra*, which etymology *KEWA* 1.88-89 and *EWA* 1.192-193 also support. These names are: Indura, Indisse, Indrajà, Indrajás, Antándrajè (dial. Untándrajè, derived by J. Petersson from \*Untā-indrajè, *unta* meaning "ant"), Pa-ìndrè, Indrupka, and Indrica or Indra (H. Petersson 1921:248). Given possible attestation to an IIr form for Skt. *índra* by the Avestan variant form *andra*, and given the special relationship that exists between early IIr and the dialects of IE that developed into Balto-Slavonic, we ought perhaps view these names, as did H. Petersson, as reflecting an IIr form for Skt. *índra*. The names of rivers, bodies of water and villages worldwide, of course, tend to preserve old forms. Such connections would support the argument that the form Skt. *índra* is very old. Regarding the relationship between early IIr and Balto-Slavonic, see T. Burrow (1955:18-23, 1973a:18-23). While we cannot determine from the Balto-Slavonic forms whether aspiration in the name had already been lost on account of loss of aspiration in Balto-Slavonic, if we assume deaspiration in the name occurred at a time before the simplification of the IE diphthong, then the Balto-Slavonic forms by necessity indicate loss of aspiration. Of interest in this regard is the village name Antándrajè. Petersson's derivation is forced. Does the name contain the same form as the Avestan variant *andra*? That this is the name of a village on the sea Indrajás suggests that it is a com-

pound the first member of which reflects Skt. *anta* “nearness, proximity”. Similarly, Pa-*indrè*, the name of a village on the river Indrajà, suggests the Skt. prefix *upa* “near to”. I have been informed by a comparative Indo-Europeanist that *-j-* in Lithuanian does not correspond to *-j-* in Sanskrit. I am not sure this would be significant with regard to loan-forms in Balto-Slavonic from Iir. C. H. Werba has informed me however (personal communication) that this is just a question of graphemics. With this in mind, I would suggest that Indrajà and Indrajās point to a compound the second member of which reflects Skt. *ja* “born from, (in compound, also) son of”. Of comparative interest here would be that in India, Indujā is a lexicographically ascribed name for the river Revā or Narmadā (M. Monier-Williams 1899:166a). Also of possible interest is the name of a tributary of the Loire River, the river Indre. The Loire meets the Indre in central France near Chenonceau (department of Indre-et-Loire), which village noted for its chateau is on the right bank of the river Cher, the tributary of the Loire just before the Indre.

Supporting the proposed connection of Skt. *índra* and *√indh/indh* from the vantage of Sanskrit lexicography is Sāyaṇa’s interpretation of the Sanskrit form listed alternately as *aidhā́*, *aidh* and *aidhā́*. Skt. *aidhā́* occurs in RV 1.166.1. It is derived variously from *édha* and *édhas* which carry the meanings “fuel” and “kindling”, and which are said to be derived from *√indh/indh*, and from *ā* + *√indh/indh*. See M. Monier-Williams (1899:231c-232a, 234a) versus O. Böhtlingk and R. Roth (1855-75:1.1110) and H. Grassmann (1873:304). Reference to the form as Skt. *aidhā́* here is not intended to imply priority to this interpretation of the form. It is adopted on the basis of its being the form listed by H. Grassmann. While the form in the *Rgveda* passage is understood today to mean “flame”, Sāyaṇa noted the form to mean “ardor, power”. See F. M. Müller (1890:1.725). Such a meaning stands in relationship to *√indh/indh* just as Skt. *indriyá* “power, force, virile power, sense ...” stands in relationship to Skt. *índra*. The two forms can be seen as reflecting if not parallel and related semantic development, then the influence of Skt. *índra*.

Possible support for such a connection between Skt. *índra* and *√indh/indh* may come from Skt. *śilindhra* “mushroom”, *śilindhraka* “mushroom (esp. one growing out of cowdung)” and *ucchilindhra* “covered with sprouting mushrooms”. Skt. *śilindhra* in its signification

as the plantain tree, *Musa sapientum*, or as the blossom of this tree (in *Śiśupālavadhā* 6.32.72), in its signification as mushroom (in *Harivaṃśa* 3358, 3606 and in Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta* 11, for instance) and in its identification as a kind of fish, *Mystus chitala* (in lexicographic citation and in late medical literature only) are perhaps to be considered on the basis of cognate forms in modern Ir for "mushroom" (in Dardic and in other speech of the Indo-Iranian frontier areas) and in a modern IA language for "the fish *Silundia gangeticus*" as the merger of discrete forms, the former possibly itself the merger of non-IA forms of unknown origin (KEWA 3.343). EWA 3.491-492, while it still separates the words for a fish from the other meanings, has now backed away from the earlier opinion regarding the other forms. EWA notes the etymologies to be simply "not clear" in both instances.

R. G. Wasson (1968, 1979) has argued that *sóma* was the mushroom Fly agaric, *Amanita muscaria*. He has also pointed out that mushrooms around the world are associated with lightning, as in *Meghadūta* 11 in which the form *ucchilīndhra* occurs (R. G. Wasson 1956). In consideration both of this and of the etymology for Skt. *īndra* < √*idh/indh* argued for in this paper, one wonders whether we rather have here a *tatpuruṣa* compound making direct reference to *sóma* as *indhra* (= *indra*) from a *śilā* "rock" – of which a combining form is *śilī*<sup>o</sup>. This would show a reflex in Sanskrit of the form Skt. *īndra* with an aspirate. (The interpretation that Wasson cites of *śilīndhra* from Skt. *śilī*, the name of a kind of worm, is a possibility suggested by M. Monier-Williams [1899:1073c] for all words of the shape *śilīndhra*. It is highly unlikely.)

This interpretation here, of course, rests on our interpretation of Skt. *īndra* as meaning "the enkindling one, the kindling spark". The original adjectival formation would have had its accent on *-rá*, but the accent would have been thrown back from the suffix onto the root in the formation of a substantive, as elsewhere in a comparatively small number of forms. See T. Burrow (1955:146-147, 1973a:147-148). H. W. Bailey (1975a:1.10) and P. Thieme (1985:243) have also argued for such a development. Also see the earlier alternate explanations for the throwing back of the accent given by W. Wüst as noted by J. Schnetz (1941:215).

That such a form would be associated with a mushroom, one type of which it has been argued is to be identified with *sóma*, would lend

support in its own right to both the association of *sóma* with the mushroom Fly agaric and to our argument here. Support in this instance for the argument here, though, does not necessarily depend on the identification of *sóma* with Fly agaric. Such identification would merely strengthen this support.

I note further that if an explanation can be found for this word for “mushroom” from within Sanskrit, it certainly makes unlikely any explanation of this word from a non-IA source.

*Sóma*, of course, is first brought down from a rock high in heaven on which Varuṇa placed it (A. B. Keith 1925:1.169, 1.171). Its descent to earth has been interpreted as being associated with lightning, the *aśáni* defined by H. Grassmann as “the thunderbolt, understood as a slinging stone” (M. Bloomfield 1892-94; H. Grassmann 1873:137). Twice, in *RV* 9.82.3 and *RV* 9.113.3 Parjanya, god of thunderstorms and rain, is said to be the father of *sóma*. On earth, in Vedic ritual, it is stone which is used to press the *sóma*. Also, *sóma* is connected closely with Agni, god of fire. In *RV* 9.66.19-21 and *RV* 9.67.23-24, for example, *sóma* is called Agni, and in *RV* 8.48.6 *sóma* is told to make the poet burn like fire which has been started by the friction of sticks (*mathitá*). The pouring of pressed *sóma* is frequently likened to thunder and lightning, and *sóma* is said to dispel darkness and is identified on account of its brightness with the sun (A. B. Keith 1925:1.168; T. Oberlies 1998-99:1.443-444, 1.495, including n. 182, 2.151, n. 107, 2.244, n. 119; see also R. G. Wasson 1968:39-42).

While this must certainly be worked out with great care at another time, could it not be that the *dvandva-devatā* to whom *RV* 1.93.6 is addressed, Agni and Soma, represent kindling or combustion from wood – or atmospheric combustion (=Indra) perhaps manifest on earth in Agni, and kindling or combustion from rock (*i.e. śilindhra*) – or heavenly combustion (if atmospheric combustion as well, also = Indra) manifest on earth in Soma (=Indu).

In *RV* 1.93.6 (*Taittirīyasaṃhitā* 2.3.14.2) the descent of fire and the descent of *sóma* are placed together as parallel mysteries. In the translation of M. Bloomfield (1892-94:11-12), “One (the fire) Mātariśvan did bring from heaven, the other (the Soma) the eagle (the lightning) snatched from the cloud [*ádreh*].” Vedic Mātariśvan, the nature of whom is not entirely clear from the *Ṛgveda*, is of course

clarified by its Persian cognate *bādrisah* “twirling stick” (A. B. Keith 1925:1.138-139; T. Burrow 1962:25). Mātariśvan is also referred to as bringing fire to man in *RV* 1.128.2. Regarding this bringing of fire to man having been compared to the Greek myth of Prometheus, see T. Oberlies (1998-99:1.384, n. 325). M. Bloomfield (1892-94:11n.) commented, “It is of interest to note that this [*RV* 1.93] is the only hymn in the *RV* which is addressed to Agni and Soma as a *dvandva-devatā*”. Regarding the pair Agni-Soma, see as well T. Oberlies (1998-99:1.287, n. 660, 1.312, n. 794).

Note also that in *RV* 2.12.3, Indra is attributed with having generated fire from between two stones archetypically. R. T. H. Griffith (1896:1.273n., Rpt. 137a n.) interpreted this as meaning “generated lightning between heaven and earth”. In a similar vein, H. H. Wilson (1850-88 and Rpt.:2.236) had earlier translated this passage as “generated fire in the clouds”. This follows the commentator Sāyaṇa. See W. H. Maurer (1986:50n.). K. F. Geldner (1951-57:1.290) translated the passage literally, as had R. T. H. Griffith, but without interpretation. W. Doniger O’Flaherty (1981:162, n. 2) commented, “the fire kindled by flints, or the sun or lightning between the two worlds”. She also refers to *RV* 3.31.1-3, which passage however is very obscure. See H. H. Wilson (1850-88 and Rpt.:3.43-44, n. 3), R. T. H. Griffith (1896:1.347-348, n. for verse 1 and n. for verse 2, Rpt. 175b-176a, same) and the introductory comments to *RV* 3.31 by K. F. Geldner (1951-57:1.366). Geldner began his comments regarding the introductory three verses, “The production of the sacrificial fire (3a) is depicted in an allegory, of which the sense is amply unclear” [translation mine]. Regarding verse 3, R. T. H. Griffith (1896:1.348n., Rpt. 176a n.) commented that it referred, in part, to “Indra’s coming, which is caused by the kindling of the sacrificial fire”. T. Oberlies (1998-99:1.250, n. 491) opined that *RV* 2.12.3 indicates that the deed of bringing fire is attributed to Indra, as mentioned above when discussing the argument from the vantage of the literature for the etymology supported here.

That the specific mushrooms referred to by *śilīndhra* in our classical Sanskrit literature need not be Fly agaric is without saying should we consider that in a mycophobic culture such as Sanskrit India became, all mushrooms are pretty much the same.



Alternately, I should note, we might interpret the *śilā*, or “rock”, as the *aśáni*, the thunderbolt that Indra wields, the stone from heaven, the compound *śilīndhra* being interpreted here as an appositional *bahuvrīhi* (i.e. “that having rock – the thunderbolt, as its kindling”). This would be in accord with the beliefs held around the world, referred to above, that lightning is associated with the genesis of mushrooms.

I add I am aware of the criticism of Wasson's opinion regarding *sóma* put forward by J. Brough (1971 and 1973), and the gentler criticism made by F. B. J. Kuiper (1969-70). And I am aware of the arguments that *sóma* is to be identified with Ephedra, including H. Falk (1989) and V. Sarianidi (1998, 1999, and 2003). “There are about ten varieties of Ephedra known, of which *Ephedra pachycladae*, *maior*, *intermedia*, and *gerardiana* are native in the mountainous regions of northern India, Iran and the mountains in between” (H. Falk 1989: 83). See also D. S. Flattery and M. Schwartz (1989:70-71) for Ephedra species in the East Iranian-North India area and modern IA names for these. I am also aware of the argument of D. S. Flattery and M. Schwartz (1989) that *sóma* is to be identified with Harmel, *Peganum harmala*. For a general overview of the topic, see J. E. M. Houben (2003). For recent criticism of both the Ephedra and Harmel theories and for support for Wasson's proposal in light of his critics, albeit without commitment, see F. Staal (2001). See especially F. Staal (2001:775, n. 4) regarding strong recent support for Wasson's argument from H. Smith (2000), which also see. See as well C. C. Bakels (2003), which throws question on Sarianidi's claims. And see G. Thompson (2003), which points out contradictions between Falk's view and Sarianidi's view, and which argues for a restoration of the interpretation of RV 10.119 as presenting evidence of ecstatic experience in the *Ṛgveda* and thereby contradicts Falk's arguments to the contrary.

I mention Wasson's opinion here because it fits in well.

With regard to the signification “a kind of fish” for Skt. *śilīndhra*, note that in Drav the usual word for “fish”, *DEDR* 4885 (=DED 3999, *DEDS*) Ta. *mīṇ* [PDr *mīṇ-*] shares the same root with words for “flash, glitter, lightning ... to cause to flash or shine ... star ... spark” in *DEDR* 4876 (=DED 3994, *DEDS*, *DEN*) Ta. *mīṇ* [PDr *mīṇ(n)-/mīṇ-/mun-*: *m[i/e]ṇ-/mit-/miṇṭ-*]. Also compare *DEDR* 5379 (=DED 4408, *DEDS*)

Ta. *vālai* [PDr *vāl-*] which terms are used for various kinds of fish, and *DEDR* 5377 (= *DED* 4406, *DEDS*) Ta. *vāl* [PDr *vāl-*] “luster, splendour, brightness ... ?spark ... shine”. And consider as well with regard to the semantic spread of Skt. *śilindhra*, *DEDR* 4498 (= *DEDS* 730) Te. *boṭla cēpa* [PCDr *poṭ(t)-*] “a sort of fish” which shares its root with *DEDR* 4499 (= *DEDS* 731, *DEN*) Pa. *boḍḍa* [PCDr *p[a/o]ṭṭ-/?puṭ-*] “edible fungus ... a kind of mushroom ... mushroom”. This material both provides support for our interpretation here of Skt. *śilindhra*, and suggests that the semantic spread of this Sanskrit form is Drav.

With regard to the signification “the blossom of the *Musa sapientum*”, the latter being the Latin term for the banana, or plantain, note that W. Roxburgh (1795-1819:3.73-74, pl. 275, 1835:1.663-664, Rpt. 222-223) noted that its spathes are “crimson on the inside; outside darker coloured.” See the plate, which shows the crimson flower. Also, do a search for “banana flower” at <http://images.google.com> to see the variations in the coloring of banana flowers. They are all in the red to pink family. Given the connection of *śilindhra* with mushrooms one type of which, the Fly agaric, has been suggested is the identification of the Vedic *sóma*, one must wonder whether the signification “the blossom of the *Musa sapientum*” for Skt. *śilindhra* came about on account of a comparison of the color of its blossoms with the red cap of the Fly agaric. Also interesting from this regard, Roxburgh noted that the *Musa sapientum* blossoms generally during the rains. Compare this with the worldwide association of mushrooms with lightning and thunderstorms.

A problem with the etymology of Skt. *índra* given here, I have been informed, is that by PIE and Vedic morphological laws, the suffix *-ra* is added to roots in either the zero-grade or o-grade normally, and not to present stems, as those with infixed *-n-*. Thus, we would expect *\*idhra*, not *\*indhra* (> *índra* by the argument here). And indeed the expected form *°idhra* does occur as the second member of compounds.

This rule, though, is not without exceptions. See, for example, Skt. *mandrá* from the *Ṛgveda* on, beside the slightly later form *madrá*, both from  $\sqrt{mad/l.mand}$ ; and Skt. *syandrá* from  $\sqrt{syand/syad}$ .

Further, the form *°idhra* is not without problems. W. D. Whitney (1885:8) listed the form with question. The form occurs in the *Ṛgveda* only in the form *ágnidhra*, which H. Grassmann (1873:10, 172) derives

from *agnīdh* (for *agnīdh*). So also O. Böhtlingk and R. Roth (1855-75:1.600). The form °*idhra* was not listed in its own right in either H. Grassmann (1873) or M. Monier-Williams (1899), nor was it etymologized in *KEWA* or *EWA*. O. Böhtlingk and R. Roth (1855-75:1.37) suggested that later forms of the shape *agnīdhra* are incorrect readings for *āgnīdhra*. O. Böhtlingk and R. Roth (1855-75:1.799) did list *idhra*, though, and noted that it is probably for *iddhra*, from *idh-* with the suffix *-tra*, as noted above when discussing that the treatment of roots containing aspirates in Sanskrit is not uniform. A. Debrunner in J. Wackernagel (1896-1964:2,2.858) echoed this latter judgment more recently, also noted in that place. Debrunner judged it a secondary formation in *-tra*, with the form when it functions as a priestly title coming from *-tr̥*. Debrunner noted that from the *Brāhmaṇa*-s on, the form occurs with both initial short *a-* and with *vr̥ddhi*. He noted that in *RV* 2.36.4d *āgnīdhrāt* stands in parallel formation with *hotrāt* (1d), *potrāt* (2d) and *praśāstrāt* (6d); and pointed to a similar listing in *RV* 2.37.1-4 of *hotrāt*, *potrāt* and *neṣṭrāt*. The form °*idhra* occurs only in *āgnīdhra* and *agnīdhra*.

Thus the occurrence of the form °*idhra*, which would seem to be based on a secondary formation in *-tra* and *-tr̥* from *agnīdh*, does not mitigate against an etymology of *Skt. índra* < √*indh/indh* as argued for in this paper.

This has been countered with a statement that W. D. Whitney (1885) shows seven examples of derivatives in *-ra* built to roots that make infix nasal presents, all of which show zero-grade in the root and no infix *-n-*. *Skt. mandrá* and *Skt. syandrá* are indeed exceptions to the notion that *-ra* is added only to zero-grades. They, however, do not reflect derivatives to roots with infix *-n-* presents. In these cases the *-n-* is part of the root and the “*n*-less” forms (*mad-*, *syad-*) come from zero-grades where the PIE vocalic nasal has been vocalized in *Iir* to *-a-*. They do show, however, that occasionally *-ra* is added to the root in full-grade. The semantically attractive etymology here can work, though, only if we assume an old (at least Proto-*Iir*) derivation in *-ra* from the infix nasal present stem rather than from the root (whether in zero-grade or full-grade) that we see in all other cases.

To be noted with regard to this comment is that I would maintain that the form *Skt. índra* is indeed very old. It would seem to me that such a position is supported in this paper.

Regarding W. D. Whitney (1885) showing seven examples of derivatives in *-ra* built to roots that make infixed nasal presents, I do not come up with this many.

As is indicated by W. D. Whitney (1889:450), while the primary suffix *-ra* is usually added to the weak form of the root, this is not invariable.

Regarding Skt. *mandrá*, KEWA 2.580 notes that the present tense transitive form *mándati* is to be connected with *mádati* not as a nasalized variant, but as an already pre-literary re-evaluation of the perfect stem *mand-* < \**ma-md-*. So also EWA 2.299-300. If the form in *-a-* were to be due to the simplification of vocalic *-ṅ-* in Iir, how would we get Gk. *μαδαρός* “damp”, *μαζός* “nipple” and Lat. *madeō*, *-ēre* “to be moist, drip with moisture, ripen, be full”. The only cognate form with *-n-* outside of Iir, according to J. Pokorny (1959-69:1.694-695), is Alb. *manj* “fatten, feed”, which form Pokorny glosses parenthetically “(\**madniō*)”. Compare this situation to Skt. *candra* (*°ścandra*), in which the *-n-* is part of the root, and its cognates Gk. *κάνδαρος*, Lat. *candeō*, *-ēre*, and so forth. Note that in this instance, the Sanskrit intensive form *cáni-ścadat* is derived from the simplification of vocalic *-ṅ-* in Iir. See J. Pokorny (1959-69:1.526).

Regarding Skt. *syandrá*, as noted above when pointing out the basis for the linguistic discussion here of the etymology argued for in this paper for Skt. *índra*, T. Burrow (1955:291, 1973a:292) suggested that *syandrá* and  $\sqrt{\text{syand/syad}}$  are collateral forms of  $\sqrt{\text{sic}}$ ,  $\sqrt{\text{syand/syad}}$  being derived by the accretion of a stem formative suffix *-d* in combination with *n* after dropping *-c*. There is no allowance here for a form with vocalic *-ṅ-* from which  $\sqrt{\text{syad}}$  may be derived in Iir. See also the etymology of Kuiper cited in KEWA 3.551, 3.474. KEWA notes here, though, that Skt. *syádate* has not been convincingly explained. EWA 2.781-782 also remains non-committal. EWA as well notes in this latter location speculation that would derive Skt. *syandrá* from Skt.  $\sqrt{\text{spand}}$ , and *visa versa*. When discussing  $\sqrt{\text{spand}}$ , it notes that derivation here too is unclear. It notes in this place that for *syandrá* in the *R̥gveda*, Kashmiri manuscripts read *spandrá*. See EWA 2.773.

To sum up, the morphological problem does not appear to be insurmountable.

### 5. Other Cognate Forms

Cognate forms to Skt. *índra*, aside from those derived directly from *índra* and  $\sqrt{\text{indh}}$ , would be Skt. *índu*, *indambara*, *indīvāra*, *indirā*, and *indindirā*.

Skt. *índu* would appear to preserve its base meaning in the *Taittirīyāraṇyaka* as “bright drop, spark”. Both “drop (of *sóma*)” and “moon” would be extended definitions. Regarding the connection between *sóma* and the moon, and derivative to this the argument regarding the relative chronology of application of Skt. *índu* to the moon, see A. B. Keith (1925:1.170-171) and T. Oberlies (1998-99:1.181, n. 153, 1.241, 1.453, n. 19). See also above with regard to Skt. *śilindhra*. Of interest here is that it is the *Taittirīyāraṇyaka* that provides the form *inttām* that is so crucial to the argument for the derivation of Skt. *índra* argued for herein. Also, it is the *Taittirīyasamhitā* in which we find placed *Ṛgveda* 1.93.6 that refers to the descent of fire and the descent of *sóma* as parallel mysteries.

Skt. *indambara* and *indīvāra* are both compounds the second member of which, *ambara* and *vāra*, in each case indicates “circumference, surrounding”. The terms are applied variably to *Nymphaea caerulea* and to *Nymphaea stellata* and *cyanea*, all lotuses that possess a blue flower. The usages would appear to be metaphorical, referring to the atmosphere, which is during the daytime blue. Skt. *ind-* and *indī-* in these instances would refer to the atmospheric form of fire with which we are associating Skt. *índra*.

Skt. *indirā* appears to be more obscure in its base meaning. Suggested by its occurrence in the compound *indirālaya*, also *Nymphaea stellata* and *cyanea*, is that *indirā* has the same basic force as *ind-* and *indī-*. The association of the form with the goddess Lakṣmī, and derivation of the form's force from this as was suggested by M. Monier-Williams (1899:165c) ought to be avoided as it occurs first in a list of goddesses in Amarasinḥa's *Nāmalingānusāsana* 1.1.1.23 (O. Böhtlingk and R. Roth 1855-75:1.800). Amarasinḥa's meanings are not always as clear and straightforward as they appeared to the Hindu writers who followed him. A simple equation between

Indirā and Lakṣmī, while this certainly was a usage after Amaraśiṅha in Hemacandra's *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* 226 and in *Kathāsaritsāgara* 4.7, for example, cannot provide us with the form's original meaning. The word *vṛttānta* in the *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana*'s *Vāgvarga* 7c is a good example of another form that appears to have taken on new meaning on the basis of Amaraśiṅha's text. See S. H. Levitt (1976:30-31). Regarding definitions in Amaraśiṅha's text in general, see S. H. Levitt ([n.d.]). Perhaps, Skt. *indirā* is to be interpreted as a feminine form of Skt. *indra*. A. Debrunner in J. Wackernagel (1896-1964:1[Suppl.].15) noted that according to H. Jacobi, Skt. *indirā* is to be compared with the trisyllabic pronunciation of Skt. *indra*. Such a form is what would be expected according to Siever's Law, regarding which point and regarding criticism of which point see above under the discussion of the trisyllabic metrical pronunciation of Skt. *indra*. Should we leave aside Siever's Law in this instance, it can be noted that if the metrical pronunciation \**indara* for *indra* represents evidence of a situation in which aspiration has yielded *ə*, as suggested above, then *ə* > *i* would represent the same development as in the generally accepted minimal pairs such as Skt. *pitr*, Gk. *πατήρ*, Lat. *pater*. Skt. *indī-* in *indīvāra*, and the alternation between *ind-* and *indī-* in *indambara* and *indīvāra*, probably would represent a similar development. Suggested, of course, is that while T. Burrow may have been correct in stating that the normal realization of *ə* in Sanskrit is Ø, there are instances in at least some of the minimal pairs which he denies in which *ə* > *i*. That such minimal pairs are valid has been argued, for example, by W. F. Wyatt Jr. (1970:5-6). The basis of such variant realization of *ə* in Sanskrit, if indeed this is what it is, is problematic. Perhaps the suggestions that the Sanskrit metrical form \**indara* for *indra* and likewise the above forms *indirā*, etc. may demonstrate the presence of *ə*, may be of aid in determining this basis.

Skt. *indindirā* "bee" is interesting in that it is reduplicated as if it were a Drav onomatopoeic form indicating a specific sound. Such forms are present in Sanskrit, and have been discussed by M. B. Emeneau (1969). Should there be a connection between *indindirā* and *√idh/indh* "to kindle (the sacrificial fire)", such as an imitation of the sound made in kindling, such would indicate of course possible Drav influence on forms derived from *√indh*. Of comparative interest here,

and suggesting a relationship between Skt. *indindirā* and √*indh/indh*, is a parallel semantic situation between Drav forms meaning “bee” as given in *DEDR* 4518 Ma. *pōnta* and Drav forms meaning “to light a fire, kindle” as given in *DEDR* 4517 Ta. *pottu* (*potti-*). To be emphasized is that these two sets of etyma appear to share the same Drav root. Their etymological connection is thereby suggested.

*DEDR* 4518 (=DED 3692, *DEDS*). Ma. *pōnta* a great fly. Kol. *potte* any winged insect, bee; *surunt potte* bee. Nk. *potte* large flying insect. Pa. (S.) *potta* large insect. [PDr \**pott-/pōnt-*] / Cf. Skt. *puttikā-* a kind of bee (Car. S. 1.27.243, Comm.: *piṅgalā makṣikā mahatyah puttikāḥ*); *pauttika-* the honey from such bees.

*DEDR* 4517 (=DED 3691, *DEDS*, *DEN*). Ta. *pottu* (*potti-*) to light (as a fire). Kurub. (LSB 1.12) *potte* a torch of leaves. Ko. *pot-* (*poty-*) to light (as a fire); *pot* torch made of a bundle of thin sticks. Ka. *pottu* to be kindled, catch fire, flame; be burnt (as rice, etc., at the bottom of a vessel), be boiled or baked too much; *n.* flaming; *pottige* flaming, flame. Tu. *puttuni* to burn (*intr.*); *pottāvuni*, *pottādruni* to light, kindle, burn; *potta* hot, burning; *potturuni*, *potruni* to kindle, set fire, incite to a quarrel. Go. (A. Y.) *pot-*, (Tr.) *pattānā*, (Ch.) *patt-*, (Mu.) *pat-/patt-*, (Ma.) *pot-* to burn, blaze; (Tr. Ph.) *pacānā* to make a bright light; (SR.) *potusānā* to light (Voc. 2384). [PDr \**pac-*: \**p[a/o]t-/p[a/u/o]tt-*]

A similar situation in which a form of IE derivation in Sanskrit appears to take on a Drav semantic spread has been pointed out above with regard to Skt. *śilindhra*. Another may perhaps be found, for example, in a comparison of the early Upanishadic usage of *hṛd* and *hṛdaya* to refer sometimes to the heart alone, sometimes to the heart and lungs, and sometimes to all vital organs including the liver. This usage is not IE according to G. W. Brown (1921:139). C. H. Werba has informed me (personal communication) that the meaning “vital organs inside the horse, the intestines” is an old meaning of one of the stems contaminated in the Proto-IIr \**g<sup>h</sup>ṛd-*. This, however, does not contradict Brown’s observation. Compare in this regard *DEDR* 1274 (=DED 1070, *DEDS*) Ma. *karal*, *karuḷ* which has similar referents to the early Upanishadic usage of *hṛd* and *hṛdaya*.

The possibility of Drav influence with regard to Skt. *indindirā* suggests that the forms *īndu*, *īndambara*, *īndīvāra*, and *īndirā* as well

are to be derived more directly from a native Skt.  $\sqrt{ind}$  (perhaps,  $\sqrt{ind[ə]}$ ?) which might be viewed to be collateral to  $\sqrt{idh/indh}$ . This root may have been suggested by the loss of aspiration in Skt. *indra*, and appears to preserve in its citable occurrences in derivatives the force of  $\sqrt{idh/indh}$ . The lexicographically associated meaning for  $\sqrt{ind}$ , of course, is “to be powerful”, which is viewed traditionally in Sanskrit studies to be a definition provided for the purpose of rationalizing Skt. *indra* (M. Monier-Williams 1899:165c; O. Böhtlingk and R. Roth 1855-75:1.800).

Perhaps to be noted in this connection is Skt. *indriyá*, which means both “power” and “sense”. This latter definition has at times been used as the basis of speculation regarding the antiquity of yoga and the connection of Indra with yoga from early times. Such an assumption is certainly neither necessary nor implied by the data. That W. Neisser (1924-30:1.160-161) viewed Skt. *indriyá* to be primary and that L. Renou (1958:122) noted that Skt. *indriyá* provided an appellative value for the name Indra have been mentioned earlier at the end of the listing of the various etymologies for Skt. *indra*. By the interpretation argued for here, Skt. *indriyá* “power” would be the primary characteristic of the kindling spark or of combustion. In the same vein, as suggested by Sāyana’s definition of Skt. *aidhā*, we would have a meaning “ardor”. “Ardor” or “passion”, of course, is characteristic of the senses – ergo *indriyá* as “sense”, *i.e.* “an ardor”. It is this word in its derived sense “power” which has been used as one of the bases for such etymologies for *indra* as those of R. Roth, H. Jacobi and H. Petersson. The present explanation would have the semantic spread of the word to be distinctly Sanskrit, and to be derived from characteristics of the phenomenon referred to by the base form’s primary meaning. This has the advantage of explaining more fully the word’s semantic spread.

## 6. Summation

Skt. *indra* has remained without firm etymology not without reason. It is not clearly associated with any root from the vantage of classical Indian grammatical tradition, and the name is not clearly associ-



ated with any meaning that might serve as a firm basis for identification from the vantage of comparative linguistics. It is hoped that it has been shown here, however, that there is more support within the Indian tradition for an association of *índra* with  $\sqrt{indh}$  than for any other association within Sanskrit, and that Sanskrit grammar itself suggests this association which has been seen before on the basis of the mythology by such Sanskritists as H. Grassmann, A. Bergaigne, F. Bollensen, J. Hertel, and V. M. Apte. Further, it is hoped that it has been shown here that this explanation has the advantage of explaining more points in Sanskrit – such as the form *inttām*, the form *śilīndhra*, the alternation of Indha and Indra as deities of the right eye (see *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* 14.6.11.2 [= *Brhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 4.2.2], *Maitryupaniṣad* 7.11, stanzas 1-3, and the allusion in *Taittirīyopaniṣad* 6), the meaning “sense” given for *indriyá*, the basic meaning of the form *ínđu*, and the forms *indambara*, *indīvāra*, *indirā*, *indindirā*, and  $\sqrt{ind}$  – than the problems which it leaves unanswered definitively. These are problems that usually have not been addressed by etymologies for Skt. *índra*, and are at times incompatible with these etymologies. The solutions argued for here to these problems, however, offer possible gain to IE linguistics. Similarly, the etymology itself offers the possibility of mythological gain, as in the instance of the proposed etymology for Skt. *śilīndhra* “mushroom” which is made possible by the etymology for Skt. *índra*. Part of the problem also it must be noted has been that Indra is from our earliest encounter with him a deity whose character, it has been argued here, is shaded by the Ancient Mesopotamian deity En-lil. When we strip away such accretions we can see more clearly the etymological origins of the deity we know as Indra.

## REFERENCES

1974. "Cimmerian". *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*. 15th ed.; Micropaedia, 3.321b. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica.

1974. "Sarmatian". *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*. 15th ed.; Micropaedia, 10.455ab. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica.

1974. "Scythian". *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*. 15th ed.; Micropaedia, 10.576c-577a. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica.

2003. [Search for phrase "banana flower"]. *Google Image Search* [website]. <http://images.google.com>. Accessed on August 13, 2003.

Allen, W. S. 1953. *Phonetics in Ancient India*. London: Oxford University Press. (=London Oriental Series,1.)

Anderson, S. R. 1970. "On Grassmann's Law in Sanskrit". *Linguistic Inquiry* 1.387-396.

Apte, V. M. 1950. "The Name: 'Indra' – An etymological investigation". *Journal of the University of Bombay* n.s. 19:2.13-18.

Arnold, E. V. 1905. *Vedic Metre in its Historical Development*. Cambridge: The University Press.

Bailey, H. W. 1953. "Analecta Indoscythica I". *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* [no vol. no.], 95-116.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1960. "Indagatio Indo-Iranica". *Transactions of the Philological Society* [no vol. no.], 62-86.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1975a. "The Second Stratum of the Indo-Iranian Gods". *Mithraic Studies: Proceedings of the First International Congress of Mithraic Studies*, 2 vols. ed. by J. R. Hinnells, 1.1-20.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1975b. "Indian síndhu-, Iranian hindu-". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 38.610-611.

Bakels, C. C. 2003. "Report Concerning the Contents of a Ceramic Vessel Found in the 'White Room' of the Gonur Temenos, Merv Oasis, Turkmenistan". *Electronic Journal of Vedic Studies* 9:1c, May 5.

Basham, A. L. 1954. *The Wonder That Was India*. Rpt. New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1959.

Benfey, T. 1848. *Die hymnen des Sâma-veda*, herausgegeben, übersetzt und mit Glossar versehen. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1862-[66]. "Uebersetzung des Rig-Veda". *Orient und Occident* 1.9-54, 385-420, 575-610; 2.233-260, 507-519; 3.128-168.

Benveniste, E. and L. Renou. 1934. *Vṛtra et Vṛθragna, étude de mythologie indo-iraniennne*. Paris: Imprimerie nationale. (=Cahiers de la Société asiatique, 3.)

Bergaigne, A. 1878-97. *La religion védique d'après les hymnes du Rig-Véda*, 3 vols. Paris: F. Vieweg.

Bezenberger, A. 1877. "Etymologien". *Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen* 1.336-342.

Bloomfield, M. 1892-94. "Contributions to the Interpretation of the Veda: I. The legend of Soma and the eagle". *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 16.1-24.

Böhtlingk, O. and R. Roth. 1855-75. *Sanskrit Wörterbuch*, 7 vols. St. Petersburg: Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Bollensen, F. 1887. "Beiträge zur Kritik des Veda". *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 41.494-507.

Brough, J. 1971. "Soma and *Amanita Muscaria*". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 34.331-362.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1973. "Problems of the 'Soma-Mushroom' Theory". *Indologica Taurinensia* 1.21-32.

Brown, G. W. 1921. *The Human Body in the Upanishads*. Jubbulpore: Christian Mission Press.

Brown, W. N. 1961. "Mythology of India". *Mythologies of the Ancient World* ed. by S. N. Kramer, 279-330. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc.

Burrow, T. 1949. “‘Shwa’ in Sanskrit”. *Transactions of the Philological Society* [no vol. no.], 22-61.

\_\_\_\_. 1955. *The Sanskrit Language*. London: Faber and Faber.

\_\_\_\_. 1962. “Sanskrit *āmoda*- ‘fragrance, perfume’”. *Indological Studies in Honor of W. Norman Brown* ed. by E. Bender, 23-27. New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society. (=American Oriental Series, 47.)

\_\_\_\_. 1973a. *The Sanskrit Language*. New and rev. ed. London: Faber.

\_\_\_\_. 1973b. “The Proto-Indoaryans”. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* [no vol. no.], 123-140.

Burrow, T. and M. B. Emeneau. 1961. *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press [=DED]

\_\_\_\_. 1968. *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary, Supplement*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. [=DEDS]

\_\_\_\_. 1972. “Dravidian Etymological Notes”. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 92.397-418, 475-491. [=DEN]

\_\_\_\_. 1984. *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. [=DEDR]

Chakravarty, U. 1995. “On the Etymology of the Word ‘indra’”. *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 76.27-33.

Collinge, N. E. 1985. *The Laws of Indo-European*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. (=Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Sciences. Series IV, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 35.)

Deeg, M. 1995. *Die altindische Etymologie nach dem Verständnis Yāska’s und seiner Vorgänger: eine Untersuchung über ihre Praktiken, ihre literarische Verbreitung und ihr Verhältnis zur dichterischen Gestaltung und Sprachmagie*. Dettelbach: Verlag J. H. Röll. (=Würzburger Studien zur Sprache und Kulture, 2: Indologie, vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft.)

Dumézil, G. 1969. *Idées romaines*. Paris: Gallimard.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1970. *Archaic Roman Religion, with an Appendix on the Religion of the Etruscans*, 2 vols. trans. by P. Krapp. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. (Original: Paris, 1966.)

Edgerton, F. 1934. "Siever's Law and IE Weak-Grade Vocalism". *Language* 10.235-256.

Emeneau, M. B. 1969. "Onomatopoeics in the Indian Linguistic Area". *Language* 45.274-299.

Falk, H. 1989. "Soma I and II". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 52.77-90.

Flattery, D. S. and M. Schwartz. 1989. *Haoma and Harmaline: The botanical identity of the Indo-Iranian sacred hallucinogen "soma" and its legacy in religion, language, and Middle Eastern folklore*. Berkeley: University of California Press. (=University of California Publications, Near Eastern Studies, 21.)

Foy, W. 1897. Review of A. Hillebrandt, *Vedische Mythologie, I: Soma und verwandte Götter* (Breslau: Wilhelm Koebner, 1891). *Indogermanische Forschungen* 8. *Anzeiger für indogermanische Sprach- und Altertumskunde, Beiblatt zu den Indogermanische Forschungen* 8.21-34.

Gaster, T. H. 1961. *Thespis: Ritual, myth, and drama in the Ancient Near East*. 2<sup>nd</sup> rev. ed. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc.

Geldner, K. F. 1886-96. *Avesta, The Sacred Books of the Parsis*, 3 vols. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1951-57. *Der Rig-Veda, aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt*, 4 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. (=Harvard Oriental Series, 33-36.)

Gnoli, G. 1980. *Zoroaster's Time and Homeland: A study on the origins of Mazdeism and related problems*. Naples: Istituto universitario orientale. (=Istituto universitario orientale, Seminario di studi asiatici, Series minor, 7.)

Gotō, T. 1985. "Altindisch *rándhra-* und uridg. *\*lend<sup>h</sup>*". *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 44.77-91.

Grassmann, H. 1873. *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*. 4. unveränderte Aufl. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1964.

Griffith, R. T. H. 1896. *The Hymns of the R̥gveda*, 2 vols. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Rpt. in one vol., ed. by J. L. Shastri. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1973.

Güntert, H. 1923. *Die arische Weltkönig und Heiland*. Haale (Saale): Verlag von Max Niemeyer.

Hamp, E. P. 1965. "Evidence in Albanian". *Evidence for Laryngeals* ed. by W. Winter, 123-141. The Hague: Mouton and Co. (= *Janua Linguarum, Series Maior*, 11.)

Hertel, J. 1925. *Die arische Feuerlehre*, I. Teil. Leipzig: H. Haessel, Verlag.

Hillebrandt, A. 1891-1902. *Vedische Mythologie*, 3 vols. Breslau: W. Koebner.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1927-29. *Vedische Mythologie*, 2 vols. 2. veränderte Aufl. in zwei Bänden. Breslau: Verlag von M. und H. Marcus.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1980. *Vedic Mythology*, 2 vols. trans. by Sreeramula Rajeswara Sarma. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. (Original: Breslau, 1927-29.)

Hock, H. H. 1996. "Pre-R̥gvedic Convergence between Indo-Aryan and Dravidian? A Survey of the Issues and Controversies". *Ideology and Status of Sanskrit: Contributions to the history of the Sanskrit language* ed. by J. E. M. Houben, 17-58. Leiden: E. J. Brill. (= *Brill's Indological Library*, 13.)

\_\_\_\_\_. 1999. "Out of India? The Linguistic Evidence". *Aryan and Non-Aryan in South Asia: Evidence, interpretation and ideology. Proceedings of the International Seminar on Aryan and Non-Aryan in South Asia, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 25-27 October 1996* ed. by J. Bronkhorst and M. M. Deshpande, 1-18. Cambridge: Harvard University, Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies. (= *Harvard Oriental Series, Opera Minora*, 3.)

Hoffmann, K. and B. Forssman. 1996. *Avestische Laut- und Flexionslehre*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. (= *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft*, 84.)

Houben, J. E. M. 2003. "The Soma-Haoma Problem: Introductory overview and observations on the discussion". *Electronic Journal of Vedic Studies* 9:1a, May 4.

Ivănescu, G. 1960. "Divinités indo-européennes empruntées aux populations de l'Asie Antérieure et de la Méditerranée". *Studia et acta orientalia* 3.117-27.

Jacobi, H. 1891-92a. "Ueber *sundara*". *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 31.315-316.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1891-92b. "Über Indra". *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 31.316-319.

Jacobsen, T. 1949. "Mesopotamia". *Before Philosophy: The intellectual adventure of ancient man*, contributions by H. Frankfort, H. A. Frankfort, J. A. Wilson, and T. Jacobsen, 137-234. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd. (Rpt. of a 1946 edition published under the name *The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, without the essay on the Hebrews by W. A. Irwin.)

\_\_\_\_\_. 1976. *The Treasures of Darkness, A History of Mesopotamian Religion*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Jokl, N. 1911. *Studien zur albanischen Etymologie und Wortbildung*. Wien: Alfred Holder. (=Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, *Sitzungsberichte, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse*, 168.1.)

Keith, A. B. 1909. *The Aitareya Āraṇyaka*. Rpt. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1969.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1925. *The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads*, 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. (=Harvard Oriental Series, 31 and 32.)

Kirste, J. 1907. Review of R. R. Bhagawat, *Key to Interpret the Veda* (Bombay, 1907). *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 21.403-405.

Kramer, S. N. 1961. "Mythology of Sumer and Akkad". *Mythologies of the Ancient World*, ed. by S. N. Kramer, 93-137. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc.

Kretschmer, P. 1928. "Weiteres zur Urgeschichte der Inder". *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 55.75-103.

Kuiper, F. B. J. 1946-48. "Vedic *sádhiṣ-* and *sadhástha-*". *Acta Orientalia* 20.23-29.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1957. "Vedic *sadhástha*, n. 'seat'". *Indo-Iranian Journal* 1.309-311.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1969-70. Review of R. G. Wasson, *Soma: Divine mushroom of immortality* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc.; Bern: Herbert Lang, 1968 [1969]) (= *Ethno-mycological Studies*, 1). *Indo-Iranian Journal* 12.279-285.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1973. "Four Word Studies: I. Vedic *ayás-* 'not to be injured'". *Indo-Iranian Journal* 15.179-190.

Kuzmina, E. E. 2001. "The First Migration Wave of Indo-Iranians to the South". *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* 29.1-40.

Levitt, S. H. 1976. "A Note on the Compound *pañcalakṣaṇa* in Amarasinha's *Nāmaliṅganuśāsana*". *Purāṇa* 18.5-38 + foldout.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1980. "Sanskrit  $\sqrt{\text{mand/mad}}$ , 'Background Noise' and Dravidian". *The Journal of Sanskrit Academy, Osmania University* 2.25-64.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2003a. "Some New Dravidian Etymologies for Sanskrit Words". *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 32:2.7-22.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2003b. "The Dating of the Indian Tradition". *Anthropos* 98.341-359.

\_\_\_\_\_. [n.d.] "The *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana* (*Amarakośa*) as a *Sūtra*". In manuscript.

Lidén, E. 1897. *Studien zur Altindischen und vergleichenden Sprachgeschichte*. Upsala: Almqvist und Wiksells Boktryckeri-Aktibolag.

Lindeman, F. O. 1997. *Introduction to the 'Laryngeal Theory'*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft. (= *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft*, 91.)



Lowenthal, J. 1926. "Wirtschaftsgeschichte Parerga". *Wörter und Sachen, Kulturhistorische Zeitschrift für Sprach- und Sachforschung* 9.173-191.

Ludwig, A. 1875. *Die philosophischen und religiösen Anschauungen des Veda in ihrer Entwicklung*. Prag: Verlag von F. Tempsky.

MacDonell, A. A. 1900. *A History of Sanskrit Literature*. New York: A. Appleton and Company.

Machek, V. 1937. "Ario-Slavica". *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 64.261-266.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1941. "Name und Herkunft des Gottes Indra". *Archív orientální* 12.143-154.

Mallory, J. P. 1989. *In Search of the Indo-Europeans: Language, archeology and myth*. New York and London: Thames and Hudson Ltd.

Maurer, W. H. 1986. *Pinnacles of India's Past: Selections from the Rgveda*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. (=University of Pennsylvania Studies on South Asia, 2.)

Mayrhofer, M. 1956-80. *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*, 4 vols. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag. (1953-56.) [=KEWA]

\_\_\_\_\_. 1992-2001. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*, 3 vols. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitäts-Verlag. (1986-92.) [=EWA]

Minns, E. H. 1910. "Cimmerii". *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*. 11<sup>th</sup> ed., 6.368b. Cambridge: The University Press.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1911a. "Sarmatae". *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*. 11<sup>th</sup> ed., 24.220. Cambridge: The University Press.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1911b. "Scythia". *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*. 11<sup>th</sup> ed., 24.526a-529a. Cambridge: The University Press.

Monier-Williams, M. 1899. *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. New ed. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

\_\_\_\_. 1919. *Hinduism*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

Müller, F. M. 1875. *Lectures on the Science of Language*, 2 vols. New York: Scribner, Armstrong and Co.

\_\_\_\_. 1890. *Rig-Veda Samhitā, The Sacred Hymns of the Brāhmins, together with the Commentary of Sāyaṇācārya*, 4 vols. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: Henry Frowde.

Muir, J. 1874. *Original Sanskrit Texts*, 5 vols. 2<sup>nd</sup> rev. ed. Rpt. Amsterdam: Oriental Press, 1967.

Narten, J. 1964. *Die sigmatischen Aoriste im Veda*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Neisser, W. 1924-30. *Zum Wörterbuch des Ṛgveda*, 2 vols. Rpt. Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint Ltd., 1966. (=Abhandlungen für die Kunde Morgenlandes herausgegeben von der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, 16:4 and 18:3.)

Norman, K. R. 1979. Review of *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, begun by V. Trenckner, vol. 2:7 (*Inda - ugghāṭima*) and vol. 2:8 (*ugghāṭiyati - udaka-sakuṇika*) (Kopenhagen: The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters; Kopenhagen: Munksgaard, 1971, 1973). *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 74.391-394.

Oberlies, T. 1998-99. *Die Religion des Ṛgveda*, 2 vols. Wien: Institut für Indologie der Universität Wien; Commission Agent, Gerold. Delhi: Commission Agent, Motilal Banarsidass. (=Publications of the De Nobili Research Library, 26 and 27.)

Oldenberg, H. 1917. *Die Religion des Veda*. 5. Aufl. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970.

\_\_\_\_. 1988. *The Religion of the Veda* trans. by Shridhar B. Shrotri. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. (Original: Stuttgart and Berlin, 1917.)

Perry, E. D. 1878-84. "Indra in the Rig-Veda". *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 11.117-208.

Petersson, H. 1921. *Studien über die indogermanische Heteroklisie*. Lund: Berlingska Boktryckeriet.

- Phelps, E. 1975. "Sanskrit Deaspirates". *Linguistic Inquiry* 6.447-464.
- Piccoli, G. 1933. "A Comparison Between Signs of the 'Indus Script' and Signs in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Etruscarum*". *Indian Antiquary* 62.213-215.
- Pokorny, J. 1959-69. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 2 vols. Bern and München: Franke Verlag.
- Polomé, E. C. 1985. "Etymology and Function of Vedic Gods". *Studi linguistici e filologici per Carlo Alberto Mastrelli*, 375-385. Pisa: Pacini Editore.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1987. "Der indogermanische Wortschatz auf dem Gebiete der Religion". *Studien zum indogermanischen Wortschatz* ed. by W. Meid, 201-217. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. (=Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 52.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1989. "Divine Names in Indo-European". *Essays on Germanic Religion* by E. C. Polomé, 55-67. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man. (=Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph, 6.)
- Renou, L. 1958. *Études Védiques et Pāṇinéennes*, 4: *Les hymnes aux Viśvedevāḥ*. Paris: E. de Boccard, Éditeur. (=Publications de l'Institut de civilisation Indienne, Série IN-8°, fasc. 6.)
- Roth, R. 1852. *Jāśka's Nirukta sammt den Nighaṅṭavas*. Göttingen: Dieterich.
- Roxburgh, W. 1795-1819. *Plants of the Coast of Coromandel; Selected from drawings and descriptions presented to the Hon. Court of Directors of the East India Company. Published by their order, under the direction of Sir Joseph Banks*, 3 vols., 300 color plates. London: Printed by Shakspeare [sic] Print. Off. for G. Nicol, Bookseller to His Majesty.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1832. *Flora Indica; or, Descriptions of Indian plants*, 3 vols. Rpt. 3 vols. in one. New Delhi: Today and Tomorrow's Printers and Publishers, 1971.
- Sarianidi, V. 1998. *Margiana and Protozoroastrism*, trans. by Inna Sarianidi. Athens: Kapon Editions.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1999. "Near Eastern Aryans in Central Asia". *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* 27.295-326.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2003. "Margiana and Soma-Haoma". *Electronic Journal of Vedic Studies* 9:1d, May 5.

Sarup, L. 1921. *The Nighaṅṭu and the Nirukta: The oldest Indian treatise on etymology, philology and semantics*. Rpt. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, [1967].

Scharfe, H. 1996. "Bartholomae's Law Revisited or How the R̥gveda Is Dialectically Divided". *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 20.351-377.

Schindler, J. 1976. "Diachronic and Synchronic Remarks on Bartholomae's and Grassmann's Laws". *Linguistic Inquiry* 7.622-637.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1977. "Notizen zum Sieversschen Gesetz". *Die Sprache* 23.56-65.

Schnetz, J. 1941. "Germanische Völkernamen: 4. Nochmals die *Ingvaeones*". *Zeitschrift für Namenforschung* 17.193-221.

Shendge, M. J. 1996. *The Aryas: Facts without fancy and fiction*. New Delhi: Abhinav Publications.

Sihler, A. 1971. "Word-Initial Semivowel Alternation in the Rigveda". *Language* 47.53-78.

Simson, G. von. 1991-92. "Interpreting Vedic Myth: The story of Indra and Kutsa". *Indologica Taurinensia* 17-18.333-342.

Smith, H. 2000. *Cleansing the Doors of Perception: The religious significance of entheogenic plants and chemicals*. New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Putnam.

Staal, F. 2001. "How a Psychoactive Substance Becomes a Ritual: The case of soma". *Social Research* 68.745-778.

Thieme, P. 1970. "Sanskrit *sindhu-/Sindhu-* and Old Iranian *hindu-/Hindhu-*". *W. B. Henning Memorial Volume* [ed. by M. Boyce and I. Gershevitch], 447-450. London: Lund Humphries.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1978. "Über einige dualische Bezeichnungen von Himmel und Erde im Veda". *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 92.32-49.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1985. "Nennformen aus Anrede und Anruf im Sanskrit". *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 44.239-258.

Thompson, G. 2003. "Soma and Ecstasy in the Rgveda". *Electronic Journal of Vedic Studies* 9:1e, May 6.

Tischler, J. 1977-2001. *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*, mit Beiträgen von G. Neumann, 3 parts. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. (=Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 20.)

Tokhtas'ev, S. R. 1992. "Cimmerians". *Encyclopaedia Iranica* ed. by E. Yarshater, 5.563b-567a. Costa Mesa, California: Mazda Publishers.

Vasmer, M. 1953-58. *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 3 vols. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag. (1950-53; =Indogermanische Bibliothek. II. Reihe, Wörterbücher.)

Verma, N. 1991. *The Etymologies in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*. Delhi: Nag Publishers.

Wackernagel, J. 1896-1964. *Altindische Grammatik*, 3 vols. Bd. I. *Lautlehre* (1896). *Nachträge zu Bd. I* by A. Debrunner (1957). Bd. II,1. *Einleitung zur Wortlehre. Nominalkomposition* (1905). *Nachträge zu Bd. II,1* by A. Debrunner (1957). Bd. II,2. *Die Nominalsuffixe* by A. Debrunner (1954). Bd. III. *Nominalflexion – Zahlwort – Pronomen* by A. Debrunner and J. Wackernagel (1930). *Register zur Altindische Grammatik von J. Wackernagel und A. Debrunner (Bd. I-III)* by R. Hauschild (1964). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.

Waddell, L. A. 1929. *The Makers of Civilization in Race and History*. London: Luzac and Co.

Walde, A. and J. B. Hofmann. 1938-56. *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 3 vols. 5. unveränderte Aufl. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag, 1982. *Registerband* comp. by E. Berger. 4. Aufl. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag, 1965. (The 5. Aufl. is a reproduction of the 3. neubearb. Aufl. by J. B. Hofmann, 1938-56, which also included as vol. 3 the *Registerband* for the first time; =Indogermanische Bibliothek. II. Reihe, Wörterbücher.)

Wasson, R. G. 1956. "Lightning-bolt and Mushrooms: An essay in early cultural exploration". *For Roman Jakobson, Essays on ... His Sixtieth Birthday* comp. by M. Halle, H. Lunt, H. McLean, and C. van Schooneveld, 605-612. The Hague: Mouton.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1968. *Soma: Divine mushroom of immortality*. Rpt. [New York]: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., [1972]. (= *Ethno-mycological Studies*, 1.)

\_\_\_\_\_. 1979. "SOMA Brought Up-to-date". *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 99.100-105.

Watkins, C. 1995. *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European poetics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Whitney, W. D. 1885. *Roots, Verb-Forms and Primary Derivatives of the Sanskrit Language*. Rpt. New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society, 1945. (Rpt.=*American Oriental Series*, 30.)

\_\_\_\_\_. 1889. *Sanskrit Grammar*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wilson, H. H. 1850-88. *Rig-Veda Sanhita: A collection of ancient Hindu hymns of the Rig-Veda*, 6 vols. Rpt. 6 vols. in 7. New Delhi: Cosmo Publications, 1977.

Winternitz, M. 1927-33. *A History of Sanskrit Literature* trans. by S. Ketkar and rev. by the author, 2 vols. Rpt. New York: Russell and Russell, 1971. (Original: Leipzig, 1905-20.)

Wyatt Jr., W. F. 1970, *Indo-European /a/*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.