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This contribution has two purposes: (I) To set forth the evidence for a hitherto unobserved Indo-European etymon, and (II) to present a new structural mode of analysis of interest for not only the study of linguistic change, but also e.g. mythopoëtic and poetic processes. In keeping with this volume's dedication to Prof. Murray B. Emeneau (under whom I had the good fortune to first study Sanskrit) my emphasis here will be Indological.

I. As background, I must first present my non-Indological data. I propose a Proto-Indo-European *dhw(-)er(H) 'to go apart bilaterally and form a gap' from the following evidence:

1. Anc. Greek: ὑσαρ 'to go apart bilaterally and form a gap' appears in ἑσαρά (stative perf.) 'to have the lips withdrawn so as to show the clenched teeth, to have the mouth agape; to gape (e.g. of wounds)'; σέρανος 'cave'; σάρνος 'chasm'; and (with* on/-n-) σάρόν 'gaping (vulva)'; σαρών 'hollow oak'; sarάπος 'gap-footed' i.e. 'pigeon-toed'; σάραβα 'vulva' (sāw(o) - suffixed to *-r/n- stems, marking natural objects; cf. OInd. āsr-g, Lat. sanguis 'blood'; OInd. šṛṅga- 'horn'; Gr. pterux 'wing' etc.; not *-g-!)

   This etymology results from my discovery, based on symmetry of phonological correspondences, that the regular Gr. reflex of PIE *dhw- is s-, not th-. [See Note 1.]

2. Lithuanian: dvėrit 'to go apart, go asunder, to gape, develop holes' etc.

3. Hittite: duwar(na)- 'to break' < *to make go asunder'. Here -nai- goes back to *-na- (factivive), as also tarnai- 'to let' and hurmai- 'to moisten'. These words conform to the transfer of -hi conj. thematic stems to -mi stems discussed in Watkins and Jasanoff.

4. Pan-IE: The etymon of door, *dhwor- *dhr- etc. need no longer be described as a "terme inanalysable par lui-même, qu'on ne peut pas rattacher a une racine verbale et dont la signification nous échappe" (Buenveniste 1969 I:312), since this word may now be explained from our etymon *dhw(-)er(H). The oldest forms refer to doors or gates with two leaves. Thus in Vedic a door or gate is designated by the dual, dvārā. Similarly in Homer 'door' is usually thúraí; Lat. fores is a great door with two leaves, and Gothic dauðrons is a two-leaved gate; here pl. forms have replaced the old du. The bivalvus door cut in half the weight on the hinges, allowing larger, more secure structures, and had the psychologically poignant appeal of symmetry, with all its important architectural possibilities. Named from
its special feature of bilateral opening, this door became the door par excellence. Thus the various late forms referring to a univalvus door are from *dhwor-*dhrur-, often retaining the plural form (substituted for the still earlier dual; hence 'door' was not a PIE plurale tantum).

Three curious facts will be addressed later: The irregular ḍ- for *dh- in OInd. dvār- dur-; the Old Iranian (singular) form dvāra- as against OInd. dvār-ā dual, and the circumstance that thūrai in Homer always refers to the concrete apparatus of a bivalvus door (and not merely a passageway), except when it refers, as frequently, to the entrance of a cave.

The oldest kind of door consisted of a single plank covering an opening, eventually mounted on a pivot. This is shown by Skt. vāra- 'gateway, door' (lex.), Prasun (Kafir) wārek 'house', Oscan veru 'portam', Umbrian verofer 'in portam (and prob. here Pol. wierzeja < *vereja- 'leaf of door'), OChSlav. vрăta, OPruсс. wartо 'door, gate' etc., whose etymon is PIE \(\sqrt{H}\)wer 'to shut up, (en)closes, obstructs, shield, protect', whence OInd. vrñōti '(en)closes, obstructs', vrtrā- 'obstruction', Old Iranian vrθra- 'resistance, defense' > Ossetic wart 'shield'; Old Irish fern 'shield' etc. From this base one may reconstruct the IE term for 'to close, to shut', OInd. āpī) vrñōti, Lat. operio (*opi-wer-), cf. Lith. užvėrši, as well as 'to open', OInd. āpa vrñōti, = Lat. aperio (*apo 'away'), also OInd. vrī vrñōti (vī 'apart'), Lith. atvėrši. This accords with the priority of \(\sqrt{H}\)wer in the IE terms for 'door'.

II. I now come to the Indological part of this paper, which illustrates the approach I shall henceforth be advocating. This is a mode of analysis arising from phenomena I call synergetic structures. This approach treats change as a "vector resultant" of patternings of features simultaneously interacting in various parameters of form, meaning, cultural context, psychological factors, etc. These interactions take place through dynamics of associative similarity of features as well as dynamics of differentiation, which often result in simultaneous alignments and polarities in various levels of function. I believe that these synergetic phenomena reflect an aspect of the operations of the mind, which in this regard may be viewed as a multidimensional associative network with a complementary mechanism whereby distinctions are maintained.
Synergetic structures may often be conveniently schematized. I shall here present a few model schemata for synergetic interactions in the realm of language. I note in passing that synergetic schemata take account of (and help account for) a range of linguistic phenomena including what is commonly called analogy (paradigmatic leveling, etc.), contamination and blending, phonesthesmes, popular etymology, malapropisms, slips of the tongue, puns, consonances (rhyme, alliteration, etc.) and varieties of word association, including those that remain unconscious and those that are manifested artistically (or humorously).

This is not the place to discuss the application of the approach e.g. to literary criticism and the study of folklore, or its relationship to currently more familiar theories and methods of "structuralism" and trends in psychology: these issues are beyond the scope of this paper. I will limit my illustration of synergetic structures to problems in Old Indic which are related to the material discussed in I.

Vedic ṣdhvar(m) ṣhvārati, ṣhvṛvati) 'deceive, injure' requires an etymology, especially since the Hitt. form with which it had earlier been grouped is a special development of 'go apart'. The fact that ṣdhvar is phonologically suited by PIE ṣdhwer(H) necessitates that the latter be considered as etymon. The semantic difference 'to go apart and form a gap': 'deceive, injure' needs of course to be reconciled. Rather than rush to an arbitrary, ad hoc judgment of how to relate these meanings, it is methodologically necessary to see what the station of ṣdhvar was in the Old Indic lexical network.

Phonologically ṣdhvar would be similar to two verbs. The first, ṣdhrau (ṣdhru), is attested only in rare forms, all zero grade nominalizations: the abstract ḍhrūti- 'seduction, deception' and the root stems ḍhrut- and ḍhru-, but as I showed in 1966, the corresponding verb is well attested in Iranian. Relevant forms include Avestan ḍrāuīnia- 'to lead astray, wreak mayhem', ppp. drūt-; ḍrauman- 'deception, mayhem; Parth. ḍrāw- 'to seduce, deceive'; Sogd. ārāw- (sic; ā- established by N. Sims-Williams) 'to seduce'; Khwarezmian ārāw (sic) 'seductive demon leading its victims far away'; and ārāuc 'remotum, *seductum'. The antiquity of the form and the meaning is guaranteed by its connection with Lat. fraus furnishing the PIE base ṣdhrew whose extended form, ṣdhreugh, yielded OInd. druḥ-, Av. drug- 'lie, deception,
demonic force, demoness'. The details are given in Schwartz (1966). From the Avestan (and Parthian) passages cited there is is clear that Ṛdraḥ was particularly associated with aēdetachma -'Fury, Disorderly Behavior', and thereby with Disintegration (vīdātu-) and indeed with drug-; the notion of Ṛdraḥ is best defined as 'making things go wrong' e.g. the stopping of the ordained motion of the heavenly bodies and leading astray the mind of man.

The other verb which phonologically resembles Ṛdhvar is Ṛhvar; Ṛvārati 'is crooked, goes off course, vacillates', Ṛvāras- 'crookedness, perversity', for which I reconstruct *ṚhuH-*el - 'go off course' (cf. Lith. žuti 'to perish', Latv. zust 'go lost'): *ṚhuH- (OIr. zūrah- 'perversity, evil'; OInd. hūchati 'is crooked'; Lith. atžūlas 'unmerciful, disinclined'), *Ṛhwel- (prob. Gr. ϕήσις 'deceitful'). A close phonological association between Ṛdhvar and Ṛhvar would result from the fact that in OInd. dialects Ṛh became Ṛ, even within the same paradigm, e.g. Ṛḥa 'to place', ppp. Vedic Ṛhitā - (rare) > Ṛitā - (usual).

Not only would Ṛdhvar(H) if it originally had the sense of PIE Ṛdhver(H) 'to go apart', be phonologically similar to both Ṛdhraḥ and Ṛhvar, it would also be semantically comparable to both, sharing with them a reference to motion away from a center or focus (point/line).

The mg. 'more apart bilaterally' would also make Ṛdhvar(H) = Ṛdhver(H) opposed to the idea of joinedness and fitting together. As it happens, in Indo-European the concrete 'fitting (being joined)' furnished in the abstract realm the idea of fittingness i.e. suitability, propriety, excellence, the good. (The proof of this follows in accordance with the following axiom of historical semantics: in a language or language group a semantic association or shift not motivated by specific systematic pressures may be verified by the reoccurrence of that association or shift in a number of phonologically unrelated instances.)

Note these examples: (1) OInd. Ṛgadhita- 'clasped', MDutch gaden 'to fit, to match', OChSlav. ugoditi 'to suit', godu '(proper) time', Eng. good; (2) Arm. Ṛdarbin, Lat. faber (ṚA/Ebh-ro-) 'joiner, craftsman', Goth. Ṛadōf 'fitting, proper', ĕadōb 'is appropriate', OChSl. doba 'suitability, occasion', dobī 'good', dobī 'best, most seemly'; (3) Gr. Ṛpēsō 'fasten', Germ. Ṛsten 'to join together', fangen 'to grasp', Goth. fauhrs 'fitting, fit', OEEng. fǣger 'fair, excellent, suitable, beautiful'; (4) Gr. ērrare 'joined, fitted together', arthōs 'joint', ērti 'exactly', Lat. ērs 'craft, artus 'joint', Gr. Ṛmēros 'companion', Hitt. n. ēra- 'companion' and c. 'that which is fitting, right suitable', Gr. ērōs 'fits, is suitable', Ṛtē 'excellence', ērōs 'better', ērīston 'best'.
In Indo-Iranian the latter group is represented by *var/*va genres; "
OInd. r̥nti 'joins together, fits' trans./intrans.); ppp. r̥t-a- 'joined'; ara- 'spoke of a wheel'; Av. arante 'are joined', aipi-arata- 'fixed, regular', Av. aśa-, arata- 'Rightness, (Cosmic) Truth, righteousness', ara-, ra- 'proper(ly)', in accord', rata (proper) time, Sogd. rtu- 'moment', OInd. (Ved.) ara-, aram 'proper(ly), in accord', rtu- '(proper) time', r̥ta- 'The Right, order(ed), (Cosmic) Truth'; 'the state of things being in, or going to, their proper place'; 'the state of being solidly held together', 'the Law which is firmly established' (= r̥t-a- 'joined').

Already in Proto-Indo-Iranian the *r̥ta- concept was opposed by *d(h)rugh- (> OInd., dr̥h-, Av. drug-) and ṣdhraw. In Vedic the association of r̥ta- with 'join' was kept alive by its having merged with the past passive participle.

(It must be noted that the older verbal noun *r̥ta- is shown by Av. aśa-; *r̥ta- may therefore a thematized root stem. Cf. Av. aś-, Pashto *r̥- 'very' < *r̥a- 'truly, verē'? Further to Gr. ārti (loc.) 'just, exactly', ārtioi 'fitting (the facts, etc.). The latter suggests the mg. 'Truth' of *r̥tā-, unique among derivatives of bases meaning 'fit together, join' may be from 'closely corresponding'; this could interact synergetically in Indo-Iranian with 'fitting, proper' and produce 'Truth' (as a cosmic potency); for 'truth' as 'epistemologically correct' Indo-Iranian had satya- 'pertaining to the way something is', from sant- 'being'.

As a value concept r̥tā- stood against ṣdhraw (ṣdhru) as expressing deception, making things go wrong, etc., and also against ṣhvar, which also expressed abstractions like crookedness, deviousness, deviation, instability, etc.

It must also be observed that r̥nti also means 'more (trans./intrans.) to the right place', synergetically related on one hand to the idea of '(fitting) reward', cf. Gr. ārnumaiti, Av. āronaoiti, aśi- etc. (and OInd. artha- 'goal'), perhaps reflecting a PIE form of *Aer 'to fit', and on the other to the homophonous r̥nti 'to move, to rise', etc. from PIE *E(e)or, so that both ṣdhru (ṣdhraw) 'to lead astray' and ṣhvar 'to go off course, bend sideways' would be opposed to this sense of ṣhvar in r̥tā-.

The dynamics of the synergetic interactions affecting ṣdhvar may now be schematized. First the words may be arranged so as to reflect their relationships:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ṣdhvar (H)} & \quad \text{/ dhru 'lead astray, make go wrong'} \\
\text{ṛnti} & \quad \text{*/dhrur 'go apart etc.'} \\
\text{ṣhvar} & \quad \text{// ṣhur 'be crooked, go off course, vacillate'.}
\end{align*}
\]
Phonologically /dhvar(H)/ dhur is similar to both /dhra\u0177/ dhru and /hvar/ hur, and is associatively attracted to both; since it is an intermediary or bridge between the latter two bases, its phonological "vector resultant" may be shown as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
/dhra\u0177 (\text{/ dhru}) \\
/dhvar(H) (\text{/ dhur}) \\
/hvar (\text{/ hur})
\end{align*}
\]

Semantically /dhvar(H) stands to both /dhra\u0177 and /hvar in a complex manner. 'Go apart etc.' stands against both 'lead astray' etc. and 'go off course', etc., which latter meanings are very similar. But /dhvar(H) shares with both /dhra\u0177 and /hvar the signification of divergent or divergent motion with reference to a point or line, and may therefore be associatively "attracted" to them. But while /dhvar(H) signifies bilateral divergence, the divergence indicated by both /dhra\u0177 and /hvar is unilateral. However /dhvar(H), like both /dhra\u0177 and /hvar, is opposed to the /I; in the case of /dhvar(H) the opposition is to /I in the meaning of 'join together', whereas /dhra\u0177 and /hvar are opposed to /I as 'to move toward a goal'. Thus the semantic relationship, as concerns motion with reference to a point or line, would be as follows (\text{\langle A away; T\rangle toward}):
(past passive participle of \( \sqrt{r} \), \( \text{rnōti} \)), but in the plane of ethical value concepts \( \sqrt{dv} \text{hrav}(H) \) had no role, whereas \( \sqrt{dhvar} \) (and \( \sqrt{hvar} \)) and derivatives (cf. dhrúti-, hváras-) were antipodal to the notion of the noun \( \text{rtá} \). As indicated, Vedic dhruv- was a synonymous counterpart of druha-, which was diametrically opposed to \( \text{rtá} \), just as Av. \( \sqrt{dv} \text{rav} \) and its derivatives patterned with drug-, systematically antipodal to aša- in the Zoroastrian dualism. (For \( \sqrt{hvar} \) as loosely patterning with \( \sqrt{dv} \text{hrav} \) against the \( \text{rtá} \)-concept, cf. Av. zbar- (*zīvar-) as a technical term for the motion of evil beings. —The history of its synonym duuar- (dvār-) I take to result from complex Iranian synergies of \( \sqrt{zīvar} \) 'go crookedly', \( \sqrt{dvār} \) 'go apart', \( \sqrt{dv} \text{rav} \) 'to run', and \( \sqrt{dv} \text{rav} \) 'to lead astray', which led to the elimination of \( \sqrt{dvār} \) 'go apart'.) Nevertheless in the metaphysical plane (inseparable from the ethical for the Indo-Iranians), \( \sqrt{dv} \text{hrav}(H) \) would have been associated with dissolution (cf. Av. Vidātu- as subject of \( \sqrt{dv} \text{rav} \)) and thus opposed, together with \( \sqrt{dv} \text{hrav} \) and \( \sqrt{hvar} \), to the \( \text{rtá} \) concept, which included cohesion and solidity. The schema for the synergy would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHYSICAL: MOTION REFERENCE Pt.\text{/}L.</th>
<th>METAPHYSICAL AND ETHICAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \sqrt{dv} \text{hrav} )</td>
<td>( \sqrt{dv} \text{hrav} ) 'mayhem', 'deception', 'wrongness'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sqrt{dv} \text{hrav}(H) )</td>
<td>( \sqrt{dv} \text{hrav}(H) ) 'dissolution'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sqrt{hvar} )</td>
<td>( \sqrt{hvar} ) 'instability' 'crookedness'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{rtá} )</td>
<td>('\text{Order}', '\text{Truth}', 'Right(eous)ness', 'Stability')</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result would be identical to that seen for the other two schemata. It must be remembered that the operations of all three were all simultaneous and interconnected in the minds of the speakers of pre-Vedic; a multidimensional model would be required to illustrate the unified synergetic process. Suffice it to say that a multiplicity of factors, in many hierarchies of language and thought, made for a close associative alignment of the three bases, both in form and meaning.

Through this rapprochement, \( \sqrt{dv} \text{hrav}(H) \) took on the meanings of \( \sqrt{dv} \text{hrav} \) (\( \sqrt{dv} \text{rhu} \)), because of their similarities and shared systematic opposition to the meanings of \( \text{rtá} \), in the various parameters schematized above. Thus prob. the pres. stem \( \text{dhūrva} \)- was modeled after \( \text{dhvāra} \). A clear instance is RV śatya-dhūrt- 'seeking to be' deceiving (perverting) truth' alongside Varuna-dhūrūt- 'seeking to deceive Varuna (the god presiding over \( \text{Rtā} \))'. More interestingly, we find dhvarás- f. and drúh- f. coordinated
in opposition to r̥tá- in RV 4.23.7-8; it is now possible to identify dhvarās- as an alternative expression for dr̥h- as the feminine hypostasis of Lie (etc.); this is confirmed by the pl. dhvarāsas, described as dvayāvīnas 'duplicitous ones' 2.23.5, the equivalent of the pl. is from *dhvaras- n., modeled (as shall be seen below) after hvaras- 'crookedness'.

Remodeling of ʰhvar (itself a cross of ḫu(v)ar- < ḫuHar- and hvār- < hvahr/l-) after ʰdvhvar(H) / dhru is shown by the alternation of hur (hurya-, hurchati), the sole expected outcome of ḫuHr/l (Ir. zūr/l, Lith žūl), with hur in hurās 'going' off course', remodeled after dhūr (dhūrti etc.) alternating with dhur (dhūrā 'violently'), where we have conditioned variants, resp. preconsonantal and prevocalic, of */dhurH/. With ʰdvhvar(H) having become semantically identical to ʰdhrav / dhru, ʰhvar developed forms like -hrut-, hruti- after forms like -dhrut-, dhruti-. Thus ends the suppression of dhru as a metathesis of dhvṛ and hru of ʰvṛ; the other alleged evidence in Indic for such a metathesis in śvasura-: śvaśrū and catvārās: catur (!), Av. caṭru-, merely reflect a PIE dissimilatory metathesis of two labial sonants (*swékuro-, *kwetw(o)r-).

The confusing diversity and mental "clutter" caused by the multiplicity of similar forms with identical/similar meanings had two results. ʰdvhvar, which had the phonological support of the rhyming ʰhvar (whose meaning was sufficiently distinct from ʰdvhvar / dhru, as Karl Hoffmann has shown), and whose opposition to the r̥tá- concept was complete in more dimensions than that of ʰdvhvar, ousted the latter as a living verb; even the nominal survivals are limited to the zero grade, dhru, supported by the semantically and phonologically similar dhru, thus also the greater frequency of the verb dhūrvati as against dhavrati tendency among sufficient speakers to avoid verbal forms of both bases (this is another solution to the confusion), so that the later language maintains only dhūrta- 'rogue' (and note the Sanskrit use of hvalate as against Vedic hvārati?).

Not only was the semantic shift of ʰdvhvar(H) a virtually inevitable regulatory response to combined tensions within the Old Indic lexical network, but it was this which in turn motivated the change of the word for 'bivalvous door' from the original form *dhwār- to the attested dvār-. The only attractive earlier explanation of this change was "analogical influence of dvā 'two". It is moot whether such an association would have sufficed against the phonemic distinction dh- : d-. But it certainly would not have taken place as long as there was a verb dhvārati 'goes apart bilaterally', of which dhvār- is the cognate noun illustrating the verb. But once dhvārati came to mean 'deceives, injures', the designation for the gates or doors of every major dwelling or fortification would
no longer be the appropriate 'that which goes apart on two sides' but would ascribe treachery and harm to those devices of security, hospitality, and transition. It would also entail sacrilege (for doors, dvār-, as goddesses, see e.g. the 5th and 6th stanzas of the Apra/Apri Hymns of the Rg- Veda). The station of *dhvār- in the lexical network provided a way around this impasse: 'two-leaf door' entered the phonosemantic field of dvā '2'; the phonemic difference now became a secure barrier closing off association with the inadmissible. To demonstrate this connection I would note that the variant pronunciation of '2' as duā brought about duār- a variant of dvār-; this is reflected in the RgVedic scansion duārā 4.51.2, a reflection of whose reality in the spoken language I would also claim in Prakrit du(v)āra-, duāria, Panjabi duār, Nepali duṇār, Eur. Romany vudar, and (in Kafiric) Waigeli dōr. etc.

The two-leaf door would be the clearest and most tangible illustration, constantly experienced in everyday life, of the original meaning of PIE *dhwer(H), 'part bilaterally and form a gap'. In OInd. the shift of meaning resulted not only in the new formal approach of 'two-leaf door' to 'two', but in the alignment with 'door' of words for 'gap, chasm, cave' from the old base of 'door'. Note that Greek has from the same PIE base not only sērma 'chasm' and sērānax 'cave', but, as remarked earlier, thūrai (*dual) as both 'two-leaf door' and 'cave entrance' (see esp. Odyssey IX 243; 415-418), the result of a synergy of two forms related phonologically as well as semantically (and, in this case, etymologically).

Now Kashmiri has bar m. 'door; bore m. 'hole permitting entrance, crack or fissure in wall', f. būrū 'spy-hole, crack in wood or stone or in a door' (Grierson; Turner). These should go back to resp. dvāra- (Turner), and (following Morgenstierne's notes on the Kashmiri mātrā vowels), *dvāraka-, *dvārika-.

I account for these forms as follows: In pre-Indic *dhvana- m. 'gap, large aperture' and *dhvari- f. ' aperture, hole', became, through alignment with *dhvār-ā > dvār-ā 'door', dvār- and dvāri-. By analogy with dvār(-ā), the thematic form dvāra- then took on the convenient meaning '(any kind of) door(way)', cf. also the Oldr. and Kafiric words for 'door'< *dvāra-. In pre-Kashmiri the words for 'gap' and ' aperture' etc. were then distinguished from dvāra- ('door' (> bar; cf. also Kashmiri brānt 'threshold') < dvārānta-, Turner) by the addition of diminutive suffixes (hence 'door' = 'large opening'; 'fissure, crack' = 'small opening'. (Note also *dvāras- in Vīkadhvaras-, the name of a demon, hence 'he who lives in a den of wolves' since this if from *dhvārās-, the Vedic dhvārās- 'Lie' must be a new creation.)
The above is confirmed by a hitherto inpenetrable RgVedic passage which occurs in one of the Sāvya hymns to Indra. Before analyzing the passage, it is necessary to summarize the Vedic myth to which it and a great many other hymns refer.

In the beginning there was an undifferentiated state which the Veda describes as stagnant waters. Within this primordial matrix there developed a speck of solid substance which became a mountain (pārvata-), or rock, in which was concentrated a force of resistance to a more differentiated cosmos. Flowing waters and a sun (establishing motion and regularity) existed latently within the enclosing, obstructing rock. This force, called Vṛtra- 'Obstruction, Resistance', was mythologized in a more active conception as a serpent lying inertly upon the mountain, or encircling it, or engulfing it. Against this doubly-represented force of blockage there arises the god Indra, who pierces Vṛtra, smashes open the mountain, lets the pent-up waters flow, and releases the sun. The base of the mountain, dharūṇa-, he extends horizontally to be the earth, and on the locus of the opened source he raises the heavens with a prop, the axis mundi down which the sun returns at night.

As against Vṛtra, who is the (En)closer (as plays on the root vr constantly remind us), Indra functions as the Opener. In a hymn of the Sāvya cycle, we read 'You, Indra, have unclosed the enclosure of waters...in the mountain (pārvate)'. In other hymns we read 'the cave (bīlam) of the waters which was shut up, having smitten Vṛtra, that did he open'. Moreover, Indra thereby opens the doors (dvār-) of the waters: 'You let the waters through the doors on all sides, Indra; you broke the mountain's fastness'; again, 'he opened the doors of the stream shut up in the rock'. Finally, in the Yajur-Vedic mantra, 'he has smitten Vṛtra; he has opened the doors'.

We may now come to our passage with dvarā- and dvarī-, RV 1.52.2-3:

sā párvato na dharūṇasya ācyutah...
Indra yad vṛtrām avadhīn nādīvṛtam...
sā hi dvarō dvarīṣu vavrā udhani
'He (is/was) like a mountain unshakable on its foundations...
(i.e. Indra, since he smote Vṛtra, the (en)closer of streams...

for he (Indra) is

dvarō dvarīṣu vavrā udhani.
(nom.) (loc.) (nom.) (loc.)
The second of the two grammatically parallel phrases consists of well-attested words, and means 'a cave at the udder'; since there should be a relationship in the signification of the two nominatives, vavrā- 'cave' would confirm the meaning 'gap, opening, chasm, cave' which was posited above on etymological grounds. In the cattle-centered imagery of the Veda, the udder, udhar/ū- was a term for the mountain or rock breached by Indra, whence flowed forth the streams; I shall show elsewhere that the Savya poet had in mind an image of four streams set flowing toward the four directions by Indra. The four teats of the udder completes the parallelism in our verse, where udhāni loc. sg. corresponds to dvarāśu loc. pl.

The interpretation of 'udder' in our verse as the outlet(s) of liquid made by Indras piercing the mountain is confirmed in an earlier hymn, RV 5.32.2: āramha udhāh párvatasya vajrin 'You have let the mountain's udder flow, o Club-wielder!' In verse 8 of the same hymn RV 5.32, Vṛtra is called the great insatiable abyss (engulfment, chasm, cave), asinvaṃ vavrām māhi, where vavrā- is an etymological variant of vṛpti, whose participle vavrivams- and similar forms, cf. nadvṛvā- and nadvṛt- 'stream encloser' occur in the Savya hymns. In 5.32 vavrā- refers to Vṛtra as a greedy gulf sucking up the liquid. (I leave for elsewhere a discussion of the relationships of water and soma in these hymns.)

It may be asked, why in 1.52.3 is Indra called (dvarā-)/ vavrā-, when the latter should refer to Vṛtra? This is explained by a complex of factors:

1) As a masculine noun with stressed thematic syllable, dvarā- would be 'opener' (as well as 'opening'), and hence describe Indra. But since dvarā- is also 'opening, chasm, cave', it is synonymous with vavrā (which is both 'engulfer' and 'gulf'). This suggests an equation Indra = Vṛtra.

2) Indra is associated with closing in one instance in the older hymn RV 3.43.3. Here is a statement linguistically unusual and stylistically striking: índro vrtrám avṛpnot i.e. 'Indra enclosed the Encloser (engulfed the Engulfer, closed down the Closer)'. This would have made an impression on later Vedic bards, whose profession it was to remember such things. The passage is no less memorable than the Greek Orthodox Epitaphios Hymn for Good Friday: 'Down in the tomb you established life, O Christ, and by your death, death did you destroy' (cf. also John Donne's 'Death thou shalt die'.)

3) By breaking into the mountain Indra literally suppliants, i.e. takes the place, of Vṛtra. The reversal of roles is introduced in our passage by the artful use of what at first passes for a cliché, Indra described as a mountain (párvata- unshakeable on its foundations (dharāyus acyutaḥ). The condition previous to Indra's feat is described by the same poet in 1.54.10: dharūnahvaram támo 'ntar vrtrásya játhareṣu párvataḥ 'darkness shaking the foundation; the mountain was in Vṛtra's maw'. In 1.56.5 the poet praises Indra for setting matters aright, vi yat tiró dharúnam acyutam rájo 'tis'hipo
'when you extended the foundation (as something) unshakable across space.'

4) The paradoxical equation of Indra and Vṛtra reflects the fact that 'cave' is both an opening (dvarā-) and an enclosure (vāvrā-), and may thus be seen as releasing or retaining liquid; similarly an udder. Doors too may be regarded as opening (dvar- and cf. Old Dardic (>Kashmiri) *dvarā-) and closing (√vr). Furthermore the ordinary word for 'to open' has the same verb (plus preverb) as 'to close', √vr, whence vṛtra-, etc.

The "equation" of Indra with Vṛtra is a rhetorical device which shows the professional excellence of the poet as well as his profundity of mystical insight (at the conclusion of the figure he calls attention to his 'art and vision' addressing his god's generosity); it serves to embellish the message of the poem as vehicle of the myth, Indra's cosmogonical act. Here it is Indra's opposition to Vṛtra which is really thrown into relief.

The following chart synoptically shows the synergetic factors serving as the unconscious elements whereby the elaborate figure was motivated, and also serves to diagram the figure as an artistic exposition in parvo of the myth:

**HYMN TO INDRA**

**THEME:** Cosmogony: Differentiation

**Motion / flux** vs. **Stasis: resistance/blockage**

**MODEL (1) (Primordial) water in mountain**

**MYTH: Indra (hero-god):** gegenaden versus Vṛtra (monster/dragon serpent)

[dvarā-(m.) 'that which (he who) opens up' ]

[dvarā- 'chasm']

[dvari- 'opening of cave, cave-mouth']

The Opener

'(En)closer, Obstruction' vāvrā-(m.) 'that which (he who) shuts up, (en)closes cavern' (engulfment)

(vāvrā- 'enclosure')

(vāvrī- 'envelopment')

**MODEL (2) Opening doors**

(dvār-; and dvara-?)

PIE √dhwer(H)

PIE √(H)wer

vs. closing doors

√vr: vrñóti etc.)

Indra's act, as Kuiper (1960) has indicated, was thought by the Vedic poets to be daily recapitulated by the goddess Dawn's rising from the cavern of darkness (the locus of the breached mountain); thus she too is often said to open doors. This act was in turn thought to be paralleled microcosmically in the individual by the activation of his inner creative illumination.
It may be fitting, in view of the insights into the amazing complexity of the mind revealed by our poet, to close this paper's door with an allusion by another hymnist to the inspired vatic arousal of this deep-lying luminosity (RV 9.10.6):

\[ \text{āpa ēvāro matināmat pratnāḥ pruvánti kāravāḥ} \] [See Note 2.]

'The poet-heralds of yore open the doors of thoughts'.

**NOTE**

As correctives to etymologies with *dhw-* > th- I offer:
(a) thairōs 'door pivot' and also 'pole upon which the side of a chariot is built' < PIE *dhvyo- 'shaft, rod', cf. Norw. darre 'long pin, spigot, peg, threshing stick', dial. also 'door pivot' and 'small post in the corner of a sleigh'; ONor. darr 'javelin', darrādr 'spear, lance, long peg', Hitt. tarma- 'nail, peg', OEng. derian 'to injure', daru 'harm'; Lith. dūrti 'to jab, stab, pierce', dūrlkis 'spear', all of which I assign to a previously unnoted PIE base √dher 'to shaft, to jab'.

(b) theelion 'sulphur' < *dhew(H)es-yo-, cf. Gr. thúos 'burnt offering, aromatic', OInd. dhavisyati 'will puff', dhavitra- 'a fan', etc. PIE √dhew 'to (be like) smoke, steam'.

(c) theós 'god' < *dhēssó-, cf. Arm. di-k' 'gods' *dheEs-, Lat. fanum, fēstus, etc.

(d) thūs, gen. thūnos 'pile', PIE *dheEyvn- > *dhēyvn-, gen. (anal.) *dheyn-os, √dheE 'to put, deposit', cf. Gr. theumôn, thōmos, etc. 'pile, heap'.

(e) thnāskō 'die', thnātanos 'death' etc.: PIE *gūhpA-, √when(A) 'to smite', which must await full discussion elsewhere.

(f) tholōs 'murk, mire, cuttlefish ink' < PIE *dhwolo-, dhw-el- 'be smoky, obfuscating, turbulent'; the traditional etymology may here be left unchanged, since *t(h)wo is attested in Mycenean, and, as was shown in Wyatt (1963), wo merges with o betw. the Myc. and Hom. periods.

(g) In confirmation of *dhw > Gr. s-, note sēpia 'cuttlefish (ink)' PIE √dhw-eEp 'be like smoke, obfuscate, swirl', from whose zero grade OHGerm. tūvar 'foolish' etc.

(g) Perhaps Gr. -s-th- of the 2nd p. mid. pl. (etc.) is to be explained by *-dhw-.

For *dhw- > š-, cf. *tw- > š-, *dhy- > š-, *dw > šf, (ē)š, *ghw-, *gwh- > φ-, ʃ-. 
NOTE 2
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