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This contribution treats Vedic verbal governing compounds (VGC) in which the second member of compound (SMC) surfaces as an i-stem that is not a synchronic simplex noun. I argue that these, together with the more marginal Vedic Bahuvrīhi type with SMC in -i-, are remnants of the PIE derivational pattern called “i-substantivization”.

1 Introduction

Many of the older Indo-European languages retain a somewhat productive process whereby an *o-stem (or *ā-stem) is replaced by an *i-stem in second members of compounds (SMC), as in the following examples:

1.)
   b. Gk. ἀλκή ‘strength’ → ἀναλκης ‘without strength’

1 I am grateful to Hannes Fellner, Stephanie Jamison, Alan Nussbaum and Georges-Jean Pinault for comments and criticism of an earlier draft of this paper, as well as to the audience at the 16th World Sanskrit Conference and at ECIEC 35. The usual disclaimers apply.
c. Arm. arat, -oy ‘blemish, stain’ → an-araticæ ‘unblemished, having no blemish’ (gen./dat./abl.pl.), hawat, -oy ‘faith’ → an-hawatíæ ‘unfaithful’ (Olsen 1999: 709f.)

d. Av. miīra ‘Mitra’ → avi-miīri- ‘against Mitra, enemy of Mitra’

e. OIr. cenēl ‘kind’ → so-chēneuil ‘well-born’, cenn ‘head’ → in-chinn ‘brain’ (prepositional governing compound)

The aim of this contribution is to shed light on the remnants of this process in Vedic by comparing the traces of i-substantivizations in Vedic SMC to that of corresponding adjectival a-stems (simplex or SMC). The discussion of this pattern has traditionally focused on Bahuvrīhis of this type, which are rare in Vedic (AiG II, 1: 105f.). However, there are a number of compounds with SMC in -i- which are not Bahuvrīhis and which have not received much attention so far (a short discussion of these can be found in AiG II,2: 294–96 and Grestenberger 2014: 92). They are synchronically endocentric verbal governing compounds (VGC), traditionally classified as a subtype of determinative compounds (Tatpurūṣa, cp. AiG II,1: 174ff.). The Proto-Indo-European status of determinative compounds has often been called into question (see Malzahn in press for a summary of this debate), but our honoranda has argued compellingly that determinative compounds with substantival SMC were part of the proto-language (Olsen 2009). I argue that at least some compounds with SMC in *-i- can likewise be analyzed as orginally endocentric and that there are remnants of this function in Vedic.

Vedic simplex nouns in -i- are feminine action nouns (e.g., dhṛjī- f. ‘gust of wind’, rāndhi- f. ‘submission’, rāmhi- f. ‘hurry’, etc.) and masculine (often adjectival) agent nouns (e.g., dhūni- ‘resounding (one)’, bhṛmi- ‘lively (one)’, cākri- ‘doing, performing’, etc.), cp. AiG II,2: 291ff., Grestenberger 2014. The dual function of this suffix is inherited from Proto-Indo-European, as emphasized by Nussbaum 2014: 304 (the following discussion and examples are based on this article). Both functions are derivationally based on *o-adjectives (for the derivational connection between PIE *o-and *i-stems see, e.g., Schindler 1980, Olsen and Rasmussen 1999, Balles 2006, Nussbaum 2014, etc.), illustrated in table 1.
Table 1. Derivation of i-stems in PIE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective (m.)</th>
<th>‘substantivization’</th>
<th>(f.) abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PIE *h₂ékro- ‘high’</td>
<td>*h₂ó/ékri- ‘high (one)’</td>
<td>*h₂ó/ékri- ‘height’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex. Gk. ἄκρος ‘high’</td>
<td>Lat. oeris m. ‘mountain’</td>
<td>Gk. ἄκρις f. ‘peak’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other cases of the masculine endocentric function include Av. tiyra- ‘pointed, sharp’ → tiyri- m. ‘pointed thing; arrow’; Ved. jīrā- ‘quick, lively’ → jīrī- m. ‘stream’ < *lively one’, etc. Nussbaum (2014) argues that these endocentric substantivizes tend to develop into adjectives in the individual branches, thus blurring the semantic difference between the original adjectival *o-stem base and the (substantival) *i-stem. While the i-substantivization process that resulted in masculine simplex nouns was not a productive derivational pattern in any of the older Indo-European languages, it is surprisingly well-attested in SMC of nominal compounds, which are susceptible to preserving morphological archaisms.

Assuming that *i- was originally substantival (as opposed to adjectival *o-), we expect compounds with SMC in *i- to occur in predicative rather than attributive use. Special attention will therefore be paid to those cases in which an i-stem is synchronically opposed to an a-adjective in the following discussion (taking into account the aforementioned trend to ‘re-adjectivization’, as well as the difficulty of distinguishing between predicative and attributive use in the Rigveda in many instances).

Moreover, and maybe more controversially, we expect compounds with *i-stem SMC to be at least occasionally endocentric, rather than exclusively exocentric (as usually assumed). I address this prediction in the conclusion. In section 2, I briefly discuss Bahuvrīhi compounds in -i-, while the main discussion in section 3 focuses on VGC in -i-.

---

2 For reasons of space I cannot discuss the formally related vrddhi-formations of the type Skt. sarātha- ‘(driving) the same chariot’ → sārathi- m. ‘co-driver’. I also have to leave aside cases of *-to- : *-ti- substitution and ti-stems in SMC more generally (but see Olsen and Rasmussen 1999).

3 This does not preclude the simultaneous use of a-stems as SMC in such compounds (cp. the examples in section 3), given the general productivity of this suff-
2 Bahuvrīhis

The number of Vedic (and IIr.) Bahuvrīhis with i- instead of a-stem SMC is small; prāty-ardhi- and the compounds in ɢandhi- are usually mentioned.⁴

prāty-ardhi- ‘possessing half of sth.; possessing equal parts’ (prāti ‘against’, ārdha- m. ‘half’ with replacement of the theme vowel), is attested twice in substantival use, e.g., RV 10.26.5a prātyardhir yajñānām ‘half-sharer of sacrifices’.

ɢandhi- is attested as SMC of su-ɢándhi- ‘having a pleasant fragrance; fragrant’ (RV 7.59.12b, 8.19.24b), āṇjana-ɢandhi- ‘smelling of ointments’ (RV 10.146.6a), dhūmā-ɢandhi- (RV 1.162.15a) ‘smelling of smoke’. The i-stem SMC is evidently a replacement of gandhā- m. ‘smell, fragrance’. Both ɢardhi- and ɢandhi- are synchronically isolated from a corresponding verbal paradigm and lack a convincing etymology outside of Indo-Iranian (EWA I: 119; 461f.).⁵

A possible additional case is ɢṛādhi- in krṣṭā-ɢṛādhi- ‘successful in agriculture’ (AV 8.10.24), with the i-stem SMC arguably replacing the simplex substantive rādhā- ‘gift, bounty’ (attested twice in the Rigveda besides the much more common s-stem rādhā-), as the accent of krṣṭā-ɢṛādhi- points to a possessive compound rather than a deverbal derivation of rādh ‘succeed, be successful’.⁶

⁴ All translations from Jamison and Brereton 2014 except where otherwise indicated.
⁵ Klingenschmitt (1980: 208ff.) proposes a connection with Lat. orbis ‘circle’ from *h₁or-dʰh₁j-, but Weiss (2006) argues that the Latin form should rather be connected with the root of Gk. ὀφανός ‘orphan’, OIr. orb ‘heir’, etc.
⁶ Two more cases could potentially be added to this list: Ṽṣadhi- f. ‘medicinal plant’ < ‘qui tranche la brûlure’, according to Pinault 2003–4 a possessive compound consisting of a root noun of *h₁eqs ‘burn’ (but note the problematic full grade in the FMC) and a verbal abstract *adhi- ‘cutting; separation’, from the same root as Hitt. atešš(a)- ‘axe’, and sānasi- m. ‘winning, gaining’ and ‘causing to win’ < *ṣh₂-nesi- ‘causing safe return provided with winning [of gain]’ (Pinault 2015: 18), the SMC a verbal abstract *nes-i- from nes- ‘return safely’.
3 Verbal governing compounds

Most Rigvedic compounds with an i-stem SMC are verbal governing compounds, with the SMC bearing the accent. They are grouped into oxytone and paroxytone stems in the following discussion.

3.1 Oxytone

°tují- ‘pushing, driving’ is attested in ātují- ‘pushing oneself towards’ in RV 7.66.18 in predicative use. There is no corresponding a-stem.

RV 7.66.18:

divó dhāmabhīr varuṇa
mitrāś cā yātam adṛūhā
pibatam sómam ātujī

“From heaven through your domains, o Varuna and Mitra, you who are without deception – travel here. Drink the soma, thrusting yourselves toward it.”

The use of °tují- in this passage is reminiscent of that of tūtují- ‘driving repeatedly, hurrying’ from the same root (for the accent cp. substantival tūtují- m. ‘driver, inciter, pusher’ in RV 10.22.3b; see Grestenberger 2013).

°yají- ‘sacrificing’ is found in ā-yají- ‘winning (goods) by sacrifice’ (Jamison and Brereton 2014), attested twice in predicative or substantival use, e.g., RV RV 1.28.7 āyajī vājasātamā “These two [=mortar and pestle? / jaws of the soma press?] gain by sacrifice and are the best prizewinners.” There is no corresponding a-stem (expected **yaja- might be “blocked” by the root noun seen in, e.g., su-yāj- ‘sacrificing well’, divi-yāj- ‘sacrificing in the light of day’, etc.).

Neither of these has a synchronic a-stem, but this is not unexpected given their synchronic morphological opacity.
Both suffix-accented i-compounds are predicative and quasi-substantival, although this is not a strong generalization given that there are only two tokens.\(^7\)

### 3.2 Paroxytone

\(^\circ\)tani- ‘stretching, spanning’ is attested once in ā-tāni- ‘pervading, stretching out’ in predicative use:

RV 2.1.10d:

\[ \text{tvāṃ viśikṣur asi yajñāṁ ātāniḥ} \]

“You seek to carve up and to stretch out the sacrifice.”

While this i-stem is synchronically deverbal, its derivational basis may ultimately be the a-stem seen in Ved. tāna- n. ‘offspring’ (< ‘that which stretches out, spans’).\(^8\)

---

\(^7\) A possible additional case is the SMC of su-rabhī- ‘fragrant’, usually taken to belong to rabh ‘seize’ (< \(^\circ\)well-seizing’?), but the etymology is too uncertain to conclude much from this form.

\(^8\) The semantic difference between transitive \(^\circ\)tani- ‘stretching, spanning sth.’ and intransitive tāna- ‘stretching (oneself) out’ might give pause, especially since no such difference is found in the case of, e.g., \(^\circ\)bharti- : \(^\circ\)bhara-. I am not sure, however, that this excludes tāna- as the derivational base for \(^\circ\)tani-, given that a number of deverbal adjectives of this type in the Indo-European languages are famously ambiguous between transitive and intransitive/passive readings in SMC, especially root nouns, e.g., Gk. βουπλήξ ‘ox-goad’ (< \(^\circ\)cattle-stinging’) vs. οἰστροπλήξ ‘stung by a gadfly’, Ved. soma-pā- ‘Soma-drinking’ vs. indra-pā-androida- ‘preferably drunk by Indra’ (cp. Malzahn To appear), but also thematic nouns, e.g. Gk. ὀρό-τόμος ‘wood-cutter’ vs. ἀ-τόμος ‘uncut’, ἀξο-τόμος ‘cut off’, etc. This is not the right place to elaborate on the difference between ‘tōmōs’, “tōmōs” and “\(^\circ\)tēmōs” versions of this type and which of them would be expected as simplex vs. as SMC (see Nussbaum To appear for a detailed treatment of the simplex forms). What is relevant is that the valency of the simplex a-stem is not a reliable predictor of the compositional meaning of a given compound containing
"bhari- ‘bringing’ is found as SMC of saho-bhári- ‘bringing victory’, attested once in predicative use in RV 5.44.3b -áriṣṭagātuḥ sā hōtā sa-
(hārāviḥ “the Hotar who goes without harm brings might.”

Compounds in °bharā-, on the other hand, are ubiquitous: antarā-
bharā- (attributive, RV 8.32.12b-c dāṇavāṃ antarābhār āḥ | indro ... “he who has gifts and brings them near—Indra”), puṣṭim-bhārā- (attributive, RV 4.3.7a kathā mahē puṣṭimbhārāya pūṣṇē “How (will you speak) to
great Pūṣan who brings prosperity, ...?”), vājam-bhārā- (attributive in, e.g., RV 10.80.1a agniḥ sāptim vājambhārām dadāti “Agni gives a prize-
bringing team”), sutam-bhārā- (attributive, RV 5.44.13a sutambhārā ṣtāmānasya sātpatir “bearing the pressed (soma) of the sacrificer, master of
the settlements, ...”), and harim-bhārā- (substancial, RV 10.96.4d).

Attributive use clearly prevails with °bharā-compounds, while the only
instance of °bhari- is predicative (albeit found in a notoriously difficult
hymn, cp. Jamison and Brereton 2014, II: 714ff.). While this is not
enough evidence for a generalization, it is worth noting that the use of the
i-compound over the a-compound cannot be metri causa in RV 5.44.3
above, and given the productivity of °bharā-compounds elsewhere it is at
least possible that the poet chose °bhari- over °bharā- because of its
slightly different semantics (a similar argument can be made for ā-tānī-,
although this lacks the corresponding °tāna-).

However, the paroxytone accent of saho-bhāri- is unexpected if this is
a substantivization of the adjectival a-stem, whereas substantival bhāra-
m. (act of) bearing, carrying off; gains, plunder’ is an unlikely
derivational basis because of its semantics (but see fn. 8).

°mathi- ‘robbing, stealing’ is found in havir-māthi- ‘oblation-stealing’,
attested in appositional use in RV 7.104.21a-b; vastra-māthi- ‘robbing
clothes’ is attested once in attributive use (RV 4.38.5a vastrāmāthiṃ nā
tāyūṃ “(like to) a clothes-stealing thief”, my translation, L.G.), and urā-
māthi- ‘sheep-robbing’ is attested once in predicative or appositional use
(there is no corresponding a-stem):

such a stem as SMC. I am grateful to Stephanie Jamison for drawing my attention
to this problem.
RV 8.66.8a-b:

\[
výkaś cíd asya vāraṇā urāmāthir
\]

ā vayuṇeṣu bhūṣati

“Even a wolf – wild and sheep-stealing – attends to its own patterns”

°muri- ‘obstructing’ is attested in ā-mūri- ‘obstructing, one who obstructs’
(predicate or appositional):

RV 8.97.10:

vivāh pṛṭanā abhibhūtaraṃ nāraṃ
sajūs tatakṣur īndram jajanūs ca rājāse
krātvā vāriṣṭhaṃ vāra āmūrim utā
ugrāṃ ējiṣṭhaṃ tavāsaṃ tarasvinam

“The superior man who is even more dominant over all battles – Indra
have they jointly fashioned and begotten for ruling – most excellent in
resolve and a hindrance in obstructing, strong, strongest, powerful,
surpassing.”

There is no a-stem, but note the root noun (ā)mūr- ‘obstruction,
hindrance’.

°rakṣi- ‘protecting, guarding’ is found in pathi-rāksi- ‘path-protector’,
attested once in predicate use:

RV 10.14.11a-b:

yāu te śvānau yama rakṣitāravau
caturkṣau pathirāksi nṛcākṣasau

“Your two dogs, Yama, who are guardians, four-eyed guards of the
path with their eyes on men ...”

° Note that °muri- cannot have come from the root noun paradigm by regular
sound change, unless one is willing to accept heavy remodelling (see Insler 1971:
83, fn. 8 and the discussion of °dhī- below).
paśu-rākṣi- ‘shepherd; cattle-protector’ is attested once as a substantive (RV 6.49.12b). There is no corresponding a-stem.

°vani- ‘winning, gaining’ is attested in upamāti-vāni- ‘winning the distributions’ in predicative use (RV 5.41.16), in rju-vāni- ‘obtaining the right things; rightfully’ in appositional or predicative use (RV 5.41.15d), in vrṣṭi-vāni- ‘winning rain’ in attributive use (RV 10.98.7c) and in vasuvāni- ‘winning goods’ in predicative use in RV 7.1.23c sā devātā vasuvānīm dadhāti “He [=Agni or the mortal] establishes him [=the mortal or Agni] as one who gains goods among the gods, …”. There is no corresponding a-stem.10

°sāni- ‘winning’ is found as SMC of pitu-śāni- ‘winning sustenance’ (RV 10.71.10c, predicative) and vāja-sāni- ‘winning prizes’ (3x, predicative in RV 3.51.2 and RV 9.110.11c (?) and attributive in RV 10.91.15c-d).

RV 3.51.2:
śatākratum arṇavāṃ śākinaṃ nāraṃ
giro ma īndram īpa yanti viśvātaḥ
vājasānim pūrbhidaṃ tūnīm aptūram
dhāmaścam abhiśaṃcam śvarvīdam

“The superior man with a hundred resolves, a flood of powers – my songs approach Indra from all sides – winning spoils, splitting strongholds, swift at crossing the waters, attending to the ordinances, attending closely, finding the sun.”

ḥṛdaṃ-sāni- ‘winning someone’s heart’ is attested once in predicative use (RV 9.61.14c yā īndrasya ḥṛdaṃsāniḥ “who gains the heart of Indra”); go-śāni- ‘winning cows’ is attested once, likewise in predicative use:

10 No corresponding simplex i-stem, either, since vanī- f. ‘wish, desire’ (AV 5.7.2, 3, 6) must be kept separate on formal and semantic grounds (from vanī- ‘wish’ rather than vanī ‘win’, see EWA II: 499–501).
RV 6.53.10:

utá no gośāṇim dhīyam
aśvasāṃ vājasāṃ utá
nrvatā kṛṇhi vītāye

“And make our poetic vision cow-winning for us, horse-winning, and prizewinning, make it manfully to be pursued.”

An a-stem °śāṇa- is attested in the compound su-śāṇa- ‘easy to win’ in RV 1.42.6c dhānāṁi suśāṇā kṛdhi “make the stakes easy for us to win.” Both the accent and meaning make this stem a very likely derivational basis for °śāṇi- (again with the caveat that both are synchronically best analyzed as deverbal; and see fn. 8). The substantival simplex sani- m. ‘prize, thing won, plunder’ should be considered an independent formation both on formal and semantic grounds.

°svani- ‘roaring, sounding’ is attested in tuvi-ṣvāṇi- ‘resounding mightily’ (7x in the RV) and is usually predicative or appositional, e.g., RV 1.127.6a sā hi sārdho nā mārutaṁ tuvisvānir “For he is very noisy like the Marut troop”.

mahīṣvāṇi- ‘roaring greatly’ is attested once as a substantive (RV 8.46.18). A possible corresponding a-stem svanā- m. ‘roaring, thundering, thunder’ is also attested as a simplex and as SMC, e.g., vāṭa-svāna- ‘roaring like the wind’ (RV 8.102.5, attributive; but note that the accentual behavior of the simplex a-stem differs from that of °svani-).

3.3 Accent unknown/other

The i-stem °dari- ‘splitting, splitter’ is found in go-dari- ‘cow-splitter’, used as an epithet of Indra in RV 8.92.11 (voc.), besides an SMC °darā- ‘splitting, splitter’ in puraṁ-darā- ‘fortress-splitter’ (likewise used as epithet of Indra and Agni, 11x). Both °dari- and °dara- occur only in epithets, and it is therefore not surprising that they both tend to be predicative substantives, e.g.:

RV 8.1.8a-b:
prāśmai gāyatrāṁ arcata
vāvātur yāḥ puraṇḍarāḥ
“Chant forth a song to him who cleaves strongholds for his favorite”

The SMC of ā-duri- (a personal name in the vocative in RV 4.30.24) could be analyzed as ṇduri- ‘splitting’ (ā-duri- = ‘one who splits open, makes accessible’?). Mayrhofer (EWA I: 703) proposes that the apparent set reflex (as if < *ṅṛṛH-i-) is a “Sonderentwicklung” of the syntagm ā darī(i) ‘break open’ (cp. ṇdari- above), but the root does not show set behavior in its verbal paradigm in early Vedic (except for some relatively transparently analogical forms of the intensive). The “local” derivational basis for *ṅdur-ı- should therefore be sought in durā- m. ‘breaker, splitter’ (3x in RV 1.53.2, see EWA I: 732).

ṅdhi- ‘place, placement’ is found in SMC of Tatpuruṣa compounds and belongs to dhā ‘put, place’, e.g., ādhi- m. ‘deposit’, paridhi- m. ‘enclosure’, apidhi- m. ‘cover’, etc. That this is more likely an original i-stem *ṅd(h1)-i- than taken from the paradigm of the root noun dhā- has been argued elsewhere (e.g., Klingenschmitt 1980: 208f., fn. 14, Jamison 1988: 221, Grestenberger 2014: 92). The expected derivational basis *ṅd(h1)-ō- may well be attested in AV nāma-dhā- ‘name-giving’ (but RV nāma-dhā), ratna-dhā- ‘allocating goods’ (besides more common ratna-dhā-) and maybe Gk. ἄγαθος ‘good’ (< ṇyāgh2-ṅd(h1)-ō-, NIL: 100), providing evidence for a derivation *X-ṅd(h1)-ō- ‘placing, setting down X’ → *X- ṅd(h1)-i- ‘X-place, X-placement’.

An i-stem ṛgreh is found in tuvi-grē-, an an epithet of Indra, besides tuvi-grē- (both hapax in the RV). Mayrhofer (EWA I: 659; 2005: 101) analyzes these compounds as tuvi- ‘strong, much’; (< *tuH-i-, root *tṛṛhH) + *ṛṛgṛ̥h3-ō/i- ‘much-devouring’ (*ṛṛgṛh3 ‘devour’), with loss of the laryngeal in the SMC due to the “veṣyovoc rule” (cp. Mayrhofer 2005: 98ff.).

Jamison and Brereton 2014 translate ‘powerfully spirited’, from halplologized *tuvi-vigrā- (vigrā- ‘lively, strong’), arguing that the thematized SMC of a set root ṛṛ ‘swallow, devour’ should surface as *ṛṛgri- based on comparison with SMC like ṛtirā- (ṛṛ ‘cross over’; Jamison 2016 ad RV 1.140.9). The latter, however, may well be inner-Indic formations to the synchronic root shape, while
Whatever the correct etymology, the synchronic -\(\alpha\)- : -\(i\)- variation in the SMC will receive the same explanation either way: as reflex of an inherited -\(i\)- substantivization. The variation has no obvious metrical reason, since both instances occur at the beginning of a Jagatī line, and no obvious (synchronic) semantic reason, as both compounds are used attributively.

4 Conclusion

Only a small group of Vedic compounds with -\(i\)- stem SMC are synchronically Bahuvṛhis, and neither these nor the VGC usually have a corresponding simplex -\(a\)- stem. In the few cases where there is a simplex noun (e.g., sanī- m. ‘prize, plunder’ vs. °sāṇi- ‘-winning’), the semantics and/or accentuation of the simplex make it unlikely that it is to be identified with the SMC.

Cases with a matching simplex (or SMC) -\(a\)- stem are much easier to find: Both Bahuvṛhis, as expected from the comparative evidence, have a synchronic -\(a\)- stem, as well as six of the twelve VGC (°tāṇi-, °bhāri-, °sāṇi-, °svāṇi- (?), °dāri-, °duri-, and maybe also °dhi- and °grī- if these are to be analyzed as VGC).  

Moreover, predicative (or “non-attributive”) use prevails for the VGC. There are not many examples, however, so this should probably not be overstated, and it must be emphasized again that the distinction between predicative and attributive use is not always clear. We have seen several examples of apparent “free variation” between an -\(a\)- stem and an -\(i\)- stem SMC for the same root where the choice of one suffix over another is not determined by meter or semantics. I interpret these as remnants of an
the synchronically isolated compounds tuvi-grā- and tuvi-grī- could reflect pre-Indic (or pre-Indo-Iranian) formations with the expected laryngeal loss.

12 I have not addressed the difference in the ablaut grade of the SMC (cp. °tāṇi-, °bhāri-, °sāṇi-, etc., vs. °duri-, °dhi-, °grī-). This must be left to future research, and it should be kept in mind that it will most likely have consequences for the exact internal analysis of the VGC provided in 3) and 4). I am grateful to Alan Nussbaum for reminding me of this issue.
inherited, albeit not highly productive pattern whereby an *o-adjective was turned into an *i-stem when it was used as a substantive or in apposition, and that this inherited pattern is not restricted to synchronic Bahuurhihs but also found with synchronic VGC.

This leads us to the question of the internal structure of these compounds. In Bahuurhihs, the expected structure is that of 2a), illustrated for dhūmā-gandhi- in 2b) and a root noun SMC (that is, a Bahuurhi without a derivational suffix) in 2c)


However, this cannot be the right analysis, since it treats -i- as the stem-forming suffix of the second noun, an analysis that is contradicted by the fact that i-stem SMC of Bahuurhihs of the dhūmā-gandhi-type are precisely not found as simplex i-stems (in contrast with Bahuurhihs with a genuine i-stem SMC, such as Ved. ghrtá-yoni- ‘having a place with ghee’). To solve this puzzle, let us turn to the VGC instead. Since these are based on verb + internal argument syntagms and the SMC is not a synchronic simplex noun (or adjective), the structure should be as in 5a), with -i- attaching to the verb phrase (3b; the bracketed “A” indicates that the resulting compound was originally analyzable as deadjectival, cp. (4)). This is also the structure of VGC with synchronic a-stem SMC, (3c):


To derive compounds like (3b) from compounds like (3c), we simply need to add substantivizing -i- to an input structure whose outermost bracket is of category A (plus some sort of (mor)phonological rule that surpasses the thematic vowel before -i-). This process is expected to create

---

13 Cp. also Fellner and Grestenberger 2017 for the analysis of the two types.
endocentric derivatives, which is indeed what we see in Vedic. So how do we end up with Bahuvrīhis?

The answer must be sought in the fact that thematic SMC (*bhará-, *dará-, etc.) were structurally ambiguous. The thematic vowel could be analyzed as derivational suffix attaching to the entire verb phrase (verb + direct object), or as derivational suffix of the SMC alone. If *-i- originally simply selected the category A (adjectives) as derivational basis, independent of the internal structure of A (or whether or not the adjectival suffix is overt), we actually expect to find both exo- and endocentric compounds in *-i-. Compare the exocentric *-i-compound in (4) to the endocentric one in (3a-b): in both cases, *-i- selects an adjectival base.

4) \([[[\text{dhúmá-}]]_{N} [\text{gandh(a)-}]_{N}]\emptyset -i- ]_{N}\)

Therefore the Bahuvrīhis that instantiate this substitution process are not necessarily more archaic than the endocentric compounds: in both cases, the derivational basis was adjectival.\(^{14}\)

This analysis also means that the internal structure of original *i-* individualizations in compounds is exactly parallel to that of the VGC of the type Gk. βαθυδίνης ‘deep-eddyng’, Lat. *agricola ‘country-dwelling’, which preserve the substantivizing (“animate” rather than feminine) function of *-eh2 (cp. Nussbaum 2014, Fellner and Grestenberger 2017), an unsurprising outcome given the many similarities between their simplex uses.

As our honoranda has shown on many occasions, nominal morphology in compounds provides important insights into the prehistory of Indo-European nominal derivational morphology in general. I hope to have adduced evidence in this paper that this is also true for the Vedic traces of the PIE *-o- : *-i- derivational pattern.

\(^{14}\) This analysis is based on a suggestion by Alan Nussbaum, namely that *-i- was simply not sensitive to the internal structure of adnominals as long as they ended in *-o-. This was certainly the case in late PIE, given that we find substantivizing *-i- in Bahuvrīhis (Lat. insomnis), prepositional governing compounds (OIr. inchinn) and verbal governing compounds (Ved. vasuváni-).
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