

T. BURROW

SANSKRIT *írā* 'NOURISHMENT'

There has not been a great deal of discussion about the form, meaning and etymology of the Sanskrit word *írā* 'nourishment'. Böhtlingk and Roth in the Petersburg dictionary treated it as a variant of *íḍā* / *íḷā* 'sacrificial food', and in this they were followed by Monier-Williams ("closely allied to *íḍā* and *íḷā*") and others. This connection is unacceptable not only on account of the phonetic difficulty involved, but also because it can be seen from the Vedic contexts in which they occur that *íḍā* / *íḷā* on the one hand and *írā* on the other are, in spite of overlapping meaning, different words which do not replace each other. In the Vedic Variants of Bloomfield and Edgerton only a single passage is cited where *íḍā* replaces *írā*: *írāvatī dhenumatī hi bhūtam*. This is the original reading found in ten texts, with a variant *íḍāvatī* in KS only. Apart from this the words *írā* and *íḍā* are never confused.

An attempt to solve the phonetic difficulty with the help of Fortunatov's law was made by F. Fröhde in Bezenberger's Beiträge, 20, p. 185. He connected *íḍ-* with Greek ἀλδαίνω 'make to grow, nourish, strengthen' assuming an earlier **ild-* which became *íḍ-* by Fortunatov's law. At the same time he derived *írā* from earlier **ilā*, thus making the two words radically related. This explanation is still retained in Pokorny's Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch, p. 27.

It is not absolutely impossible to derive *íḍ-*, *íḍā* in this way if one assumes a laryngeal before the *-d-*, since **lhd-* would in fact produce *íḍ-*, but this would seem to be a very unusual combination to form a nominal stem in Indo-European. Furthermore there is an alternative explanation of the forms *íḍ-*, *íḍā* which is quite satisfactory and is generally accepted. According to this explanation the form *íḍ-* arose from certain sandhi combinations of the stem *iṣ-* 'strength, vigour, nourishment, prosperity' in declension, namely nom. sg. *it* (before vowels and sonants *íḍ*) and instr.

pl. *iḍbhis*, etc., from which there was extracted a new stem *iḍ-*. Curiously enough, although there is no reason to doubt this explanation, the forms *it*, *iḍbhis*, etc. are not actually found to occur. The noun *iṣ-* is defective and *iḍ-* even more so. The missing cases are supplied when required by the corresponding cases of the *ā*-extension of *iḍ-*, *iḍā* (*iḍā*, *iḍābhis*, etc.). The stem *iḍā* arises by the secondary addition of the feminine suffix *-ā* to the stem *iḍ-*, a process which is familiar in the case of other monosyllabic stems, e.g. *kṣapā* 'night' beside *kṣap-*, *diśā* 'direction' beside *diś-*, etc. (cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, p. 176, III, p. 247 ff.).

The correctness of this derivation is supported by the fact that these stems may be exchanged for each other in certain stock combinations: cf. *iṣās pātis* RV 4, 55, 4 and *iḷās pātis* RV 6, 58, 4; *sām iṣā mādantaḥ* VS 11, 75 and *iḷayā mādantaḥ* RV 3, 59, 2; *sām iṣā-rabhemahi* RV 8, 32, 2 and *iḷābhiḥ sām rabhemahi* RV 8, 32, 2. The combination *iṣó* *grhé* in RV 8, 26, 17 is used in much the same sense as *iḷās padé* RV 1, 128, 1 and *iḷāyās padé* in RV 3, 23, 4.

H. Lüders (Wackernagel-Festschrift, 299 ff. = *Philologica Indica* 552) expressed the view that *irā*, along with its derivatives *irāvant-*, *ánirā*, *anirā-*, is not to be derived from *iḍā*, but is a separate independent word. His main purpose in this section of his article was to establish that the development *-ḍ-* > *-l-*, well known in later Sanskrit (and Prakrit) is not found in the Veda, or at any rate in the older portions of the Vedic literature. In this connection he dealt with the compound *iḷāṃda-* 'providing nourishment' which occurs in MS 4, 2, 1, 7; TS 7, 5, 9, 1 (and in other places). Since, as Lüders was successful in showing, there is no change of *-ḍ-* to *-l-* in these texts, but only of *-ḍ-* to *-ḷ-* (whence later *-l-*), it follows that *iḷāṃda-* cannot stand for **iḷāṃda-* (**iḍāṃda-*) in the texts in which it occurs. This being the case Lüders connects the *iḷā-* which appears in this compound with *irā*, regarding the pair as an instance of the common alternation between *r* and *l*. This is undoubtedly true and it applies in all places where this compound occurs. In agreement with this the Vedic Word Concordance, in its *Saṃhitā* section (Vol. 6, p. 834), gives this word as *iḷāṃda-*, but in its *Brāhmaṇa* section (Vol. 1, p. 229) it wrongly gives the word as *iḍāṃda-* / *iḷāṃda-*. That this is incorrect can be shown by reference to the passages cited, which in fact read *iḷāṃda-*,

e.g. Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa 5, 3, 1, 2. Only in Aitareya Āraṇyaka 5, 3, 2, in Keith's edition do we find *ilānda-* but here also the Ānandāśrama edition reads *ilānda-* which view of the other evidence must be taken as the correct reading.

For the alternation *r* / *l* in *irā* / *ilā* Lüders quotes as similar instance *m̄luc-*, *labh-*, *loman-* and *lohita-*, which appear in the tenth book of the Ṛgveda as opposed to forms with *r* in the earlier books. He seems to regard these as later forms, replacing earlier forms with *r* (and such is the case with *lohita-*) but as a general rule, as I have had occasion to stress elsewhere (Kratylos, 15, p. 53) the appearance of *l* in the later language as opposed to Ṛgvedic *r* is usually a sign that the *l* is original. The balance of probability is therefore that of the two forms *irā* and *ilā*, *ilā* is likely to be the more original. In any case the *ilā* which appears in the compound *ilānda-* is another form of the word which normally appears as *irā* and it has no connection with the *ilā* derived from *idā* in the later language, which according to Amara and the other lexicographers is used in the sense of 'earth' and 'cow'.

The connection of the *ilā-* in *ilānda-* with the noun *irā* 'nourishment' was quite clear in the mind of the authors quoting this term. This is so in the passage quoted by Lüders — TS 7, 5, 9, 1, *tābhya ilāndena irām lūtām avārunddha*, and equally so in Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa 5, 3, 2, *etad vai sāksād annam yad ilāndam, irā annam vā etad, irāyām annādye 'ntataḥ pratitiṣṭhati* "This *ilānda-* (here the name of a *sāman*) is in a visible manner food; it verily is nourishment, food; they are established finally in nourishment, food."

This passage not only confirms the identity of forms *ilā* and *irā*, but it also fixes the meaning of *irā* as 'food, nourishment' in a general sense, since it treats the word as practically synonymous with *annādyā-*. All the other meanings given in the dictionaries (such as 'any drinkable fluid, draught, especially of milk; comfort, enjoyment' MW) can be dispensed with. On the other hand a somewhat more restricted meaning appears in the passage quoted from the Taittirīya Saṃhitā. Here *lūtā* is not a past participle agreeing with *irā* (= *pūrvavichinnā*, Comm.) on account of the accent which is on the root in contrast with the final accentuation of past passive participles. It can be taken as a derivative of the IE root which appears in Oslav. *loviti* 'hunt, catch (as prey)', *lovŭ* 'hunter's quarry, prey, catch', etc. (Pokorny, IEW, p. 655). In BSOAS, 38, 76 (1975) Skt.

lāva(ka-) 'quail' (lit. 'quarry') and Pkt. *olāvaa-* 'hawk' (lit. 'catcher of prey') were derived from this IE root. A derivation from the same root gives a suitable meaning for *lūtā* which will thus mean 'game, food got by hunting' as opposed to *īrā* which is the normal and regular sustenance got from agriculture and cattle keeping. The same derivation provides a good explanation for *lūtā*, *lūtikā* 'spider' of which the original meaning would be simply 'predator'. In view of the large number of derivatives in Sanskrit from this IE root which can be registered, there can be little doubt that the lexical words *lotā-*, *lotra-* 'plunder, booty' should be derived from this same root (with Pokorny, etc.) and not regarded as a Prakritism for *lopra-* (as Mayrhofer). Apart from this restriction in this passage *īrā* means 'food, nourishment' in the most general sense. As opposed to this *īḍā* is more specifically applied to the food which is offered in sacrifice, consisting primarily of milk and its products. Occasionally it appears to be used in a wider sense; for instance, in the phrase *īlayā mādantaḥ* the more general meaning would seem appropriate in view of the similar combination in *īraṃ-mād-*, *īraṃ-madā-*.

In the compound *īraṃmadā-* (VS), *īraṃmād-* (MS) an epithet of Agni in the form of lightning and *Apāṃ-napāt*, which Monier-Williams renders 'delighting in drink' the first member has a short vowel which cannot be explained from the stem *īrā*. The same form occurs in *īraṃmadantīḥ* (ApŚ.) for which see Aryendra Sharma, Beiträge zur Vedischen Lexicographie (Neue Wörter in M. Bloomfields Vedic Concordance, PHMA, Heft 5/6) p. 71. Sharma observes that it is not clear whether this is to be treated as a compound or as two words (*īraṃ madantīḥ*). The latter option is chosen by Garbe in his edition of the Sūtra. This *īraṃ-* is not to be taken as acc. sg. of a stem *īrā-*, which Sharma suggests as a possibility, but as the acc. sg. of a root stem *īr-*. This is the older, simpler form of the stem from which *īrā* is derived by secondary addition of the suffix *-ā* in the same way that *īḍā* was derived from *īḍ-*. The stem is of the same type as that of *gír-* 'song' and the enlargement can be compared with Pa. *gírā* which has developed from Vedic *gír-*. Structurally *īr-* and *gír-* represent the zero grade of disyllabic roots. In the case of *īr-*, from what has been said above about *īlā* = *īrā*, it can be seen that it represents an earlier **il-* just as *púr-* 'city' of similar structure (though having the *u*-vowel on account of the preceding labial) is from earlier **pul-*.

A few words need to be said about the meaning of the root *mad-* which ap-

pears in the second member of this compound (and in some examples cited above, e.g. *īlayā mādantaḥ*). This root appears very frequently in the Veda, producing a great variety of verbal forms. It is normally identified with the root *mad-* of classical Sanskrit conjugated in the fourth class (*mādyati*) meaning 'to be or become intoxicated'. This meaning fits some passages in the Veda, but is unsuitable in others. In such cases the general meaning 'rejoice' is often resorted to. This is not very satisfactory, and in fact a more precise meaning, which suits many contexts, is provided by the ancient Indian tradition itself. According to the Dhātupāṭha the root *mad-* when conjugated in the tenth class is used in the sense of *tr̥pti-* 'being or becoming satisfied (with food, drink)'. This meaning obviously suits many Vedic passages, and so they are paraphrased in some cases in Sāyaṇa's commentary; e.g. 10, 12, 7 *devā vidāthe mādayante* is rendered by Sāyaṇa *haviṣā ātmānaṃ tarpayanti tr̥pyanti vā*, and 10, 15, 14 *svadhāyā mādayante* is paraphrased *haviṣlakṣaṇena annena tr̥pyanti*. In such cases the suitability of this meaning strikes the reader as obvious, and the traditional meaning of *mādayate* in the tenth class can be accepted in such contexts, as being superior to alternative renderings ('rejoice, carouse', etc.). On the other hand the commentary is not consistent; *mādayāse* is paraphrased *mādyasi* in RV 8, 54, 2 and *mādayasva* is rendered *modaya* in RV 8, 86, 6, although in both cases the above mentioned meaning would do. What applies to *mādayate* in the tenth class applies also to the corresponding reduplicated aorist. In VS 19, 36 *ākṣan pitāro amīmadanta pitāraḥ* is to be translated "The fathers have eaten, they have become satisfied", not "The fathers have eaten, they have become intoxicated".

In a number of cases *mad-* conjugated in the first class has the same sense as *mādayate* in the tenth class. The meaning 'be nourished, be satisfied (with food or drink)' is to be assumed when the verb is used in combination with words meaning food or nourishment; e.g. *svadhāyā mādanti* RV 1, 154, 4; *ūrjaṃ mādanti* RV 7, 49, 4; *īlayā mādanto* 3, 59, 3. The root *mad-* in this sense is to be regarded as a homophone of *mad-* 'to be intoxicated, excited, exhilarated'. Its Indo-European connection is with Goth *mats* 'food', *matjan* 'to eat' and related Germanic words, which on their part should also be kept separate from Skt. *mādyati* 'be intoxicated, excited' as well as from Lat. *madeo* 'be wet', etc. (which should also be separated from Skt. *mādyati*).

The etymology of *írā*, which has developed from *ír-*, which in turn is out of **íl-*, is to be found in the common IE root *al-* 'to nourish'. As noted above *ír-* (< *íl-*) is, like *gír-*, the zero grade of a disyllabic root. This causes some difficulty since the derivatives of IE *al-* registered by Pokorny (IEW, p. 26-27) do not as a rule point to a disyllabic root. Nevertheless there is no reason why such an extension should not also have existed, and Ernout-Meillet note that such a disyllabic base appears to be indicated by Lat. *alimentum*, etc.: "Les formes latines, *alimentum*, etc., indiqueraient une racine disyllabique; mais *altus* ne concorde pas". One may assume that there existed a simple root *al-*, and also an extended disyllabic base. From the latter a root noun **íl-*, whence *ír-*, > *íra* is regularly derived, as are similar forms, *gír-*, etc.