Is Greek -cύνη cognate with Sanskrit -tvana-m?

1. This question has been answered in the affirmative for sixty years, and the doctrine of Brugmann in the *Grundriss*² (2, 1 § 196) is substantially identical with the conclusions reached by Aufrecht in KZ. 1, 481sq. True, Brugmann more specifically accounts for -cu- instead of -tu-, and he realizes that Indo-Iranian -tvana-m has rather the look of being -twa-m extended by -na-. This, if a fact, militates against the assumption that -cu- (for -tu-) is in weak gradation with Skv. -tva-, and has induced Brugmann to write -cuv-η : -tvan-am.

2. In the Rîgveda the words in -tvand-m all alternate, with a single (accidental) exception, with words in -tvā-m. They occur as follows:

1) (Formed on adjective stems:) *martyatvandm* 'mortalitas' 1° (no occurrence of **martyatvdm*), *mahitvandm* 'magnitudo' 5°, *mahitvand* (Ins. sg.) 8° (*mahitvdm* 21°, **tvā* [Ins. sg.] 33°, other forms 2°).

2) Formed on nounstems:) *kavitvandm* 'sapientia' 1° (**tvdm* 1°), *janitvandm* 'Frauentum' 1° (**tvdm* 2°), *patitvandm* 'Gattenschaft, Eheverbindung' 1° (**tvdm* 1°), *vasutvandm* 'Reichtum' 4° (**tvdm* 1°) *vr̥ṣatvandm* 'Mannheit' 1° (**tvdm* 2°), *sakhitvandm* 'amicitia' 2° (**tvdm* 10°).

3. With this list before us it is hard to separate -tvandm from -tvām, yet it is not easy to see how -tva- was extended to -tvana-. Aufrecht called attention to the frequency of the instrumental in -tvanā (chiefly true of *mahitvanā-m*, for which I have given the figures above) and Grassman would correct one instance of quadrisyllabic *mahitv<a>ā* to *mahitvanā*. It is conceivable, but I do not think it probable, that *mahitvanā* has an adventitious *n*, like the *n* that has intruded into the Indo-Iranian *a*-declension gen. plur. of the type of Skr. *devā<nā>m*, OPers. *bagā<nā>m*, Av. *daēvā<nā>m*. But this adventitious *n* has also intruded in the Sanskrit *i*- and *u*- declension of masculines and neuters, giving the instrumentals in -inā und -unā. Likewise, presumably under the influence of the pronominal declension, Sanskrit *a*-stems exhibit an instrumental in -enā (*devē-na* like *kē-na té-na*) and a neut. plur. in -ā-ni. By having recourse to the same pronominal analogy we might set up the claim that the Indo-Iranian prototype of Skr. *mahitvā-m*, Ins. *mahitv<an>ā* exhibited the influence of such pronominal instrumentals as

OPers. *tya-nā aniya-nā*, Av. *ka-na* (cf. Gr. ἰ-va). From *mahitvand* the new nominative *mahitvand-m* was abstracted. The limitation of these instrumentals to the abstracts in *tvā-m* would, however, be difficult of explanation, and the oxytonesis of the new type presents a problem (but cf. Skr. *sátvan-* | *satvand-*)¹.

4. The correlation of *tva-* and *tvana-* may be due to a merely formal analogy, in which semantic likeness had little part. If Skr. *mīthu-* alternating with *mīthu-nā-* 'paired, iugatus' be confronted with Av. *miθwa-* | *miθwa-na-*, we may have the very pair of words that constituted the source of the analogy for the alternation of *-tva-* with *-tvana-*. Nor is a semantic ground lacking for the influence of this pair of words. In Sanskrit, *mīthund-m*, as a neuter substantive, is used in the ritual literature of the Brāhmaṇas in the sense of 'Paarung, Begattung', and the Avesta accords with the Rīgveda in using the dual of this word-stem of a married pair. The Indo-Iranian antecedents of the Avestan duals *miθwa* and *miθwana* 'coniuges' (whence 'coniugium') may well have supplied the semantic influence from which Skr. *janitvand-m* sprang as a doublet to *jani-tvā-m* 'Frauentum, Stand der Ehefrau' and *patitvand-m* to *patitvā-m* 'Gattenschaft, Eheverbindung', — cf. Av. *nāiri-θwana-* 'Stand der (Ehe-)frau, Ehestand', the solitary Avestan instance of the secondary suffix *-θwana-*²).

5. The way is now cleared for the study of the Greek suffix *-cύvη*, which I strongly suspect of having no connection

1) Skr. *sátvan-* means 'fortis; milites, copiae'. Perhaps it comes from *sa* 'co' + *tvān*, to the root *tā-* 'to be strong' (see § 4 fn.).

2) There seems to be one Avestan example of *-θwana-* as a primary suffix, viz: in *ā-stao-θwana-m* 'sich angeloben an —, sich einschwören auf —': *stao-θwa-m* 'laus'. As a primary suffix *-θwa-* is common in the Avesta. The special signification of this *-θwa-* as a primary suffix is elusive and probably forever indeterminable (for its range of usage see Brugmann, Gr.² 2, 1 § 338; Jackson, Avesta Gram. § 792). As a secondary suffix (already proethnic, see Brugmann, l. c., § 339), the meaning of 'power', transparent in Skr. *mahi-tvā-m* and *pati-tvā-m* — cf. also *vr̥ṣa-tvā-m* which Grassmann defined by 'männliche Kraft' — looks most apt for all the Rīgveda instances cited above. Accordingly *-tva-m* may belong with the proethnic root *tā-* (weak grade) 'to be strong' (see Walde, s. v. *tumeo*). Among the primary derivatives the sense of 'power' is applicable to the gerundials, and a substantive like *īrē(F)ā* 'willow' admits of definition as 'viere-capax', cf. also Av. *daθ-tvā-* 'sollertia'. I am far, however, from supposing that the suffix *-tu-*, in its various grades, had only one source of derivation.

whatever with Indo-Iranian *-tvana-*. Certainly the Vedic examples listed above show no substantial accord with the Homeric examples to be listed below.

6. I start with Pindaric ἵππο-κόας (fem. ἵππο-κόα) 'horse-driver' which, when confronted with Homeric ἵππο-κύνη, leaves, little room for doubt that ἵππο-κύνη is a compound and meant 'horse-driving', cf. O 679—681;

ὥς δ' ὅτ' ἀνὴρ ἵπποισι κελητίζειν ἐὺ εἰδώς
 ὅς τ' ἐπεὶ ἐκ πολέων πύρρας συναίρεται ἵππους,
 σεύας ἐκ πεδίοιο μέγα προτὶ ἄστυ διήται
 λαοφόρον καθ' ὁδόν,

which Lang Leaf and Myers render by

And even as a man right well skilled in horsemanship that couples four horses out of many, and hurrying them from the plain towards a great city, drives along the public way.

7. By a similar analysis of μαχλοσύνη we can vindicate the Homericity of Ω 29—30:

ὅς νείκεε θεός, ὅτε οἱ μέσσαυλον ἔκοντο,
 τὴν δ' ἦνός, ἣ οἱ πόρε μαχλοσύνην ἀλεγινήν.

Aristarchus questioned these lines because μάχλος 'subans, impudica' is *femininum tantum*¹). All the better for the sense of our passage, for μαχλο-κύνη yields the precisely applicable sense of 'impudicarum consecratio'. Herein -κύνη is comparable in sense with ἐccύμενος 'percupidus'.

8. The spread of -cύνη from ἵππο-κύνη was due to the gradual fading of the precise sense of the posterius whereby it became a confix and at last a suffix. In sense, ἵπποκύνη was felt as an abstract, not to ἵππος, but to ἵπποτης²), ἵππεύς, not as the 'art of the horse', but as the 'art of the horseman'. Thus we understand how the conceptual group ἵπποτης : ἵππο-κύνη gave rise to the group δεσπότης : δεσποκύνη (Herodotus), while the group ἵππεύς : ἵπποκύνη gave rise to ἱερεύς : ἱερωκύνη (Herodotus) 'priesthood' (note the rythmically lengthened ω, ———— to ————). But *o/ā* stems of agent nouns are also represented in the following groups:

δαιτροκύνη (π 253) : δαιτρός 'carver' (cf. *δαιτρεῦς : δαιτρεύω);
 δουλοκύνη (X 423) : δοῦλος (cf. δουλεύω), undoubtedly influenced by δεσπο-

1) [But *virtue* comes very near being *femininum tantum*, too. Proof-note.]

2) Not belonging with *eques* but for *ἵππο-ποτης : Skr. *āśva-pati-s*, cf. δεσπότης : Skr. *dām-pati-s* 'household' (see Fay, Cl. Quart. 3, 273).

σύνη, its conceptual opposite; θεμιστο-σύνη (Orph. hym. 79. 6) : *θεμιστεύς (in θεμιστεύω); κλεπτοσύνη (τ 396) : κλέπτης 'thief'; κουροσύνη 'iuventus' (Anth. Pal.), 'mirthfulness' (Theocr.), τὰ κουρόσυνα sc. ἱερὰ (late) : κοῦρος 'iuvenis'; Ξεινοσύνη (φ 35, ἔγχεος ἔδωκεν | ἀρχὴν Ξεινοσύνης = gladium dedit, initium amici-consectandi) : ξείνός.

9. This nearly exhausts the list of agent nouns represented in the -σύνη abstracts, but there remains τεκτο-σύνη 'carpentry' (ε 250) : τέκτων 'carpenter', in which it is quite indeterminable whether the startform was *τεκτο[νο]σύνη with incontiguous haplogy, or τεκτό-σύνη with a variant stem such as we find in Latin *homicida*, or whether, last of all, τεκτοσύνη was loosely modelled on ἵπποσύνη without regard for τέκτων. It is the third mode of formation which we must recognize in παλαιμοσύνη (Θ 103, 126; Ψ 701) : (τὸ) πάλαιμα 'wrestling'. From adjectives in -μων, modelled on the τεκτοσύνη : τέκτων pair, we may note:

ἀπραγμοσύνη (Aristoph., Thuc., Xen.), γνωμοσύνη (Solon 8. 1), τὰ ἡγεμόσυνα sc. ἱερὰ (Xen.), μνημοσύνη (Pindar, as nom. propr. Hesiod, h. Hom.), cf. τὸ μνημόσυον 'souvenir, monumentum' (Hdt.), φραδοσύνη (h. Hom., Apol. 99), χαρμοσύνη (Plutarch, Orph.) : τὸ χάσμα, cf. χαρμόσυνα ποιεῖν 'to make rejoicings' (Hdt.).¹

10. The abstracts thus formed from adjectives applicable chiefly to persons acting (agents) gave rise to abstracts from adjectives denoting personal qualities. To this group belong the following:

ἀβροσύνη (Sappho, Eur.), ἄδροςσύνη (Hesiod), ἀληθοσύνη (Theognis), δικαιοσύνη (Pindar), — cf. also δικαιοσύνης of Zeus, An. Bek.; Eustath. — which do not differ from ἀβρότης etc. In μαργοσύνη (Anac., Theognis) we may have to recognize μάργος = homo furiosus.

11. In the following group neuters in -ος combined with -σύνη yield nouns in -οσύνη practically identical in meaning with the simpler neuters in -ος. The phenomenon is comparable with the identity, in old Latin, of *tempestas* with *tempus*. The extension of βριθός to βριθοσύνη may thus be due to a merely instinctive verbosity, but it probably came about more gradually, after the following illustration which is chronologically defective: τεκτοσύνη (: τέκτων) formed a fit model for τεχνοσύνη (Anth. Pal.), which does not differ from τέχνη. But to some of these compounds the etymological sense of -σύνη quasi 'studium, consecratio' may be restored. The list is as follows:

1) [Aufrecht's list is not as complete for Homer as I had thought. I have since come upon ἐπιπροσύνη 'prudentia', ἐφημοσύνη 'auctoritas', ὑποθημοσύνη 'admonitio, instinctus'. Proof-note.]

βριθoύνη (E 839, M 460), γηθoύνη (N 29, Φ 390), ζηλoύνη (h. Hom.), καλλoύνη (Eurip.), κερδoύνη (δ 251, ξ 31, X 247), κηδoύνη (App. Rhod.), ταρβoύνη (c 342), χητoύνη (Anth. Pal.).

Of these, κερδoύνη suggests 'lucris studium', with the sense of 'studium' rather faded, and ταρβoύνη might well be rendered by 'timoris impetu'. Alongside of γηθoύνη stands the adjective γηθόcυνoc (ε 269, λ 540, Δ 272 = 326 = Σ 557, H 122, N 81), and this is the only Homeric adjective in -όcυνoc to a noun in -oύνη that may be said to be vigorously alive (cf. δεcπόcυνoc 'erilis' in hym. Hom.). Now γηθόcυνoc may be rendered by Lat. 'laetus', but it is not over rendered by 'gaudio impulsus', nor by English 'joy-spiced', with -cυνoc much in the sense of -ccυtoc in αὐτό-ccυtoc (Aesch., Soph.) = 'self-spiced, self-moved'. So γηθo-cύνη = quasi 'gaudii impulsus' ('impulse of joy'). It is profitless with Brugmann to assert that the abstracts in -oύνη are secondary, so to speak, to the adjectives in -όcυνoc. If preponderance of Homeric usage were chronologically significant rather would the converse seem true.

12. In view of the detailed considerations given above, my contention is that the abstracts in -cύνη are all due to irradiation from an etymological source in which, as in ἱππο-cύνη (§ 6) and, to a less degree, in μαχλoύνη (§ 7) and γηθo-cύνη (§ 11), -cυνη had the force of 'driving, impetus, impulse; seeking' (: cεύω). A strong ground for the truth of the postulated irradiation lies in the fact that all the Greek words end in -oύνη, for ἱερω-cύνη with its rhythmically lengthened *ō* is not an exception. It is not necessary to give examples for irradiation but conspicuous modern instances like *motor-neer* : *engin-eer*, *electro-lier* : *chandel-ier* may be cited. In like manner the Greek nouns in -εύc may all have started in βασι-λεύc if, as I have recently contended (Class. Quart. 5, 119 sq.) -λεύc is a root noun *-lēw-s* meaning 'looser; leader'. The method of irradiation would have been something like this: from βασι-λεύc to ἱερεύc to δαιτρεύc (in δαιτρεύω); cf. βασιλεύc : *θεμιστεύc (in θεμιστεύω); βασιλεύc : ἱππεύc etc. etc. Conceptual opposition must also be reckoned with, as in βασιλεύω : δουλεύω, βασιλεύc : οἰκέύc.

13. There remain θάρcυνoc (Π 70; N 823 'prudens; fretus' and πίcυνoc 'fretus', explained by haplology from *θαρ[co]cυνoc and *πι[co]cυνoc. I would not however separate θάρcυνoc from θαρcύνω 'incito', though this makes little difference in the morpho-

logy, for θαρcύνω may well be derived from *θαρcoc-cύνω, wherein -cύνω is but a flexion variant of cεύω 'incito', and the composition of the verb is of the type of Eng. *par[t]takes*, Germ. *platzgreift*, Skr. *namaskaroti*, Lat. *animadverto* though, to be sure, the prius of composition, θαρcoc-, is on the point of submergence (cf. on Skr. *gav-iṣ* etc. in IF. 26, 32). We come out very well however by comparing the Greek pair θαρcύc : θαρcύvoc with Skr. *mīthu-* : *mīthund-* (§ 4). It may be noted in passing that θαρc-c-ύvoc 'fretus' is etymologically connectible with Lat. *fre-tus*.

14. In view of γηθόcύvoc (§ 11) the derivation, after Brugmann, from *πιc[c]-cύvoc is tenable enough, but a form πιc[c]o-, from πιθyo- : Lat. *fidius* is even better justified (? πείc-α from πιθ-yā). The extension of this *πιc[c]o-c to πίcύvoc 'fretus' may have been prompted by θαρcύvoc, which has the same meaning. The voice question need not be raised. Words of reciprocal relation (cf. *foedus*) interchange their voice: *friend* of mine is passive, *friend* to me is active, but *friend* is, morphologically, a present active participle. Lat. *gratus*, a past and passive participle, exhibits the same fluctuation, thanks to being used (in the plural) reciprocally; cf. Horace's *noti columbi*.

Austin, Texas.

Edwin W. Fay.