

Some marginal linguistic notes about *R̥gveda* I.187 (*annastuti*)¹

Massimo Vai
Università degli Studi di Milano

I. *Sāyaṇa* and the *R̥gvidhāna*

At the beginning of the commentary to *R̥gveda* (henceforth RV) I.187, which is dedicated to *pitú*, even though it is traditionally known as *annastuti*, *Sāyaṇa* explicitly introduces a passage from the *R̥gvidhāna*, whose reading is different in some points from that of Meyer's critical edition (Meyer 1877, 10: 'totum hunc locum citat Sāyaṇus ap. Müller [1903] non sine variis lectionibus'), although the general sense is the same.

Meyer's text is quoted below – in the transcription of his time – adjoining *Sāyaṇa*'s variant readings according to the current mode of transcription:

R̥gvidhāna 26.6

pitum̐ nv ity upatishṭeta nityam annam upasthitam̐
pitum̐ nu *iti upa*+√*sthā*-OP3SG always food-ACC *upa*+√*sthā*-PT-ACC
[pūjayed aṇanam̐ nityam̐ bhuñjīyād avikutsayan /6/]
√*pūj*-OP3SG food-ACC always √*bhuj*-OP3SG a-vi+√*kuts*-PRPT-NOM
(*Sāyaṇa*: *bhum̐jīta hyavikutsayan*)

27

nāsyā syād annajo vyādhir;
NEG_of-him √*as*-OP3SG from-food-NOM disease-NOM
visham̐ apy annatām̐ iyāt.
poison-NOM also √*ad*-PT-TĀ-ACC √*i*-OP3SG
(*Sāyaṇa*: *viṣam̐ apyam̐ṛtam̐ bhavet*)

[visham̐ ca pītvai_tat sūktam̐ japeta
poison-ACC and √*pā*-GER_this hymn-ACC √*jap*-OP3SG
vishanāṇanam̐ /

1. Acknowledgment of help: it is my most pleasant duty to thank Maria Piera Candotti, Guido Borghi, Paola M. Rossi and Tiziana Pontillo for many valuable suggestions.

poison-destroying-ACC

(Sāyaṇa: *japed viṣavināśanam*)

nāvāgyatas tu bhuñjīta, nāçucir,
na_a-vāg-yata-NOMPTC √*bhuj*-OP3SG na_a-śuci-NOM

na jugupsitam.

NEG disgusting-ACC

dadyāc ca pūjayec caiva juhuyāc ca çuciḥ sadā /;
√*dā*-OP3SG and √*pūj*-OP3SG and_PTC √*hu*-OP3SG and pure-NOM always

(Sāyaṇa: *havis tadā*)

kshudbhayaṃ nāsyā kiṃcit syān; nānnajaṃ

hunger-fear-NOM NEG_of-him any √*as*-OP3SG NEG_from-food-ACC

vyādhim āpnuyāt.]

disease-ACC √*āp*-OP3SG

And the following is Gonda's (1951, 32-33) translation:

(Whilst muttering the *sūkta* beginning with) 'the nourishment' one must regularly worship food that is at one's disposal: one shall regularly honour one's food and eat it without reviling. (Then) a disease caused by food will not (befall) him; even poison will become food. And when one has drunk poison one shall mutter this *sūkta* which is poison-destroying. But one must not eat without being reserved in speech, nor when one is not pure, nor (eat) disgusting food. And one shall always give and worship and offer (oblations in a) pure (state): (then) one will be entirely exempt from fear of hunger, (and) one will not catch a disease caused by food.

As Patton (2005) has abundantly illustrated, this passage allows us to understand, so to speak, the pragmatic value of RV I.187: a prayer which concerns food, but not in the sense as it is normally understood. In other words, it is not a thanksgiving for received food, but a formula to be muttered in order to receive protection from eventual damage caused by food (or even by its lack).

Interestingly Sāyaṇa in his commentary always glosses *pitú-* with *pālakāṇna-*, so etymologically associating it to 'protect'. This etymology agrees with one of the alternatives occurring in Nirukta 9.24:²

piturityannanāma / pātervā / pibatervā / pyāyatervā / tasyaiṣā bhavati

The word *pitu* is a synonym of food. It is derived from [the root] *pā* [to protect], or from *pā* [to drink], or from *pyāy* [to swell].³

2. Quoted from Sarup (1967, 147).

3. Maria Piera Candotti points out to me that the name *pitṛ-* 'father' could be analysed as an agent noun by the Indian grammarians, and precisely as the agent noun of the root *pā-* with the meaning 'to protect'. So it seems to me that, in analysing *pitu-*, Sāyaṇa has combined that analysis of *pitṛ-* with Nirukta's analysis of *pitu-*, choosing the 'irregular' root form *pi-* with meaning 'to

Patton (2005) has devoted her entire monograph to the relationship between the *Rgvidhāna* and *Rgveda* and has already drawn some interesting conclusions on the practical and habitual use of the Vedic hymns. While many scholars see this as a magical use, Patton prefers to think of it in terms of the metonymic use of the hymns. In any case,

(...) the Vidhāna literature consists entirely of *viniyogas*, or applications of Vedic mantras, outside the sacrificial situation entirely. These texts imply that the brahmin himself, through the mere utterance of mantras, can change any situation in which he might find himself. These Vidhāna texts are, in a way, a natural extension of the Gṛhya Sūtras, although the domestic ritual itself is less present and the focus is on the use of the Vedic text alone as having magical powers.⁴

Besides this quoted passage from the *Rgvidhāna*, *pitú-* is also found elsewhere in the *Rgveda* as one of the main elements for which gods are asked for their protection and revenge is requested against those who try to steal it, e.g.:

RV 7.104.10

yó	no	rásam	dípsati	pitvó	agne
who-NOM	us	essence-ACC	√ <i>dabh</i> -DES.3SG	<i>pitú</i> -GEN	Agni-VOC
yó	ásvānām	yó	gávām	yás	tanūnām
who	horses-GEN	who-NOM	cows-GEN	who-NOM	bodies-GEN
ripúḥ	stenáh	steyakṛd		dabhrám	etu
deceitful-NOM	thief-NOM	committing-theft-NOM		distress-ACC	√ <i>i</i> -IMP3SG
ní	śá	hīyatām	tanvā	tánā	ca //
PREV	he	√ <i>hā</i> -IMP.PS3SG	self-INSTR	offspring-INSTR	and

Geldner (1951, II, 274) translates:

Wer uns den Saft der Speise verderben will, den unserer Rosse, Kühe oder unserer Leiber, o Agni, der Schelm, der Dieb, der Diebstahl begeht, soll dahin schwinden, er soll mit Leib und Kindern eingehen!

Jamison–Brereton (2014, II, 1016-17):

Whoever wishes to cheat us of the essence of the food, o Agni, or of our horses, of our cows, of our bodies, / let the swindling thief who does the theft go to insignificance. Let him be bent double, along with his life and lineage.

protect', possibly through the irregular affix (*tu*N. This analysis could explain his constant glossing *pitú-* as *pālakāna*.

4. Patton 2005, 27.

The previous observations have illustrated the pragmatics connected with RV I.187. But what exactly is the meaning of *pitú-*?

2. Uses of the word *pitú-* in comparison with *ánna-*

RV I.187 is traditionally known as *annastuti*. Graßmann (1996, 812) translates *pitú-* as ‘*Saft, Trank, Nahrung* [von pi]; in 187 als gottheit personificirt’: he therefore relates it etymologically to the verb $\sqrt{pi-}/pī-$ ‘Schwellen, Strotzen; voll sein (von Gütern, Segen)’.

Mayrhofer in KEWA (II, 278) translates *pitú-* as ‘nourishment, food, esp. solid food’. However he thinks about i.e. **pitu-* in terms of ‘ein isoliertes idg. Nomen, von dem zwar denominative Verba ausgegangen sind, das aber auf keine Verbalwurzel sicher zurückgeführt werden kann’. The same scholar in EWAia (II, 130) accepts Kuryłowicz’s explanation of the i.e. alternation **pitu-/ *peitu-* as ‘Ergebnis verschiedener Fixierung eines ursprünglich beweglichen Paradigmas’.

In the Brāhmaṇic sources the *pitú-* = *ánna-* equivalence is clearly stated, e.g.:

Aitareya Brāhmaṇa I.13.13

pituṣaṇir		ity.	ánnam	vai	pitu-NOM,
bestowing-food-NOM		<i>iti</i>	food-NOM	PTC	nourishment
dakṣiṇā	vai		pitu		
fee-NOM	PTC		nourishment-NOM		

Keith (1920, 116) translates: ‘winner of nourishment (he says); nourishment (*pitú*) is food (*ánna*); nourishment is sacrificial fee’.

The same association of *pitú-* with a request for protection, as found in the *Ṛgvidhāna*, can also be observed elsewhere, in particular, as protection from food that can be a source of harm:

Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa I.9.2.20

pāhí	mā	didyóḥ	pāhí	prásityai	pāhí
Protect me		thunderbolt-ABL	protect	fetter-DAT?	protect
dúriṣṭyai ⁵		pāhí	duradmanyā	íti	sárvābhyo
badly-sacrificing-DAT?		protect	bad-food-ABL	<i>iti</i>	all-ABL
gopāyēty	evaitád	āh	āviṣám		m_ārttibhyo
protect_iti	<i>eva_etad</i>	√ah-3SG	non-poisonous-ACC		me_pain-ABLPL
					naḥ pitúm
					our nourishment

5. With abl. case in T.S. 2.3.13.3: *dúriṣṭyā eváinam pāti*, cf. Delbrück 1888, 110.

kr̥ṇv	ity	ánnaṃ	vaí	pitúr	anamívāṃ	na
√kr̥-IMP	iti	food-NOM	PTC	nourishment-NOM	salubrious-ACC	our
idám	akilviṣam	ánnaṃ	kurv	íty	evai_tád	āha
this-ACC	sinless-ACC	food-ACC	√kr̥-IMP	iti	eva_this	says

Eggeling (1882, 261) translates:

‘Guard me from the thunderbolt! guard me from bonds! guard me from defective sacrifice! guard me from noxious food!’ he thereby says, ‘Protect me from all kinds of injury!’ - ‘Make our nourishment free from poison!’ – nourishment means food: ‘make our food wholesome, faultless!’ this is what he thereby says.

The possibility of incurring the danger of food poisoning is not only a concern of the *Brāhmaṇas*, but also of some *Ṛgvedic* hymns, e.g.:

RV 8.25.20

váco	dirgháprasadmani_ī́se	vā́jasya	gómataḥ /	
speech-NOM	having-extensive-seat-LOC_√īś-ATM3SG	prize-GEN	cow-rich-GEN	
ī́se	hí	pitvò	’viśásya	dāváne //
√īś-ATM3SG	hi	nourishment-GEN	non-poisonous-GEN	√dā-INF

Jamison–Brereton (2014, II, 1082):

The speech at (the plays) providing a long seat [= ritual ground] gains control (*ī́se*) over a prize rich in cattle. It gains control (*ī́se*) over non-poisonous food for giving.

Geldner (1951, II, 335):

Ein Wort bei Dirghaprasadman⁶ vermag rinderreichen Lohn, es vermag ja giftlose Speise zu geben.

This also allows us to observe that non-poisonous food (*pitvò aviśásya*) is a matter of concern in *ṚV* too, just as in the *Ṛgvidhāna* and in *Sāyaṇa*’s commentary.

6. Geldner (1951, III, 335, n. 20: ‘In diesem Zusammenhang wäre Beziehung auf Sūrya wohl denkbar’.

3. *Can ánna and pitú be synonymous?*

In some RV hymns *pitú-* and *ánna-* seem totally interchangeable, e.g.:

RV 10.117.2-4

2

yá ādhrāya cakamānāya pitvó
 who-NOM poor-DAT √kam-PPF.ATM-DAT nourishment-GEN
 'nnavān sán raphitāy_opajagmūṣe /
 having-food-NOM √as-PTPR-NOM √raph-PPP-DAT_upa+√gam-PPF-DAT
 sthirám mánah kṛṇuté sévate puró
 hard-ACC mind-ACC √kṛ-ATM3SG √sev-ATM3SG hitherto
 _tó cit sá marḍitāraṃ ná vindate //
 also PTC he merciful-acc NEG√vid-ATM3SG

3

sá íd bhojó yó gṛhāve dādāty
 he PTC charitable-NOM who-NOM beggar-DAT √dā-PAR3SG
 ánnakāmāya cārate kṛśāya /
 food-desirous-DAT √car-PRPT-DAT emaciated-DAT
 áram asmai bhavati yāmahūtā
 in-accordance to-him √bhū-3SG invocation-LOC
 utā_pariṣu kṛṇute sákhāyam //
 and_future-LOC √kṛ-3SG.ATM friend-ACC

4

ná sá sákhā yó ná dādāti sákhye
 NEG he friend-NOM who NEG √dā-3SG friend-DAT
 sacābhūve sácamānāya pitvāḥ /
 companion-DAT √sac-PRPTATM-DAT nourishment-GEN
 āpā_smāt pré_yān ná tát óko asti
 āpa_from-him prá+√i-OP3SG NEG this-NOM home-NOM √as-3SG
 pṛṇāntam anyám āraṇaṃ cid ichet //
 √pṛ-PT-ACC another-ACC foreign-ACC PTC √iṣ-OP-3SG

Jamison–Brereton (2014, III, 1587):

2. Whoever – when a man, weak and broken, has approached desiring nourishment (*pitvó*) – though he has food (*annavān*), hardens his heart, though he always used to be his friend, he also finds no one to show mercy.

3. Just he is benefactor who gives to the beggar who, emaciated, goes roaming, desirous of food (*ánnakāmāya*). He becomes sufficient for him at his pleading entreaty, and he makes him his companion in the future.

4. He is no companion who does not give of his food (*pitvāḥ*) to a companion, who, being in his company, accompanies him. He should turn away from him; this is not a home. He should seek another who gives, even a stranger.

Geldner (1951, III, 342-343):

2. Wer selbst Speise hat, aber gegen den Armen, der Speise begehrend, klappernd kommt, sein Herz verhärtet und doch früher sein Freund war, auch der findet keinen, der sich seiner erbarmet.
3. Der ist ein Gastfreier, der dem Bettler gibt, welcher abgemagert, Speise wünschend kommt. Er steht ihm zu Diensten, wenn er ihn unterwegs anruft, und für die Zukunft erwirbt er sich einen Freund.
4. Der ist kein Freund, der dem Freunde von seiner Speise nichts gibt, dem treuen Kameraden. Er soll sich von ihm abwenden, hier ist seines Bleibens nicht; er suche einen anderen Geber, auch wenn der ein Fremder ist.

In actual fact, the beggar is described once in this passage *asādhṛāya cakamānāya pitvó*, and the second time, in the following verse, as *ánnakāmāya cārate kṛśāya*. Therefore in this case *pitú-* and *ánna-* seem to be coreferring words. Benveniste (1955, 32) thinks that this whole hymn highlights the *pitú-* = *ánna-* equivalence.⁷ Other cases of similar co-occurrence can also be found elsewhere, e.g.:

ṚV 10.1.4

áta	u	tvā	pitubhṛto	jānitrīr
then	PTC	thee	nourishment-bringing-NOMPL	parents-NOMPL
annāvṛdham			prāti caranty	ánnaiḥ /
by-food-growing-ACC			prāti+√car-PR3PL	foods-INSTR
tā	īm	prāty	eṣi púnar	anyárūpā
them	PTC	prāti+√i-2sg	in-turn	having another shape-ACCPL
ási	tvām	vikṣú	mānuṣīṣu	hótā //
√as-2SG	thou	tribe-LOCPL	human-LOCPL	hótṛ-NOM

Jamison–Brereton (2014, III, 1368):

And then your birth-givers [= ‘kindling wood’], bringing nurture (*pitubhṛto*), proceed toward you, who are strengthened by food (*annāvṛdham*), with food (*ánnaiḥ*); you go toward them in turn as they (acquire) other form [= ‘burn’]. You are the Hotar among the clans of Manu.

Geldner (1951, III, 122):

7. See Benveniste (1955, 32-33): ‘L’hymne X 117 porte sur le don de nourriture e met en évidence l’équivalence *pitú-* = *ánna-*. Le riche pourvu d’aliments (*ánnavān* str. 2) ne doit pas repousser le pauvre qui désire la nourriture (*cakamānāya pitvó*, cf. *ánnakāmāya* str. 3); on blâme celui qui ne donne à ses amis aucune part de sa nourriture (*pitvāh*)’.

Dann kommen dir, dem durch Speise Wachsenden, die Nahrung bringenden Erzeugerinnen mit Speisen entgegen. Zu ihnen kehrst du wieder zurück, wenn die andere Gestalt angenommen haben. Du bist der Opferpriester unter den menschlichen Stämmen.

In this case too, the *jānitṛīs* are *pitubhṛt-* and proceed bringing *ánna-*: therefore, *pitú-* and *ánna-* also seem to be synonymous words.

From the point of view of Indo-European comparative linguistics, we are in the presence of two distinct terms, whose analysis presents a quite different degree of difficulty: *ánna-*, as is known, is normally reduced to **adna-* (see EWAia I, 79) and this should be the past participle of $\sqrt{h_1ed-}$ ‘eat’ (see. LIV², 230), a well spread root throughout the whole Indo-European family.

Instead, the etymological relationships of *pitú-* are much less perspicuous, and some occurrences in the RV seem to contradict the idea of ‘solid food’ (*feste Nahrung*), which is proposed in EWAia II, 130. In fact, Widmer (2004, 21-22) also identifies some instances where *pitú* can be ‘squeezed’ and ‘drunk’, e.g.:

RV 10.15.3

āhám	pitṛñ	suvidátrām̃	avitsi
I	fathers-ACC	propitious-ACCPL	\sqrt{vid} -AORISGATM
nápātam	ca	vikrámaṇam	ca viṣṇoḥ /
grandson-ACC	and	stride-ACC	and Viṣnu-GEN
barhiśádo		yé	svadháyā ⁸ sutásya
on-barhis-sitting-NOMPL		who-NOMPL	<i>svadhā</i> -INSTR <i>sutá</i> -GEN
bhájanta	pitvás	tá	ih_āgamiṣṭhāḥ //
\sqrt{bhaj} -INJ3PL	pitú-GEN	they-NOM	here_most-willingly-coming-NOMPL

In this case, Geldner’s translation and Jamison–Brereton’s are very different: Geldner (1951, III, 145):

Die (Manen), die auf dem Barhis sitzend nach Herzenslust vom ausgepreßten Trank (*sutásya ... pitvás*) genießen, die kommen am liebsten hierher!

Jamison–Brereton (2014, III, 1393):

Those who, sitting on the ritual grass, share in the pressed soma (*sutásya*) and the food (*pitvás*) at (the cry of) ‘*svadhā*’, they are the most welcome arrivals here.

8. Here Jamison and Brereton think that *svadhā* should be understood as the moment of the invocation; Geldner, on the contrary, understands ‘to their (viz. ‘Manes’) heart’s content’.

In this context, Geldner considers *sutásya* [...] *pitvās* ‘ausgepreßten Trank’ as a single nominal constituent, whereas Jamison and Brereton translate it as two (asyndetically) coordinate constituents: *sutásya* ‘pressed soma’⁹ and *pitvās* ‘food’. In the following case too, *pitúm* appears as ‘den Trank’ in Geldner’s translation, while it is translated as ‘the nourishment’ in Jamison–Brereton’s:

RV 1.61.7

asyéd	u	mātúḥ	sávaneṣu	sadyó
his_PTC	PTC	mother-GEN	sávana-LOCPL ¹⁰	instantly
maháḥ	pitúm	papivāñ	cārv	ánnā /
great-GEN	pitú-ACC	√pā-PF.PT.NOM	pleasing-ACCPL	food-ACCPL

Geldner (1951, I, 78):

Bei seiner Mutter Somaspenden hat er so gleich den Trank (*pitúm*) seines großen Vaters getrunken, seine Lieblingsspeisen (*ánnā*). Vishnu, der Stärkere, stahl den gekochten Reisbrei; er traf den Eber durch den Fels hindurch schießend.

Jamison–Brereton (2014, I, 180):

Just this one – he, having already in an instant drunk the nourishment (*pitúm*) of his great (father), the pleasing food (*ánnā*) at his mother’s soma-pressings – while Viṣṇu the stronger stole the cooked (rice-porridge), he pierced the boar through the stone, (Indra) the archer.

4. Etymological problems: *pitú-* in comparative Indo-European linguistics

Pokorny (1959, 793) attributes a large set of derivatives to the i.e. root **pej(ə)-*, **př-* ‘fett sein, strotzen’, among which we find: *př-tu-* ‘Fett, Saft, Trank’; *páyate* ‘schwillt, strotzt, macht schwellen, strotzen’ and *páyas* ‘Saft, Wasser, Milch’.

A totally different opinion is sustained by Benveniste (1955, 29-36) who deems it unlikely that a single lexical unit could contain such an extraordinary diversity of concepts: ‘moisture, milk, pitch, juice, grease, pine, grass, feed’. On the contrary, he suggests that it would be more reasonable to separate what he considers the result of confusion amongst different separate root units, so that:

9. Cf. Monier-Williams (1986, 1219 col. 2).

10. Graßmann 1996, 1492: ‘mit *mātúr* bildlich von der als Opfertrank gefasstes Muttermilch, die Indra schlürft’.

1) some lexemes should not be introduced into this same lexical family, e.g.: the OCS verb *pitěti* ‘nourish’ should have nothing in common with the Gr. Boeotian verb *πιτεύω* ‘irrigate, water’: in fact *πιτεύω* is more likely to have been remade as a derivative of **πῑτός* = scr. *pītá-* ‘drunk’, therefore as a Greek dialectal innovation related to *πίομαι* ‘drink’.

2) **pitu-* ‘pine’ should be excluded too: it is only a nominal term with no verbal link: *πίτυς*, with short *i*, and should be not compared with *pītu-dāru-* which instead appears with a long *ī* and which moreover alternates with *pūtudāru-* and other forms as well. The lexeme for ‘resin, pitch’ must still be considered different: this should be from a stem **pik-*, see *πίσσα*, Lat. *pix picis*.

3) moreover, the terms denoting ‘fat, fatty’ (‘graisse, gras’) Skt. *pīvar-*, Gr. *πῑ(ρ)α* should be kept apart from the previously cited roots. On the contrary, gr. *πῑμελή* ‘fat’, OIr *íth*, *ítha* ‘fat’, Skt. *pīna-* ‘fat’ should belong to this same group.¹¹

Benveniste is in total disagreement with Grassmann’s translation of *pitú-* as ‘Soft, Trank, Nahrung’ and also with Monier-Williams’ translation as ‘juice, drink, nourishment, food’. In his opinion, these translations were evoked by a comparison with **pī-*, **pay-* ‘swell’ to which *pītu-dāru-* ‘pine’ was also annexed because of its interpretation as ‘sap tree’, the notion of ‘juice’ being the link between the two. On the contrary, he considers *pitú-* as always and only meaning ‘nourishment’ and mostly ‘solid food’. This is evident by the already mentioned *pitú-* = *ánna-* equivalence of *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* I.13.13. In the scholar’s opinion, this sense is confirmed by the phraseology of other hymns in which the term appears, and little does it matter that it sometimes appears as ‘squeezed juice’: the squeezed soma is indeed the food of the gods *par excellence*.

5. OIr. *íth* < **pitu-*

As Pokorny and Benveniste had already noted, the outcome of **pitu-* with the meaning of ‘grain’ is present in Celtic. The OIr glosses allow us to obtain a good part of the paradigm, e.g., Stokes–Strachan (1903, II, 101): *lens.ti.lenticula* glossed with *cenele netha* ‘a kind of grain’ (OIG *cenéle n-hetha* ‘a kind of corn’ 51b6).¹²

Widmer (2004, 18) reconstructs the paradigm of *íth* in this way:

11. Benveniste also doubtfully introduces Lat. *opīmus* (<**opī-pīmus?*) into this group, while the latter derivation is excluded by de Vaan (2008), who considers more likely a derivation of the stem of Lat. *ops opis*.

12. The presence of nasalization is due to particular *sandhi* phenomena of OIr grammar, here in particular because of the neuter gender of *cenéle* ‘kind’.

Nom. Sg. *ith*
 Gen. Sg. *etho/ etha/ atho*
 Dat. Sg. *ith*
 Gen. Pl. *ith / na neath*

Widmer (2004, 18-19), just like Pokorny, considers the possibility that this lexeme is etymologically connected with the verb (LIV², 464) **pejH-* ‘strotzen, schwellen, fett, voll sein’. In OIr. we also find *íth* ‘Fett, Speck’ < **piHtu-* with no formal problems, because it shows the usual outcome of the long /ī/ of i.e. *-*iH-*. However, this derivation becomes problematic if we also wish to include *ith* in the same lexical family, since it occurs with the short vowel /i/. However, it has been pointed out (see Widmer 2004, 19; Neri 2011, 270; Zair 2012, 139) that the allomorph **piHtu-* of the same root could have eliminated the laryngeal by the so-called *Wetter Regel*: VHTR/UV > VTR/UV,¹³ that is, loss of laryngeal before stop plus resonant. The denomination ‘Wetter’ refers to the loss of the laryngeal in the derivation **h₂ueh₁-tro-* > **h₂uetro-* to be assumed in order to explain the short vowel in protogerm. **wedra-* > germ. *Wetter* ‘weather’.

However, the allomorph before the vocalic /u/ **piHtu-* would not be eliminated, but a split in two different lexemes would be produced, corresponding to *ith* ‘corn, grain’ and *íth* ‘fat, lard, grease’ in OIr.¹⁴ Moreover, in OIr, according to McCone (1991, 3), another outcome of the same root *ithe* ‘eating’ < **ityā* < **pit-yā* penetrated into the paradigm of *ithid* ‘eat’, which presupposes an earlier **it-*, besides the subj. *es-*, fut. *ís-*, which both presuppose **h₁ed-*.

In any case, the loss of the laryngeal would have already occurred in the protolanguage period, since the outcomes with a short vowel (or however without a laryngeal, as Lit. *piētū-*) are also present in Indo-Iranian. Therefore, in contrast with Benveniste, Widmer can also include **pej/iH-ur/n* ‘Fett’ *πῖ(ι)αϞ* and its derivative **piH-uon-* ‘fettig’ *pīvan*, *πίων* in the same lexical family.

6. Conclusions

1) *ánna-* could have existed longer than *pitú-* because the two terms could indeed be used interchangeably, but *ánna-* had the advantage of being transparent within the paradigm of the verb $\sqrt{ad-}$;

13. Neri (2011, 295): ‘Schwund eines postvokalischen Laryngals vor Okklusiv + unsilbischer Resonant oder Halbvokal + Vokal’.

14. Other examples of the same rule in Neri (2011, 264 ssg.): he also considers that gr. μέτρον ‘measure’ vs. μήτρον ‘land measure’ could be explained by resorting to an analogous split from the same root **meH₁-*.

2) whatever the correct hypothesis for the origin of *pitú-* may be, it soon became a semantically opaque word, since it was no longer clear to which verb it could be reconnected: *pitúm papivān* of RV 1.61.7 seems to allude to an association with $\sqrt{pā}$ - ‘drink’ and, moreover, some contexts may facilitate its interpretation as liquid nourishment.

3) Sāyaṇa in his commentary always glosses *pitú-* with *pālakāṇna-*, associating it etymologically to ‘protect’, as suggested also in *Nirukta* 9.24.

RV 1.187: text and translation

Text from TITUS	Geldner	Jamison–Brereton
<p>Verse: 1</p> <p>पितुं नु स्तोषम्महो धर्मणि तविषीम् । pitúṃ nú stoṣam mahó dharmāṇam táviṣīm /</p> <p>यस्य त्रितो व्योजसा वृत्रं विपर्वमुर्दयत् ॥ yásya tritó vy ójasā vṛtrāṃ víparvam ardáyat //</p>	<p>Die Speise will ich jetzo preisen, die mächtige Erhalterin der Stärke, kraft deren Trita den Vritra gliedweise zerlegte.</p>	<p>Now I shall praise food, the support and the power of the great, by whose might Trita shook Vṛtra apart till his joints were parted.</p>
<p>Verse: 2</p> <p>स्वादो पितो मधो पितो वयं त्वा ववृमहे । svādo pito mádho pito vayám tvā vavṛmahe /</p> <p>अस्माकमविता भव ॥ asmākam avitā bhava //</p>	<p>Wohlschmecke nde Speise, süße Speise, wir haben dich erwählt. Sei unser Helfer!</p>	<p>O sweet food, o honeyed food, we have chosen you: for us be a helper.</p>
<p>Verse: 3</p> <p>उप नः पितुवा चर शिवः शिवाभिरुतिभिः । úpa naḥ pitava ā cara śivāḥ śivābhir ūtībhīḥ /</p> <p>मयोभुरद्विषेण्यः सखा सुशेवो अद्रयाः ॥ mayobhúr adviṣeṇyāḥ sakhā suśévo ādvayāḥ //</p>	<p>Komm zu uns, o Speise, freundlich mit deinen freundlichen Hilfen, als erfreulicher, nicht unverträglicher Freund, als liebvoller, unzweideutiger!</p>	<p>Draw near to us, food – kindly with your kindly help, joy itself, not to be despised, a very kind com- panion without duplicity.</p>
<p>Verse: 4</p> <p>तव त्ये पितो रसा रजांस्यनु विष्टिताः । táva tyé pito rāsā rājāṃsy anu viṣṭhitāḥ /</p> <p>दिवि वाता इव श्रिताः ॥ diví vātā iva śritāḥ //</p>	<p>Deine Säfte, o Speise, sind durch die Räume verbreitet, bis zum Himmel reichen sie wie die Winde.</p>	<p>These juices of yours, food, are dispersed throughout the realms, adjoined to heaven like the winds.</p>

<p>Verse: 5 तव त्वे पितो ददतस्तव स्वादिष्ठ ते पितो । táva tyé pito dádatas táva svādiṣṭha té pito / प्र स्वाद्धानो रसानां तुविग्रीवा इवेरते ॥ prá svādmāno rāsānāṃ tuvigṛīvā iverate //</p>	<p>Diese deine Verschenker, o Speise, diese deine Genießer, o süßeste Speise, die Genießer deiner Säfte kommen vorwärts wie starknackige Stiere.</p>	<p>These (juices) are those that yield you, o food, and they also are part of you, sweetest food. Those who receive the sweet- ness of your juices press forward like strong-necked (bulls).</p>
<p>Verse: 6 त्वे पितो महानां देवानाम्मनो हितम् । tvé pito mahānāṃ devānām máno hitām / अकारि चारुं केतुना तवाह्निमवसावधीत् ॥ ákāri cāru ketúnā tāvāhim āvasāvadhīt //</p>	<p>Nach dir, o Speise, steht der Sinn der großen Götter. Schönes ist in deinem Zeichen getan worden. Mit deiner Hilfe hat Indra den Drachen erschlagen</p>	<p>On you, food, is the mind of the great gods set. A dear (deed) was done at your sig- nal: he smashed the serpent with your help.</p>
<p>Verse: 7 यददो पितो अजगन्विवस्व पर्वतानाम् । yád adó pito ájagan vivásva pārvatānām / अत्रा चित्रो मधो पितो ऽरम्भुक्षाय गम्याः ॥ átrā cin no madho pitó 'ram bhakṣāya gamyāḥ //</p>	<p>Wenn jener Morgenschim- mer der Berge gekommen ist, o Speise, dann sollst du uns hier, du süße Speise, zum Genießen geschickt kommen.</p>	<p>When yonder dawning light of the mountains has come, o food, then you should also come here to us, honeyed food, fit for our portion.</p>
<p>Verse: 8 यदपामोषधीनाम्परिशमारिशामहे । yád apām ośadhīnāṃ pariśmāriśāmahe / वातापे पीव इद्धव ॥ vātāpe pīva id bhava //</p>	<p>Wenn wir den Rahm der Wasser, der Pflanzen kosten, dann werde uns, du Freund des Vata zu Speck.</p>	<p>When we bite off a full share of the waters and plants, o you friend of the wins – be- come just the fat.</p>

<p>Verse: 9 यत्ते सोम गवाशिरो यवाशिरो भजामहे । yát te soma gávāśiro yāvāśiro bhājāmahe / वातापि पीव इद्धव ॥ vātāpe pīva íd bhava //</p>	<p>Wenn wir, o Soma, von dir, dem milchgemischten, gerstegemischten, genießen, so werde uns, du Freund des Vata, zu Speck!</p>	<p>When we take a share of you when mixed with milk or mixed with grain, o Soma, o you friend of the winds – be- come just the fat</p>
<p>Verse: 10 करम्भ ओषधे भव पीवो वृक्क उदारथिः । karambhá oṣadhe bhava pīvo vṛkká udārathīḥ / वातापि पीव इद्धव ॥ vātāpe pīva íd bhava //</p>	<p>Werde, du Pflanze, zu Grütze, Speck, Nierenfett,, werde uns, du Freund des Vata, zu Speck.</p>	<p>Become the gruel, o plant, the fat, the steaming [?] suet [?].</p>
<p>Verse: 11 तं त्वा वयम्पितो वचोभिर्गावो न हव्या सुषूदिम । tām tvā vayám pito vácobhir gāvo ná havyā suṣūdima / देवेभ्यस्त्वा सध्मामदम्सभ्यं त्वा सध्मामदम् ॥ devébhyaḥ tvā sadhamādam asmábhyaṃ tvā sadhamādam //</p>	<p>Wir haben dich, o Speise, mit Reden schmackhaft gemacht wie Kühe die Opferspenden, dich den Göttern zum gemeinsamen Mahle, dich für uns zum gemeinsamen Mahle.</p>	<p>We have sweetened you with words, o food, as cows [= milk] do the oblations – you as feasting companion for the gods, you as feasting companion for us.</p>

References

- Benveniste 1955 = É. Benveniste, *Homophonies radicales en indo-européen*, «Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris» 51 (1955), 14-41.
- de Vaan 2008 = M. de Vaan, *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages*, Brill, Leiden–Boston 2008.
- Delbrück 1888 = B. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax. Syntaktische Forschungen*, 5, Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, Halle 1888.
- EWAia = M. Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindiarischen*, Universitätsverlag C. Winter, Heidelberg (1986–2001), 3 vols.
- Geldner 1951 = K. F. Geldner, *Der Rig-Veda aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt und mit einem laufenden Kommentar versehen*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA 1951, 3 vols.
- Gonda 1951 = J. Gonda, *The Rgvidhāna. English Translation with an Introduction and Notes*, N.V.A. Oosthoek's Uitgevers Mij., Utrecht 1951.
- Graßmann 1996 = H. Graßmann, *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*, 6, überarbeitete und ergänzte Auflage von Maria Kozianka, Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden 1996.
- Jamison–Brereton 2014 = S. W. Jamison, J. P. Brereton, *The Rigveda. The Earliest Religious Poetry of India*, Oxford University Press, Oxford–New York 2014, 3 vols.
- KEWA = M. Mayrhofer, *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*, Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, Heidelberg 1956–1976, 4 vols.
- LIV² = H. Rix, *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Zweite Auflage*, Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, Wiesbaden 2001.
- McCone 1991 = K. McCone, *OIr. -ic 'reaches', ithid 'eats', rigid 'stretches, directs, rules' and the PIE 'Narten' present in Celtic*, «Ériu» 42 (1991), I-II.
- Meyer 1877 = R. Meyer, *Rgvidhānam*, Typis A. W. Schadii, Berolini 1877.
- Monier-Williams 1986 = Sir Monier Monier-Williams, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Etymologically and philologically arranged with special reference to cognate Indo-European languages, New Edition, greatly enlarged and improved (1899), Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1986.
- Müller 1903 = *Rig-Veda-Samhitā together with the Commentary of Sāyaṇāchārya*, Vol. I, ed. by F. Max Müller, Krishnadas Academy, Varanasi 1903.

- Neri 2011 = S. Neri, *Wetter. Etymologie und Lautgesetz*, Dissertation zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades eines Doctor philosophiae (Dr. Phil.), Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena 2011.
- Patton 2005 = L. Patton, *Bringing the Gods to Mind. Mantra and Ritual in Early Indian Sacrifice*, University of California Press, Berkeley–Los Angeles–London 2005.
- Pokorny 1959 = J. Pokorny, IEW, *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Francke Verlag, Bern–München 1959.
- Sarup 1967 = Lakshman Sarup, *The Nighaṇṭu and the Nirukta*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi–Varanasi–Patna 1967.
- Stokes–Strachan 1903 = Stokes, Witley, Strachan, John (eds.), *Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus. A Collection of Old-Irish Glosses, Scholia Prose and Verse*, Vol. II, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1903.
- TITUS = *Thesaurus Indogermanischer Text- und Sprachmaterialien* (<http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/indexe.htm>).
- Widmer 2004 = P. Widmer, *Das Korn des weiten Feldes. Interne Derivation, Derivationskette und Flexionsklassenhierarchie: Aspekte der nominalen Wortbildung im Urindogermanischen*, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, Innsbruck 2004.
- Zair 2012 = N. Zair, *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Celtic*, Brill, Leiden–Boston 2012.

