



universität
wien

DIPLOMARBEIT

Titel der Diplomarbeit

“The Vedic *i*-Stems and Internal Derivation”

Verfasserin

Laura Grestenberger

angestrebter akademischer Grad

Magistra der Philosophie (Mag. phil.)

Wien, April 2009

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt:

A 330

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt:

Indogermanistik

Betreuerin:

Dr. Melanie Malzahn

The Vedic *i*-Stems and Internal Derivation

Laura Grestenberger

University of Vienna

Acknowledgements

I am most deeply indebted to my advisor Dr. Melanie Malzahn for introducing me to the hidden depths of Indo-European and Vedic nominal morphology and having the patience of monitoring my progress in these subjects (and occasionally kicking my *śróṇī*).

Furthermore, I have profited enormously from Prof. Martin Peters' classes and his readiness to discuss the dark sides of PIE internal derivation in and outside of these. He was also kind enough to proof-read and comment on the introduction of this thesis, for which I would like to thank him.

I would also like to thank Prof. Heiner Eichner, Prof. Chlodwig Werba, Prof. José Luis García-Ramón and Prof. Stefan Schaffner for their help with specific problems relating to Anatolian, Vedic, Greek and Germanic, respectively.

As for my colleagues, I am very grateful to Katharina Simma for her help with the database and her appreciation of the necessity of cigarette breaks and to Bernhard Koller for introducing me to and helping me with the intricacies of \LaTeX , and to both of them for getting me hooked up with Indo-European linguistics in the first place. Furthermore, I need to thank Sarah Zobel and Matthias Wenigwieser for occasionally reminding me that generative syntax is where it's at.

Finally, I wish to thank Livia Grestenberger, Tine Bazalka, Philipp Probst and Manuela Hogl ("The Not Agains"), Tyma Kraitt, Patricia Richter, the I.S.T. Austria, and, of course, my parents for their moral (and material) support and wise words on various linguistic and non-linguistics issues.

Contents

Acknowledgements	III
List of Abbreviations	V
1 Introduction	1
1.1 On internal derivation	1
1.2 <i>i</i> -stems in PIE	4
1.2.1 <i>o/e</i> -acrostatic substantives	4
1.2.2 \bar{e}/e -acrostatic substantives	5
1.2.3 “Caland” abstract substantives	5
1.2.4 Proterokinetic <i>ti</i> -abstracts	7
1.2.5 Hysterokinetic (<i>C</i>) <i>i</i> -stems	7
1.2.6 Amphikinetic (<i>C</i>) <i>i</i> -stems	7
1.2.7 PIE <i>i</i> -stem adjectives ?	8
2 Classifying the Vedic <i>i</i>-stems	11
2.1 Productive formations	11
2.1.1 <i>ti</i> -stems	11
2.1.2 <i>i</i> -formations to verbal roots: agent and action nouns	13
2.1.3 <i>u</i> -stems extended by an <i>i</i> -suffix	16
2.1.4 Formations in <i>-tāti-</i>	17
2.1.5 Infinitives	17
2.1.6 Denominal (<i>vṛddhi-</i> and non- <i>vṛddhi-</i>) formations in <i>-i-</i>	17
2.1.7 Substantive/adjective pairs with opposing accent	19
2.2 Unproductive formations	20
2.2.1 Inherited forms	20
2.2.2 Possible loanwords	21
2.3 Forms left unconsidered	21
2.4 The <i>i</i> -stem paradigm	24
3 The Vedic data	27
3.1 The structure of the entries	27
3.2 The data	28
4 Conclusion	157
Appendix: Comments on metrical distribution	160
References	163
English abstract	171
Deutsche Zusammenfassung	172
Lebenslauf	173

List of Abbreviations

AiG	<i>Altindische Grammatik</i> , Debrunner 1954, Wackernagel 1905, Wackernagel/ Debrunner 1930
Arm.	Armenian
AV	Atharvaveda
Av.	Avestan
AzI	<i>Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik</i> , Hoffmann 1975, 1976 and 1992
EWA	<i>Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen</i> , vol. I & II, Mayrhofer 1992, 1996
FMC	First member of compound
Gr.	Greek
Hitt.	Hittite
ID	Internal derivation
Iir.	Indo-Iranian
Ion.-Att.	Ionic-Attic
Lat.	Latin
Lith.	Lithuanian
LIV ²	<i>Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben</i> , Rix 2001
Lyd.	Lydian
MHG	Middle High German
MS	Maitrāyaṇīyasamhitā
Myc.	Mycenaean
NIL	<i>Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon</i> , Wodtko/Irslinger/Schneider 2008
OAv.	Old Avestan
OCS	Old Church Slavonic
OE	Old English
OHG	Old High German
OIr.	Old Irish
ON	Old Norse

Pal.	Palaic
PN	Personal name
RIVELEX	<i>Rigveda-Lexikon</i> , Krisch 2006
RV	Rigveda
SMC	Second member of compound
Toch.	Tocharian
Ved.	Vedic
YAv.	Young Avestan

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 On internal derivation

That Proto-Indo-European used a morphological process called internal derivation (ID) as a means of word formation is a relatively undisputed assumption within Indo-European studies. The investigation of the exact mechanisms of this process, however, is far from completed. The scope of this thesis is to delve deeper into one particular aspect of ID and investigate the behavior of the continuants of Indo-European nominal stems formed with the suffix **-i-* in Vedic, in particular with regard to their suffix ablaut.

Although a complete and thorough study would, of course, have to include positive evidence from as many IE languages as possible, there is a specific reason for concentrating on Vedic as a first step. Vedic has hitherto been one of the richest sources of evidence for ID and particularly for the phenomenon I am going to concentrate on: the relationship between acrostatic abstract nouns and proterokinetic adjectives. Although a derivational connection between abstract *u*-stems and corresponding adjectives has previously been assumed by Emile Benveniste (cf. Widmer (2004, 29)), the precise process has been studied only recently. The fundamental concepts of a comprehensive theory of ID as well as the term itself go back to some of Jochem Schindler's lectures in the Seventies¹.

In the case of Indo-Iranian, Hoffmann's 1976 article on YAv. *vaṇhūuqm* (AzI II, 593-604) has been crucial in focusing on the phenomenon. Hoffmann interprets *vaṇhūuqm* as reflecting an original **_uah_uām²*, the Iranian outcome of the G.pl. of the acrostatic *u*-stem **h₁uósu-/h₁uésu-* "good (thing), blessing" which is also continued by the Vedic neuter substantive *vásu-*. He then points out that within this originally acrostatic paradigm, inflectional endings normally found in protero- and hysterokinetic paradigms are evidenced in Vedic, Avestan, and maybe Greek. Hoffmann's explanation for this seeming anomaly is that the structural ambiguity of some case forms that could belong to both protero- and hysterokinetic stems on the one hand and to acrostatic stems on the other hand led to the analogical creation of further protero-/hysterokinetic patterns within the paradigm of (originally acrostatic) **h₁uósu-*³. However, originally *vásvas* rather belonged to the paradigm of *vásu-* n. "good thing", and *vá-*

¹Nussbaum (1998a, 147ff., fn. 161 & 162), Widmer (2004, 29).

²-*ṇhūu-* being an irregular outcome of **-h_u-* caused by a blend.

³“Von den übrigen Kasusformen des vedischen und avestischen Paradigmas können Nom.Akk.Du.m ved. *vásū*, aav. *vohū* < **_ṛ1uésu-_ṛ1* und Nom.Akk.Pl.n. ved. *vásū*, aav. *vohū* < **_ṛ1uésu-_ṛ2* sowohl der akro-dynamischen als auch der proterodynamischen Flexionsform angehören. Das war wohl Anlass zur Ausbildung weiterer proterodynamischer Flexionsformen wie z.B. Gen.Sg. ved. *vásos*, av. *vaṇhōuš*, Dat.Sg. ved. *vásave*, av. *vanhauuē*, die auch dem undifferenzierten Normalparadigma der *u*-Stämme (...) angehören.” (AzI II, 599).

śos to that of an adjective *váśu-* “good”⁴. Thus, we find a functional as well as a formal distinction showing up with *váśu-*, which suggests a more systematic basis for the variation *váśvas/váśos* than would be a mere analogy.

If we assume, following the Vedic, Avestan, and Greek evidence, that the acrostatic inflection started out in a paradigm of a neuter substantive while the proterokinetic forms started out in that of a respective adjective and furthermore postulate a derivational connection between substantive and adjective, there is only one possible direction for this derivation⁵:

$$R(\acute{o}/\acute{e}) \text{ acrostatic substantive} \quad \rightarrow \quad R(\acute{e}/\acute{o}) \text{ proterokinetic adjective}$$

Vedic examples of this process include:

<i>krátu-</i> “strength” (\leftarrow <i>kró/étu</i> ⁶ -), G.sg. <i>krátvas</i> $<$ <i>*krétu-es</i>	\rightarrow	<i>*krétu-/krt-éu-</i> , G.sg. <i>krátos</i> “(the) strong” \leftarrow <i>*krt-éu-s</i>
<i>mádhū-</i> “sweetness; honey” (\leftarrow <i>*mó/éd^hu</i> ⁷ -) G.sg. <i>mádhvas</i> $<$ <i>*méd^h-u-es</i>	\rightarrow	<i>*méd^hu-/m(e)d^h-éu-</i> G.sg. <i>mádhos</i> “sweet” \leftarrow <i>*med^h-éu-s</i>

A number of caveats are in order at this point. First of all, the distinction between the originally acrostatic and proterokinetic stems is not often very clear-cut. Part of the difficulty of spotting ID within different paradigms in different daughter languages is the fact that the derived paradigm was apparently quite often influenced by its derivational base in a number of aspects. Take *krátos*, for example: Normally, proterokinetic *u*-adjectives would generalize the zero grade of the root with the suffix accented throughout the paradigm (cf. *purú-* “numerous, many” $<$ **p^hh₁u-*, *gurú-* “heavy” $<$ **g^ur^h₂u-*, Gr. βαρύ-). G.sg. *krátos*, however, must go back to the accented *e*-grade of the root, which was generalized in the substantive (since the strong stem ablaut vowel *-o-* would have resulted in *-ā-* by Brugmann’s Law), and thus shows an influence of the derivational base on the substantive.

This kind of influence was especially likely to occur between acrostatic and proterokinetic paradigms sharing a derivational history, because a number of their case forms would be identical anyway. The neuter paradigm of the derived adjective was especially susceptible to collapsing with the underlying substantive, since in PIE the neuter of any adjective could be used as the respective de-adjectival abstract, cf. Nussbaum (1998a, 148); Widmer (2004, 134), which, however, could lead to a use of the underlying acrostatic abstract as a neuter of the respective adjective in return, cf. Widmer (2004, 155ff).

Partly because of this coincidence, acrostatic abstract nouns seem to have already undergone serious remodelling in the proto-language. The genitive singular, which was originally identical to the nominative singular except for the *e*-grade of the root, was substituted by a

⁴See Nussbaum (1998a, 132 & 147) on this.

⁵This is a necessary conclusion if we follow Schindler’s assumption that the acrostatic stems were at the very left of a hierarchical chain of possible ID processes (namely acrostatic \rightarrow proterokinetic \rightarrow hysterokinetic \rightarrow amphikinetic) and therefore could not be derived by a process “to the right” of them (Nussbaum (1998a, 147); Widmer 2004, 99, fn.135).

⁶In this and the following case, Vedic apparently generalized the weak stem of the acrostatic paradigm, since we would otherwise expect Brugmann’s Law to apply.

⁷The expected *o*-grade of the strong stem may be reflected in Toch. B *mot* “wine” (cf. Peters (2002, 104), Widmer (2004, 101), but also Pinault’s (2003, 183) objections).

more “oblique-looking” genitive of the structure R(\emptyset)-S(\acute{e})⁸ at least in Indo-Iranian in cases such as Ved. *dāru-* “wood”, originally *o/e*-acrostatic **dōru-/déru-* with the genitive remade to seemingly proterokinetic **dr-éu-s* > Ved. *drós*. Alternatively, a hysterokinetic-looking genitive with S(\emptyset)-D(e) of the type Ved. *krátvas* < **krét-ŭ-es*, *ávyas* (*ávi-* “sheep”) < **h₂éu-ĭ-es* was introduced⁹. Such remodelling was not restricted to the genitive singular and the determination of where and how it has taken place is going to play an important role in the analysis of the Vedic *i*-stems and the question of whether or not derivational processes of the type described above can be postulated for PIE **(C)i*-stems.

Additionally, a comparison of the derivational behavior of the *i*-stems to that of the *u*-stems must not be restricted to simplex nouns and adjectives, since we know that any athematic simplex noun used as a second member of a possessive compound devoid of a special compounding suffix had to inflect like an uncompounded internal derivative of its own (that is, exocentric nominal composition could “trigger” ID). Traces of this phenomenon are found in examples like

- Gr. *πατήρ* “father” (< hysterokinetic **-tēr*) → *εὐ-πάτωρ* “having a noble father” (< amphikinetic **-tōr*)
- Ved. *jānu-* (< acrostatic **gō/énu-* “knee”) → *mitá-jñu-* “with upright knees” (< proterokinetic **-gñ-eu-*, cf. G.sg. *-jños*)

Interestingly, this pattern seems to have retained a certain degree of productivity and may even have spread secondarily in some IE languages as a means of distinguishing the second members of Bahuvrīhis from their uncompounded counterparts, as Tremblay (2003, 250f.) has argued for Avestan and as may be the case in Greek as well, to judge from examples like *ἀνήρ* “man” → *εὐήνωρ* “having brave men” etc. Thus, any account of the Vedic *i*-stems has to take their behavior as second members of possessive compounds into consideration, since even if we had evidence that PIE *i*-stems did not show ID in such formations, it may still have become secondarily productive¹⁰.

The scope of this thesis is to analyze the attested Vedic *i*-stems with respect to two questions relating to aspects of internal derivation:

1. Do the *i*-stems display the type of suffixal variation seen in pairs like G.sg. *krátvas*: *krátos*, and if so, does this reflect an inherited principle of deriving *i*-adjectives from acrostatic substantives or is this just due to an analogy with the *u*-stems?
2. Is there a (regular) variation between the suffixal ablaut of the simplex with respect to its use as a second compound member?

⁸A quite similar process can be found in the paradigms of root nouns like **dom-* “house”, G.sg. **dém-s* → **dm-és*; somewhat differently **pod-* “foot”, G.sg. **péd-s* → **ped-ós*, etc., Schindler (1972a, 32ff.), see also Schindler (1994, 397). This was apparently a fairly widespread innovation in paradigms where the nominative and genitive singular were distinct only with respect to their root ablaut, probably because root ablaut itself was becoming unproductive as a means of morphological distinction.

⁹Schindler 1994, 397, in nuce Hoffmann (1976, 598). Note that the S(\emptyset)-D(e) option is reminiscent of the root-noun examples, the only difference being the zero-grade suffix, while the “proterokinetic” option can be traced back to the influence of derived proterokinetic paradigms which influenced the derivational base (cf. *krátos*, *mádhos* etc.), or to that of the locatives in **-eu(i)-*.

¹⁰Compare the case of the Hittite *i*-adjectives, cf. Rieken (2005), to be discussed below.

Since the generalization of a certain suffix variety rather than another may be conditioned or facilitated by metrical exigencies, the bulk of this thesis will be dedicated to recording the attested *i*-stems with respect to their metrical positions. That certain structural requirements of the Vedic metre lead to the preservation of archaisms is well known, and a metrical analysis should therefore be the starting point for an evaluation of the status of the Vedic *i*-stem suffix variants. To give an overview over the various classes involved, I will briefly discuss the PIE and Vedic *i*-stems first, which should also help to determine in which PIE *i*-stem classes (and their Vedic continuants) the phenomenon at stake here would be expected to occur in the first place.

1.2 *i*-stems in PIE

Before turning to the Vedic data itself, we need to summarize what is known about PIE *i*-stems. Since the suffix manifests itself in a wide variety of forms and functions within the IE daughter languages, some kind of cursory classification is needed before we can proceed. The accent/ablaut-types assumed here for athematic nouns with primary nominal suffixes are those established by Heiner Eichner, Gert Klingenschmitt, Helmut Rix and especially Jochem Schindler since the 1970ies and which are (relatively) unanimously agreed to be linked by a chain of possible derivations (cf. Widmer 2004, 62ff.):

	acrostatic	proterokinetic	hysterokinetic	amphikinetic
Strong	R(ó)-S(ø)-E(ø)	R(é)-S(ø)-E(ø)	R(ø)-S(é)-D(ø)	R(é)-S(o)-E(ø)
Weak	R(é)-S(ø)-E(ø)	R(ø)-S(é)-E(ø)	R(ø)-S(ø)-E(é)	R(ø)-S(ø)-E(é)

This is, of course, the simplified version leaving out the \bar{e}/e -acrostatic stems, the ablaut of the locative singular, the fact that the distinction between these classes was not particularly clear-cut outside the singular (see 2.4.) etc. But since there are some very elaborated discussions of these types, e.g. Schaffner (2001), Neri (2003), Widmer (2004) a.o., I will forgo discussing the details here (except where they become relevant for my subject, of course) and simply assume these four “canonical” classes. Attempts at establishing more classes, like Tremblay (1996) & 1998, Schaffner (2001) (to name some more recent ones), will be discussed when they directly concern the Vedic material I am dealing with. In principle, however, I agree with Pinault (2003) that these four classes explain (and predict) most of the evidence attested in the diverse IE languages and that the theoretical framework for analyzing PIE nominal ablaut should be kept as slim as possible, especially when seeming divergences can be reasonably explained as *einzel sprachliche* innovations.

Thus, the following PIE $*(C)i$ -stems are commonly accepted:

1.2.1 *o/e*-acrostatic substantives

Some of the most widely attested *i*-stems fall into this group, including $*h_2ó/éyi$ - “sheep” (Ved. *ávi*-, Gr. *ὄις*, Lat. *ovis*, Toch. B *āuw*, Arm. *hoviw*, OHG *ouwn*), $*ró/éh_1i$ - “wealth” (Ved. *rayí*-, Av. *rāii*-, Lat. *rēs*), $*h_1ó/ég^{uh}i$ - “snake” (Ved. *áhi*-, Av. *aži*-, Gr. *ὄφις*), $*Hó/égni$ -

“fire” (Ved. *agní-*, Lat. *ignis*, OCS *ognъ*), **pó/éti*¹¹ “master; husband” (Ved. *páti-*, Av. *paiti-*, Gr. *πόσις*, Lat. *potis* (adj.) “able (to)”, Toch. A *pats*, B G.sg. *petso* etc).

1.2.2 \bar{e}/e -acrostatic substantives

This type is controversial because a number of possible examples are likely to be based on “Narten¹²” roots, that is, roots that seem to “add” an *-e-* to the ablaut grade of the root regular in the respective category (i.e. in nominal and verbal formations where R(*e*) normally surfaces, they have R(\bar{e}), whereas when we expect R(\emptyset) they have R(*e*)). The reason for this behavior has yet to be established, and maybe it was originally phonologically rather than morphologically conditioned¹³. Thus besides Gr. $\delta\tilde{\eta}\rho\iota\varsigma$ “fight” < **dēr-i-* we also find a *ti*-stem $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\rho\rho\iota\varsigma$ “fur, leather cover” < **der-ti-*, with R(*e*) instead of expected R(\emptyset) (as in Ved. *dṛ̥ti-*). Since the question of ID within the acrostatic type is far from being solved¹⁴ and there are no certain examples of R(\bar{e}/e)-i- stems in Vedic, this type will not be discussed any further here.

1.2.3 “Caland” abstract substantives

This group is of particular interest for the question at hand because of its abstract semantics. The “Caland system” is named after Willem Caland, who first noted that certain adjectives substitute the suffixes they have if used as a simplex by *-i-* in case they act as first compound members, see Caland (1892, 1893). Caland concentrated on the relation **-ro-* adjective : **-i-* (abstract) stem that is evident in Indo-Iranian in examples such as Av. *tiγra-* “sharp”: *tiži-i-aršti-* “having a sharp spear”. Since secondary adjectives were illicit as first members of Bahuvrīhi compounds and had to be replaced by their basic nouns¹⁵, it looks like the distinctive suppletion pattern characterizing the Caland system was established by replacing the suffixal adjective not with the respective abstract root noun to be expected but with an abstract nominal stem in *-i-*. Thus the original meaning of a compound like Av. *tiži-i-aršti-*

¹¹This reconstruction is problematic because R(*e*) is not directly attested. It could be argued that the failure of Brugmann’s Law to apply in the Indo-Iranian outcome (no **pāti-*!) points to an *e*-grade reflected in this branch of IE. However, since the reorganization of the paradigm apparently took place very early in Proto-Indo-Iranian or even PIE (cf. Tremblay (1998, 29f.), who argues in favor of several different internally derived paradigms), *pāti-* may simply reflect a generalized weak stem **pot-i-* without context for Brugmann’s Law due to its closed syllable. Both scenarios are plausible, and the problem of reconstructing unattested ablaut grades for the sake of system conformity remains.

¹²Named after Johanna Narten, who first described the phenomenon in certain Vedic verbal paradigms, see Narten (1968).

¹³Melanie Malzahn (p.c.) has pointed out to me that some of the most conspicuous Narten roots are of the structure CEC (e.g. **sed*, **h₁ed*, **dek̑*). The zero grade of these roots (which we expect in a large number of forms, such as the weak stem of *e/ø*-root nouns, the dual and plural of the active and all forms of the middle in verbal paradigms, etc.) would then be *CC, and although we do find reflexes of such structures of IE roots occasionally, they were far from common. Thus it is plausible that the root vowel was reintroduced to avoid this type of cluster. Once a weak stem with R(*e*) instead of expected R(\emptyset) had been created, and considering that PIE athematic word formations never had the same grade in the strong stem and the weak stem, the strong stem could have been upgraded in the same way, by “adding” an *e* to the expected grade, thus giving R(\bar{e}). Of course, quite a large number of prolific Narten roots are of the CeRC-type, which would have made an unproblematic CRC zero grade, and the whole complex definitely needs further investigation.

¹⁴That is, opinions diverge on whether or not a derivation \bar{e}/e -acrostatic \rightarrow *o/e*-acrostatic (or the other way round) was possible. Either way, the canonical pattern (i.e. the strong stem of the derivative has the same root ablaut grade as the weak stem of the derivational base) would not apply in these cases. Nussbaum (1998a) furthermore argues in favor of an \bar{e}/o -acrostatic type, which could have served as the derivational base of the *o/e*-type.

¹⁵According to Jochem Schindler’s (1986) account of possessive compounds in PIE. Contrarily, Balles (2006, 275) seems to suggest that the first members of compounds *tiži-i-*, *āpγi-* etc. were in fact adjectives. On the status of PIE *i*-adjectives see below.

would have been “having a spear that is with sharpness”, with the first compound member expressing an instrumental relation, cf. Schindler (1986, 396).

The comparison of the Greek forms with Indo-Iranian and thus the establishment of this phenomenon as an Indo-European one goes back to Wackernagel (1897). In Greek, the phenomenon may be evidenced in pairs such as ἀργός “quick, bright” (if < *h₂rġ-ró-): ἀργί-πους “quick-footed” (lit. “having a foot that is with quickness”), but note that ἀργί- may just have been the abstract of a bare *o*-stem *h₂rġŋ- standing beside *h₂rġŋ-ró-. Actually beside the *-ó/é-Ci- acrostatic abstract¹⁶ *h₂ó/ékri- “sharpness” (Gr. ὄχρις “point, peak”, Lat. *ocris* “mountain” (reflecting the *o*-grade), Gr. ὄχρις “mountain top” (showing *e*-grade with laryngeal coloring) evidently based on a *-ro-adjective Gr. ἄχρος < *h₂ék-ró- standing beside a *u*-stem (Lat. *acus* “needle”¹⁷) we also find traces of an abstract with the bare *i*-suffix in Gr. ἀχίς “spear(head)” and possibly Lat. *aciēs*¹⁸ “sharpness”. Accordingly, as abstracts of *-ro-adjectives we do not only meet root nouns and *-ri-stems, but also bare *-i-stems that probably had started out as *-i-abstracts to bare *-o-adjectives standing beside *ro-adjectives. As for the origin of these *-i-abstracts, thematic stems had their thematic vowel replaced by *-i(X)-¹⁹ in quite a number of secondary formations, as argued for by Schindler in his account of Gr. ἰππεύς (“In IE secondary formations, the thematic vowel of the *o*-stems can be replaced only by *-i-; otherwise it is preserved”, Schindler 1976, 351) and of the Old Indic *cvi*-formations (Schindler 1980)²⁰. The Caland phenomenon may have its roots in just this morphological process, since it seems that at some point the derivations *-Co- → *-Ci- and *-o- → *-i- were not kept distinct any more, enabling bare *-i-abstracts to be associated with *Co-adjectives as well and eventually supplanting them in the first member of certain possessive compounds²¹.

As for the inflection of these *i*-abstracts, there is some evidence that they may have adopted acrostatic inflection in analogy to some more “primary-looking” *o/e*-acrostatic abstracts, cf. ὄχρις/ἄχρις, but the simplex use of such abstracts appears to be secondary to the use as

¹⁶Despite the concrete semantics in Greek and Latin, an originally abstract meaning has to be assumed because a concretization of an abstract substantive is cross-linguistically easier to motivate than the opposite development.

¹⁷A substantivization of a *u*-adjective, according to Nussbaum (1976, 15).

¹⁸If from *h₂ék-ġ-i-é/h₂-s, as Balles (2006, 230) seems to suggest, that is, with a structure R-S1-S2-D. However, Steinbauer’s account (apud Mayrhofer (1986, 133)), following Eichner and Rix, appears to prefer a primary derivative of the structure R-S-D with a suffix *-ġéh₂-. As a matter of fact, *aciēs* may just derive from a hysterokinetically inflected *i*-stem.

¹⁹That is, extended *i*-suffixes that are highly likely to go back to secondary derivatives of Caland *-i-abstracts (cf. Nussbaum’s (1999) account of Lat. *-idus*, also Balles’ (2003) elaboration of the prehistory of the suffix).

²⁰I cannot follow Schlerath’s (1988) and Bammesberger’s (1989) critique of Schindler’s account. Both appear to miss Schindler’s point about the Slavic evidence: At no point does he claim that pairs such as the much-quoted OCS *zъlb*: *zъlbъ* are direct continuants of equivalent PIE pairs. The point is rather that the pattern *-o- : *-i- (which is hardly a “spärliche und durchaus ungleiche Verteilung”, Bammesberger (1989, 107)) must have furnished the template upon which the Slavic pairs were consequently built. This is not at odds with Bammesberger’s claim that quite a few of the OCS *ĭ*-stems actually go back to root nouns whose continuants were collapsed into a single class with those of the PIE *i*-stems, because the derivational pattern, once productive, would of course have been extended to these forms as well. Furthermore, Schlerath’s claim that “Bildungen mit -o- und -i- gehören im Idg. zu den häufigsten überhaupt und so ist selbstverständlich zu erwarten, daß solche Bildungen bei der gleichen Wurzel nebeneinander vorkommen”, l.c. 39, would render a search for connections between morphological patterns in IE as such impossible.

²¹Mention should be made of Rasmussen’s (2009) claim that the *-o- : *-i- pattern stemmed from a “phonetic reduction” (p. 262) caused by a PIE stress rule *-ò- → *-i- and was thus not a morphological process. However, the evidence of the individual languages does not support this claim, and although the grammaticalization of a phonetic rule is a widely-known phenomenon, assigning such a rule to some pre-PIE stage would be mere speculation.

Caland-FMC anyway and there are thus not many examples that allow the reconstruction of the root ablaut.

The only detailed study of the Caland system so far is Nussbaum's 1976 dissertation in which some of the more productive Caland roots and their derivatives are discussed establishing the **-ro-* → **-i-* process as part of a suppletion pattern including a number of thematic suffixes (e.g. **-ro-*, **-mo-*, *-no-* etc.) whose starting point was quite probably an abstract root noun.

1.2.4 Proterokinetic *ti*-abstracts

This group may be connected to the process of deriving **i*-abstracts from thematic formations described above, because a number of *ti*-abstracts seems to be derived from verbal adjectives of the type R(∅)-*tó-* via substitution of *-o-* by *-i*²². This would explain why the default ablaut grade of the root in such abstracts is R(∅): it was generalized under the influence of the underlying R(∅)-adjective²³. Since primary *ti*- and *tu*-abstracts were proterokinetic (strong stem R(e)-S(∅)-D(∅/e), weak stem R(∅)-S(e)-D(∅)), *ti*-derivatives of *tó*-adjectives mainly display proterokinetic suffix ablaut as well. However, there is also evidence for an influence of acrostatic *i*-abstracts in I.sg. forms such as Ved. *svastí* and *ūtí* (cf. Schindler (1980, 391 with fn. 19)), more on which below.

1.2.5 Hysterokinetic (C)*i*-stems

There are not many examples of this type (cf. Widmer (2004, 53)), but it is nevertheless found in a number of cases, some of them clearly internal derivatives, e.g. Hitt. *utnē-* “land” < **ud-n-ē(i)* and Gr. *κόρης/ κοίρης* (Hesych), Ved. *kaví*²⁴, Av. *kauuāi-*, Lyd. *kavés-*, all most likely going back to hysterokinetic **kouH-ē(i)* “seer, priest” (Schaffner 2001, 427). However, the unexpected *o*-grade may point to the influence of a derivational base of an *o/e*-acrostatic **kouH-i-* or, if we want to assume external derivation, **kou(H)-eh₂*²⁵. Now, Ved. *kaví-* could *formally* go back to an acrostatic **kouH-i-*, but since Avestan clearly reflects the hysterokinetic paradigm, the Vedic form may simply have been adjusted to the normal Vedic *i*-stem inflection within Old Indic.

An internally derived hysterokinetic *ti*-abstract is quite probably reflected by Lat. *uātēs* “seer, prophet” < **ueh₂-tē(i)+s* according to Schaffner (1999, 191ff., see also chapter 4).

1.2.6 Amphikinetic (C)*i*-stems

These include abstracts like Gr. *πειθώ(ι)* “persuasion”, but also concrete or concretized nouns like Ved. *sákhī-/sákhāy-* < **sók^h(h₂)-o*i** “companion” and Toch. B *yesti* “clothing” < **uēs-toi²⁶*, which is, of course, an old *ti*-abstract.

²²Pace Balles (2006, 279, esp. fn. 455). There are a number of examples for this pattern in Vedic (see below).

²³Martin Peters, p.c. Of course, we do have R(∅) in the weak stem of a proterokinetic paradigm as well, but we would expect the *e*-grade of the strong stem to surface much more often than it actually does.

²⁴Synchronically adapted to the “default” *i*-inflection, see below in more detail.

²⁵Which would then be in a very similar relation to **kouH-ē(i)*- as is **sok^h-eh₂*- “company” (indirectly attested in Homeric *ὑπάων* “companion”) to **sok^h-h₂-ō(i)*- “belonging to the company (= companion)”, cf. Ved. *sákhī-/sákhāy-* “companion” (see also Schindler *apud* Mayrhofer (1974, 290, fn. 13)).

²⁶Cf. Malzahn (2002).

As for Oettinger's (1995; 1999) reconstruction of *i*-collectives, the collective semantics of his examples are more likely caused by their hystero- and amphikinetic inflection than by the suffix *-i-* itself, cf. Tremblay (2003, 242, fn.38); Pinault (2003, 174f.), which Oettinger (1999) tries to explain as being secondary. At any rate, a number of his examples hardly seem to display a collective meaning at all: Gr. $\pi\epsilon\theta\acute{\omega}$ is an abstract, Gr. $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\phi\iota\tau-$ has been explained by Pinault (1980) (cf. 1.2.7.) below as stemming from a hypostasis of an *i*-abstract I.sg. in **-t*, an explanation that might be extended to **méli-t-* as well. Since most of the items concerned are not central to the subject of my thesis, I will not discuss this type any further.

1.2.7 PIE *i*-stem adjectives ?

A core question of ID in *i*-stems is the status of adjectives in *-i-*, since a precondition for an investigation of the relation of *i*-substantive: *i*-adjective is, of course, the existence of both. Even though not all *u*-adjectives, as a parallel, may have been internally derived²⁷ either, in order to make a claim about possible internally derived *i*-adjectives, one first has to look at the actual attested ones (if any). However, the *communis opinio* on this matter is that PIE did not have any primary-looking *i*-adjectives at all, internally derived or not, because we do not find a single example that is actually attested in more than one language²⁸. Before searching for proof for this claim in Vedic, I would like to review Balles' (2006) radically different approach²⁹.

Balles' central claim is that PIE was "underspecified" in the domain of nominal word formation ("wortartunterspezifiziert"), that is, there was no systematic distinction between concepts such as "red" and "redness"³⁰. In her account, **i-* was the main suffix that was used for deriving stems expressing such concepts, which (on account of being underspecified as to what part of speech they were assigned) could be used both as adjectives and substantival abstracts (Balles 2006, 290). At a later stage, when PIE started to develop adjectives as a distinct class of words, these *i*-stems were split functionally by being recharacterized through thematic suffixes (namely the Caland suffixes) in their adjectival function, while the stems themselves were fixed on their abstract value, giving the familiar Caland abstracts. However, according to Balles, some of the *i*-stems escaped this process and were retained in their adjectival meaning. Thus, primary-looking *i*-adjectives would be archaisms pointing to the earlier stage of "wortartunterspezifizierte Eigenschaftskonzepte" (Balles 2006, 273).

Balles' examples of such archaic *i*-adjectives (Balles 2006, 275f.) are, however, problematical. As a matter of fact, all those adjectives of the $\chi\acute{\upsilon}\delta\iota\mu\omicron\varsigma$ type can perfectly well be explained as external adjectival derivatives from Caland *i*-abstracts³¹. Accordingly, all evidence in favor of an adjectival stem **g^{uh}eh₂i-* and a number of the examples from the other roots can be dispensed with. After all, even if we were sure that (late) PIE had both *i*-abstracts and *i*-adjectives in one way or another, we would not be able to tell whether a given secondary

²⁷Nussbaum 1998a, 147, fn. 163.

²⁸"Dafür, dass die Grundsprache keine *i*-Adjektiva kannte, spricht zunächst die simple Tatsache, daß kein einziges mehrsprachiges *i*-Adjektiv rekonstruierbar ist. Die in den Einzelsprachen belegten *i*-Adjektiva verdanken ihre Existenz ganz unterschiedlichen (sekundären) Entwicklungen." (Praust 1998, 134, fn. 235).

²⁹See Balles (2009) for an abridged version of her 2006 dissertation.

³⁰"Die Konzepte ROT und RÖTE bzw. ROTSEIN fielen also nicht nur konzeptuell und semantisch, sondern auch morphologisch in einer Form zusammen." (Balles 2006, 271).

³¹Nussbaum (1999, 400) gives some more examples of this process, cf. also Nussbaum (1976, 62ff.)

Caland adjective in **i-Co-* etc. had been derived from an abstract or an adjective³².

As for Gr. Αἰθί-οψ (**h₂eǵid^hi-*), ἄργυ- (**h₂erǵi-*), Ved. *śiti-pád-* < **śviti-pád-* (**k̑ueǵiti-*), *kravyā́d-*, *á-kravi-hasta-* and *rudhi-krá-*, these are clearly Bahuvrīhi compounds of the type described above, with the “adjectival” first member better explained as a Caland *i*-abstract (one would think that the fact that the “adjective” ἄργυ- only appears in such a position favors that interpretation). The Vedic forms in *-it-* and *-ita-* (*harít-/hárita-*, *ásita-*, *rohít-/róhita-*) have been explained as hypostasized instrumental singular forms in *-t* made from abstract *i*-stems (Pinault 1980, Peters 1989, 214ff., Widmer 2005, 196f.) and thus deliver no proof of *i*-adjectives either.

The only “real” adjectives in Balles’ list (i.e. those that are actually used as adjectives in the respective daughter languages, as opposed to the examples above) are Ved. *hári-/Av. zāiri-* and Ved. *śuci-* (which I am going to discuss below) and Hitt. *harkiš*. Note that each of these “archaisms” fails to be attested in adjectival use in more than one branch of Indo-European. Hitt. *harkiš* “white” (a cognate of Gr. ἄργυ-) belongs to a class of Hittite *i*-adjectives which do actually show proterokinetic suffix ablaut. However, Rieken has argued that this was in fact an innovation introduced in analogy to the inherited suffix ablaut of the *u*-stems, from which the pattern acrostatic substantive: proterokinetic adjective spread to the Hittite *i*-stems (most of which actually go back to the Caland system). The fact that “für keines der hethitischen *i*-Adjektive das zugrundeliegende *i*-Abstraktum bezeugt ist” (Rieken 2005, 56) is explained as originating in a “polarization” process: Within the Caland system, *i*-abstracts were derived from (*C*)*o*-adjectives, and this pattern of “*i*-substantivization” still existed in Hittite to some extent (*āndara-* “blue” → *āntari-* “blueness; type of blue wool”³³). In Rieken’s account, once the derivational direction had become opaque, *i*-adjectives could be derived from substantivized neuter *o*-stems as well and introduced a seemingly proterokinetic inflection in analogy to the *u*-adjectives, thus “skipping” the intermediate stage of an *i*-abstract. However, the “polarization” suggested by her seems somewhat far-fetched. Alternatively, one could imagine that the respective Caland *i*-abstracts were reinterpreted as adjectives when used as noun characterizing appositions³⁴. A further strategy was suggested by Schindler, according to whom these adjectives are simply back-formations from compounds with the respective FMCs (I will come back to this question in chapter 4).

All of these strategies have their problems, but either way the variety of manifestations of the Anatolian “*i*-mutation” suggests that this innovation took place at some late Pre-Hittite stage, that is, the ingredients inherited from PIE were interpreted and innovated differently in the Anatolian languages showing the *i*-mutation phenomena³⁵. As for the so-called “*i*-mutation” itself, this has actually also been explained by a former presence of feminine **-ih₂-* stems in Anatolian and may therefore not belong here at all. Taken together, all this means that it is rather unlikely that Hittite adjectives of the type *harkiš* are as archaic as Balles claims them to be.

This picture is not substantially changed by Meißner’s re-evaluation of the evidence. Meißner argues that the first compound members in *-i-* found in Caland compounds should

³²Balles herself points at this in fn. 444.

³³Rieken 2005, 57.

³⁴In fact this is how Balles suggests to explain the adjectival meaning of Ved. *pūti-* “putrid”, which evidently goes back to a *ti*-abstract (Balles 2006, 276f.).

³⁵Cf. Rieken 2005, 62ff. for the development within the different Anatolian branches.

in fact be analyzed as adjectives, since there are few exact *Wortgleichungen* for abstracts in *-i-* in the individual languages and pairs like Lat. *ravus*: *ravis* etc. are “offenbar gänzlich andersgeartet” (Meißner 1998, 241), although he does not explain why. Even though Meißner is right in saying that Gr. ἀργυ- = Ved. ṛjī- is probably the only secure case of a Caland FMC attested in different IE branches, this is of no consequence since we are not, despite the title of his article, dealing with a “law”, but with a *system* of suppletion of a number of nominal suffixes, each of which with its own history within the individual IE languages, under conditions which are only beginning to be understood. Under such circumstances, comparison has to go further than merely being baffled by the lack of exact cognates³⁶. In addition, his arguments in favor of an analysis of the FMC as adjectives are not convincing. First, he argues that the exclusion of adjectives from the use as FMC only holds for denominal possessive adjectives (l.c., 242). But if Nussbaum’s (1976) analysis of the various Caland formations going back to a root noun holds, a denominative possessive adjective is exactly what we have in pairs such as Ved. *śukrá-*; *śúc-* etc., which was then in composition suppleted by an associated abstract *i*-stem (originally derived from an associated adjective in bare **-o-*, cf. 1.2.3. above). Furthermore, the supposed parallelism with *u*-adjectives acting as FMC in compounds like Lat. *acupediūs*, Gr. ὠκύπτερος, Ved. *āśupátvan-* etc. fails for the same reason; these forms are, following Schindler’s theories about IE nominal composition (1986, 1997), much better analyzed as *u*-abstracts. All in all, there is still no unambiguous evidence for PIE primary-looking *i*-adjectives, and I will therefore follow the traditional explanation of Caland FMCs as *i*-abstract nouns.

³⁶After all, we do not find many exact cognates in the sphere of nominal composition either, but no-one would doubt the existence of e.g. possessive compounds in PIE just because of this.

Chapter 2

Classifying the Vedic *i*-stems

2.1 Productive formations

2.1.1 *ti*-stems

Feminine *ti*-stems are one of the productive means of forming abstracts in Vedic: We find more than 80 of them occurring as simplex nouns (although often concretized). In the majority of cases, these stems have zero grade of the root and inflect according to the default *i*-stem pattern. As pointed out in 1.2.4. above, there may well be a connection between these stems and the derivational process **-o-* : **-i-*. This does not necessarily mean that the *ti*-class as such originated from this process, but we do find a number of cases in Vedic where an abstract *ti*-stem and a verbal adjective in *tá-* are found side by side displaying the same root ablaut:

ūtí- f. “help” : *°ūtá-*

pītí- f. “drink” : *pītá-*

matí- f. “thought” : *matá-* etc.

Synchronically, *ti*-abstracts show a predilection for occurring as second compound member (AiG II,2, 633): 40¹ of the attested 109 verbal abstracts in *-ti-* occur solely in this position. Of those attested as simplex nouns in the RV, 34 are also found as a SMC. The main bulk of these are determinative compounds or even ‘synthetic’ compounds (derived synchronically from verbal phrases), but there are also some Bahuvrīhis (e.g. *ákṣiti-*) and verbal governing compounds, with the verbal abstract in *-ti-* to be taken as if being a non-finite form of the underlying verb, as in RV VI,20,13d *idhmá-bhr̥ti-* “bringing firewood”². This type, of course, goes back to possessive compounds (< **“having the bringing of firewood”*, cf. Schindler 1986, 1997), and the accented FMC fits with the analysis of this compound as having originated as an inner-Indic Bahuvrīhi. At the level of PIE, however, the accent in possessive compounds had originally been on the SMC, since the FMC was “hyper-reduced”, i.e. had zero-grade in both the root and the suffix, see Schindler (1987, 345f.). Furthermore, in a number of cases the

¹A note on the numbers: Although I have tried to be as accurate as possible in counting and classifying the *i*-stems, there may be room for debate in a few cases, e.g. if a verbal abstract is found only in the SMC of a Bahuvrīhi compound without relation to a synchronically productive verbal root, the compound could be given as a simplex or segmented (*°X-ti-*) depending on the degree of synchronic opacity of the complex; cases like *citti-/cittí-* have been counted only once although one might also argue for two different entries, etc. This means that “absolute numbers”, especially relating to productive categories, may be debatable, although the possible range of variation is limited anyway (+/- 5 in the case of the *ti*-stems).

²Melanie Malzahn, in class.

compound in question seems to vacillate between the older possessive-compound semantics and the newer usage as determinative compound. For present purposes it will suffice to bear in mind that the productive *i*-formation found as a SMC of nominal compounds are verbal abstract *ti*-stems.

As for the accent, a number of *ti*-stems apparently preserve traces of the proterokinetic accent switch between the strong and the weak stem in doublets such as *cítiti-/cittí-* “thought”, *śákti-/śaktí-* “strength, power” etc., which differ with respect to the position of the accent they have generalized, cf. Kuiper (1942, 221), Schaffner (2001, 438ff.). Technically, these cases should be synchronically treated as two different stems, but I have subsumed them under the same entry since they most likely go back to the same lexical item.

A detailed study of the Rigvedic and post-Rigvedic *ti*-stems is Liebert (1949), who distinguishes primary from secondary *ti*-stems.

1. **Primary *ti*-stems** are made directly from the verbal root and are usually of the structure R(\emptyset)-*tí-*, having generalized the root grade and accent of the weak stem of the underlying PIE proterokinetic paradigm. About a fifth of the attested Rigvedic *ti*-stems have, however, generalized *e*-grade of the root. A number of the roots concerned end in a nasal or go back to roots ending in a laryngeal, but apart from that no (phonological) condition for the generalization of either R(\emptyset) or R(e) can be discerned.
2. **Secondary *ti*-stems** are inner-Indic formations made from substantives or suffixal verbal stems (cf. AiG II,2, 628f.; Liebert 1949, 175ff.), but this is a relatively small class (17 cases, not counting the numerals) in the Rigveda. These stems always have concrete and in some cases collective meaning, e.g. *aratí-* m “(collective of) spokes of a wheel” ← *ará-* m “spoke”, *vṛkátí-* m “(wolf-like) robber” ← *vṛka-* m “wolf”, etc.

Examples of secondary stems derived from verbal stems (instead of roots) are the reduplicated *ti*-stems (cf. AiG II,2, 629).

The suffix *-ti-* was furthermore used to derive decades from cardinal numbers, as in *saptá* “seven” → *saptatí-* “seventy” (AiG III, 369f.). This principle was inherited from PIE, the **-ti*-formations no doubt having had collective/abstract semantics, cf. *pán̄ca* “five” → *pañktí-* “group of five” (and not **“fifty”*). This is also implied by the Slavic cardinals which go back to precisely such *ti*-derivatives built to the inherited PIE cardinals, cf. OCS *šestŭ* “six” < **s(u)ek̑s-ti-* “sixty”. Rau (2009) accounts for this pattern by setting up original *to*-adjectives such as **pñk̑^u-tó-* ‘connected with 5 (vel sim.)’ (p. 140, fn. 7), from which **ti*-abstracts could be derived in the familiar way. These derivatives then came to be associated with the cardinals themselves at some later stage of PIE and became productive within the system of numerals of the individual languages, thus allowing the explanation of the peculiar phonological shape of Ved. *aśítí-* “eighty” as an Indo-Iranian development.

In the data section I will cite the relevant passages of Liebert’s study in problematic cases, but not for the synchronically clear R(\emptyset /e)-*tí*-formations.

2.1.2 *i*-formations to verbal roots: agent and action nouns1. “Simple” agent/action nouns: R(e/ø) -*i*-

A few of these forms are made from *set*-roots and found as second compound members of (synchronically) verbal governing compounds (cf. AiG II,2, 294ff.). The obvious explanation would be to postulate that this type goes back to right-headed VGC of the *vṛtra-hán*-type (the head being synchronically a verbal root), which in turn goes back to possessive compounds with a root noun in the head, cf. Schindler (1997, 537). We would then have to assume that the root allomorph in *-i-* that originated from regular sound change in the context *^oCH+C (thus before the endings of the N.sg, I.D.Abl.du., I.pl., D.Abl.pl. and L.pl.) was subsequently reanalyzed as *i*-stem, the *i* being interpreted as a morpheme of its own. This analysis is already implied by Debrunner (AiG II,2, 294ff.) in his discussion of this type. The forms for which this might hold are: ^o*gr̥bhi-* “seizing, grasping”, ^o*dhi-* m “placing, placement”, ^o*vyathi-* a “ambling, staggering”, *saní-* m “procurement, gain”, ^o*sthí-* f “standing”³. If the reflex of a root-final laryngeal was reanalyzed as a suffix in such formations, it may have provided the basis for the spread of the *-i-* to other compounds of the same type. But this is not a particularly smooth explanation. First, it runs counter to the tendency of laryngeal loss in second compound members⁴. Second, of the twenty forms of this type occurring solely as SMC, only the five cited above are without doubt *set*-roots, which may be considered too marginal to exert such influence on the type. On the other hand, ^o*dhi-* and ^o*sthí-* are derived from “high-profile roots” more likely to be the starting point for analogical levelling in other formations rather than the other way round. In both cases, we seem to find reflexes of mobile-accent root nouns: ^o*dhā-* < *^{dh}*eh₁-C* : ^o*dhi-* < *^{dh}*h₁-C*, *sthā-* ← *^{steh}*h₂-C*⁵ : ^o*sthí-* < *^{sth}*h₂-C*⁶. The paradigms may then have split into strong stem and weak stem continuants (cf. the case of *jáni-* and *gnā-*) after the vocalisation of laryngeals, as per Jamison (1988, 221), with the *-i-* reinterpreted as a suffix. But this scenario is still unsatisfactory because, as Jamison (l.c.) points out, it presupposes that there were *i*-stems in SMC that could provide the template for such a reinterpretation in the first place (but see below). Furthermore, Klingenschmitt (1980, 213f., fn.14) points out that laryngeal vocalization in such ablauting paradigms could hardly have taken place in Iranian at all (actually he thinks that in Iranian laryngeals became regularly vocalized only in the L.pl.) and that we nevertheless find Iranian cognates in *-i-*. As for Indic, it is certainly noteworthy that out of the 47 attestations of ^o*dhi-* in the Rigveda, there is, in fact, only one I.pl. and one L.pl. each (i.e. contexts in which ^o*dhi-* < *^{dh}*h₁-C* would have arisen by sound law), while ^o*sthí-* is attested only once in the N.sg.

Klingenschmitt’s first point of critique, on the other hand, the functional divergence between ^o*dhā-* and ^o*dhi-*, is not an insurmountable problem since such a development

³There are a number of other possible candidates: *granthí-* m “knot” ^o*mathi-* “robbing” and ^o*múri-* m “obstruction” may go back to roots ending in *-H*. ^o*vani-* “winning” may be analogous to *saní-* since the root *van* apparently shows a number of innovations in analogy to *san* (EWA II, 499). They may be relevant to the phenomenon, but since they provide rather insecure evidence, I will leave them aside.

⁴Although the conditioning factors of this phenomenon are far from clear.

⁵The aspirate was generalized throughout the paradigm from those cases where it was due to regular sound change, i.e. *^{sth}*h₂-V*, cf. EWA II, 766.

⁶This may also have been the regular outcome of *Th₂(C)#, cf. Mayrhofer 1986, 138f.

is often encountered with paradigm splits (especially if we have to assume that these reanalyzed root nouns were merged with other SMC in *i*).

This means that those forms in *-i-* as SMC which look like agent nouns associated with a synchronically productive verbal root may actually go back to two different sources: “compositional *i*”-compounds (see 2.1.6. below) and root nouns ending in laryngeals (like $^{\circ}grbhi-$) which, when the vocalization of laryngeals in the context $*H\#$ took place, were reinterpreted as *i*-stems taking the former as templates.

The second group synchronically associated with verbal roots are action nouns in *-i-* with parallels in a number of other IE languages. There are a few cases which seem to reflect the Greek type $\tau\rho\acute{o}\pi\iota\varsigma$ “keel”, that is, *i*-abstract nouns with *o*-grade of the root probably going back to *o/e*-acrostatic abstract nouns, see Schaffner (2001, 425 fn. 39), e.g. $\bar{a}j\acute{i}-$ m “race, contest” < $*h_2o\hat{g}-i-$, $\acute{r}am\hat{h}i-$ f “hurry” < $*h_1l\acute{o}/\acute{e}ng^{uh}-i-$ (NIL, 243), etc. These were often concretized in the individual languages (cf. Solmsen 1909, 157ff. for Greek). On the other hand, we find (original) abstracts with $R(\emptyset)$ and accented suffix, some of them only in infinitival use in the D.sg., e.g. $kr\acute{s}i-$ f “field, tillage” ($kr\acute{s}$ “plough”), $kr\acute{t}i-$ (m or f) “knife” ($kr\acute{t}$ “cut off”), inf. $dr\acute{s}áye$ ($dr\acute{s}$ “see”), etc. Since the Vedic *i*-stems generalized the (proterokinetic) full-grade suffix in the weak stem (see 2.4. below), suffixal ablaut alone cannot be decisive in determining the PIE connection of the latter type. $R(\emptyset)$ could in principle reflect the root grade of the weak stem of a proterokinetic paradigm or of both the strong and the weak stem of a hysterokinetic paradigm. A connection with the latter has been proposed by Schaffner, who compares the Vedic $R(\emptyset)i$ -abstracts to the Germanic masculine *i*-abstracts of the type OE *snide* “cut” etc. Since these apparently lack traces of $R(e)$ and show no signs of *grammatischer Wechsel* indicative of a proterokinetic paradigm, Schaffner (2001, 434f.) argues that this type could go back to hysterokinetic *i*-abstracts as found in Lat. *fidēs* “trust” (< $*-ē(i)$ with the N.sg. ending *-s* secondarily restituted). This is not objectionable as such, though slightly awkward because he then has to assume that the desinences of the Germanic stems were “nach dem häufigeren proterokinetischen Typ [...] normalisiert” (l.c.) since they apparently constitute no evidence for original hysterokinetic paradigms. This means that if it wasn’t for the lack of traces of $R(e)$ and *grammatischer Wechsel* in this type, one might as well assume underlying *proterokinetic* abstracts in the first place. The same goes for the Vedic $dr\acute{s}áye$ -type, although in this case the missing $R(e)$ may also be due to the influence of the *ti*-stems; as Pinault (1999-2000, 467) notes, we find a few cases of action nouns in both *-i-* and *-ti-* made from the same root, and he cites precisely $kr\acute{s}ti-$: $kr\acute{s}i-$ as example of this pattern (note also $^{\circ}dr\acute{s}ti-$: $dr\acute{s}áye$). The generalization of $R(\emptyset)$ may therefore be analogical, but since the “proterokinetic” suffix became productive in Vedic we still cannot determine which accent/ablaut-type is continued by these formations. We can assume that originally hysterokinetic *i*-stems would have adopted the “default” *i*-inflection judging by the development of $kav\acute{i}-$ ← $*kouH-\bar{e}(i)$. In principle, a Ved. N.sg. $*kav\acute{a}$ would be perfectly acceptable, and the lack of such a form could be explained assuming that hysterokinetic *i*-stems as such were remodelled after the proterokinetic (singular) paradigms. However, regarding the $dr\acute{s}áye$ -type, this line of argument would quickly become circular, and there is therefore

no secure evidence for determining the underlying PIE type.

2. -(C)ani-

The suffix *-ani-* was used to build agent/action nouns much like the group in simple *-i-* discussed above, e.g. *taráni-* a “advancing” (*tṝ* “conquer, cross over”) etc., but we find more formations made from the desiderative stem: *ruruksáni-* “wishing to break, destroy sth.”, *āśusúksáni-* a “striving to shine forth”, *siśāsáni-* “striving to win” etc., cf. AiG II,2, 207, § 96. There are about 20 stems of this type in the Rigveda.

These forms are apparently partly hypostases of infinitives in *-ani* (AiG II,2, 208) and *-sani* (AiG II,2, 924f.), which Stüber (2000) has traced back to locatives in **-en* made from abstract *s*-stems (and later recharacterized by “locatival” **-i*). Furthermore, a few formations show a suffix *-váni-* (derived from *-van-* ?), but this was a marginal group already in the Rigveda, cf. AiG II,2, 906 § 723.

3. Reduplicated verbal adjectives

The bulk of this type shows R(\emptyset), short-vowel reduplication and is synchronically associated with a reduplicated perfect stem. Of particular interest is a small subclass in which the reduplicated syllable has lengthened grade; the relevant forms are $^{\circ}$ -*cācali-* “moving”, *tātrpi-* “nourishing, strenghtening”, *tūtujī-/ tūtujī-* “attacking”, *dādhr̥ṣi-* “bold, courageous”, *yūyudhi-* “pugnacious”, *yūyuvi-* “fending off sby./sth.”, *vāvahi-* “moving/driving quickly”, *sāsahí-* “victorious”. This pattern shows that these formations, even if the principle was inherited, must be of Inner-Indic origin (cf. Barschel 1986, 307), since Avestan has only the short-vowel reduplicated type (e.g. *čaxraiiō* = Ved. *cákrayas*, see Tremblay 1998, 114). Synchronically, a third of the ca. 30 (simplex) formations corresponding to this type are accented on the reduplicated syllable, which Barschel explains as a general tendency towards barytone accent in *i*-stems⁷. He furthermore draws attention to a possible connection with certain Germanic (synchronically unreduplicated) verbal adjectives in *-i-* which also tend to show the same root grade as the weak stem of the corresponding preterit (< perfect, Barschel 1986, 307ff., AiG II,2, 294, Matzel 1990). If this connection holds, there can be no doubt that the Vedic type continues a formation in suffixal *-i-*⁸. A point in favor of this are *set*-forms like *táturi-* and *pápurī-* apparently continuing **R̥HV*, and especially the variation seen in *pápurī-*: *pápri-* (both meaning “giving generously”), which Kuiper traces back to (apparently optional) compositional laryngeal loss in the latter form (Kuiper 1961, 27). Taken together, this points to Indo-Iranian formations in suffixal *-i-* (because of the Avestan parallels) which became modestly productive in Indic before the specific developments of IIr. **H*.

The question remains whether this pattern can be traced back to PIE and thereby connected with Germanic or stems from independent developments in the two branches. Both Germanic and Indic show a close synchrony of the root grade of the verbal adjective and the corresponding weak perfect stem:

⁷Barschel 1986, 309f.

⁸The alternative would be analyzing the *-i-* as a laryngeal reflex originating from reduplicated (*set*) root nouns. Such formations were, if an Indo-European type at all, extremely marginal (cf. the few examples given by Schindler 1972b, 8). Note also the problem of compositional laryngeal loss which makes it unlikely that the starting point of this type of *-i-* formations was the vocalization of laryngeals. Furthermore, the idea of a laryngeal reflex (“*e*”) is already refuted in AiG II,2, 294.

Germanic		Vedic	
Verbal adjective	3.pl. pret.	Verbal adjective	Weak perf. stem
OHG <i>°bāri</i>	<i>bārun</i>	<i>babhrí-</i>	<i>babhr-</i>
OHG <i>nuzzi</i>	<i>nuzzun</i>	<i>tátrpi-</i>	<i>tātrp-</i>
OE <i>swice</i>	<i>swicon</i>	<i>cákri-</i>	<i>cakr-</i>

However, this table is strongly simplifying matters. For example, although tantalizing, OHG *°bāri-* and Ved. *babhrí-*, despite being both built to a perfect stem of **b^her* in the respective languages, can hardly be considered exact cognates. First, as Stefan Schaffner has pointed out to me (p.c.), Germanic *nominal* formations would be expected to retain their reduplication. One could argue that a correspondance as close as the one displayed between the verbal adjectives and their preterit stems might have entailed loss of (nominal) reduplication as well. But the picture is further complicated by the fact that Germanic “-*i*-adjectives” are in fact usually said to be a mixed class which continues both *°-(i)io-* formations, among them such with lengthened root grade (the equivalents of Vedic gerunds of the type *ādyā-* “edible”), and genuine *i*-adjectives (Matzel 1990, Heidermanns 1993, 61). But even if the bulk of these “-*i*-/*ja-*” verbal adjectives could be shown to go back to *°-(i)io-* stems, we still have to find an explanation for those that do not. This brings us back to the question of internally derived proterokinetic *i*-adjectives. I have argued so far that PIE did not have such formations. If the Germanic verbal adjectives in *i-* could be shown to display *grammatischen Wechsel* as compared to corresponding verbal abstracts, this would indicate that such a pattern did exist after all and furnished a template for the Germanic *i*-adjectives. As Stefan Schaffner (p.c.) has suggested to me, verbal abstracts associated with the verbal classes I-III might be a starting point for investigating this possibility, since in a few cases they have retained the *o*-grade of the root typical of the strong stem of acrostatic (abstract) nouns (see also Schaffner 2001, 425, fn. 39). Internally derived (proterokinetic ?) adjectives to these stems (“having X-ness”) might then have spread to other verbal stems originally not associated with *o/e*-acrostatic verbal abstracts. An investigation of the relevant Germanic forms is, however, way beyond the scope of this work. At any rate, even if this theory held for Germanic, it would shed little light on the Vedic reduplicated adjectives, since we would then have to admit that the two types do not go back to the same PIE formation, but adopted the root grade of the weak preterit/perfect stem independently. At this stage, the Germanic evidence offers potentially relevant parallels to be kept in mind when dealing with these forms, but in no way an explanation.

2.1.3 *u*-stems extended by an *i*-suffix

The clearest example of this type is Ved. *jívrī-* “frail, old”, which Pinault (1987-1988) has shown to go back to a *u*-adjective **ǵ₅rh₂-u-*, cf. the root **ǵ₅rh₂* “grow old”. This type of “extended” *u*-adjectives is known from other IE languages as well, cf. the Latin type *gravis*, Toch. A *ārki*/Toch. B *ārkwī* < **h₂erǵ-u+i-* (cf. Nussbaum 1976, 68), etc. The core of these formations was associated with the Caland system, but there is strong evidence that the *i*-extension did not take place before the IE languages had split up. For example, PIE **ǵ₅reh₂-*

u-*i*- would have given a Latin form **grāuis* (Nussbaum l.c.), so the short vowel of the root must have been generalized before the suffix *-i-* was added. Exactly the same goes for Ved. *jívrī-*: PIE **ǵ₂h₂-u-i-* would have resulted in Vedic **jūrvi-/*jīrvi-* (Nussbaum l.c., Pinault 1987-1988, 330), so the “*i*-extension” must have taken place after the development **R̥HV* → Ved. *i/uRV* vs. **R̥HC* → Ved. *ī/ūrC*.

This type is not exactly abundant in Vedic; apart from *jívrī-*, there are only five other comparable formations: *ghṛṣvi-* “cheerful”, *śíśvi-* a “growing” (in *súśíśvi-* a “growing well”, cf. *śíśu-* m “young one”) and the quasi-perfect participles *jágrvi-* “alert, awake” (*jar* “wake up”, pf. *jāgāra* “is awake”, EWA I, 574f.), *dādhrvi-* “able to support, take load” (*dhar* “hold, support, fix”, EWA I, 778f.) and *dīdivi-* (*dī* “shine”, pf. *dīdāya*). As Rau (1998) has noted, the latter in fact belong to a small inner-Vedic system “in which **u-*, **ūi-*, and **uan-* stems built to the perfect stem alternate with ‘normal’ perfect participles” (p. 144), and are thus quite close in morphological make-up and semantics to the formations discussed in 2.1.2.3. above.

Since this form of extension must have been Indic, I have grouped these items with other productive formations, although they can by no means be compared to the productivity of, for example, the *ti*-stems.

2.1.4 Formations in *-tāti-*

The suffix forms abstracts from adjectives (cf. *ariṣṭātāti-* “intactness”), which can be concretized (*ástatāti-* “homestead”), and in some cases seem to have collective meaning (*devātāti-* “group of gods”, not **“godliness”*), cf. AiG II,2, 621, § 464. There are nine formations of this type in the Rigveda. *-tāti-* is clearly related to the suffix *-tāt-* (both are restricted to Vedic Sanskrit).

2.1.5 Infinitives

I have restricted myself to infinitives going back to D.sg. forms of stems in *i-* and *ti-* (*drśáye* etc.) and have left out other potentially interesting formations, such as the infinitives in *-dhyai*, simply for reasons of space. I have distinguished cases in which the D.sg. of a widely attested *ti*-abstract or *i*-action noun is used as an infinitive (which is not, however, marked in the entry of the relevant paradigm) from cases where we only have a D.sg. in precisely this use. In the latter case, I have put the underlying stem in brackets, since we cannot be sure that it ever existed outside the infinitival formation.

2.1.6 Denominal (*vṛddhi-* and non-*vṛddhi-*) formations in *-i-*

Synchronically, *vṛddhi*-formations in *-i-* (e.g. *āgniveśi-* “descendant/relative of *Agniveśa*”, etc.) are largely restricted to patronymics and derived from **-o/Ved. -a*-thematic bases. We do, however, find occasional forms hinting at a broader usage, cf. Ved. *sārathi-* m “co-driver (of a chariot)”, derived from *sarátha-* a “driving the same chariot”. The type is Indo-Iranian (cf. Av. *māzdaiiasni-* ← *mazdaiiasna-* “follower of Mazda”, Tremblay 1998, 104ff.) and is also attested in Germanic⁹. The origin of *vṛddhi*-formations in general is likely to be connected to hypostases from athematic locative singular formations, as was suggested by Jochem Schindler. As elaborated below (2.4.), a certain number of PIE (monosyllabic) locatives had

⁹Schulze *apud* Specht (1935, 221).

lengthened grade. From such a locative hypostases could be formed via the suffix **-o-*, e.g. **pód-/péd-* “foot”, L.sg. **pēd* → **pēd-ó-* “at the bottom”, cf. Gr. *πηδόν* “end of an oar, oar blade”. On the other hand, we find locatives with R(e) and varying locative suffixes (**i*, **er*, **en* etc.). Hypostases from locatives of the type R(e)-*i* are, again according to Jochem Schindler and elaborated by Balles (1997), the base of the highly productive suffix **-(i)̄īo-*, which is continued by the Vedic gerunds in *-iya-*, for example. Furthermore, this suffix became productive in prepositional derivational compounds (*Ableitungskomposita*), e.g. **en salī* “in the water” → **en-salī-ó-* “being in the water” > Gr. *ἐνάλιος*. As Balles has argued, the original distribution of the suffix was monosyllabic **-īo-* in compounds vs. disyllabic **-īīo-* in uncompounded nouns, although this distribution has been blurred in the individual IE branches¹⁰.

On the other hand, we find evidence for PIE *ø*-suffix hypostases in formations like Ved. *rohít-* “red”, derived via *ø*-suffixation from an L.sg. in **-it* (Pinault 1980, 32, Widmer 2005, 197). We could now speculate that the Indo-Iranian *vṛddhi*-type in *-i-* goes back to hypostases of lengthened-grade locatives with zero suffix, to which locative **-i* was further added. This would, however, imply that the original (phonologically conditioned) distribution in the L.sg., R(*ē*)-*ø* vs. R(e)-*i*, was given up at some point and a mix of both types took place (which is, however, not a very problematic assumption). We furthermore find traces of nouns of appurtenance in *-i-* without *vṛddhi* in Vedic, which in this line of argument might point to the original state of affairs, e.g. *nīdī-* m “nest-mate” (< “belonging to the nest”, cf. *nīdā-* “nest”) and *sápti-* “steed” (< “belonging to a team of seven horses”, *saptá-* “seven”), AiG II,2, 304. A possible parallel from Greek might be the type *γάστρις* “glutton” ← *γαστήρ* “stomach”, displaying exactly the same “belonging/pertaining to X”-semantics (of course, the *vṛddhi* principle was alien to synchronic Greek word formation).

That *vṛddhi*-formations in *-i-* were originally made from athematic bases as well has also been argued by Nussbaum recently¹¹, Vedic examples being N.V.du. *mádhvī* (*mádhv-i-* ?) ← *mádhv-*, *nārī-* (/i- ?) “woman” ← *nár-* “man” and *°jāni-* “wife” ← **g^uenh₂* “woman”.

Taken together, we may be able to reconstruct the following original system of hypostases from locatives¹²:

R(e)- <i>i</i>	+ <i>ø</i>	Type Ved. <i>sápti-</i>	+ <i>-ó-</i>	Type Gr. <i>ἄλιος</i>
R(<i>ē</i>)- <i>ø</i>			+ <i>-ó-</i>	Type Gr. <i>πηδόν</i>

Forms of the structure R(*ē*)-*i* (that is, apparent *ø*-suffix hypostases from locatives in *-i* with R(*ē*)) could then point towards a secondary generalization of the L.sg. ending *-i* in other contexts (since there is as yet no evidence for a “hypostasizing *i*”).

This complex is furthermore connected to the problem of the “compositional *i*-suffix” found in a number of IE languages. Descriptively, we have an *i*-suffix supplanting an **o-* at the end of a second compound member. The commonly cited examples are Gr. *ἄναλις* “cowardly” (*ἀλα(ή)* “defense, protection”), Lat. *imberbis* “beardless” (*barba-* “beard”), Ved. *prátyardhi-*

¹⁰Gr. *ἐνάλιος*, for example, presupposes a disyllabic suffix. Greek has actually (apart from a few exceptions) generalized this allomorph in both simplex nouns and compounds, cf. Balles (1997, 154ff.)

¹¹Cf. Nussbaum (2009).

¹²I do not, of course, mean to imply that the examples given here directly reflect L.sg. hypostases but a morphological pattern that (probably) goes back to such.

“possessing half of sth.; equal” (*árdha*- “half”) etc. This pattern looks tantalizingly similar to the Caland suppletion discussed above (and in fact the comparison has been made already by Jacobsohn 1928, 57f., although hesistantly). Jacobsohn furthermore argues that this pattern originated in Bahuvrīhi compounds, but as a matter of fact, the standard formation of such compounds would make us expect a second compound member in **-o-* or **-to-*, as in Gr. ἄμβροτος “immortal”. In this kind of compound, however, the SMC cannot be identical to the simplex verbal adjective βροτός “mortal” < **mr̥-tó-*, since PIE did not have determinative compounds. Rather, as Martin Peters reminds me, it must reflect the substantivized neuter with the N.A.sg. **mr̥-tóm* “mortality” (the neuter of a PIE adjective could be substantivized and used as an abstract noun), thus giving a possessive compound **n̥-mr̥-tó-* “having no mortality”.

We can now put into perspective what has been said about SMC *ti*-abstracts (2.1.1.). PIE thematic adjectives in **(t)o-* formed abstracts mostly in the following two ways: 1) by substantivization of the thematic adjective, 2) by substantivization through substitution of *-o-* by *-i-*. Both possibilities concurred in possessive compounds, where both the *i-* and the *o-* abstracts could surface as second compound members. This accounts for the variation in the PIE poetic formula Gr. γλέος ἄφθιτον = Ved. *ákṣiti śrávas* (cf. Schulze 1933, 258, fn.3), and ἄναλις then may have the *i*-abstract of an **alk-ó-* “provided with ἄλκ-” as SMC.

However, the question remains if this “compositional *i*”-phenomenon can reasonably be connected to the *vṛddhi-*/non-*vṛddhi-i*-formations discussed above. Jochem Schindler apparently hinted at the possibility that a starting point for these first may have been prepositional government compounds going back to \emptyset -hypostases of preposition + locative in **-i* syntagma (exactly like the *Ableitungskomposita* described above, but with a \emptyset -suffix instead of “hypostasizing **-o-*”)¹³. Once again, this would result in a parallelism of **i- \emptyset* : **i-ó-* hypostases. The extension of this principle to Bahuvrīhi compounds would then have been a secondary development (*pace* Jacobsohn), maybe connected to the principle of “*i*-substantivization” of **-ó-*adjectives which may have been extended to Bahuvrīhi SMC under the influence of *Ableitungskomposita* in *-i*¹⁴.

Admittedly, this connection is still fairly sketchy but certainly merits attention. For the moment it may be best to distinguish between exocentric denominal *-i-* (Vedic *vṛddhi-* formations etc.) and “substantivizing” *-i-* (ὄκρις: ἄκρις, etc.) and be wary of possible overlappings between the two.

2.1.7 Substantive/adjective pairs with opposing accent

In four cases, we find a substantive that looks like a substantivization of the corresponding adjective, but with oxytone accent instead of the expected “substantivizing” retraction of the accent. These are *jūr̥ṇí-* f “glow, flame”: *jūr̥ṇi-* a “glowing”, *tūtují-* m “leader”: *tútují-* a “attacking”, *bhṛmí-* m or f “officiousness”: *bhṛ̥mi-* a “impatient, officious”, *vṛ̥ṣṇí-* m “ram”: *vṛ̥ṣṇi-* a “strong, ram-like”. Widmer interprets the last case as showing traces of the original difference

¹³Martin Peters, in class.

¹⁴That these two compound types interfered with each other’s morphology has to be assumed anyway, cf. the well-known example of the two possible interpretations of Gr. ἔνθεος 1. “having (a) god inside” (Bahuvrīhi), 2. “(being) with/in god” (prepositional governing compound). In PIE, these two types were morphologically differentiated to avoid such double readings, but this distinction appears to have become somewhat blurred in the different IE languages.

in accentuation found in neuter vs. gendered adjectives in PIE (cf. Widmer 2004, 153f.). As already mentioned above, the neuter stem of an adjective e.g. **pélh₁-u-*/*p_lh₁-éu-* “many” was probably acrostatic and accented on the root; since the neuter was highly susceptible to substantivization, a rule “oxytone adjective implies barytone (neuter) substantive” could have been generalized. On the other hand, *vṛṣṇi-* is actually suppleting the paradigm of *vṛṣan-* a “strong, manly” (in the n. N.A.sg.) and may therefore be suspected to have gotten its accent analogically (NIL, 723, fn. 10). We would then have to assume that Vedic had inherited an *i*-substantivization **ṛs-ní-* “manliness” vel sim. of an underlying adjective in **-nó-* (actually attested in YAv. *varəśna-* “male”).

This still leaves the other three cases to be explained, but if we assume that these *Ci*-stems are “*i*-nominalizations” (Weiss 1996, 205), the oxytone substantive should be older than the corresponding adjective (cf. also inherited *mi*-stems like *ūrmí-* m “wave”, *raśmí-* m “rein” etc., AiG II,2, 775). However, *tútuji-* clearly belongs to the formations discussed in 2.1.2.3. with primary (verbal) adjective usage, and *jūṛṇi-*/*jūrṇi-* and *bhṛmí-*/*bhṛmí-* have no certain outer-Indic cognates at all and are therefore not the best suspects for the preservation of an archaism. Thus it seems that this was not really a productive morphological pattern at all, but a coincidence of formations which acquired this peculiar accent opposition for different reasons.

2.2 Unproductive formations

2.2.1 Inherited forms

This group comprises the continuants of group 1.2.1. (*agní-*, *ávi-*, *páti-* etc.), but also formations which can only be traced back to Indo-Iranian and/or which can be connected to nominal formations in other IE languages but differ from these in their morphology, e.g. *aratní-* m “elbow”, YAv. *frārāθni-*°, but Gr. ὠλένη (EWA I, 109). I will not be able to discuss each of these in depth; in most cases I will restrict myself to citing the etymology, cognates and the relevant literature.

As will be noted, I have not cited any *ti*-stems here although there are a number of Vedic *ti*-abstracts that have clear cognates in other IE languages and can therefore be considered inherited formations (e.g. *dṛti-*, *pīti-*, *matí-*, etc.). But since *ti*-stems became extremely productive in Vedic, these cases are usually analyzable as having been formed from the zero-grade of a verbal root as well. I have therefore refrained from distinguishing between inherited and inner-Vedic *ti*-abstracts, but will cite relevant IE cognates in the respective entries.

Forms associated with the Caland system

Particularly interesting are inherited nominal formations of “Caland origin” and their interaction with synchronically productive formations, especially with regard to the question of PIE adjectives. Since the subject of my investigation has led me to concentrating on the second member of compounds, I cannot discuss the evidence of *i*-stems occurring solely as FMC of Caland Bahuvrīhis. In fact, the Caland system will only become important for my thesis if such FMCs are found in simplex use - and, of course, in those cases where they turn up as adjectives.

2.2.2 Possible loanwords

The question of the nature and extent of loanwords in the Rigveda is still hotly debated (cf. Das 1995, Kuiper 1995a), but we obviously have to assume that Old Indic, like any other language, had adopted new lexical items through the contact with other languages (Indo-European and Non-Indo-European) before its first attestation. Naturally, loanwords are expected to have been adapted to the phonological and morphological structure of the borrowing language to a certain extent, which in a number of cases may render the decision whether a particular lexeme is inherited or borrowed difficult. But, as Kuiper (1991) has argued in detail, strict linguistic criteria can in most cases decide whether an Indo-European origin is *possible* for a given word even if its meaning is unclear or “an Indo-European etymology does not seem to readily present itself” (Das 1995, 208). All in all, Kuiper lists 383 possible loanwords in the Rigveda (1991, 90ff.), which, as he points out himself, with all due caution probably make up little more than 5% of lexemes attested in the Rigveda (Kuiper 1991, 95f., see also Kuiper 1995b, 261 for a recalculation), which is a ridiculously small amount anyway¹⁵. In the case of the *i*-stems, there are few lexemes which may in fact reflect loans from other (most likely Dravidian or Munda) languages. I have included these in my database because the way loanwords are adapted to the inflectional system of the borrowing language might in theory give interesting insights into the synchronic rules of word formation in that language (that is, we do not expect loanwords to assume “archaisms” of the borrowing language). In the case of those few stems concerned, of course, all one can say is that they completely adapted to the default *i*-inflection. Of the items listed by Kuiper as possible loanwords, 34 are stems in *i*-: *āṇí-*, *oṇí-*, *karkarí-*, *kalí-*, *kāśí-*, *kīrí-*, *képi-*, *kriví-*, *krīdī-*, *khādī-*, *gandhāri-*, *cúmuri-*, *cedí-*, *jálpí-*, *turphāri-*, *turvīti-*, *tīkṣi-*, *dundubhí-*, *dhūni-*, *námuci-*, *paṇí-*, *pāṇí-*, *piśāci-*, *pīthi-*, *platí-*, *plāśí-*, *balí-*, *yayāti-*, *rají-*, *śakūni-*, *śakūnti-*, *śātri-*, *śalmalí-*, *sthiví-*.

Of the 410 *i*-stems I counted in the Rigveda, this is quite close to the percentage assumed by Kuiper for loanwords in the RV as such, i.e. 8,3%, and probably less because there are in fact Indo-European etymologies for a few of these items. Furthermore, cases like *dundubhí-* “kettle drum” and *karkarí-* “lute” may also be interpreted as “Indic” onomatopoeics (I have included possible onomatopoeics in my database since they too may be expected to conform to synchronically productive morphological rules in their inflection) in the sense that such formations often show cross-linguistic similarities without there necessarily being a direct connection (through inheritance or borrowing).

In the entries of these lexemes, I will therefore cite both the relevant passages in Kuiper (1991) and alternative explanations (if extant).

2.3 Forms left unconsidered

There are a number of formations with what might be called an “*i*-stem-look” to them which in fact may or have to be explained otherwise and which I have therefore not listed in my database. The first group comprises stems which may have inflectional endings of the *i*-

¹⁵It is therefore misleading to suggest that this number might be used as a claim “to prove the existence of a massive number of non-Aryan bearers of R̥gvedic culture” (Das 1995, 217), a statement which makes no sense anyway unless the term “Aryan” is used here to refer to ethnicity rather than the participation in the Vedic ritual, which is even more suspicious.

stems (i.e. the N.pl. °*ayas*, etc.) in some cases, but go back to and mainly reflect different IE formations. These are *ákṣi-*/*akṣi-* n “eye”, *sákthi-* n “thigh” and *hárdi-* n “heart”, which Beekes (1987) has explained as reflecting a N.sg. in **H* or having been modelled on a semantically close lexeme with such a N.sg. (such as *ásthi-* “bone”). Nussbaum (1986, 161) aptly calls this group “secondary heteroclitics” because like the “primary” heteroclitics they display different suffixes in the strong vs. the weak stem (*i/n*).

sákhi- m “companion” has already been mentioned (1.2.6.), *trí-* “three” is only inflected in the plural and goes back to a hysterokinetic paradigm¹⁶, *ví-* m “bird” has been shown to go back to an *o/e*-root noun by Schindler (1969).

I have, however, included items which go back to PIE non-*i*-stems but are, for different reasons, *i*-stems in Indic, e.g. *jáni-* “woman” < **g^uen-h₂* (cf. the entry below), etc.

Furthermore, there are a number of uncertain cases which are listed as *i*-stems in Grassmann’s dictionary (Grassmann ⁶1996) but which may be explained otherwise and have therefore been left out. These are

- *atasí-*: *atasṛ-* according to Mayrhofer (EWA I, 57) following Oldenberg. Unclear Hapax (attested only once in the G.pl. in VIII,3,13).
- *ághātí-*: “cymbal player”. An *in*-stem according to EWA I, 159 and AzI I, 131 (following Oldenberg). Kuiper lists this as a possible loan (1991, 19; 27).
- *krudhmí-*: “easily angered”, *krudh* “be(come) angry”, may also be an *in*-stem according to Mayrhofer (EWA I, 415). Hapax (VII,56,8).
- *kṣoṇí-*, *ṛ-*: “roar, lowing”. The *ṛ*-stem is clearly older (there is only one unequivocal *i*-form (X,22,9)), cf. EWA I, 438f.
- *jarbhári-*: Hapax in the peculiar hymn X,106,6 (*jarbhári*), EWA I, 579.
- *dvarí-*: Hapax (I,52,3) in the L.pl., might also be an *in*-stem, EWA I, 763f.
- *bhadraśóci-*: a “having glittering lights”, attested four times in the V.sg. This is better analyzed as analogical vocative of the *s*-stem *śocíṣ-*, created after the gendered *i*-stem vocative, cf. AiG III, 290.
- *mathí-*: “robber”, Hapax in the G.pl. (RV VIII,53,8: *mathínáam*), but both Oldenberg (1912, 120) and Geldner (1951, II, 376 ad 8d) read *matínám* and I have therefore restricted myself to citing the compound attestations (see the entry °**máthi-**).
- *maháye*: Hapax in RV X,65,3. In Grassmann ⁶1996, 1019 this is listed as an infinitive of *mah* or *maṁh*, but Lubotsky (1997, II, 1053), following AiG II,2, 298, groups this with the causative stem *mahay-* “glorify”.
- *vasávi-*: Hapax (L.sg. °*yām*, RV X,73,4), a feminine motion *āvi*-stem derived from *vásu-* “good(s)” according to AiG II,2, 415.
- *víci-*: Hapax in X,10,6 (*vícyā*), I.sg. of **vi-añc-* according to Mayrhofer (EWA II, 568) and Thieme (1995, 1043, fn.18); Oldenberg (1912, 206) hesitates between this analysis and a possible *i*-stem.

¹⁶Although it has to be said that there was probably no real distinction between protero- and hysterokinetic plurals in the late proto-language anyway, cf. 2.4.

- *vyáthi*-: “sway, staggering”, *vyath* “stagger, amble. Cf. the entry °*vyathi*- below.
- *śubhrí*-: Only attested in the L.pl. (I,29,1; V,34,8), maybe an *ín*-stem, cf. EWA II, 647.
- °*śrī*-: More likely °*śrī̃*- (except for V,60,8 °*ibhis*), EWA I, 458f.
- *śraúṣṭi*-: Only in VIII,48,2 *śraúṣṭīva* “like an obedient mare”, cf. EWA II, 672. This appears to be derived from an abstract **śraúṣṭi*- “obedience”, but since the *ti*-stem itself is not attested I have not included this form.
- *sádhi*-: “seat” (VIII,43,9: N.sg. °*iṣ*) is an *s*-stem, cf. EWA II, 694.
- *sániti*-: Hapax in the L.sg. in I,8,6, a *tu*-stem according to Mayrhofer (EWA II, 696f.) and Liebert (1949, 51f.).
- *sutakri*-: Unclear hapax in the V.sg. (VI,31,4), cf. EWA I, 610f. Oldenberg (1909, 388f.) suggests a segmentation *suta-kre*, the SMC could then be analysed as an “compositional *i*”-form of *krī* “buy”.
- *sūrmí*-: “tube”. The two attestations (I.sg. °*iyā* in VII,1,3 and A.sg. °*iyam* in VIII,69,12) are better interpreted as belonging to the same *ī*-stem, cf. EWA II, 742.
- *sr̥ṇí*-/*sr̥ṇi*-: “sickle”. All attestations reflect an *ī̃*-stem, cf. EWA II, 743f.
- *sváni*-: Attested twice in VI,46,14 (which might be a verbal form of *svan*) and IX,66,9. Schindler (1972b, 51) tentatively assumes a root noun for the latter attestation since “Wurzeln auf *-anⁱ/amⁱ* gewöhnlich kein Nact. bilden” (l.c.). Furthermore, the neuter gender would be quite exceptional (on neuters in *-i*- in general see Beekes 1987).
- °*hasti*-: Only in V,39,1 *ubhayaāhastí*, which may also belong to *hastín*- “having hands”, cf. Macdonell (1910, 214).

2.4 The *i*-stem paradigm

Before turning to the distribution of the suffix allomorphs, I am going to discuss the default shape of a Vedic *i*-stem paradigm, its origins and the varieties that are attested or might be expected in use.

The following table shows a summary of the relevant morphemes attested in the R̥gveda (the “default” forms are bold):

	Sg.			Du.			Pl.		
	m	f	n	m	f	n	m	f	n
N.	-i-s		-i	-ī			-ay-as		-ī, -i, -ī-ni
V.	-e						-y-as		
A.	-i-m						-ī-n	-ī-s	
I.	-inā , -yā	-yā, -ī, -i	-inā	-i-bhyām			-i-bhis		
D.	-ay-e , -y-e		-i-bhyas						
Abl.	-e-s , -y-as								
G.	-y-os			-īnām					
L.							-ā, -au		

The nominative and accusative reflect the zero-grade suffix and ending expected in both acrostatic and proterokinetic paradigms. Since we have seen above that we cannot assume that PIE had neuter acrostatic adjectives, the neuter set will have to be explained as an inner-Indic addition to the paradigm.

The instrumental ending we would expect in an acrostatic paradigm, $-ī < *i-h_1$, and $-i < *i\#\#\#$ with Kuiper’s Law, is only found in the feminine sg. In the masculine and neuter paradigms, the renewed ending $-inā$ has supplanted it already in the RV. This ending may have been created under the influence of the I.sg. of the pronominal paradigms, but it may also have been introduced in analogy to the $^o in$ -stems, with the nasal reanalyzed as part of the ending rather than the suffix, cf. AiG III, 148; Schmidt (1885, 92). In addition, we find a proterokinetic I.sg. in $-y-ā^{17}$, which partly overlapped with the newly introduced I.sg. $-y-ā$ of the feminine *devī*-type. However, while the former goes back to $*i-éh_1$, the latter continues $*i-h_2-éh_1$, and Sievers’ Law makes it possible to distinguish between the two in cases where the metre forces us to reconstruct disyllabic $-iyā$ after a light syllable (i.e. in a non-Sievers context).

The dative and genitive/ablative endings reflect proterokinetic $*-éi-ei$ and $*-éi-s$, respectively, but with the accent fixed on the root in most *i*-stem paradigms. As for the locative, it was already shown by Johannes Schmidt (1885) that the original ending was $-ā$, which goes back to PIE $*-ē(i)^{18}$. The lengthened grade was apparently caused by a synchronic rule of PIE which “upgraded” the suffix ablaut in the endingless L.sg. as compared to the suffix

¹⁷Since the evidence of the relevant IE languages seems to point to an I.sg. of the structure R(ø)-S(ø)-éh₁ in proterokinetic paradigms. Apparently, the accented (hysterokinetic) allomorph of the I.sg. ending was introduced very early into the proterokinetic inflection.

¹⁸Apparently, the glide could be optionally deleted in this position, cf. N.sg. Av. *kāuuā* < $*koyH-ē(i)$, but N.pl. *kāuuānas*, Ved. N.sg. *sākhā* < $*sok^s-h_2-ō(i)$, N.pl. *sākhāyas*.

ablaut in the other oblique cases in a given athematic paradigm, cf. Schmidt (1885, 308), Schindler (1994, 397), also Tremblay (2004). Formally, this seems to have worked like the Narten phenomenon described above, i.e. $\emptyset \rightarrow e$, $e \rightarrow \bar{e}$. This rule goes back to a PIE compensatory lengthening rule established by Jochem Schindler (1973, 153ff.) for monosyllabic forms, $*VRR\# > *\bar{V}R\#$, in the case of the L.sg. $*-e\bar{r}i+i > *-e\bar{r}i > *-\bar{e}i$. At some point this originally purely phonological process was apparently “morphologized” as a L.sg. marker.

The variant *-au* is a secondary introduction of the ending of the *u*-stem L.sg. to avoid hiatus in pausa and between vowels, cf. AiG III, 156.

The N.A.V. dual goes back to $*-ih_1$, which is expected for *i*-stems going back to acrostatic paradigms, but problematic for those reflecting proterokinetic *ti*-stems because we would expect the weak stem (and thus the *e*-grade suffix variant) to surface in the dual. However, Nussbaum argues that the fact that such proterokinetic duals do not surface anywhere in IE points to a rather early analogy¹⁹, and we can thus assume that both acrostatic and proterokinetic *i*-stems had the same suffix ablaut in the dual before they were merged into a single *i*-inflection in Indo-Iranian.

The G.L. dual seems to reflect $*-\bar{i}He/o\bar{u}s$, which can be explained by the syncretism of the genitive and locative dual in Indo-Iranian, leading to a contamination of the G. dual ending Iir. $*-H\bar{a}s$ with the locative particle *-u* that gave the diphthong underlying Ved. *-os*, cf. Malzahn (2000, 219)).

The N.V.pl. of the gendered stems continues proterokinetic $*-e\bar{i}-es$. Actually, a proterokinetic strong stem would be expected to have R(e)-S(\emptyset)-D, which, since there apparently was no zero-grade allomorph of the N.pl. ending in PIE, would have been identical with the “open inflection” variety $-y-as < *-\bar{i}-es$ in Vedic (on the root-grade see below). However, it seems that descriptively the proterokinetic stems switched to “hysterokinetic” (i.e. accented suffix in the strong stem, cf. $-áyas$, S(\emptyset) in the weak stem) so early that it does not really make sense to speak of a distinct “proterokinetic” plural inflection, cf. Nussbaum (1986, 281f.), Neri (2003, 63, esp. fn. 151: “è tuttavia pure possibile che la flessione proterodinamica esistesse originariamente solo al singolare.”).

The open-inflection variety ${}^o-y-as$ would be the expected innovated²⁰ N.pl. ending in originally acrostatic paradigms, but it seems that the full-grade suffix supplanted it rather early.

The A.pl. has the zero-grade suffix expected in an originally acrostatic paradigm, but this was shared with the proterokinetic type (and quite likely the hysterokinetic type as well) and is therefore not much of a clue. The A.pl.m. $-\bar{i}n$ evidently goes back to $*-\bar{i}n-s < *-\bar{i}m-s$, with the length to be explained in the same way as that found in the A.pl. of the masculine *a*-stems, viz. by a PIE development $*-Vms < *-\bar{V}m \rightarrow *-\bar{V}ms (> *-\bar{V}s)$. Since PIE originally did not correlate types of inflection with gender, we have to assume that this was the original ending of the feminine as well and that $-\bar{i}s$ once again reflects the influence of the *dev̄*-type, where the development $*-ih_2-ms \rightarrow *-imms \rightarrow *-\bar{i}s$ is the regular outcome of Lex Stang. A further possibility is the generalization of different morphologically conditioned A.pl. allomorphs

¹⁹Nussbaum (1986, 283).

²⁰At least, if there was a rigid distinction between the different accent-ablaut classes. In fact, what we would have to reconstruct for the N.pl. of an $-o/\acute{e}$ -acrostatic *i*-stem, assuming that this was a strong case, is R(\acute{o})- $\bar{i}-es$. There are, however, no traces of original *o*-grade of the root in the N.pl. of *i*-stems, and in Vedic in particular we do not expect to find any because the zero-grade suffix ${}^o\bar{i}V$ caused a closed root syllable, thus blocking Brugmann’s Law.

in analogy to the m. *a*- and f. *ā*-stems described by Neri (2003, 64, fn. 154).

The neuter ending $-\bar{i}/-i$ reflects the stem vowel plus the collective marker $*-h_2$ ($-i$ being the Kuiper variant); $-\bar{ini}$ is modelled on the n. N.A.pl. of the *a*-stem adjectives, cf. AiG III, 160f. In the rest of the paradigm we find the “acrostatic” zero-grade suffix, except for the genitive plural, which has been remade already in Proto-Indo-Iranian. The expected G.pl. ending $*(y)\bar{am}$ is found occasionally in Avestan, cf. AiG III, 161 for examples, and only once in Vedic ($r\bar{a}y\bar{a}m$, RV IX,108,13).

All in all, the Vedic *i*-stem paradigm seems to reflect a mix of the two most important *i*-formations that had been inherited from PIE: acrostatic *i*-stems and proterokinetic *ti*-stems, with the proterokinetic full-grade suffix dominating the weak stem of the sg. and the N.(V.) pl. This spread of proterokinetic suffix forms was apparently favored by the collapse of the original root pattern strong stem: *o*-grade, weak stem: *e*-grade in acrostatic paradigms and the predominance of the full-grade suffix in the *u*-stem paradigms, with which the *i*-stems were eventually synchronized.

There is also some evidence for paradigmatic levelling in the “opposite” direction in the I.sg. of some *ti*-stems which have S(\emptyset) instead of the expected hysterokinetic-looking desinence (cf. Ved. *svastí* and $\bar{u}t\bar{i}$ mentioned above). That this allomorphy existed in the I.sg. of *ti*-stems already in PIE is suggested by Latin denominatives of the type *festināre* “hurry” ← $*festino-$ “hasty” < $*-tih_1-no-$ (Vine 1999) and certain Greek adverbs which go back to “fossilized” instrumentals (e.g. $\delta\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}$ “namely, by name”²¹). These “acrostatic” allomorphs may partly be explained as the extension of a highly productive process to certain *ti*-stems, namely that of deriving denominative adjectives and verbs from I.sg. forms of the type $*-Vh_1$ ²². On the other hand, it seems that *ti*-abstracts derived from *to*-adjectives were acrostatic anyway²³ (as a consequence of the general pattern *o*-adjective → (acrostatic ?) *i*-substantive) and would thus be expected to have S(\emptyset) in their oblique cases. At any rate, this was a minor tendency compared to the spread of proterokinetic suffix ablaut in the oblique cases of Vedic *i*-stems.

²¹Martin Peters, in class.

²²Although a *lautgesetzliche* reduction of unstressed $*-i\bar{e}h_1-$ to $*-ih_1-$ in denominative adjectives and verbs is also possible.

²³Thus Nussbaum *apud* Peters (2002, 102).

Chapter 3

The Vedic data

3.1 The structure of the entries

To convey as much information as possible about the distribution of the suffixes of the Vedic *i*-stems, each entry consists of the respective case form, the part of the verse in which it occurs and the number of occurrences in this part of the verse within each of the ten books of the Ṛgveda, followed by the indication of the verse(s) in which the form is found. The following entry, for example, means: “The N.Sg. *rayís* is found twice in the first book of the Ṛgveda at the opening of an eight-syllable line, in 127,9 and 128,1.”

case	form	verse position	book	number of attestations	verse reference
N.Sg.	rayís	8/	1	2	127,9; 128,1;

The positions within the verse are indicated as follows:

12/	opening of a 12-syllable verse
12\	break of a 12-syllable verse
/12	cadence of a 12-syllable verse
/12-	cadence of a truncated 12-syllable verse
/12+	cadence of a 12-syllable verse with an additional syllable
8	position within an 8-syllable verse not clearly determinable

Since I am interested in potential variation in the suffix, the verse positions always refer to the metrical position of the desinence of a given word, that is, in cases where a form ends the break of a trimeter verse and begins its cadence, this will be rendered as “/x”. I am basing my analysis on the Rigveda edition by Van Nooten and Holland (1994); I will indicate the cases in which I deviate from their restitutions.

Furthermore, I have summarized books 2-7 as “F” (i.e. “family books”) because of the chronological and linguistic coherence of these books (and also in order to save space). Within the entries in this section I am using the old verse numbering system going back to Grassmann’s *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda* (Grassmann ⁶1996) for the same reason. Since I will use the book-hymn-verse-system when discussing a particular form and since concordances are readily available, this should not create too much confusion.

As the focus of this thesis is not primarily etymological in nature, I will not comment exhaustively on each lemma, but restrict myself to citing the relevant entries in Mayrhofer's *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen* (henceforth EWA) and other relevant literature. Synchronically productive formations will be cited with the verbal root they were built to. If there is a PIE etymology, I will also cite the reconstructed root given by EWA, which in most cases will be identical to the reconstructions found in LIV² and NIL (I will mark the cases in which the reconstructions deviate). In case the item is not explicitly mentioned by Mayrhofer, the EWA-entry referring to the verbal root will be given in brackets. Items which are only attested as the second compound member of a Bahuvrīhi-compound will be rendered as (a) “having, possessing (etc.) X”, since the adjectival value is connected to the SMC.

3.2 The data

aṁhatī- f “distress, plight”, a secondary *ti*-stem (see 2.1.1.2.), EWA I, 38; NIL, 301ff.; RIV-ELEX, 4.

N.Sg.	aṁhatís	/12	1	1	94,2;
		/8	8	1	684,9;
A.Sg.	aṁhatím	/8	8	2	676,2; 676,21;
D.Abl.Pl.	aṁhatíbhyas	11/	F	1	409,10;

agní- m “fire”, < *Hó/égni-, EWA I, 44f.; RIVELEX, 25ff. The etymology is uncertain and there are no verbal forms attested that might correspond to this root. Thieme (1995, 1020) unconvincingly reconstructs *ng-ni- (containing the root of Ved. *nagná-* “naked”), which is hard to believe from a semantic point of view. Compounds in the Rigveda with °agni- as their second member are: *iddhāgni-* “whose fire is kindled”, *jamādagni-* PN (EWA I, 571), *dīdyagni-* “having a bright fire”, *sāmiddhāgni-* “whose fire is kindled”, *svagní-* “having a good fire”, and the dvandvas *indrāgní-*, *palastijamadagní-* and *viśvāmitrajamadagní-*.

Of some interest is the derivation *agnāyī-* “wife of Agni”. In AiG II,2, 425 this is analyzed as a feminine *i*-motion subtype built mainly to masculine stems in *i*- and *u*- via the suffixes °*āyī-* / °*āvī-*. The explanation of the full grade in the suffix of the derivational base as stemming from an old L.sg. °*āyV* < **ēiV* is already quoted in AiG II,2, 416 (referring to Benfey) and has recently been confirmed by Remmer (2006, 101f.), who explains the type as originating in hypostases from locatives of *i*- and *u*-stems, respectively¹. Thus, the *agnāyī*-type preserves the original L.sg. suffix of the *i*-stems.

N.Sg.	agnís	12/	1	10	36,17-18; 112,17; 128,4; 128,7; 143,2; 143,5; 143,6; 157,1; 161,9;
			F	19	193,8; 236,2; 236,8; 237,1; 237,2; 237,4; 237,6; 237,9; 237,11; 260,3; 365,1; 365,4a,c; 398,15a-c; 414,7; 449,2; 566,2;
			8	6	632,9; 639,23; 643,13; 645,19; 659,6; 680,13;
			10	11	889,7; 891,1; 904,2; 926,6; 939,8; 941,2; 941,5a,c,d; 941,7; 976,5;

¹E.g. **Hegn-ēi* “at the fire; at Agni’s” → **Hegn-ēi-ih₂* “the (female) one who is at Agni’s/with Agni”. In fact, this was probably an inner-Indic rather than a PIE formation, but the suffix clearly goes back to **ih₂* which, whatever its origins, was to become the athematic feminine motion suffix found in the Vedic *devī*-inflection (on which see most recently Stüber 2007).

		/8	F	1	405,14;
			8	1	678,11;
			10	2	911,39; 916,13;
		/8-	8	1	712,2;
		8	1	1	188,11;
			F	2	305,4; 370,2;
			8	2	639,19; 1025,5;
			10	1	911,40;
	°agnis	12/	10	1	889,7;
		11/	F	1	391,2;
A.Sg.	agním	12/	1	9	35,1; 36,1; 36,2; 36,7; 112,1; 128,8; 143,4; 143,7; 161,3;
			F	20	193,1; 193,3; 216,1; 236,3; 236,4; 236,5 (= 966,6); 236,13; 236,14; 237,3; 237,5; 257,3; 260,2; 365,2; 365,4b,d; 449,4; 456,4; 456,7; 557,1; 560,1;
			8	8	643,20; 643,25; 669,17; 680,11; 680,12-15;
			10	13	837,3; 837,4; 861,3 (= 861,4-12); 889,9; 890,3; 917,6; 917,8; 918,2; 948,4; 952,5; 976,4b,c; 976,5;
		12-/	1	1	127,1;
		12\	1	1	139,1 ² ;
		/12	1	1	106,1;
			F	3	215,7; 260,1; 263,15;
			8	1	680,12;
			10	1	890,8;
		11/	1	13	58,7; 71,7; 72,4; 84,18; 96,1 (= 96,2-7); 113,9; 116,8; 146,1; 157,5; 164,46; 174,3; 181,9; 186,3;
			F	35	195,1; 195,3; 201,4; 201,6; 235,2-4; 235,11; 235,14; 251,4; 253,1; 254,1; 254,5 (= 927,1c); 263,5; 298,17; 298,19; 299,1; 302,8; 302,11 (= 357,4); 355,4; 355,7; 356,12; 397,7; 414,1; 442,3; 442,8; 457,46; 517,1; 517,2; 518,3; 519,1; 519,5; 526,3; 526,5; 558,6;
			8	1	668,6;
			10	20	827,5; 832,5; 833,3a,b; 833,5; 842,9; 871,6; 872,9; 887,9; 906,5a-c; 906,6a,b; 906,7; 914,3; 914,12-14; 927,1b;
		11\	F	3	
		11+\	F	1	451,1;
		/11	1	1	164,46;
			F	21	203,3; 243,9 (= 878,6); 257,2; 265,15; 297,19; 335,2; 335,4; 354,8; 358,3; 439,2; 448,1; 462,9; 490,2; 491,1; 522,4; 523,1; 555,5; 560,3; 594,3; 596,2; 615,4;
			10	8	833,3; 887,16; 894,9; 896,3; 914,8-10; 947,7;
		8/	1	15	1,1; 12,1; 12,7; 12,9; 14,3; 23,20 (= 835,6); 36,11a,d; 38,13; 44,3; 44,4; 44,8; 45,4; 136,6; 170,4;
			F	29	199,5; 232,19; 243,5; 244,6; 245,4; 246,3; 247,3; 261,2; 261,11; 261,12; 263,1; 360,1; 360,10; 363,3 (= 457,40); 368,1; 368,3; 368,5; 368,6; 371,1; 375,4; 376,2 (= 380,7); 379,4 (= 712,3); 379,9; 382,6 (= 680,12b); 455,2; 456,17; 457,48; 501,12; 532,3;

²Both Van Nooten/Holland (1994, 86) and Lubotsky (1997, 16) give *agním*, but this appears to be a misreading, as Müller's edition clearly has the expected short *-i*. The source of the error was probably Aufrecht's second edition (on which Van Nooten/Holland have based their text), where the accent has been printed rather oddly, giving the impression of an accented length.

		8	34	631,6 (= 967,3); 639,2; 639,4; 639,13; 643,2; 643,7; 643,22 (= 659,8; 669,2; 711,10); 651,14; 659,1a,b; 663,19; 663,24 (= 664,6); 663,25; 663,31; 664,1; 664,3; 664,7; 664,13; 664,15; 664,26; 680,12a,d; 680,14a,d; 680,15; 683,1; 683,6; 693,1; 711,4 (= 711,6; 711,6); 711,7; 711,22a,c; 712,1; 712,10;	
			10	9	846,2; 846,6-8; 847,1; 944,6; 962,1; 981,5; 982,1;
		8	1	1	27,1;
			F	4	247,5; 261,6; 379,1; 532,1;
			8	5	627,32; 631,9; 665,1; 682,8; 683,4;
			10	1	842,14;
V.Sg.	agne	12/	1	6	44,5; 44,10; 94,1 (= 91,2-14); 127,11; 144,7; 161,1;
			F	15	192,15; 192,16 (= 193,13); 193,2; 193,6; 236,6; 237,7; 237,10; 244,3; 262,5; 297,3; 400,2; 414,8; 449,5; 489,10; 532,9;
			8	2	639,9; 643,26;
			10	3	917,3; 948,6; 976,3;
		11/	1	7	58,8; 73,4; 76,5; 147,5; 189,1-3;
			F	60	200,2; 200,4; 200,6; 235,16; 235,22 (= 906,7d); 235,23 (= 239-241,11; 249,7; 256,5; 257,5); 248,3; 248,4; 249,5; 249,6; 253,3; 253,4; 254,2; 254,3; 256,2; 256,3; 257,2; 259,1; 259,4; 259,5; 262,4; 263,8; 291,5; 300,3; 300,12; 302,1; 306,3; 355,11; 357,7; 357,9; 358,9; 381,2; 382,3; 414,6; 442,13; 443,11 (= 455,6); 444,1; 445,6; 451,2; 451,5; 452,1; 452,2; 452,4; 454,1-3; 454,5; 454,6; 456,14; 456,15; 456,16; 456,19; 492,5; 501,3; 519,3; 525,5; 530,3; 533,1; 533,3; 559,3;
			10	10	827,2; 838,6; 905,5; 905,6; 906,7c; 913,5; 913,7; 913,21; 924,12; 954,6;
		8/	1	31	1,4; 1,6; 1,9; 12,3 (= 12,10; 15,4); 12,5; 12,12 (= 664,4; 847,8); 13,4; 14,7; 14,10; 14,11; 22,9; 26,2; 27,4; 36,5; 36,12; 44,1; 44,2 (= 631,2); 44,7; 44,9; 44,11; 45,6 (= 263,4); 45,8; 45,10; 75,2-5; 79,4; 79,6; 97,1; 105,13; 188,3;
			F	59	198,1; 198,4; 198,5; 244,2; 244,7; 245,9; 247,6; 250,6; 255,3; 258,1-5; 261,3; 261,10; 261,15; 262,1; 262,3; 262,6; 263,12; 303,2; 305,1; 361,9; 363,4 (= 443,9); 364,1; 367,1; 367,6; 370,5; 374,3; 375,1; 375,2; 376,4; 377,1; 377,4; 378,1; 379,3; 380,1; 380,3; 380,4; 380,6; 382,4; 405,1; 410,1; 443,1; 443,8; 443,10; 457,3; 457,9; 457,10; 457,16; 457,21; 457,33; 457,36-39; 457,43; 531,13;
			8	42	631,7; 639,29a,c; 643,6; 643,11; 643,28; 643,30; 659,3; 663,2; 663,12; 663,15; 663,16; 663,18; 663,23; 663,26; 663,27; 664,2; 664,5; 664,8; 664,11; 664,14; 664,22; 664,25; 664,29; 669,1; 669,3; 669,5; 669,7; 669,16; 669,18-20; 680,5; 680,6; 680,8; 683,7; 684,11; 684,13; 684,16; 693,9; 711,16; 711,18;
			9	5	778,19; 778,21; 779,23; 779,24; 779,26;
			10	9	847,6; 913,23; 944,1; 944,7; 966,1; 967,1; 982,4; 982,5; 1017,1;
		8-/	8	1	712,13;
		5	F	5	306,1; 306,4; 306,5; 306,7; 306,8;

agne	12/	1	25	31,1-7; 31,9-15; 31,17; 36,4; 36,6; 36,9; 58,4; 127,9; 139,7; 140,10; 140,11; 141,9; 144,6;	
		F	37	192,1; 192,2 (= 917,10); 192,3-14; 193,7; 193,9-12; 228,6; 243,2; 243,7; 297,1; 362,1-7; 365,5; 365,6; 405,8 (= 405,9-10); 449,6; 456,8; 456,9; 575,1;	
			8	1	668,14;
			10	11	837,5; 917,4; 917,7; 917,9; 917,11; 948,2; 948,7; 948,8; 966,4; 968,1; 968,2;
	12\	8	1	712,4;	
	/12	F	5	297,2; 365,3; 449,6; 489,4; 489,9;	
		8	1	643,29;	
		10	1	948,3;	
	11/	1	29	31,8; 31,16; 31,18; 58,6; 58,9; 59,1; 71,6; 71,10; 72,3; 72,7; 72,10 (= 298,20); 73,5; 73,7; 73,9; 73,10 (= 298,20); 76,1; 76,2; 94,16; 95,9; 95,11 (= 96,9); 140,13; 147,1; 147,4; 150,3; 164,11; 189,4-7;	
		F	146	194,3; 195,8; 226,15; 235,1; 235,20; 235,23 (= 239-241,11; 249,7; 256,5; 257,5); 238,11 (= 518,11); 240,2; 240,5; 240,7; 240,9; 241,10; 248,7; 249,2-4; 252,1-5; 253,2; 253,5; 255,1; 255,4; 288,21; 288,22; 289,2; 291,6; 295,6; 297,4; 297,5; 298,5; 298,9; 298,10; 298,13; 298,16; 299,6; 299,7; 299,13; 299,14; 299,16; 300,2; 300,4; 300,7; 300,15; 301,6; 301,14; 302,6; 302,9; 302,10; 307,1-3; 307,5; 308,1; 308,2; 308,5; 308,6 (= 952,8); 355,8; 355,9; 355,10b,d; 356,7; 356,8 (= 858,6); 356,11; 357,1; 357,6; 357,8; 357,11; 358,1; 358,4-8; 358,10; 358,11; 366,3; 366,4a,c; 366,6; 381,1; 381,3; 382,2; 397,6; 442,1; 442,7; 442,9-11; 442,13; 445,1; 445,8; 448,5; 450,7; 452,6; 453,6; 456,11; 456,12 (= 520,9); 458,8; 491,9; 501,2; 507,9; 517,3; 517,5; 517,7-9; 517,11; 517,13; 517,17-19; 517,21-24; 519,7; 519,10 (= 520,10); 520,7; 521,3; 521,5; 521,8; 521,9a,d; 523,2; 523,7 (= 524,7); 524,3; 524,5; 525,6; 526,4; 527,1; 527,3; 527,5; 529,2; 529,3; 530,2; 533,6; 534,22; 555,5; 558,2; 558,5; 559,5; 609,7; 609,8;	
			8	2	621,33; 631,10;
			10	51	828,7; 830,4; 830,6; 830,7; 832,7; 833,2; 833,4; 833,7; 834,6; 837,7; 837,8; 837,9 (= 838,9); 841,9; 841,10; 841,12; 842,1; 842,8; 846,10; 871,2; 871,11; 872,10; 877,3; 877,9; 895,3; 895,4; 895,6; 895,10; 896,1; 896,11; 913,6; 913,10-14; 913,17; 913,19; 913,20; 913,24; 913,25; 914,5; 917,15; 924,10; 924,11; 936,3; 941,9; 950,1; 954,1; 968,3; 968,5; 968,6;
	11\	F	1	517,20 (= 517,25);	
/11	1	6	60,5; 76,3; 140,12; 143,8; 147,2; 147,3 (= 300,13);		

			F	57	195,9; 200,3; 200,5; 235,1; 235,17; 238,1; 240,8; 248,5; 248,6; 251,2; 251,3; 251,5; 257,4; 288,3; 298,2; 298,6; 298,12; 298,14; 299,4-6; 299,9; 299,12; 299,15; 300,5; 300,10; 300,13; 307,4; 307,6; 308,4; 357,5; 366,5; 384,12; 384,13; 384,5; 397,15; 401,7; 442,7; 445,7; 446,4; 446,6; 446,7; 447,3; 448,3; 449,7; 451,6; 454,4; 501,2; 501,3; 518,1; 521,4; 521,6; 527,2; 528,3; 555,4; 620,10; 620,14;	
				10	16	827,7; 828,1; 830,1; 833,1; 842,5; 871,3; 871,9; 871,10; 877,1; 877,5; 877,7; 895,8; 913,4; 913,8; 913,16; 924,8;
		/11-		1	1	73,8;
		10/		1	1	67,6;
				8	1	639,33;
		/10	F	1		550,8;
		8/		1	19	1,7; 12,4 (= 74,7); 12,8; 13,1; 14,1; 14,8; 22,10; 23,24; 27,7; 36,19; 44,13; 45,1-2; 45,7; 74,9; 79,8; 79,9; 79,11; 150,1;
			F	31		196,8 (= 664,28); 244,1 (= 664,19); 247,7; 250,3; 250,5; 360,4; 360,5 (= 457,47); 361,10; 363,1; 363,7; 364,4; 367,4; 367,5; 372,5; 374,1; 374,2; 377,2; 380,5; 443,5; 457,1; 457,7; 457,12; 457,13; 457,27; 457,31; 457,45; 489,8; 492,13; 531,12; 532,5; 532,7;
				8	28	631,1; 639,15; 639,17 (= 663,30); 639,25; 639,26; 639,30; 643,14; 659,2; 663,3; 663,9; 663,10; 663,17; 663,28; 663,32; 663,33; 664,17; 664,18; 664,23; 664,24; 664,30; 669,11; 669,16; 680,4; 684,1; 711,1; 711,2; 711,20; 712,14;
				10	9	842,13; 845,3; 847,4; 847,7; 911,38; 913,22; 944,8; 982,2; 982,3;
		8-/		8	1	683,8;
		8		1	10	14,2; 19,1 (= 19,2-9); 23,23 (= 835,9); 26,10; 36,15; 74,8; 79,7; 97,4; 142,1; 142,4 (= 359,3);
			F	20		197,1; 197,2; 197,7; 262,2; 263,10; 360,7 (= 364,5); 360,8; 363,6 (= 639,28); 364,2; 364,3; 364,6; 364,7; 370,4; 382,5; 455,3; 457,25; 489,3; 489,7; 493,12; 531,7;
				8	10	631,3; 659,10; 663,13; 663,14; 663,20; 669,9; 680,1; 683,11; 684,10; 693,4;
				10	2	847,2; 967,6;
I.Sg.	agnínā	5	F	1		306,2;
		12/		1	1	36,18;
				8	1	655,1;
		11\		1	1	162,11;
			F	1		397,7;
		8/		1	2	1,3; 12,6;
		/8		8	1	663,14;
	°agninā	/8	F	1		296,18 (= 710,8);
				9	1	774,24 (= 777,25);
D.Sg.	agnáye	12/		8	1	643,15;
		12\	F	1		236,1;
		/12		1	3	127,10; 140,1; 143,1;
			F	1		449,1;
				8	2	639,5; 643,24;
				10	1	917,14;
		11/	F	5		366,1; 451,3; 521,1; 524,6; 529,1;
				10	1	906,7;

		11\	1	1	77,1;
			F	5	240,1; 301,1; 444,2; 519,7; 520,1;
		/11	F	1	578,2;
		8/	1	2	78,5; 127,4;
			F	3	244,5; 359,1; 359,11;
			10	1	1013,1;
		/8	1	3	74,1; 79,10; 127,10;
			F	9	247,1; 304,5; 361,1; 370,1; 379,7; 457,22; 489,1; 530,1; 531,4;
			8	6	639,22; 643,23; 663,11; 664,27; 712,6; 712,8;
			10	1	911,41;
G.Abl.Sg.	agnés	12/	1	3	36,20; 128,5; 143,3;
			F	3	216,3; 236,9; 260,6;
			10	4	862,12; 895,1; 895,2; 902,5;
		11/	1	1	24,2;
			F	6	249,1; 269,9; 269,10; 336,1; 522,2; 604,2;
			9	1	808,5;
			10	12	829,4; 832,1; 833,3; 842,7; 860,11; 877,2; 877,6; 877,8; 906,2; 906,4; 906,6; 956,4;
		/11	1	3	72,2; 115,1; 122,5;
			F	6	229,5; 297,7; 351,7; 356,10; 447,5; 507,10;
			10	1	1007,2;
		8/	1	2	44,12; 97,5;
			F	6	199,1; 199,6; 245,8; 311,5; 367,2; 405,2;
			8	5	626,7; 663,1; 664,20; 682,9; 684,7;
			9	1	734,2;
			10	2	888,5; 888,6;
L.Sg.	agná	/11	1	2	59,3; 124,1;
			F	1	391,5 (= 871,10);
		8/	F	2	455,1; 610,4;
			8	2	647,3; 681,15;
	agnaú	11/	F	5	207,1; 289,3; 293,5; 321,1; 481,3;
			10	1	914,7;
		/11	1	3	162,19; 189,8; 124,1;
			F	7	206,4; 264,2; 299,11 (= 914,2); 302,4 (= 493,17); 355,12; 452,5; 518,7;
			10	3	914,1; 991,4; 1005,3;
		/11-	10	1	832,3;
		8/	F	1	304,6;
N.A.Du.	agní	12/	F	1	500,3;
		11/	F	2	399,4; 501,1;
	°agní	12/	F	1	400,3;
			10	1	891,2;
		11/	F	2	551,1; 609,3;
			10	1	951,1;
		11+/ 8/	10	1	987,4;
			1	5	21,1-4 (21,3 = 5,86,2; 6,60,14); 139,9;
			F	4	246,4; 440,4; 501,4; 610,10;
			8	3	660,3; 660,4; 660,7;
V.Du.	°agnī	/12	10	1	993,4;
		11/	1	20	109,1; 108,1-3; 108,4 (= 7,93,6); 108,5-13; 109,2; 109,4; 109,5-8;
			F	2	609,1; 609,4;
			10	1	987,1;
		/11	8	1	1026,2;
		8/	1	3	15,11; 21,5; 21,6 (=7,94,8);
			F	28	246,1; 246,2; 246,5-9; 381,6; 440,1; 500,1; 500,2; 500,4-10; 501,7; 501,8; 501,9 (=8,38,7-9); 501,13; 501,15; 610,1-3; 610,7; 610,9;
			8	3	658,1 (=658,2; 658,3); 658,4 (=658,5; 658,6); 660,1;

I.D.Abl.Du.	°agníbhyaṁ	11/	1	1	109,3;			
			8	1	660,12;			
			10	2	942,9; 954,9;			
		8/	8	1	660,5;			
			/8	F	1	440,6;		
		G.L.Du.	°agn ₂ yós	8/	8	2	658,10; 660,8;	
					N.V.Pl.	12/	F	1
				8	8	1	623,20;	
					10	1	861,6;	
				/12	F	3	260,4; 341,5; 434,7;	
10	1				861,1;			
11/	1			2	59,1; 123,6;			
	F			4	218,2; 507,2; 517,4; 588,4;			
10	1			914,18;				
	11\			10	2	861,13; 872,7;		
/10	8	1	639,33;					
	8/	1	1	127,5;				
/8	F	2	360,6; 434,3;					
	1	2	50,3; 164,51;					
F	2	256,4; 434,6;						
	8	3	648,2; 663,4; 663,5;					
°agnáyas	/12	F	1	287,16;				
		8/	1	2	26,8a,c;			
	F	1	531,8;					
		8	1	639,7;				
	/8	1	1	26,7;				
		8	1	669,6;				
	°agnayas	12/	1	1	83,4;			
			/8	8	1	647,7;		
	A.Pl.	agnín	11/	F	1	517,14;		
				I.Pl.	11/	F	1	451,2;
11\	agníbhis	F	3	452,6; 453,6; 519,1;				
			/8	1	1	26,10;		
F	1	258,4;						
			8	3	638,9; 639,7; 669,1;			
10	1	967,6;						
			D.Abl.Pl.	11\	F	1	517,4;	
G.Pl.	agnínáam	11/	10	1	904,3;			
			L.Pl.	11\	1	1	108,4;	
F	1	517,22;						
			/8	F	1	360,6;		

°aṅgúri- f “finger”, Indo-Iranian, EWA I, 49.

N.Sg.	°aṅgurís	/12	F	1	350,4;
		/8	F	1	223,7;
V.Sg.	°aṅgure	/8	10	1	912,8;

añjí- a “anointing”, *añj* < **h₃eng^u* “anoint, embalm, oil”, EWA I, 54; RIVELEX, 90f. Compounds: *vṛṣadañjí-* “raining ointment”, *svédañjí-*, “having sweat as ointment, oiled with sweat”.

N.A.Sg.	añjí	11/	1	1	124,8;
			F	2	354,9; 573,3;
		8/	8	1	649,1;
N.Pl.	añjáyas	8	8	1	640,11;
		/12	1	1	166,10;
		11/	10	1	921,6;
11\	F	1	594,1;		
				V.Pl.	°añjayas

A.Pl.	añjín	11\	10	1	903,2;
I.Pl.	añjibhis	12/	1	1	64,4;
		/12	1	3	36,13; 85,3; 87,1;
			F	1	225,13;
		12-\	10	1	904,7;
		11/	1	1	113,14;
		/8	1	1	7,2;
			F	2	406,15; 410,1;
	°añjibhis	11/	10	1	893,6;
L.Pl.	añjíṣu	12/	F	1	407,4;
		12\	F	1	227,2;

átithi- m “guest”, EWA I, 57f.; RIVELEX, 99; NIL, 655, fn. 108. Pinault (1998a) proposes an etymology **h₂o-th₂-ti-*, that is, a *ti*-stem (abstract or agent noun) made from an *s*-mobile variety of **steh₂* “stand” and a preverb **h₂o* “exprimant la proximité” (Pinault 1998a, 469), the unexpected aspiration (instead of **áthiti-*) being explained as analogous to the regular outcome of the word as second compound member, cf. the Rigvedic (Bahuvrīhi-)PN *nípātithi-*, *mitrátithi-*, *médhátithi-*, *médhiyātithi-* (see Pinault 1998a, 453f. for the respective etymologies and a discussion of the Mitanni-Indic attestations).

N.Sg.	átithis	12\	F	1	193,8;
		/12	1	1	128,5;
			F	2	236,2; 336,5;
			8	1	639,8;
			10	1	917,2;
		11\	1	1	73,1;
			F	4	297,20; 355,9; 445,2; 558,4;
		/11	F	5	355,8; 357,5; 358,5; 524,4; 525,3;
		/8	F	2	372,1; 443,7;
			8	1	712,12;
	°atithis	12\(?)	1	1	36,10;
		/8	1	1	36,11;
V.Sg.	átithe	/8	8	1	683,7;
	°atithe	/8	8	2	621,30; 653,4;
A.Sg.	átithim	12\	F	1	362,2;
		/12	1	1	44,4;
			F	5	237,8; 260,2; 456,1; 456,4; 456,6;
			10	1	918,1;
		11\	F	2	298,7; 448,1;
			10	1	948,1;
		/11	1	2	58,6; 186,3;
			F	2	195,1; 519,5;
			10	2	827,5; 950,3;
		8/	1	1	127,8;
		/8	F	1	457,42;
			8	4	664,1; 683,1; 693,1; 712,10;
	°atithim	/12	1	1	36,17;
			8	1	1018,9;
		/8	8	2	622,40; 628,20;
		8	8	1	1018,9;
G.Abl.Sg.	°atithes	/8	9	1	755,3;
		8	10	1	859,7;
L.Sg.	°atithau	12/	8	1	1020,1;
		/12	8	1	1020,1;
A.Pl.	átithīn	/8	F	1	404,3;

átri- m name of a Ṛṣi, etym. unclear, EWA I, 59; RIVELEX, 108.

N.Sg.	átris	/12	1	1	139,9;		
		11/	F	2	394,8; 432,4;		
		/11	1	1	183,5;		
			F	1	394,6;		
A.Sg.	átrim	8/	F	4	361,10; 427,6; 427,7; 428,1;		
			8	1	662,5;		
		12/	10	1	976,5;		
		11/	1	2	116,8; 117,3;		
			F	1	491,10;		
			10	1	906,3;		
		/11	F	2	369,5; 587,5;		
		8/	F	1	199,5;		
			8	1	625,25;		
			10	2	969,1; 969,2;		
V.Sg.	atre	/11	F	1	394,7;		
D.Sg.	átraye	12/	1	1	51,3;		
		/12	1	3	112,7; 112,16; 119,6;		
			10	1	865,9;		
		11/	1	1	118,7;		
			F	1	584,5;		
		/11+	1	1	180,4;		
		/8	8	3	682,3; 682,7; 682,8;		
			10	1	969,3;		
		G.Abl.Sg.	átres	12/	8	1	655,19;
				12	8	1	656,7 (= 657,7);
11/	F			1	356,6;		
N.Pl.	átrayas	8/	F	1	394,9;		
		/8	F	4	376,4d,e; 393,5d,e;		
D.Abl.Pl.	átribhyas	8/	F	1	421,5;		
G.Pl.	átriṇām	12/	8	1	656,6;		
		8/	8	1	658,8;		

addhāti- m “seer, wise one”, cf. *addhā* “certain, known”, a secondary *ti*-stem (2.1.1.2), EWA I, 64; RIVELEX, 128.

N.Pl. addhātáyas 8/ 10 1 911,16;

ádri- m “stone”, EWA I, 65; RIVELEX, 133f. Since a segmentation *a-dr-i-* “unsplitting, unbreakable” (cf. *dṝ* “split”) is not unanimously accepted, I have treated this lexeme as a simplex.

N.Sg.	ádris	/12	10	1	902,2;
		/11	1	1	165,4;
			F	6	265,7; 399,7; 481,2; 538,1; 551,3; 584,4;
A.Sg.	ádrim	12/	1	1	51,3;
			8	1	669,16;
			10	1	939,4;
		11/	1	3	62,4; 71,2; 85,5;
			F	6	298,15; 299,11; 312,8; 314,6; 317,6; 458,5;
			10	2	854,9; 871,6;
		/11	1	4	61,7; 62,3 (= 894,11); 73,6; 88,3;
			F	8	235,1; 297,14; 297,15; 397,4; 399,1; 473,2; 480,2; 503,7;
			9	1	809,39;
			10	1	938,8;
I.Sg.	ádrinā	8/	F	1	406,9;
		8	1	1	7,3;
		12/	1	1	168,6;

G.Abl.Sg.	áдрес	11/	10	1	854,3;
		/11	1	3	93,6; 117,16; 118,3;
			F	5	265,6; 395,12; 522,2; 538,4; 595,4;
			9	1	799,8;
L.Sg.	áдрау	8/	1	1	139,10;
			10	1	846,7;
		/11	F	1	439,2;
			9	1	808,10;
N.A.Du.	áдрī	10/	1	1	70,4;
		11/	1	1	109,3;
N.Pl.	áдрayas		F	2	555,1; 558,1;
		12/	9	1	791,4;
			10	1	920,8;
		12\	8	1	624,13;
			10	2	904,6; 920,13;
		/12	F	2	207,5; 315,5;
			10	3	902,7; 920,11; 926,8;
		11/	F	1	266,16;
		11\	1	1	149,1;
			F	1	504,3;
			10	3	915,6; 920,14; 930,2;
		/8	F	3	275,2; 441,2; 489,5;
			8	4	1022,3; 672,2; 681,11; 697,3;
		V.Pl.	adrayas	12/	10
		/12	10	2	902,4; 902,8;
I.Pl.	áдрibhis	12/	9	3	783,3; 787,4; 798,23;
		12\	8	1	655,2;
		/12	1	3	130,2; 135,2; 135,5;
			F	4	227,1; 278,5; 287,10; 341,5;
			9	3	780,9; 792,5; 798,34;
		11\	1	1	121,8;
		/10	9	1	821,18;
		8/	9	1	775,13;
		/8	1	3	137,1; 137,3b,c;
			F	2	394,1; 440,6;
			8	4	621,17; 642,8; 658,3 (= 674,8); 691,5;
			9	13	723,5; 736,5; 738,5 (= 742,5; 744,2; 750,2; 751,6; 762,3); 746,3; 763,1; 777,8; 777,15; 778,29; 779,3; 813,3; 813,11; 819,1; 819,10;

ánaršani- m name of a demon, unclear, cf. EWA I, 123 for a discussion of possible Indic etymologies; RIVELEX, 178.

A.Sg. ánaršanim /8 8 1 652,2;

abhištī- m “patron, helper”, EWA I, 92f.; RIVELEX, 350f.; NIL, 236, fn. 2, 655, fn. 108. Both *abhištī-* and *abhīštī-* have been associated both with *as* “be” (${}^{\circ}sti-$ < ${}^{\circ}h_1s-ti-$) and *sthā* “stand” (${}^{\circ}sti-$ < ${}^{\circ}sth_2-ti-$, Mayrhofer l.c.). NIL opts for the connection with *sthā*, Liebert (1949, 33ff.) groups both lexemes together with *stī-* m “dependents, relatives”. Since there seems to be little agreement, I have opted for individual entries.

N.Sg. abhištis /11 F 1 268,4;
10 2 926,12; 930,10;
8/ 1 1 9,1;

abhiṣṭi- f “help, support”, EWA I, 92f.; RIVELEX, 349f.; RIVELEX, 350f.; NIL, 236, fn.2, 655, fn.108. Compounds: *svabhiṣṭi*³- a “granting good support”.

N.Sg.	°abhiṣṭís	/11	F	1	474,1;
A.Sg.	°abhiṣṭím	/12	1	1	51,2;
			8	1	639,32;
N.A.Sg.n.	°abhiṣṭí	/11	F	1	617,2;
D.Sg.	abhiṣṭaye	/12	F	1	225,14;
			8	1	710,1;
			10	2	875,4; 919,11;
		8/	8	1	677,5;
		/8	1	1	129,1;
			F	2	371,5; 392,3;
			8	6	628,17; 632,4; 647,13; 1019,1; 676,1; 676,10;
			10	2	835,4; 919,11;
L.Sg.	abhiṣṭau	/11	1	1	158,1;
			F	8	312,4; 312,9; 395,9; 474,5; 508,11; 535,8; 535,9;
			10	2	832,1; 887,22;
N.Pl.	abhiṣṭayas	/12	1	2	52,4; 119,8;
		/8	F	1	327,10;
			10	2	848,12;
	°abhiṣṭáyas	11/	1	1	173,9;
I.Pl.	abhiṣṭibhis	/12	1	1	129,9;
			8	2	623,2; 1022,5;
		/8	1	2	47,5; 129,9;
			F	2	342,2; 392,5;
			8	1	639,20;

amáti- f “apparition” (?), unclear, EWA I, 95f.; RIVELEX, 369.

N.Sg.	ámátis	/12	1	1	64,9;
		/11	1	1	73,2;
A.Sg.	ámátim	11\	F	4	272,8 (= 554,1); 399,2; 416,5; 423,1;
		/11	F	2	554,2; 561,3;

ámati- f “lack, distress, predicament”, EWA I, 95; RIVELEX, 368f. Mayrhofer proposes a segmentation *á-mati-* (cf. *matí-* f “thought”, *man*), thus a Bahuvrīhi “having no (fore)thought”, in which case the attestations would belong to the entry °*mati-* below.

N.Sg.	ámatis	12\	10	1	859,2;
		/12	10	1	865,6;
A.Sg.	ámatim	12\	1	1	53,4;
		/12	10	1	902,4;
		11\	F	3	242,2; 287,15; 307,6;
		/11	10	1	868,10;
		/8	8	1	638,11;
D.Sg.	ámataye	11\	F	1	517,19;
		/8	F	1	250,5;
G.Abl.Sg.	ámates	/12	F	1	390,3;
			8	1	675,14;
			10	1	869,3;

ambí-, ív- f “mother”, probably a nursery word, EWA I, 100; RIVELEX, 392.

A.Sg.	amb _i yam	/8	8	1	681,5;
N.Pl.	ambáyas	8/	1	1	23,16;

³May also belong to *abhiṣṭi-* above.

áyopāṣṭi- a “having claws of iron”, EWA I, 85f.; RIVELEX, 448f.; Oldenberg (1912, 315). Obviously a Bahuvrīhi made from *áyas-* “metal, iron” and some derivation of *apāṣṭhā-* “barb”, but the lack of aspiration of the dental is puzzling. Since nothing more concrete can be said on the shape of the SMC (“compositional *-i-*” ? Cf. 2.1.6), I have not segmented this compound further.

N.Sg. **áyo|_opāṣṭis** 11\ 10 1 925,8;

aráṇi-, ṛ^d- f “firewood”, to be segmented *ar-áṇi-* (see 2.1.2.2), **ṛ* “grind” < **h₂el_h1*, EWA I, 108; RIVELEX, 464f.

N.Sg.	aráṇī	/8	F	1	363,6;
N.A.Du.	aráṇī	/8-		10	1 1010,3;
G.L.Du.	aráṇ_iyos	11/	F	1	263,1;
G.L.Du.	aráṇyos	/11	F	1	517,1;
I.Pl.	aráṇibhis	12		1	1 129,5;
		12+		1	1 127,4;

araṇyānī-, ṛ^d- f spirit, goddess of the wilderness, cf. *áraṇa-* a “different, strange”, Lat. *alius*, Gr. ἄλλος etc., EWA I, 107f.; RIVELEX, 465.

N.Sg.	araṇyānís	8/		10	1	972,2;
		8		10	2	972,3; 972,5;
A.Sg.	araṇyānīm	8/		10	1	972,6;
V.Sg.	araṇyāni	8/		10	1	972,1;
		/8		10	1	972,1;
L.Sg.	araṇyānyám	8		10	1	972,4;

aratí- m “(collective of) spokes of a wheel”, *ará-* m “spoke”, a “secondary” *ti*-stem (cf. 2.1.1.2), EWA I, 108f.; RIVELEX, 465f.; Koch (2003, 354).

N.Sg.	aratís	12\	F	1	193,2;
		/12		1	1 128,6;
		11\		1	1 59,2;
				10	1 829,6;
		/11	F	5	195,2; 298,1; 444,5; 453,3; 508,8;
				10	5 829,1; 829,2; 829,7; 871,7; 887,20;
A.Sg.	aratím	/12		1	1 128,8;
			F	4	193,3; 297,1; 456,4; 532,1;
				8	2 639,1; 639,21;
		11/	F	1	334,4;
		11\	F	2	251,4; 526,3;
		/11		1	1 58,7;
			F	2	448,1; 490,2;
				10	1 872,4;
D.Sg.	aratáye	11\	F	1	521,1;
L.Sg.	arataú⁴	/11	F	1	356,1;

aratní- m “elbow”, YAv. *frāraθni-*^o, apparently going back to **Hol-en-*, but the derivational history is not entirely clear, EWA I, 109; RIVELEX, 466f.

⁴Thus Van Nooten/Holland (1994, 202), but see Oldenberg (1909, 312f.) for a discussion of other suggested readings (namely *aratnau* and *aratau*).

L.Sg.	aratnaú	11/	10	1	986,4;
N.Pl.	aratnáyas	/8	8	1	689,8;

arí- m “stranger”, EWA I, 111f.; RIVELEX, 476f.; Thieme (1938). Despite Thieme’s detailed study of the lexeme and its derivations and meanings in Vedic, possible non-Indo-Iranian connections remain doubtful. One of the less disputed possibilities appears to be Lat. *alius*, Gr. ἄλλος “other” first proposed by Specht (1944).

N.Sg.	arís	/12	9	1	791,3;
			10	1	865,5;
		11\	10	1	854,1;
		/11	F	1	580,3;
		8/	1	1	150,1;
			8	1	622,14;
		/8	1	2	4,6; 9,10;
			8	2	681,16; 1020,9;
A.Sg.	arím	/12	F	1	402,5;
		/8	F	1	199,2;
D.Sg.	aráye	11+\	F	1	454,5;
G.Abl.Sg.	aryás	12/	F	4	214,13; 408,12; 456,3 (= 941,5); 599,5;
			8	3	641,16; 644,22; 675,12;
			9	1	791,1;
			10	1	902,2;
		11/	1	6	33,3; 71,3; 118,9; 122,14; 169,6; 185,9;
			F	16	203,4; 203,5; 277,2; 298,18; 300,6; 325,1; 334,2; 346,11;
					356,12; 387,6; 465,4; 537,5; 537,9; 564,3; 584,2; 616,5;
			8	1	668,8;
			10	5	853,8; 853,19; 885,3; 942,6; 974,3;
		11\	F	3	316,3; 387,2; 524,1;
		/11	1	4	73,5; 116,6; 121,15; 184,1;
			F	14	214,15; 298,12; 312,19; 320,8; 388,9; 461,1; 466,7; 477,5;
					488,9; 492,2; 564,3; 572,22; 576,11; 608,4;
			10	3	853,8; 868,1; 915,3;
		/10	1	1	70,1;
			F	1	550,18;
		8/	1	2	81,6; 81,9;
			F	2	489,16; 547,5;
			8	4	621,4; 659,2; 672,7; 674,9;
			9	1	735,3;
			10	4	846,4; 912,1; 912,3; 959,3;
		/8	F	2	455,3; 486,33;
			9	1	773,11;
			10	1	1017,1;
		/8-	F	1	344,1;
		8	F	2	457,27c,d;
			8	3	639,36; 654,10; 669,12;

ariṣṭátāti- f “intactness”, *áriṣṭa-* a “intact”, EWA II, 461f.; RIVELEX, 482.

D.Sg.	ariṣṭátátaye	8	10	2	886,8 (= 886,9; 886,10); 923,7;
I.Pl.	ariṣṭátátibhis	8	10	1	963,4;

arcátri- a “singing”, *arc* < **h₁erk^u* “shine, gleam; sing, praise”, but the suffix is problematical, EWA I, 114f.; RIVELEX, 500f.

N.Pl.	arcátrayas	11/	F	1	507,10;
--------------	-------------------	-----	---	---	---------

arci- m “beacon, flame”, *arc* “shine, gleam; sing, praise” < **h₁erk^u*, EWA I, 114f.; RIVELEX, 502. Compounds: *svarcí-* “flaming well” (< “having a good flame, shine”).

N.Sg.	°arcís	/11	F	1	194,2;
N.Pl.	arcáyas	12\	10	1	966,1;
		/12	1	2	36,3; 36,20;
		11\	F	1	302,10;
		/8	1	2	44,12; 48,13;
			F	4	360,7; 363,5; 371,3; 379,8;
				8	2 664,4; 664,17;
				9	1 778,5;
I.Pl.	arcíbhīs	/8	F	2	433,8; 489,7;

°ardhi- a “half”, *árdha-* m “part, half”, EWA I, 119; Klingenschmitt (1980). Compounds: *prátyardhi-* a “possessing half of sth.” (a “compositional *-i-*”-stem, cf. 2.1.6).

N.Sg.	°ardhis	12/	10	1	827,5;
		8/	10	1	852,5;

arhariṣváni- a unclear, see EWA I, 124 for possible etymologies.

N.Sg.	arhariṣvánīs	/12	1	1	56,4;
--------------	---------------------	-----	---	---	-------

aváni- f “river, stream”, unclear, EWA I, 131; RIVELEX, 552. Compounds: *dásāvani-* a “having ten streams (?)”⁵.

N.Sg.	avánīs	11\	1	1	181,3;
		/8	1	1	4,10 (= 652,13);
A.Sg.	avánīm	12\	1	1	140,5;
		11\	F	1	315,6;
L.Sg.	avánā	/12	F	1	408,2;
N.Pl.	avánayas	11\	1	2	186,8; 190,7;
			F	1	439,6;
A.Pl.	avánīs	/12	F	2	204,7; 365,5;
		11\	10	1	925,4;
		/11	1	2	61,10; 62,10;
			F	2	502,3; 603,1;
D.Abl.Pl.	°avanibhyas	12/	10	1	920,7;

ávarti- f “shortcoming, need”, RIVELEX, 559, where the SMC is connected to *ṛtú-* “right time” and *ṛtá-* “true” (< **h₂er* “put together; fit”) following AiG II,2, 634, 667, also see the entry **nírṛti-**.

A.Sg.	ávartīm	11/	F	1	430,2;
		/11	1	1	118,3 (= 292,3);
I.Sg.	ávart_iyā	11/	F	1	314,13;

ávi- m “sheep”, < **h₂ó/éu-i-*, Gr. *ὄις*, Lat. *ovis* etc., EWA I, 135; RIVELEX, 568f.; NIL, 335ff. The “open inflection” of this word is restricted to the G.sg. *ávyas*, which in each of its 14 attestations in the RV is associated with a form of *vāra-* “(body) hair (of animals)”, the

⁵The compound is attested only in RV X,94,7a, where it is left untranslated by Geldner (III, 296 ad. 7a). Renou (1967, 151) suggests that it might be a term for part of the harness.

phrase referring to the sheep's wool used for straining in the preparation of Soma. This seems to point to a morphological archaism preserved in semi-formulaic expressions (since it would otherwise be difficult to explain why *ávi-* did not switch to the default open inflection like *áhi-* “snake” did, which closely resembles it in phonological structure and semantics). Compounds attested are *ajāví-* “goats and sheep”, *átyavi-* “(trickling/running) through the sheep's wool” (said of *sóma-*) and *tryávi-* “having a year and a half (= three periods of gestation)”. Note in particular the N.pl. *°aváyas* with full grade of the suffix instead of “open class” *-yas*. Since the N.pl. is only attested in the second compound member, one might suspect a case of ID, but this is unlikely for the following reasons: a) *ajāváyas* means precisely “goats and sheep” and is thus not a Bahuvr̥hi (were ID can be expected to show up synchronically), b) if the G.sg. is indeed an archaism with restricted use, we have no reason to assume that the rest of the paradigm did not generalize the default inflection including a N.pl. in *-áyas* in simplex as well as compound usage. In this case, even the parallel existence of a G.sg. **áves* would not be surprising.

N.Sg.	ávis	12\	9	1	790,1;
	<i>°avis</i>	/8	9	1	725,1;
A.Sg.	°avim	11\	F	1	289,14;
		/8	9	1	718,5 (= 757,5; 818,11);
G.Abl.Sg.	ávyas	12/	9	4	780,7; 786,9; 798,48; 820,5;
		8/	8	1	622,2;
			9	9	718,1; 719,6; 724,4; 728,8; 732,1; 740,1; 762,3; 775,10;
					813,16;
N.Pl.	<i>°aváyas</i>	/8	10	1	916,10;
I.Pl.	ávibhis	12\	9	2	798,11; 819,2;
		11\	9	1	803,2;
G.Pl.	ávīnām	10/	9	1	821,7;
	ávīnaam	/8	9	1	819,8;
			10	1	852,6;

aśáni- f “thunderbolt, arrowpoint”, **h₂ek̂* “be sharp”, cf. Ved. *°áśri-* “point, sharp edge”, *áśman-* m “rock, stone”, Gr. ἄζων etc., EWA I, 136; NIL, 287ff.; RIVELEX, 589.

N.Sg.	aśánis	/12	1	1	143,5;
			8	1	647,18;
		11/	10	1	913,5;
		/11	F	3	312,17; 447,5; 459,10;
		8	1	1	176,3;
A.Sg.	aśánim	12\	F	1	620,20;
		/12	1	1	54,4;
		/11	F	1	264,16;
		8/	F	1	620,25;
		/8	1	1	80,13;
I.Sg.	aśányā	11\	F	1	205,2;
I.Pl.	aśánibhis	11\	10	1	913,4;

aśīti- f “eighty”, cf. *aṣṭá-* “eight”, for the phonological difficulties of the *ti-* derivative see the discussion in EWA I, 137; RIVELEX, 593; Rau (2009).

I.Sg.	aśītyā	11/	F	1	209,6;
-------	---------------	-----	---	---	--------

°**ásri-** f “sharp edge, point”, < **h₂ó/ékri-*, the exact cognate of Gr. ὄχρις/ ἄχρις, EWA I, 138; NIL, 287ff. Occurs only as SMC in the Bahuvrīhi compounds *triráśri-* “having three edges”, *cáturaśri-* “having four edges” and *śatáśri-* “having a hundred edges”.

N.Sg.	° ásris	/11	1	1	152,2;
A.Sg.	° ásrim	11/	1	1	152,2;
		/11	F	2	318,2; 458,10;

°**aṣṭi-** (a) “having arrival, reaching”, *naś* “reach” < **H₍₂₎nek*, EWA I, 575; EWA II, 27f. Only in the Bahuvrī compound *jarádaṣṭi-* a “living long, reaching old age” (< **“having the reaching of old age”*).

N.Sg.	° aṣṭis	/11	10	1	911,36;
A.Sg.	° aṣṭim	/11	F	1	553,7;

así- f “sword”, < **h₂ṛsi-*, EWA I, 145; RIVELEX, 656. Thieme (1971, 2, 766ff.) connects this to Ved. *ásita-* “black”, Lat. *ēnsis* “sword” and Gr. ἄσις⁶ “mud” via an original meaning “the black one”. A further cognate may be found in Pal. *hašira-* “dagger”. The semantics and morphology of these formations point to the Caland system, but unfortunately we do not have any attestations of *así-* in compounds in the Rigveda.

N.Sg.	asís	11/	10	1	915,8;
		/11	10	1	905,6;
A.Sg.	asím	8/	10	1	912,18;
I.Sg.	asínā	11\	1	1	162,20;

ástatāti- f “homestead”, *ásta-* n. “home, place of return”, RIVELEX, 670; see 2.1.4.

A.Sg.	ástatātim	8/	F	1	361,6;
--------------	------------------	----	---	---	--------

áhi- m “snake” < **h₁ó/ég^{uh}i-*, YAv. *aži-*, Gr. ὄφις etc., EWA I, 156; RIVELEX, 736f.

N.Sg.	áhis	12/	F	2	222,6; 395,16 (= 550,17);
			9	1	798,44;
			10	2	890,4 (= 918,12); 892,11;
		11/	1	4	32,5; 32,8; 79,1; 186,5;
			F	5	490,14; 491,14; 516,14; 551,13; 554,5;
		/11	1	1	32,13;
		8/	10	1	919,5;
A.Sg.	áhim	12/	10	1	922,4;
		12\	10	1	939,8;
		/12	1	1	51,4;
			8	1	623,20;
		11/	1	3	32,1; 32,2; 103,2;
			F	14	203,3; 210,2; 266,11 (= 315,2; 471,4); 313,7; 315,3;
					318,5; 324,1 (= 893,12); 383,3; 384,6; 385,7; 386,2; 458,9;
					458,10; 461,2;

⁶But the Greek word is unlikely to be a cognate since PIE **h₂ṛsi-* should have given a Proto-Greek form **asi-* > **ahi-* (with loss of intervocalic *-s-*, cf. the Myc. *a-i-qe-u /ahi-k^weus/* “hypocoristic of **A(h)ι-φόνταξ* ‘he who kills with the sword’”, Ventris/Chadwick² 1973, 528 (I am grateful to J.L. García Ramón for drawing my attention to the Mycenaean evidence). As for ἄσις, an alternative etymology would be a connection with Lat. *sentīna*, Gr. ἀντλος “(dirty) water at the bottom of a ship” (< **snti-*), which would give ἄσις via regular sound change and is a semantically equally attractive solution (Martin Peters, in class).

		11\	F	4	206,1; 315,9; 513,3; 554,7;
		/11	1	1	103,7;
			F	4	203,11; 267,7; 383,2; 383,8;
		10/	F	1	202,5;
		/10	F	1	550,16;
		8/	1	2	80,13; 187,6;
			8	1	702,2;
		/8	1	1	80,1;
			10	1	959,2;
I.Sg.	áhinā	12\	10	1	939,3;
		11\	F	3	202,2; 313,1; 351,6;
D.Sg.	áhaye	11/	F	1	620,9;
		11	F	1	385,4;
			8	1	705,5;
G.Abl.Sg.	áhes	/12	1	1	52,10;
			10	1	874,1;
		11/	1	1	32,14;
		8/	8	1	702,12;
G.Pl.	áhīnām	/11	1	2	32,3; 32,4;

ágniveśi- m PN “descendant of *Agniveśa*”, cf. 2.1.6.

A.Sg. ágniveśim /11 F 1 388,9;

ājī- m “race, contest”, *aj* “drive, move forward, hurl” < **h₂eĝ*, apparently continuing *o*-grade of the root (**h₂oĝi-*, cf. the Gr. type τρῶπις), EWA I, 50f., 160.

A.Sg.	ājīm	12	10	1	928,12;
		11/	F	5	320,8; 337,8; 338,5; 395,4; 614,4;
		11-/	F	1	465,6;
		/11	1	1	179,3;
			F	3	316,3; 354,10; 516,2;
		8/	8	2	665,7; 1022,8;
			9	1	744,5;
G.Abl.Sg.	ājés	/11	F	1	337,11;
			10	1	928,5;
L.Sg.	ājá	12/	1	2	102,3; 102,10;
			F	1	599,2;
		11/	1	1	116,2;
		/11	1	1	63,6;
		8/	9	1	778,8;
	ājáu	12/	1	1	51,3;
			10	1	928,1;
		/12	1	1	112,10;
		/12-	10	1	901,9;
		/11	1	1	52,15;
			F	5	266,6; 287,24; 312,19; 460,3; 461,13;
			8	1	705,14;
			9	3	803,1; 809,13; 809,20;
			10	3	887,1; 887,8; 894,2;
		8/	1	1	176,5;
N.Pl.	ājáyas	/8	1	1	81,3;
			F	1	548,17;
A.Pl.	ājín	/11	F	1	476,2;
L.Pl.	ājīṣu	/12	1	1	130,8;
			F	2	225,3; 599,6;
		11/	4	1	313,9;
		/8	1	2	81,1; 130,8;
			F	1	389,7;

10 1 982,1;

āṅí- m bolt connecting the wheel to the axle, EWA I, 161f.; Koch (2003, 358); a possible loanword according to Kuiper (1991, 79ff.)

N.Sg. āṅís /11 F 1 397,8;
A.Sg. āṅím 11/ 1 1 35,6;
L.Sg. āṅaú /11 1 1 63,3;

ātí- f “duck”, EWA I, 163f. Mayrhofer reconstructs a proterokinetic *ti*-stem **h₂énh₂-ti-/h₂ṅh₂-téi-* to incorporate the evidence of Gr. νῆσσα, Lat. *anat-/anit-*, OHG *anut* etc.

N.Pl. ātáyas 11/ 10 1 921,9;

°ānaśí- a “reaching”, *naś* “reach, attain” < **H₍₂₎nek̂* (EWA II, 27f.). Only in *vyānaśí-* a “reaching, penetrating”, cf. 2.1.2.3.

N.Sg. °ānaśís 11/ F 1 283,3;
 12/ 9 2 798,5; 815,6;

āpí- f “ally, friend”, etym. unclear, EWA I, 168. Compounds: *ánāpi-* a “without friends, having no friends”, *devāpi-* m “friend of the gods”, *vātāpi-* m “friend of *Vāta*” (< “having the wind/ *Vāta* for a friend”, cf. EWA II, 542 on *vātāpya-*), *sumná(y)āpi-* a “united in friendship”, *svāpí-* a “having (a) good friend(s)”.

N.Sg.	āpís	12/ 8 1 623,1;		
		11/ 1 1 31,16;		
		F 5 285,6; 321,6; 462,8; 485,10; 604,6;		
		10 1 943,7;		
		/11 F 2 285,6; 313,17;		
		8/ 1 1 26,3;		
		F 1 486,17;		
		8 1 655,18;		
		°āpis 12/ 8 1 641,13;		
		10 1 865,6;		
V.Sg.	°āpe	11/ 10 2 924,5; 924,8;		
		11+/ 10 1 924,7;		
		/11 10 1 921,6;		
		11/ 10 2 924,2; 924,4;		
		8/ 1 1 187,8 (= 187,9; 187,10);		
		8 1 1022,5;		
		A.Sg.	āpím	/11 10 1 833,3;
				8/ 8 1 669,10;
		I.Sg.	°āpinā	11/ 10 1 924,6;
		D.Sg.	āpáye	11\ F 1 229,11 (= 524,6);
/8 1 1 26,3;				
G.Abl.Sg.	āpés	/11 F 2 218,17 (= 209,11; 220,7); 299,13;		
		10 1 909,6;		
N.A.Du.	āpí	11/ 10 1 932,4;		
		/11 F 1 337,2;		
V.Du.	°āpī	/11 F 1 337,7;		
N.Pl.	āpáyas	/12 1 1 110,2;		
		F 2 225,10; 407,2;		
		/11 F 1 220,4;		

A.Pl.	āpīn	/11	F	1	547,12;
I.Pl.	āpībhis	/8	8	1	1022,5;
L.Pl.	āpīṣu	11\	F	1	220,4;

iti- f < **h₁i-ti-* “the going”, *i* “go, walk” < **h₁ei₂*, EWA I, 102; NIL, 220ff. Compounds: *ádhīti-* f “memory”, *ápīti-* f “reaching”, *abhīti-* f “charge, attack”, *úditi-* f “sunrise/ sunset”, *úpeti-* f “advancement”, *ṛjīti-* a “glowing” (< *ṛji-iti-*⁷), *éti-* “arrival”, *dabhīti-* m “fraud, swindler” (< *dabhi-iti-*⁸), *dhunéti-* a “whose walk is thundering”, *páreti-* f “departure”, *prátīti-* f “approach”, *préti-* f “flight”, *sámiti-* f “assembly, meeting”.

N.Sg.	° itis	11/	1	1	76,1;		
			F	1	461,13;		
		/11	1	1	95,8;		
			F	1	337,4;		
			10	2	837,8; 1017,3;		
		8/	10	1	847,2;		
			11/	10	1	901,7;	
		V.Sg.	° ite	8/	6	1	516,12;
		A.Sg.	° itim	/12	1	1	112,23;
				11/	7	1	537,9;
D.Sg.	ityai ¹⁰	/11	1	1	33,4;		
			F	1	206,9; 456,11;		
		/8	10	1	992,4;		
			11/	1	2	113,6; 124,1;	
			° itaye	/12	1	1	204,9;
				10	1	939,9;	
			11/	F	1	467,6;	
			11\	F	1	535,4;	
			/8	1	1	36,20;	
				F	1	326,21;	
G.Abl.Sg.	° ites	/11	1	1	121,10;		
L.Sg.	° itā		F	1	206,4;		
		12/	8	1	712,11;		
		11/	F	1	557,4;		
		11\	1	2	108,12; 115,6;		
			F	4	416,8; 423,3; 522,7; 592,3;		
			/11	F	1	492,1;	
			8/	8	1	681,17;	
			° itau	/11	10	1	1004,2;
			11\	10	1	1004,2;	
			/11	F	1	252,1;	
N.Pl.	° itayas	/8	F	1	195,8;		
			10	1	923,6;		
A.Pl.	° itīs	/12	10	2	895,1; 917,4;		
		11/	F	1	346,2;		
I.Pl.	° itibhis	11/	F	1	224,3;		
		/11	9	1	804,6;		
		11/	10	1	905,7;		

⁷The first compound member is quite likely a direct cognate of Gr. ἀργί-, although the possibility remains that it is to be associated with *ṛjú-* “straight” (and thus with the root **h₃reǵ* rather than **h₂erǵ*) after all, cf. Nussbaum (1976, 11, 25f.), NIL, 226 fn. 26, 317.

⁸Cf. the Caland-system form *dabhrá-* a “small”, Nussbaum (1976, 7), see also EWA I, 696, NIL, 226, fn. 26.

⁹I am following Oldenberg (1912, 279) and Geldner (1951, III, 256) in assuming a N.sg.f. in agreement with *sindhū* in 7c (cf. Geldner’s translation “Geradeaus schießend, schimmernd, weiß, führt sie in ihrer Größe Stromschnellen und Staubwolken mit sich. Die unbeirrte Sindhu ...”, where *Sindhu* is the subject of the preceding clause; note also the rendering of the FMC as “straight” rather than “glowing” (which Oldenberg accepts)). Van Nooten/ Holland (1994, 520) reconstitute *ṛjīti- éni-* without commenting on the case (I.sg.?).

¹⁰Cf. NIL, 226, fn. 25.

(iṣī-) f, infinitive of *iṣ* “dispatch, drive, send” (EWA I, 271f.).

D.Sg. iṣāye 11\ F 1 493,15;

iṣṭāni- unclear, probably to be segmented *iṣ-tāni*-. The SMC would then belong to *tan* “stretch” (EWA I, 202), but a connection with (*s*)*tan* “sound, roar” is also possible (AiG II,2, 295).

N.Sg. iṣṭānis /12 1 1 127,6;
/8 1 1 127,6;

iṣṭī- f “drive, dispatch, wish”, *iṣ* “dispatch, drive, send” < **h₁e₂is(h₂)*, EWA I, 271f. Compounds: *áśvamīṣṭi*- a “wishing for horses; having a desire for horses”, *éṣṭi*- f “wish”, *krandādiṣṭi*- a “hurrying thunderously”, *gāvīṣṭi*- a “wishing for/desiring cattle”, *dīviṣṭi*-¹¹ f “wish for heaven”, *páva(s)iṣṭi*- a “desiring/ wishing for (small) livestock”, *vásya(s)iṣṭi*- f “the reaching of goods, blessings”.

N.Sg.	iṣṭís	/11	F	1	300,7;
V.Sg.	iṣṭe	/11	1	1	143,8;
			F	1	449,7;
	°iṣṭe	/8	F	1	197,2;
D.Sg.	iṣṭāye	/12	1	4	57,2; 112,1; 112,2; 129,4;
			F	2	398,4; 511,4;
			10	4	862,5; 875,9; 918,13; 941,4;
		11/	1	1	113,6;
		11\	1	1	113,5;
			F	1	608,3;
			9	1	809,42;
		/11	10	1	896,11;
		/8	1	1	30,12;
			F	2	426,3 (= 432,3; 658,4); 428,3;
	°iṣṭaye	/12	8	3	670,7; 695,2; 695,3;
			10	1	926,2;
		/8	1	2	25,4; 176,1;
			8	2	670,7; 684,11;
			9	1	820,10;
		8	9	1	778,15;
G.Abl.Sg.	iṣṭés	11/	1	1	125,3;
L.Sg.	iṣṭáú	12/	10	1	870,9;
		/11	1	1	148,3;
			F	3	219,7; 302,7; 452,3;
		/8	1	1	62,3;
	°iṣṭau	/11	1	1	91,23;
			F	4	281,4; 462,8; 472,3; 488,20;
			8	1	1026,3;
			10	1	928,2;
		/11-	10	1	887,23;
N.A.Du.	°iṣṭī	/11	1	1	180,4;
N.Pl.	iṣṭáyas	/12	1	1	145,1;
		11/	F	1	515,1;
	°iṣṭayas	/8	F	1	590,1;
L.Pl.	°iṣṭīṣu	/12	1	2	139,4; 141,6;
			F	1	417,5;
			8	1	644,5;

¹¹May also belong to *iṣṭi-/yaj* below, cf. EWA I, 726.

	9	1	788,2;
	10	1	973,2;
/8	1	5	36,8; 45,7; 48,9; 86,4; 139,4;
	F	4	305,3; 342,1; 343,1; 500,7;
	8	3	624,19; 685,9; 696,3;

īṣṭi- f “sacrifice”, *yaj* “offer, sacrifice” < **Hiaġ*, EWA II, 392f. Compounds: *bhandádiṣṭi-* a “rejoicing over the sacrifices” (cf. EWA II, 244f.), *sādhadiṣṭi-* a “making the sacrifice succeed”.

A.Sg.	īṣṭim	/11	1	1	166,14;
	°īṣṭim	/12	F	1	236,5;
I.Sg.	īṣṭyā	11\	10	1	995,2;
D.Sg.	°īṣṭaye	/8	F	1	441,1;
I.Pl.	°īṣṭibhis	/12	F	1	237,6;
L.Pl.	īṣṭiṣu	/12	10	1	973,2;

°ukti- f “utterance”, *vac* “speak” < **uekʷ*, OAv. *°uxti-*, EWA II, 489ff. Compounds: *áchaukti-* f “call, appeal”, *námasukti-* f “expression of admiration, reverence”, *satyókti-* f “expression of truth”.

N.Sg.	°uktis	12/	10	1	863,2;
A.Sg.	°uktim	/11	1	1	189,1;
			F	2	248,2; 397,9;
L.Sg.	°uktau	/11	F	2	395,26a,c;
I.Pl.	°uktibhis	/12	8	1	712,13;
		11\	1	2	61,3; 184,2;
		/8	8	1	624,6;

udārathí- a “steaming” (?), to be segmented *udāra-thí-* (cf. *udārá-* “rising” (?)), etym. unclear, EWA I, 216; Oldenberg (1909, 184); AiG II,2, 173.

N.Sg.	udārathís	/8	1	1	187,10;
--------------	------------------	----	---	---	---------

upabdí- m “noise”, cf. *upabdá-* m “noise” (< **-bd-ó-*, EWA II, 78), *pad* “fall, take a step”, EWA II, 76ff.; NIL, 526ff. See also 2.1.6 on “compositional *i*”-formations.

N.Sg.	upabdís	/11	1	1	169,7;
			9	1	800,5;
			10	1	887,9;
		8/	1	1	74,7;
I.Pl.	upabdíbhis	/12	10	1	920,4; 920,13;

°uṣṭi- f “shine”, *vas* “shine, become bright” < **h₂ues*, cf. Ved. *uṣás-*, Gr. ῥώς, Lat. *aurōra* etc., EWA II, 530; NIL, 357ff. Compounds: *viyuṣṭi-* f “lightening up”.

L.Sg.	°uṣṭau	12/	10	1	867,1;
		11/	F	2	384,13; 465,9;
		/11	1	2	118,11; 124,12 (= 505,6);
			F	6	249,2; 297,5; 310,4; 319,5; 335,3; 416,8; 585,5; 587,3;
			10	2	832,3; 925,1;
		8/	1	1	48,6;
L.Pl.	°uṣṭiṣu	/12	1	1	44,3;

	F	2	225,12; 341,2;
	8	2	640,15;
	10	4	861,1; 861,5; 902,1; 948,7;
/12-	10	1	903,5;
11/	1	1	171,5;
	F	1	254,1;
/8	1	1	44,4;
	9	1	810,11;
8	1	1	44,8;

úsri- “matutinal”, EWA I, 239; NIL, 357ff. To be connected with Ved. *uśás-*, Gr. ἠώς, Lat. *aurōra* “dawn” < amphikinetic **h₂e_us-ōs*. This *s*-stem may have been part of the Caland system, since we seem to find a (*C*)*o*-adjective (Ved. *usrá-*) as well as an *i*-abstract (in Gr. ἠϊ-καρός, Av. *ušī-*). However, Nussbaum (1976, 48f.) points out that the latter may also reflect a locative singular in *-i*. In any case, *úsri-* is one of the problematic cases where an *i*-stem derived from an *o*-stem (if *úsri-* ← *usrá-*) appears synchronically as an adjective rather than in the expected substantival use. We cannot even argue that this adjectival value somehow stems from the use of *úsri-* in compounds, because we do not find any in the Rigveda. In fact, *úsri-* occurs only twice in the N.pl. in RV IX,65,1a and IX,67,9a, in the verse *hinvánti súrám úsrayah* “Those of the early morning are speeding the sun”¹². Since this is exactly the meaning the N.pl. of *usrá-* would have, we may interpret *úsrayas* as an *Augenblicksbildung* to avoid the regular N.pl. *usrás*, which would have given a Gāyatrī with seven syllables instead of eight. The other alternative, the renewed *a*-stem N.pl. *-ásas* (which never occurs within the paradigm of *usrá-* in the Rigveda) would have given a cadence — — —, which would be highly marked compared to the default — ◡ — given by *úsrayas*.

N.Pl. úsrayas /8 9 1 777,1 (= 779,9);

ūtí- “help”, *av* “help, protect, encourage” < **h₁/₂e_uH*, EWA I, 134. Compounds: *ákṣitoti-* a “bringing unperishable help”, *áchidroti-* “giving safe protection”, *ánūti-* f “non-support”, *ántiyūti-* a “being close bringing/with help”, *itáūti-* a “helping, encouraging continuously”¹³, *urvīyūti-* “whose help is far-reaching”, *citróti-* a “bringing/ giving shining help”, *tvóti-* a “receiving your help”, *śatámūti-* a “bringing hundredfold help”, *śatóti-* a id., *sadyá(s)ūti-* a “whose help is near”, *sahásramūti-* a “bringing thousandfold help”, *sahásroti-* a id., *sūtí-* a “bringing good help”.

N.Sg.	ūtís	12/	F	1	575,4;	
		11/	1	2	63,6; 117,19;	
			F	1	466,1;	
		/11	F	1	225,15;	
		8/	F	1	486,14;	
	°ūtís	12/	1	2	52,2; 145,3;	
		/12	1	2	102,6; 130,8;	
			9	1	786,3;	
		/11	1	1	146,2;	
				F	3	456,1; 465,2; 584,3;
		8/	1	1	5,9;	
			9	1	774,14;	

¹²“Die morgendlichen treiben die Sonne zur Eile”, Geldner (1951, III, 50).

¹³According to Grassmann ⁶1996, 203, but see EWA I, 188 for different explanations.

N.A.Sg.	°ūti	/8	1	1	622,26;	
		/12	1	1	151,9;	
		/11	F	1	584,8;	
V.Sg.	°ūte		10	1	887,2;	
		/11	F	1	537,8;	
A.Sg.	ūtīm	8/	8	2	654,7; 666,3;	
		11/	10	1	930,5;	
I.Sg.	ūtī	8/	1	1	10,10;	
			8	1	634,6;	
		/11	F	2	313,16; 504,5;	
		8/	1	1	138,1;	
			8	1	708,8;	
		12/	1	1	64,13;	
			8	3	641,7; 675,14; 706,7;	
			10	1	890,1;	
		11/	1	2	136,7; 185,9;	
			F	1	470,6;	
	10	1	930,4;			
	11\	F	1	465,9;		
	/11	1	4	100,1 (= 100,2-15); 129,8; 158,1; 178,1;		
		F	28	202,13; 203,14; 208,8; 211,2; 259,5; 297,5; 319,2;		
				321,2; 325,1; 325,4; 330,9; 337,11; 339,4; 384,1;		
				397,10; 446,7; 451,5; 460,10; 464,3; 467,5; 470,5;		
				474,4; 535,11; 536,2; 541,1; 543,4; 553,5; 573,7;		
			9	1	809,38;	
			10	2	841,4; 861,13;	
		8/	1	2	136,6; 172,1;	
			F	5	327,1; 443,4; 486,17; 575,9; 575,10;	
			8	3	677,4; 680,5; 708,7;	
	°ūtī	11/	F	1	470,6;	
	ūt,yā	/8	1	1	135,5;	
			F	1	489,9;	
			8	1	638,7;	
			10	1	982,2;	
D.Sg.	ūtāye	12\	1	1	144,5;	
			F	1	362,1;	
			8	3	632,14; 641,2; 697,4;	
		/12	1	4	48,14; 56,4; 106,1; 106,6;	
			F	3	225,14; 400,3; 560,1;	
			8	1	1019,4;	
			10	6	869,1; 889,11; 890,8; 892,9; 927,9; 927,12;	
		11/	F	2	340,3; 462,9;	
		11\	F	2	248,2; 264,22 (= 265,22; 266,17; 268,11; 269,11;	
					270,11; 272,10; 273,9; 277,8; 282,5; 283,5; 284,5;	
					915,18; 930,11);	
				10	1	887,27;
		/11	1	2	35,1; 104,2;	
			F	1	542,5;	
		/11+	10	1	907,7;	
/8	1	11	4,1; 8,1; 9,9; 22,5; 23,3; 30,6; 30,7 (= 641,9); 36,13;			
			45,4; 105,17; 129,4; 130,9;			
		F	14	196,1; 223,8; 243,1; 261,6; 271,8; 328,2; 343,3; 359,3;		
				359,5; 364,6; 367,1; 371,1; 374,4; 610,5;		
		8	17	621,3 (= 635,12; 677,5); 621,4 (= 669,18); 625,4;		
				626,27; 626,44; 627,6; 632,15; 642,1; 652,4; 652,10;		
				654,6; 658,9; 665,17; 675,1; 677,1; 692,1; 701,7;		
		9	4	763,4; 774,7; 777,17; 778,4;		
		10	2	952,3; 952,7;		
G.Abl.Sg.	°ūtes	/8	8	1	622,22;	
N.A.Du.	°ūtī	/11	10	1	857,7;	
N.Pl.	ūtāyas	/12	1	7	51,2; 52,4; 52,5; 52,9; 84,20; 111,4; 119,2;	

			F	1	408,7;
		11/	1	1	100,7;
			F	1	465,3;
		11\	F	4	248,6; 477,3; 541,3; 542,4;
		/11	1	1	167,1;
		8/	1	1	8,9; 91,9;
		/8	1	2	11,3; 134,2;
			F	3	327,10; 485,6; 486,3;
			8	4	666,7; 667,1e,f; 675,12;
	° <i>ūtáyas</i>	8/	8	1	667,1 (= 667,2-18);
	° <i>ūtayas</i>	/12	8	1	623,15;
			9	1	788,5;
			10	1	904,2;
		8/	10	1	966,3;
		/8	F	1	419,5;
			9	1	778,14;
V.Pl.	° <i>ūtayas</i>	/12	F	1	408,15;
A.Pl.	<i>ūtís</i>	/12	1	1	119,8;
		11/	10	1	832,6;
		8/	1	1	130,5;
			8	1	625,23;
I.Pl.	<i>ūtíbhī</i> s	12\	1	1	112,1 (= 112,2-23);
			F	1	214,1;
		/12	1	5	39,9; 53,10; 79,7; 83,1; 129,5;
			F	2	222,3; 449,6;
			8	2	644,11 (= 670,13); 706,11;
			10	1	875,3;
		11/	F	4	287,21; 312,9; 396,8; 460,8;
		11\	F	9	202,19; 235,19 (= 265,18); 270,1; 337,10; 451,3; 535,3;
					540,4; 574,3; 600,3;
			8	1	668,15;
		/11	F	1	387,7;
		/8	1	8	7,4; 23,6; 30,8 (= 960,4); 30,8; 39,8; 46,15; 129,5;
					187,3;
			F	9	199,6; 327,3; 327,12; 327,13; 328,1; 328,5; 363,6 (= 639,28); 394,3 (= 633,33; 679,6); 485,3;
			8	16	625,24; 628,1; 628,18; 632,5 (= 657,1-6; 670,5; 960,3); 633,17; 633,24; 633,25; 639,30; 640,24; 642,16; 652,12; 1022,5; 1022,8; 676,16; 704,8; 711,15;
			9	3	716,5 (= 716,6); 764,5; 774,25;
L.Pl.	<i>ūtīṣu</i>	/8	8	1	640,15;

ūrmí- m “wave”, < **ul̥H-mi-*, EWA I, 245. Compounds: *átyūrmi-* a “overflowing”, *ánūrmi-* a “not faltering, staggering” (said of Indra, < *“(not rough (sea, lake etc).)), *ruśadūrmi-* a “having light waves”.

N.Sg.	<i>ūrmís</i>	12/	9	3	790,2; 792,5; 798,40;
		/12-	F	1	207,5;
		11/	F	1	354,1;
			10	1	974,5;
		/11	F	1	488,14;
			F	1	822,11;
		8/	F	1	267,13;
			8	2	634,10; 684,9;
			9	2	776,11; 820,5;
	° <i>ūrmis</i>	8/	9	1	729,3;
V.Sg.	° <i>ūrme</i>	/12	1	1	58,4;
A.Sg.	<i>ūrmím</i>	12/	9	1	798,8;
		12-/	8	1	1028,3;

		/12	F	1	354,11;
		11/	F	1	488,2;
			9	1	808,19;
			10	2	856,9; 949,2;
		11\	F	1	563,1;
			10	2	856,2; 856,3;
		/11	1	1	95,10;
			F	5	281,1; 353,2; 458,12; 482,2; 488,4;
			9	2	800,5; 808,7
			10	2	856,7; 856,8;
		8/	9	2	756,1; 761,1;
	° <i>ūrmim</i>	8/	8	1	644,22;
I.Sg.	<i>ūrmīnā</i>	/12	9	6	780,8; 786,5; 788,3; 798,13; 798,25; 819,15;
		/8	9	1	818,10;
	<i>ūrmīyā</i>	11\	1	1	184,2;
G.Abl.Sg.	<i>ūrmés</i>	8/	9	1	762,1;
L.Sg.	<i>ūrmā</i>	12/	9	1	797,10;
		8/	9	2	733,3; 751,4;
		8-/	9	1	724,3;
	<i>ūrmaú</i>	12/	9	2	784,7; 785,2;
		8/	1	1	27,6;
			9	1	726,1;
N.Pl.	<i>ūrmáyas</i>	/12	1	3	44,12; 52,7; 168,2;
			8	1	712,11;
			9	2	793,1; 798,2;
		11\	F	2	354,6; 485,20;
			9	1	807,3;
			10	1	894,1;
		/8	F	1	612,5;
			9	3	719,8; 745,1; 773,5;
A.Pl.	<i>ūrmín</i>	/11	F	1	315,5;
I.Pl.	<i>ūrmíbhis</i>	/12	F	1	502,2;
			10	1	890,9;
		11/	1	1	95,10;
		11\	F	2	267,2; 354,7;

°*rkti-* f “praise”, *arc* “shine, gleam; praise” < *(*h*₁)*erkʷ*, EWA I, 114f.; Liebert (1949, 29, esp. fn. 4). Compounds: *svrṛktí-* a/f “praiseworthy, (having) high praise”.

N.Sg.	° <i>rktís</i>	/11	1	1	153,2;
			F	3	452,5; 540,2; 613,9;
N.Sg.	° <i>rktím</i>	12/	1	1	64,1;
		11/	F	1	586,7 (= 587,6; 589,3);
		/11	F	9	195,1; 226,15; 295,5; 395,2; 451,1; 451,6; 524,3; 547,11; 552,2;
			8	1	705,10;
			10	4	856,1; 900,5; 906,7; 930,7;
		8/	F	1	610,4;
		/8	F	1	457,26;
I.Sg.	° <i>rktí</i>	/11	1	5	61,2; 61,4; 61,16; 184,5; 186,9;
			F	1	395,10;
N.Pl.	° <i>rktáyas</i>	/8	8	1	628,22;
I.Pl.	° <i>rktíbhis</i>	/12	1	2	52,1; 168,1;
			F	6	237,9; 285,1; 456,4; 502,2; 599,9; 612,1;
			8	1	698,7;
			10	3	867,1; 889,5; 890,4;
		11/	1	2	61,3; 62,1;
		8/	F	1	379,3;
		/8	F	1	296,12;
			8	2	628,3; 660,10;

ṛṣi- m “poet”, EWA I, 261; NIL, 584f. fn.1. Scarlata (1999, 527, fn. 729) tentatively suggests a connection with the root **h₁ers* “flow” (LIV², 241), which in turn may be connected to Vedic *ṛṣvā-* “high” via a semantic development “be full of juice” → “grow high” → “be high, exalted”. Ved. *ṛṣi-* would then be a substantivization (“exalted one”) of an adjective **ṛṣí-* “high, exalted”. Scarlata cites the Vedic compound *saptarṣí-* “The Seven Ṛṣis (also used as the designation of the stellar constellation *Ursa Maior*)” which shows the adjectival accentuation of the suffix. This is, however, the synchronically expected accentuation in a determinative compound¹⁴ and thus no proof of an underlying syntagma **saptá ṛṣáyas* implied by Scarlata. An underlying possessive compound¹⁵, on the other hand, would be expected to be accented on the FMC (cf. the only other compound in the RV which has *ṛṣi-* as second compound member, *śrutárṣi-* a “having famous Ṛṣis”). Apart from that, the semantic connection to the root **h₁ers* appears less than secure.

N.Sg.	ṛṣis	12\	1	1	106,6;	
		/12	1	1	31,1;	
			F	1	332,6;	
			8	1	1020,2;	
		11/	F	1	287,9;	
			8	1	629,10;	
			9	2	799,3; 808,6;	
			10	1	907,1;	
		11\	1	1	179,6;	
			F	2	322,1; 383,1;	
		/11	10	1	924,5;	
		10/	1	1	66,4;	
		8/	F	1	255,3;	
			8	3	623,14; 626,41; 688,1;	
			9	2	778,20; 819,7;	
			10	1	852,5;	
		/8	F	3	429,1; 455,2; 457,14;	
			8	6	624,20; 628,8; 628,15; 629,7; 636,7; 643,16;	
			9	1	747,4;	
			10	1	859,4;	
V.Sg.	ṛṣe	12/	8	1	643,24;	
		11/	F	1	413,8;	
			10	1	856,10;	
A.Sg.	ṛṣim	8/	9	1	826,2;	
		12/	F	1	408,7;	
		11/	1	2	117,3; 117,4;	
			F	3	277,5; 408,14; 604,4;	
			10	2	906,4; 933,6;	
		11\	F	1	549,13;	
			10	1	951,5;	
		/11	10	1	839,4;	
		/8	1	1	10,11;	
			9	1	766,1;	
D.Sg.	ṛṣim	11/	10	1	873,3;	
		ṛṣaye	11\	10	2	853,22; 899,7;
			8/	F	1	432,6;
G.Abl.Sg.	ṛṣes	/11	F	1	387,10;	
			10	1	849,7;	
N.Pl.	ṛṣayas	12/	9	1	798,4;	

¹⁴Cf. AiG II,1, 267ff.

¹⁵Which at any rate could only be assumed for the name of the stellar constellation (“having seven high/exalted ones”), not for the other synchronic meaning of the compound.

		12\	1	1	164,15;
			10	2	956,7; 976,4;
		11/	8	1	626,12;
		11+ /	F	1	338,8;
			10	1	908,4;
		11\	1	2	48,14; 162,7;
			F	2	346,1; 538,9;
			9	1	804,2;
			10	9	880,3; 899,11; 906,5; 924,9; 934,8; 934,11; 956,5; 956,6;
					941,9;
		/8	8	1	628,6;
			10	1	888,5; 916,7;
V.Pl.	°rṣáyas	11/	10	1	935,4;
	rṣayas	12\	F	1	287,10;
			10	1	888,4;
A.Pl.	ṛṣīn	8/	10	1	980,5;
	°rṣīn	11/	10	1	908,2;
I.Pl.	ṛṣibhis	12/	9	1	780,7;
		12\	8	1	623,4;
		11\	1	1	189,8;
			F	1	316,5;
			10	1	871,12;
		8/	9	1	779,31 (= 779,32);
		/8	1	2	1,2; 23,24;
			8	1	679,14;
D.Abl.Pl.	ṛṣibhyas	12\	10	1	840,15;
	rṣibhyas	12\	8	1	1028,6;
G.Pl.	ṛṣīnām	12\	9	1	815,3;
		11/	10	1	974,3;
		/11	F	6	475,1; 485,13; 544,2; 545,4; 586,4; 586,5;
			10	1	915,16;
		8/	9	1	774,17;
	ṛṣīnaam	8/	10	1	848,1;
		/8	F	2	419,6; 420,5;
L.Pl.	ṛṣīṣu	11\	10	1	897,3;

ṛṣṭī- f “spear”, YAv. *arṣti-*, probably a *ti-*derivative of *rṣ* “push, stab”, EWA I, 261. Compounds: *bhrājadṛṣṭi-* a “possessing gleaming spears”.

N.Sg.	rṣṭís	/11	1	2	167,3; 169,3;
A.Sg.	°rṣṭim	/11	F	1	507,11;
N.Pl.	rṣṭáyas	12/	F	1	411,6;
		12\	F	1	408,11;
		/12	1	1	64,4;
		/8	F	1	571,2;
			8	2	640,11; 648,5;
	°rṣṭayas	/12	1	4	31,1; 64,11; 87,3; 168,4;
			F	1	409,1;
			10	1	904,7;
V.Pl.	°rṣṭayas	/12	F	1	225,5;
A.Pl.	rṣṭís	8/	F	1	406,6;
I.Pl.	rṣṭíbhīḥ	/12	1	2	64,8; 85,4;
			F	1	227,2;
		11\	10	1	913,7;
		/8	1	1	37,2;
			10	1	913,23;
L.Pl.	rṣṭíṣu	/12	1	1	166,4;

oṅí- m “arm”, unclear, EWA I, 279; listed as a possible loanword in Kuiper (1991, 91). Compounds: *dásoṅi-* a “having ten arms”.

A.Sg.	oṅím	/11	1	1	61,14;
	°oṅim	/11	F	1	461,8;
				10	1 922,12;
D.Sg.	°oṅaye	11/	F	1	461,4;
G.L.Du.	oṅ _i yòs	/8	9	3	728,1; 777,11; 813,14;

óṣadhi- f a medicinal plant, unclear, EWA I, 282.

N.Sg.	óṣadhis	/12	1	1	166,5;
V.Sg.	óṣadhe	/8	1	1	187,10;
				10	1 923,23;
A.Sg.	óṣadhim	/8	10	2	911,3; 971,1;
N.Pl.	óṣadhayas	8/	10	1	923,22;
		/8	10	1	843,14;
		8	10	1	923,17;

kapí- m “monkey”, unclear, EWA I, 300f. Compounds: *vṛṣákapi-* m “male, manly ape”.

N.Sg.	kapís	/8	10	1	912,5;
	°kapis	/8	10	3	912,1; 912,3; 912,18;
V.Sg.	°kape	/8	10	3	912,20-22;
A.Sg.	°kapim	/8	10	2	912,4; 912,8;
G.Abl.Sg.	°kapes	8/	10	1	912,2;
		8	10	1	912,12;

karkarí- f “lute”, probably an onomatopoeic, EWA I, 313f., whereas Kuiper (1991, 19f., 91) lists this as a possible loanword.

N.Sg.	karkarís	/12	F	1	234,3;
--------------	-----------------	-----	---	---	--------

kalí- m PN, unclear, EWA I, 323; Kuiper (1991, 19f., 91).

A.Sg.	kalím	12/	1	1	112,15;
G.Abl.Sg.	kalés	12/	10	1	865,8;
V.Pl.	kálayas	8/	8	1	675,15;

kavā́rí- a “humiliating”. Mayrhofer (EWA I, 328f.), following Hoffmann (AzI II, 411ff.) assumes a compound made from an extinct present stem **kava-* “humiliate” and *arí-* “stranger” (cf. the type *Trasádasyu-* PN “making the enemy tremble”). Pinault (1999-2000), however, argues in favor of analyzing the SMC as an agent noun **h₂r-i-* made from the root **h₂er* “take, acquire” (LIV², 270f.), which, according zu him, may also be found in Ved. *sū́rī-* (on which see below). Since no *communis opinio* appears to exist, I have treated *kavā́rí-* as a simplex.

D.Abl.Pl.	kavā́ribhyas	11/	10	1	933,3;
------------------	---------------------	-----	----	---	--------

kaví- m “seer, wise one”, < **kouH-ē(i)*, Av. *kauuaiti-* etc., quite likely derived from the root underlying Ved. *kav* “intend to” (Lat. *caveō* “I am careful”, Gr. *κοέω* “notice” etc.), EWA I, 328f., see also 1.2.5. above. I cannot agree with Tremblay (1998, 2003), who reconstructs an “anaki-

netic” paradigm **kouh-2-ōi*, G.sg. *kóu-h₂-i-s*. Tremblay’s “anakinetic” type comprises only a few items which can all be explained as *einzel sprachliche* innovations of the four “canonical” types cited in the introduction (cf. Pinault (2003, 155ff.), Neri (2003, 39ff.), Widmer (2005, 59ff.)), and the reconstruction of a new accent-/ablaut-type isolated from the derivational chain connecting the more well-established types and therefore merely a descriptive label is methodologically hard to motivate (the same goes for the “rhizokinetic” and “mesostatic” types). As for the evidence, Ved. *kaví-* is no proof of original root accent, as claimed by Tremblay (1998, 38), because it is in fact always accented on the suffix. Lyd. *kavés* may actually go back to an Iranian loanword (Heiner Eichner, p.c.), although Tremblay doubts this, in which case the accent of the Lydian word might not be reliable evidence. Finally, as already pointed out above, the *o*-vocalism of the root could simply reflect the vocalism of the derivational base. That Vedic does not have any traces of a N.sg. **kavá* is puzzling, but on the other hand the hysterokinetic paradigm shared plenty of forms with the proterokinetic inflection that apparently became dominant early in Indic (i.e. practically the entire dual and plural paradigm) and might have adapted its singular inflection to this type as well.

Compounds: *ákavi-* a “unwise”, *dhārayátkavi-* a “carrying, protecting the wise ones”.

N.Sg.	kavís	12/	1	2	31,2; 151,7;
			F	1	365,3;
			9	3	794,2; 796,5; 819,7;
			10	3	890,4; 917,3; 950,7;
		12\	9	1	790,2;
		/12	F	8	214,17; 236,7; 237,4; 237,11; 349,2; 398,6; 434,2; 448,7; 448,7;
			9	7	780,5; 783,7; 786,2; 797,9; 798,20; 798,26; 819,18;
			10	2	918,12; 926,6;
		11/	1	5	95,4; 95,8; 149,3; 164,16; 174,7;
			F	12	257,1; 288,6; 312,3; 312,11; 322,1; 355,6; 385,10; 399,9; 490,4; 520,4; 525,3; 534,8;
			9	3	806,3; 808,17; 809,2;
			10	2	890,16; 913,21;
		11\	9	1	804,2;
			10	1	936,1;
		/11	1	2	71,10; 76,5;
			F	2	473,3; 534,2;
			9	1	808,17;
		/10	9	1	821,13;
		8/	1	1	12,6 (= 531,2; 711,1);
			F	1	359,2;
	8	4	661,5; 664,12; 669,3; 684,4;		
	9	5	732,1; 737,3; 739,1; 759,4; 771,3;		
	10	1	846,4;		
/8	1	4	11,4; 79,5; 91,14; 188,1;		
	F	2	263,12; 311,1;		
	8	5	628,11; 659,1; 659,9; 664,21; 669,5;		
	9	8	719,4; 721,1; 724,4; 724,8 (= 756,2); 726,1; 730,2; 774,14; 774,30; 776,30;		
A.Sg.	kavím	12/	1	1	114,4;
			F	3	214,1; 236,10; 456,7;
			9	2	784,6; 814,6;
		/12	9	1	798,25;
		11/	1	1	116,14;
			F	9	253,1; 298,12; 312,9; 358,3; 442,8; 448,1; 467,3; 490,4; 522,2;

			10	1	925,9;
		11\	F	1	263,5;
			10	1	914,14;
		8/	1	1	12,7;
			8	2	693,2; 711,17;
			9	1	775,20;
		/8	1	1	128,8;
			F	1	368,5;
			8	2	664,26; 711,5;
V.Sg.	kave	/12	F	2	192,13; 286,6;
			9	2	798,13; 798,29;
		/11	F	1	262,4;
		/8	1	3	13,2; 130,9; 175,4;
			F	7	197,7; 276,6; 375,3; 380,3; 457,30; 494,5; 494,7;
			8	3	664,30; 665,14; 711,18;
			9	6	737,6 (= 762,4); 774,27; 776,24; 778,3; 778,10; 812,5;
			10	1	966,1;
I.Sg.	kavínā	11\	F	1	490,10;
		/8	9	1	749,6;
D.Sg.	kaváye	12\	10	1	875,3;
		11\	F	7	298,20; 299,16; 321,2; 355,12; 369,1; 456,11; 461,4;
G.Abl.Sg.	kavés	11/	F	2	219,1; 480,1;
			10	1	831,3;
		8/	9	1	722,8;
N.A.Du.	kaví	12/	10	1	866,6;
		8/	1	1	2,9;
			8	1	628,23;
		/8	1	1	13,8 (= 142,8; 188,7);
			8	1	660,3;
	°kavī	/12	1	1	160,1;
V.Du.	kávī	8/	8	1	628,2;
	kavī	11/	1	1	117,23;
		8/	8	1	628,5;
N.Pl.	kaváyas	12/	9	1	784,6;
		12\	1	2	31,1; 159,4;
			F	2	215,7; 332,7;
			9	1	785,7;
			10	1	1003,1;
		11\	1	4	103,1; 146,4; 163,12; 164,5;
			F	11	242,4; 268,7; 285,7; 288,10; 298,12; 399,4; 431,1;
					569,1; 592,4; 602,3; 603,3;
			9	2	809,29; 809,57;
			10	9	831,2; 831,6; 914,13; 940,2; 940,5; 940,6; 950,9;
					955,4; 1003,2;
		8/	F	1	406,13;
		/8	10	2	927,4; 980,5;
A.Pl.	kavín	11/	1	1	164,6;
			F	1	272,1;
V.Pl.	kávayas	11\	F	1	411,8;
		8/	F	1	575,11;
	kavayas	12-\	10	1	879,10;
		11\	1	1	185,1;
			F	4	288,17; 412,3; 490,6; 490,11;
			10	1	914,18;
I.Pl.	kavíbhis	12\	9	2	786,9; 820,12;
		11\	1	1	76,5;
			F	4	235,5; 242,9; 265,16; 473,3;
G.Pl.	kavínám	12	F	1	214,1;
		/11	F	7	235,2; 239,1; 272,2; 290,5; 396,3; 459,14; 473,2;
	kavínáam	/8	9	2	779,13; 848,10;
		8	9	1	776,10;

L.Pl. °kaviṣu 11\ F 1 520,4;

°kāti- (a) “having a wish, desire for sth.”, *kā* “desire, like” < **keh*₂, EWA I, 334. Compounds: *ṛṇākāti-* a “desiring recompensation”, *kāmakāti-* a “wishing for wishes”.

A.Sg. °kātīm 8/ 8 1 670,2;
N.Pl. °kātayas /8 8 1 701,14;

kāśí- m “closed hand, fist”, unclear, may be a loanword according to Kuiper (1991, 14: “a handful”), EWA I, 345.

N.Sg. kāśís /11 F 1 264,5;
I.Sg. kāśínā 11\ F 1 620,8;
/8 8 1 687,10;

kikidīví- m “jay”, onomatopoeitic, EWA I, 349.

I.Sg. °kikidīvínā /8 10 1 923,13;

kīrí- m “singer”, could belong to *kr̥* “praise, honor, commemorate”, EWA I, 357, but Kuiper (1991, 76ff.) argues for a meaning “frisking” and connects it with *kr̥dī-* id., both being varieties of the same non-IE loan **kīd* “to frisk”.

N.Sg. kīrís 11/ F 2 478,1; 537,8;
8 1 712,13;
A.Sg. kīrīm 11/ 10 1 893,11;
D.Sg. kīráye /11 F 2 464,3; 613,10 (= 614,7);
G.Abl.Sg. kīrés 12/ 1 1 31,13;
10 1 867,2;
/11 F 1 203,6;
N.Pl. kīráyas 11\ F 1 616,4;

kīrtí- f “glory”, < **kr̥H-tí-*, *kr̥* “praise, honor, commemorate” < **kerH/kreH*, EWA I, 310f., 357. Compounds: *sukīrtí-* a/f “well praised, having good praise; (song of) praise”.

N.Sg. °kīrtís 11/ 1 1 60,3;
/11 1 1 186,3;
8/ F 1 364,4;
A.Sg. kīrtīm 11/ 10 1 880,1;
°kīrtīm 11/ F 1 219,1;
I.Sg. °kīrtíyá /8 8 1 646,19;
N.Pl. °kīrtáyas /8 8 1 665,33;

kukṣí- m “cheek; buttocks (Du.)”, EWA I, 360. Jamison (1987, 71ff.) convincingly argues in favor of assuming an original meaning “cheeks” < “hollow, cavity” to explain the frequent occurrence of the dual, the meaning “belly” is thus secondary, the Rigvedic compound *vīrákukṣi-* a “whose belly carries heroes” (said of a pregnant woman) must have originally referred to the rounding of the belly.

N.Sg. kukṣís 8/ 1 1 8,7;

A.Sg.	kukṣim	/11	10	1	906,1;
D.Sg.	kukṣáye	/8	8	1	701,24;
L.Sg.	kukṣá	12/	9	1	792,3;
		/10	9	1	821,18;
N.A.Du.	kukṣí	11/	10	1	854,2;
		10	F	1	202,11;
		8/	10	1	912,14;
G.L.Du.	kukṣ _i yós	/8	F	1	285,12;
			8	1	637,5;
N.Pl.	kukṣáyas	11\	F	1	270,8;

°kūti- f “intention”, *kū* “intend to”, EWA I, 328; cf. **kaví-**. Compounds: *ākūti-* f “intention”.

N.Sg.	°kūtis	11/	10	1	954,4;
		/8-	10	1	1017,4;
I.Sg.	°kūtyā	/8	10	1	977,4;

°kūrmí- a “moving”, *car* “move” < **k^uel(H)*, EWA I, 534f., 659. Compounds: *tuwikūrmí-* a “moving mightily”.

N.Sg.	°kūrmís	/11	F	1	264,3;
		/8	8	2	622,31; 636,8;
A.Sg.	°kūrmím	/11	F	1	463,5;
		8/	8	1	677,1;
		/8	8	1	690,2;

kṛti- m or f “knife, dagger”, *kṛt* “cut (off), split, break” < *(*s*)*kert*, EWA I, 315f., 390.

N.Sg.	kṛtís	/12	1	1	168,3;
-------	--------------	-----	---	---	--------

°kṛti- f “deed”, *kṛ* “do, make, cause” < **k^uer*, Av. *ākərəti-* “procurement”, EWA I, 307ff. Compounds: *ākṛti-* f “component, constituent”, *apākṛti-* f “fending off, defense”, *áramṅkṛti-* f “preparation, service”, (*n*)*iṣkṛti-* f “restoration”, *kuhayākṛti-* a “having one’s activity where” (*kuhayā* “where”), *dvádaśākṛti-* a “consisting of twelve parts”, *bráhmakṛti-* f “performance of the prayer”, *váṣatkṛti-* f the uttering of “váṣat” during the ritual, *sváhākṛti-*, (*tī-*) f dedication or blessing of sth. through the utterance “*sváhā*”, *havískṛti-* f “preparation of the libation”, *hásṅkṛti-* f “joke, merriment”.

N.Sg.	°kṛtis	/11	F	1	545,3;
		8/	10	1	923,9;
		/8	8	1	698,6;
			10	1	911,5;
V.Sg.	°kṛte	/8	8	1	644,30;
A.Sg.	°kṛtim	/12	1	2	31,5; 164,12;
			10	1	991,1;
		/11	F	3	530,3; 544,5 (= 545,5; 546,5); 545,2;
		/8	1	2	18,8; 93,3;
			F	1	531,6;
			8	1	667,2;
			9	1	717,11;
I.Sg.	°kṛti	/8	1	1	14,8;
			10	1	917,11;
N.Pl.	°kṛtīs	/8	10	1	923,9;
L.Pl.	°kṛtīṣu	8/	1	1	188,11;

kṛ̥tti- f “fur, leather cover”, *kṛt* “cut (off), split, break”, EWA I, 391. Note the difference between the *i*-abstract/agent noun *kṛtí-* “dagger” (as if “cutting, cutter”) and the concretized *ti*-verbal abstract (as if “the cutting(s), that which has been cut off” → “fur”).

N.Sg. **kṛ̥ttis** 12-/ 8 1 699,6;

kṛ̥ṣí- f “field, tillage”, *kṛṣ* “plough, draw a plough” < **k^uels*, EWA I, 319f.

A.Sg. **kṛ̥śím** 11\ 10 1 860,13;

kṛ̥ṣṭí- f “tillage, (group of people living within a) border drawn by a ploughshare; Sg.: border”, *kṛṣ* “plough, draw a plough” < **k^uels*, EWA I, 319f., 397. See Thieme (1971, 1, 247ff.) for a detailed account of the semantics. Compounds: *viśvákṛṣṭi-* a “belonging to, concerning all peoples”.

N.Sg.	° kṛ̥ṣṭis	/11	1	1	59,7;
A.Sg.	° kṛ̥ṣṭim	/11	F	1	334,2;
G.Abl.Sg.	kṛ̥ṣṭés	11/	F	1	338,1 (= 338,2);
N.Pl.	kṛ̥ṣṭáyas	/12	1	1	52,11;
			8	1	625,38;
			9	2	781,7; 798,37;
		11/	F	1	283,1;
		/11	10	1	876,5;
		/8	1	2	4,6; 36,19;
			F	3	326,2; 373,3; 547,9;
			8	3	683,10; 684,10; 712,3;
			10	2	886,4; 945,6;
	° kṛ̥ṣṭayas	/12	F	1	260,5;
			10	1	918,6;
	° kṛ̥ṣṭīs	/11	1	1	169,2;
A.Pl.	kṛ̥ṣṭís	12/	1	1	160,5;
			8	1	644,19;
		11/	F	4	293,1; 459,3; 535,1; 601,3;
		/11	1	1	189,3;
			F	6	277,7; 313,6; 313,7; 317,2; 334,10; 472,1;
			10	1	1004,3;
		8/	1	1	7,8;
			8	1	671,2;
I.Pl.	kṛ̥ṣṭíbhis	11\	1	1	100,10;
G.Pl.	kṛ̥ṣṭínám	11/	1	2	59,5; 177,1 (= 313,5);
			F	5	355,6; 459,2; 521,5; 522,1; 542,5;
		8/	8	2	633,9; 652,19;
	kṛ̥ṣṭínáam	8/	F	1	486,16;
		8	8	1	677,7;
L.Pl.	kṛ̥ṣṭíṣu	/12	1	1	102,7;
			F	2	193,10; 287,16;
		/8	1	1	74,2;
			F	1	487,7;
			8	1	701,18;

képi- a unclear, EWA I, 399f.; Kuiper (1991, 91).

N.Pl. **képayas** /12 10 1 870,6;

krívi- m PN/ethnonym, unclear, EWA I, 412f.; Kuiper (1991, 91).

N.Sg. **krívīs** 12/ F 1 398,4;

		8/	8	1	696,1;
			9	1	721,6;
A.Sg.	krívim	12/	8	1	642,12;
		/12	F	1	213,2;
			8	1	1020,8;
		/11	F	1	208,6;
		/8	1	1	30,1;
			8	1	640,24;

krīḍí- f “bouncing, dancing”, *krīḍ* “play, jest, move about”, EWA I, 413. Kuiper (1991, 76ff.) argues in favor of the root being a loan.

N.Pl.	krīḍāyas	12/	1	1	87,3;
		11/	10	1	920,14;
		11\	10	2	904,6; 921,9;

kṣāti- f “blaze, glow”, *kṣā* “burn”, only in Indic, EWA I, 430.

N.Sg.	kṣātís	/11	F	1	447,5;
-------	--------	-----	---	---	--------

kṣití- f “dwelling; people”, *kṣi* “dwell, inhabit” < **tkei*, YAv. *š(a)iti-*, Gr. *κτίσις* etc., EWA I, 427, 431f. Compounds: *uruksití-* f “unlimited dwelling-place”, *dhārayátksití-* a “supporting, fostering the people”, *suksití-* a/f “(having a) good dwelling place”.

N.Sg.	kṣitís	12/	1	1	151,4;
		11/	F	1	301,5;
		/10	1	1	65,5;
N.A.Sg.n.	°kṣiti	/8	1	1	40,4 (= 712,5);
			9	1	778,7;
A.Sg.	°kṣitím	11/	F	1	616,4;
		11\	1	1	91,21;
			F	1	210,8;
			10	1	846,10 (= 925,12);
		/11	F	2	226,15; 443,11;
		/8	1	1	40,8;
			F	1	590,6;
	°kṣitim	/12	1	1	136,3;
D.Sg.	°kṣitáye	11\	F	1	572,24;
L.Sg.	°kṣitáú	12/	9	1	796,1;
N.A.Du.	°kṣitī	/12	10	1	958,2;
N.Pl.	kṣitáyas	12\	1	1	151,3;
		11\	1	2	33,6; 100,7;
		11\	F	8	252,1; 320,4; 334,5; 355,10; 386,10; 390,6; 442,5;
					544,4;
			8	1	636,9;
			9	1	801,6;
	°kṣitáyas	8	8	1	663,18 (= 663,29);
A.Pl.	kṣitís	/12	F	1	237,9;
		11/	F	6	248,4; 391,4; 506,1; 581,2; 591,4; 595,1;
		/8	8	1	626,26;
	°kṣitís	11\	F	1	580,4;
		/8	F	1	360,8;
			8	1	693,6;
D.Abl.Pl.	kṣitíbhyas	11/	F	1	502,3;
		/11	F	1	915,11;
		8/	F	1	247,4;
G.Pl.	kṣitínám	12\	F	1	487,7;

		11/	F	1	268,2;
		/11	1	3	59,1; 72,7; 177,3;
			F	3	254,4; 473,4; 614,1;
	kṣitīnāam	11/	10	1	904,1;
		/8	1	1	7,9;
			F	2	361,1; 389,2;
			8	1	676,13;
			10	1	1013,1;
		8	1	1	176,3;
	°kṣitīnāam	/8	9	1	820,7;
L.Pl.	kṣitīṣu	12\	F	1	193,3;
		11\	1	1	73,4;
			F	1	604,7;

°kṣiti- (a) “suffering destruction”, *kṣi* “destroy, obliterate” < **d^hg^{uh}e_i*, Gr. φθίσις, Lat. *sitis* etc., EWA I, 428, 431. Compounds: *ákṣiti-* “immortal, indestructible, unforgettable” < **h* “having no mortality, destruction”, see section 2.1.6.

N.A.Sg.n.	°kṣiti	/8	1	1	40,4 (= 712,5);
			9	1	778,7;

kṣipañi- f “whipcrack”, *kṣip* “hurl, throw”, the root has Iranian cognates but no certain IE ones, EWA I, 437.

A.Sg.	kṣipānīm	/12	F	1	336,4;
--------------	-----------------	-----	---	---	--------

khādī- m “ring, bracelet”, probably to be connected with *khād* “bite, chew”, which is also found in Iranian, EWA I, 451f., 452. Compounds: *vṛṣakhādī-* a “adorned with strong, heavy bracelets”, *śubhrakhādī-* a “having shiny rings, bracelets”, *sukhādī-* a “adorned with/ having good rings, bracelets”.

N.Sg.	khādīs	12/	1	1	168,3;
D.Sg.	°khādāye	/12	F	1	441,1;
N.Pl.	khādāyas	/12	1	1	166,9;
			F	1	408,11;
		/11	F	1	572,13;
	°khādāyas	/12	1	1	87,6;
	°khādāyas	/12	1	1	64,10;
			8	1	640,4;
L.Pl.	khādīṣu	/12	10	1	864,1;
		/8	F	1	407,4;

gāti- f “going”, *gam* “go, move, come” < **g^uem*, EWA I, 465f.; NIL, 175ff. Compounds: *āgati-* f “arrival”, *sāṃgati-* f “come-together, assembly”.

A.Sg.	gātīm	/8	F	1	418,3;
	°gatīm	/11	F	1	340,1;
L.Sg.	°gatau	/8	F	1	196,6;
	°gatyām	8/	10	1	967,4;

gandhāri- m ethnonym, etym. unclear, EWA I, 462f., probably non-Indo-European according to Kuiper (1991, 7).

G.Pl. *gandhārīṇām* 8/ 1 1 126,7;

°**gandhi-** a “smelling of sth.”, *gandhá-* m “smell”, etym. unclear, EWA I, 461f., see 2.1.6. Compounds: *āñjanagandhi-* a “smelling of ointments”, *dhūmāgandhi-* a “smelling of fumes, smoke”, *sugāndhi-* a “smelling good”.

N.Sg. °*gandhis* /11 1 1 162,15;
A.Sg. °*gāndhim* 8/ F 1 575,12;
 °*gandhim* 8/ 10 1 972,6;

gābhasti- m “hand”, EWA I, 463f.; Oldenberg (1909, 55). Compounds: *pūrṇāgabhasti-* a “whose arms are full”, *sugābhasti-* a “having good, pretty arms”, *sūgabhasti-* a id., *syāmagabhasti-* a “having straps for/instead of carriage shafts”.

N.Sg. °*gābhastis* /11 F 1 397,4;
 °*gabhastis* 11/ 1 1 122,15;
A.Sg. *gābhastim* 12/ 1 1 54,4;
 °*gābhastim* /11 F 1 490,9;
 °*gabhastim* 11/ F 2 561,4; 587,3;
L.Sg. *gābhastau* /11 1 1 62,12;
 F 2 209,8; 461,9;
 10 3 870,2; 887,3; 899,8;
N.A.Du. *gābhastī* /11 F 2 460,3; 553,3;
G.L.Du. *gābhastīyos* /12 1 3 64,10; 82,6; 130,4;
 F 2 294,5; 408,11;
 9 3 783,3; 788,2; 822,5;
 10 1 922,3;
 11\ F 1 470,2;
 /8 1 1 88,6;
 F 2 434,3; 486,18;
 8 1 632,7;
 9 4 722,2 (= 725,7); 732,6 (= 748,4; 581,6); 776,5;
 819,13;
N.Pl. °*gabhastayas* /12 9 1 784,2;

gāvvyūti- f “pasture, pasturage”, EWA I, 481. Synchronically without connection to a verbal root, although the segmentation appears to be **gav-yūti-* (*gáv-* m/f “cow, cattle”), for proposals concerning the etymology of the SMC see Mayrhofer and NIL, 407ff., fn.1 (“?**ieuh*₁- ‘Getreide; Gerste’ ”). Compounds: *agavyūti-* a “containing no pasturage”, *urūgavyūti-* a “having wide pasturage”, *parogavyūti-* a “across/beyond the pasturage”.

N.Sg. *gāvvyūtis* 12/ 9 1 786,3;
 11/ 10 2 840,2; 906,6;
 °*gavyūtis* 11/ 9 1 802,4;
N.A.Sg.n. °*gavyūtí* 12/ 8 1 699,20;
 11/ F 1 488,20;
A.Sg. *gāvvyūtīm* 12/ 9 2 790,5; 797,8;
 11/ F 3 578,5; 581,4; 593,4;
 8/ F 2 296,16 (= 625,6); 420,3;
A.Pl. *gāvvyūtīs* /8 1 1 25,16;

girí- m < **g^hrH-í-* “mountain”, YAv. *gairi-*, cf. Ved. *gurú-* “heavy”, Gr. βαρύς < **g^hrH-ú-*,

EWA I, 487. Compounds: *bṛhadgiri-* a “dwelling in high mountains”.

N.Sg.	girís	12/	8	2	1019,2; 707,4;
		11/	F	1	316,6;
		/8	1	1	37,7;
			8	1	627,5;
A.Sg.	girím	10/	1	1	65,5;
		12/	1	1	56,2;
		/12	F	2	408,5; 410,4;
		11/	F	1	313,2;
			10	1	915,7;
		8/	8	1	697,2;
G.Abl.Sg.	girés		10	1	981,1;
		/8	8	2	665,30; 673,5;
		12/	1	1	56,3;
			8	1	1018,2;
		11/	F	1	467,5;
		8/	1	2	130,7; 191,16;
L.Sg.	giráú	/8	8	1	652,4;
		8/	8	1	665,5;
N.Pl.	giráyas	12/	1	1	64,7;
		11/	F	1	507,11;
		11\	1	2	61,14; 63,1;
			F	2	395,11; 465,8;
			10	1	885,3;
		8/	8	1	627,34;
		11/	F	1	411,8 (= 412,8);
		12/	8	1	635,2;
			10	1	870,8;
			/12	10	1
A.Pl.	°girayas girín	8/	1	1	37,12;
		11\	1	1	109,6;
			F	1	611,2;
D.Abl.Pl.	giríbhyaś	/8	8	1	686,6;
		12/	F	1	502,2;
		/11	8	1	705,2;
G.Pl.	girīṅám	8/	8	1	666,18;
		/8	8	2	626,28; 627,14;
		12\	9	1	794,3;
L.Pl.	girīṣu				

gūrtí- f “(song of) praise”, *gṛ-* “praise, honor, welcome” < **g^uerH*, cf. Lat. *grātus*, Lith. *girti* etc., EWA I, 468f. Compounds: *abhígūrti-* f “song of praise”, *viśvagūrti-* a “welcome, praise-worthy to all”.

N.Sg.	°gūrtis	/12	1	1	162,6 (= 162,12);
D.Sg.	gūrtáye	11\	10	1	887,15;
V.Du.	°gūrtī	/11	1	1	180,2;
N.Pl.	gūrtáyas	12/	1	1	56,2;
		/12	8	1	1019,5;
I.Pl.	gūrtíbhīś	/12	9	1	817,1;

°*gṛbhi-* a “seizing, grasping” < *°*g^hṛbh₂-* or *°*g^hṛbh₂-i-* (cf. Jamison (1988, 222, esp. fn. 16)), *grabh* “seize, grasp, take” < **g^hrebh₂*, EWA I, 505ff. Compounds: *durgṛbhi-* a “difficult to reach, seize”, *pádgrbhi-* a “grabbing the feet” (name of a demon, cf. EWA II, 68f.).

N.Sg.	°gṛbhis	/12	1	1	140,6;
-------	---------	-----	---	---	--------

A.Sg. °gṛbhim /12 10 1 875,5;

gṛbhītātāti- f “awe”, -tāti- stem built to the verbal adjective gṛbhītá- of grabh “seize, grasp, take” (EWA I, 505ff.), see section 2.1.4.

D.Sg. gṛbhītātātaye 8 F 1 428,4;

gṛṣṭí- f “(first-calf) heifer (in the RV-attestation: “cow which has given birth just once (to Indra)”, etym. unclear EWA I, 494.

N.Sg. gṛṣṭís 11/ F 1 314,10;

granthí- m “knot”, granth “connect, tie sth. to sth.”, at least Indo-Iranian, but without clear IE cognates, EWA I, 504f.

A.Sg. granthím 11/ 9 1 809,18;
8/ 10 1 969,2;

gráhi- f demon, to be connected with the early variant grah of grabh “seize, grasp, take”, EWA I, 505ff.

N.Sg. gráhis 11/ 10 1 987,1;

°grí- a unclear, EWA I, 659. Compounds: *tuvigrí-* a, epithet of Indra (cf. also *tuvigrá-*). Both Grassmann⁶ 1996, 544 (“viel verschlingend”) and Mayrhofer (l.c.) suggest a connection with gṛ “devour”, the second compound members °grá-/°grí- could then be analyzed as “compositional *i*”-varieties (cf. section 2.1.6) *°g^ur_h3-ó/i- with compositional laryngeal loss.

D.Sg. °gráye 12/ F 1 212,2;

ghāsí- m “food”, ghas “eat”, Indo-Iranian, but no PIE etymology, EWA I, 514.

A.Sg. ghāsím /11 1 1 162,14;

ghṛṇi- m < *g^ur_h-ni- “heat”, *g^uer “become warm” (Vedic has only nominal formations of this root), cf. Ved. ghrṇá- n. “heat”, EWA I, 515f.; NIL, 196ff. Compounds: ághrṇi- a “glowing, radiating”.

N.Sg. °ghṛṇis 11\ 10 1 843,5;
/8 1 1 23,14;
V.Sg. °ghṛṇe /12 1 1 138,4;
F 1 489,16;
8 1 624,18;
/11 F 1 556,6;
8/ 1 1 23,13;
F 2 494,9; 496,1;
/8 F 4 296,7; 494,3; 494,8; 496,3;
8 1 624,17;
9 1 779,12;
I.Sg. ghṛṇī¹⁶ 11/ F 1 224,6;

¹⁶See Oldenberg (1909, 214) for a rejection of a conjecture *ghṛṇer wa*. He also hints at the possibility of an

G.Sg.	ghṛ̥ṇes	/8	F	1	457,38;
L.Sg.	ghṛ̥ṇā	11/	F	1	444,7;

ghṛ̥ṣvi- a “cheerful”, derived from *ghṛ̥ṣu-* id. (see section 2.1.3), both probably belong to *hr̥ṣ* “be excited, happy”, EWA I, 517f., II, 807f.

V.Sg.	ghṛ̥ṣve	/11	F	1	298,13;
D.Sg.	ghṛ̥ṣvaye	/8		1	1 37,4;
			F	2	328,6; 328,9;
				8	1 673,12;
				9	2 714,8; 728,1;
G.Abl.Sg.	ghṛ̥ṣves	/12	F	1	459,12;
		/11	F	2	280,1; 609,2;
N.Pl.	ghṛ̥ṣvayas	/12		1	2 85,1; 166,2;
		/8		9	2 733,1; 813,8;

cákri- a “making, causing sth.”, *kṛ* “do, make, act” < **k^uer*, OAv. *čaxri-*, EWA I, 307ff., 523, see section 2.1.2.3. Compounds: *ācakrī-* a “making, turning sth. into sth.”, *urucákri-* a “creating unrestrictedness, boundlessness”.

N.Sg.	cákris	12/	F	1	250,4;
		11/	F	1	536,1;
				9	1 789,5;
		/11		9	1 800,4;
		8/	F	1	250,4;
	°cakrís	/12	F	1	217,4;
		/11	F	1	465,5;
A.Sg.	cákrim	8/		1	1 9,2;
D.Sg.	cákraye	/8		1	1 9,2;
N.Pl.	°cakráyas	/8	F	1	421,4 (= 638,15);

caṣṣāṇi- m “viewer, observer”, *caṣṣ* “shine, appear, see” < **k^uek̂(s)*, OAv. °*čaṣāni-*, EWA I, 523, 524, see section 2.1.2.2.

N.Sg.	caṣṣāṇis	/11	F	1	445,2;
-------	----------	-----	---	---	--------

carāṇi- a “moving, mobile”, *car* “move, walk, stroll” < **k^uel(H)*, EWA I, 534f., see section 2.1.2.2.

G.Pl.	carāṇīnaam	/12		8	1 644,23;
-------	------------	-----	--	---	-----------

carkṛ̥tí- f “praise”, *kṛ* “praise, laud, commemorate” < **kerH/kreH*, EWA I, 310f., 536. Note the different root grade compared to unreduplicated *kīrtí-*, which has been explained by Kuiper (1961) as (inner-Indic) laryngeal loss in reduplicated formations and compounds.

N.Sg.	carkṛ̥tís	/8	F	2	428,9; 489,21;
-------	-----------	----	---	---	----------------

carṣāṇí- f “border (sg.), people (pl.)”, *kr̥ṣ* “plough, draw a plough” < **k^uels*, EWA I, 319f., 538, cf. the entry **kr̥ṣtí-** above, also see section 2.1.2.2. Compounds: *prácarṣāṇi-* a “having no borders” (cf. Thieme 1971, 1, 252), *vícarṣāṇi-* a “having remote borders”, *viśvácāṣāṇi-* a

underlying adjective (which would explain the feminine I.sg. in *-ī*).

“pertaining to/concerning all peoples”.

N.Sg.	carṣaṇís	/8	1	1	46,4;
	°carṣaṇís	/12	1	1	35,9;
			F	2	236,8; 332,5;
			9	1	796,1;
		11/	10	1	909,4;
		/11	F	1	222,3;
		/8	1	2	27,9; 79,12;
			F	7	232,10; 245,1; 360,3; 377,4; 443,2; 486,16; 487,3;
			8	1	633,6;
			9	7	713,2; 723,7; 740,5; 752,1; 756,3; 760,5; 779,22;
		8	9	1	774,10;
		4	F	1	213,3;
N.A.Sg.n.	°carṣaṇi	/12	10	1	919,10;
V.Sg.	°carṣaṇe	/12	1	1	31,6;
			8	2	653,3; 707,10;
			10	1	876,4;
		/8	1	2	9,3; 78,1 (= 457,29; 457,36; 663,2);
			F	1	392,1;
			8	4	637,7; 643,2; 753,5; 772,4;
			9	1	778,1;
		8	F	1	443,1;
A.Sg.	°carṣaṇīm	/12	1	2	64,12; 64,14;
			F	1	236,15;
			8	1	1022,6;
		/8	F	2	368,6; 485,4;
			9	1	772,1;
N.A.Du.	°carṣaṇī	/12	F	1	417,3;
V.Du.	°carṣaṇī	11/	1	1	109,5;
N.Pl.	carṣaṇáyās	11\	1	1	184,4;
			F	3	466,7; 472,1; 474,2;
		/8	F	1	443,2;
			8	3	622,33; 636,6; 636,9;
A.Pl.	carṣaṇís	/11	F	1	277,2;
		/8	1	1	86,5 (= 303,4; 377,1);
			F	2	434,2; 531,2 (= 813,9);
D.Abl.Pl.	carṣaṇībhyas	/12	1	1	55,1;
			F	1	489,15;
		11/	1	1	109,6;
		/11	F	2	472,5; 513,5;
		/8	1	1	84,20;
			F	1	333,8;
G.Pl.	carṣaṇínám	12/	10	1	919,9;
		/11	1	1	32,15;
			F	7	240,5; 316,8; 442,8; 459,1; 463,1; 471,5; 543,3;
			10	2	929,1; 1006,3;
		/10	8	1	705,4;
		/8	8	1	636,1;
	carṣaṇínáam	12\	10	1	952,6;
		/8	1	4	7,9 (= 176,2); 17,2 (= 421,2); 86,6; 127,2 (= 643,7; 669,17);
			F	5	244,1; 296,6; 304,8; 327,4; 393,4;
			8	5	673,4; 677,4; 679,1; 701,1; 702,16;
			10	1	835,5;

°cācali- a “moving, staggering”, made from the variety *cal* from *car* “move” < *k^hel(H), EWA I, 534f., see section 2.1.2. Compounds: *ávicācali*- a “not staggering”.

N.Sg. °cācalis /8 10 2 999,1; 999,2;

°citi- f “respect, attention”, *ci* “notice, pay attention to, honor” < *k^(u)eṯ, EWA I, 531. Compounds: *āpaciti-* f “punishment, revenge”.

A.Sg. °citim /11 F 1 324,4;

citti- f “thought, understanding”, *cit* “realize, recognize” < *k^(u)eṯ-t, Av. *čisti-*, EWA I, 547f. Compounds: *ācitti-* f “thoughtlessness, foolishness”, *pūrvācitti-* f “first thought (only as D.sg. “on first thought; immediately)”. Ved. *cittī-* f, which is only attested in the I.pl. in RV I,164,29, probably preserves a variety of the old proterokinetic mobile accent paradigm (cf. Schaffner (2001, 438ff.)), in fact, *cittī-* is the synchronically less marked variety (*ti*-abstracts are usually accented on the suffix). The word is sometimes translated as “crackling, rattling” (EWA I, 542), but since this is uncertain, I have subsumed the attestation under this entry.

N.Sg.	cittis	10/	1	1	67,10;
		8/	10	1	911,7;
	°cittis	/11	F	1	602,6;
A.Sg.	cittim	11/	F	2	212,6; 298,11;
	°cittim	11/	F	1	298,11;
I.Sg.	cittī	8/	8	1	688,4;
	°cittī	12/	F	2	350,3; 605,5;
D.Sg.	°cittaye	/12	1	2	112,1; 159,3;
			8	1	645,12;
		/8	1	1	84,12;
			8	3	623,9; 626,9; 632,33;
			9	1	811,5;
I.Pl.	cittibhis	/12	F	3	236,3; 237,3; 398,10;
			8	1	1028,3;
		/8	8	1	664,19;
	cittibhis	12/	1	1	164,9;
	°cittibhis	11/	F	1	308,4;

cúmuri- m name of a demon, unclear, EWA I, 546, a possible loanword according to Kuiper (1991, 91). Compounds: *dhúnīcúmuri-* m “Dhuni and Cumuri”.

A.Sg.	cúmurim	/12	10	1	939,9;
		11\	F	1	467,6;
		/11	F	3	206,9; 459,8; 535,4;
N.A.Du.	°cumurī	11\	F	1	461,13;

cedī- m ethnonym, unclear, EWA I, 550; Kuiper (1991, 7, 91).

N.Pl. cedāyas /8 8 1 625,29;

°cyuti- f “quick movement”, *cyu* “(begin to) move” < *k^(u)ieṯ, EWA I, 552f. Compounds: *hāstacyuti-* f “quick movement of the hands”.

I.Sg. °cyutī 11/ F 1 517,1;

jáguri- a “tiresome, exhausting”, probably to be connected with *glā* “be reluctant, unwilling, grow tired”, EWA I, 510, 563.

N.Sg. **jáguris** /11 10 1 934,1;

jágmi- a “going quickly”, Grassmann ⁶1996, 464, *gam* “go, move, come” < **g^uem* (EWA I, 465), see section 2.1.2.

N.Sg.	jágmis	/12	F	1	214,11;
		11/	F	1	536,1;
		8/	8	1	702,22;
D.Sg.	jágmaye	/11	8	1	666,17;
		/8	F	1	483,1;
N.A.Du.	jágmī	/11	10	1	932,8;
N.Pl.	jágmayas	/12	1	2	85,8; 89,7;

jághni- a “beating, slaying”, Grassmann ⁶1996, 464, *han* “beat, slay, kill” < **g^hen* (EWA II, 800f.), see section 2.1.2. Compounds: *nijaghni-* a “beating sbdy. to the ground”.

N.Sg.	jághnis	8/	9	1	773,20;
	^o jaghnis	8/	9	1	765,2;

jághri- a “sprinkling, splashing”, Grassmann ⁶1996, 464, *ghar* “sprinkle” (EWA I, 512f.), Av. ^o*ǰayrīm* (Tremblay (1998, 114)), but the further IE connection is unclear. Also see section 2.1.2.

N.Sg. **jághris** /11 1 1 162,15;

^o**jaǰñi-** a “knowing”, *ǰñā* “know” < **ǰneh₃*, EWA I, 599ff., section 2.1.2. Compounds: *ápraja-ǰñi-* “unknowing”.

N.Pl. ^o**jaǰñayas** /12 10 1 897,9;

jáni-, ^{ī^d} f “wife, woman” < **g^uén-h₂*, G.sg. *g^un-éh₂-s* (cf. Ved. *gnā-* f “wife (of a god)”, which developed out of the weak stem in the course of a paradigm split), EWA I, 568f.; NIL, 177ff. The paradigm is notoriously tricky, but quite likely reflects a proterokinetic stem with the ablauting variety of the collective suffix **h₂*. Hardarson (1987), following Schindler (1972a, 33), interprets this as a collective “group of women” derived from a root noun **g^uon-/*g^uen-* “woman”. Although formally acceptable, the only actual evidence usually cited in favor of such a paradigm are OIr. *bé* and Hitt. *SAL-za/SAL-anza*, which, as Jasanoff (1989) has argued, may go back to proterokinetic **g^uén-h₂* as well.

As far as Vedic is concerned, it looks like the strong and the weak stem developed into two different paradigms (this is paralleled by Avestan, Tremblay (1998, 107)), but the N.sg. *jánis* is unlikely to directly reflect (secondarily sigmatized) IIr. **H#*, because of the PIE ^oVRH# > ^oV̄R# rule (Jasanoff (1989, 137f.), Nussbaum (1986, 129f.), a common example is Gr. *ὑδωρ* < **-or-h₂* and its cognates, as well as the parallelism of Szemerényi’s Law). This would have given a Ved. N.sg. **ǰā* which would have been in serious conflict with the homonymous *ǰā* “child” < **ǰneh₃-ǰñh₃*. Jasanoff suggests that the paradigm was remodelled after the A.sg. *jánim*, the regular outcome of **g^uén-h₂-m* (but we would actually expect **g^uén-h₂-m*). On the other hand, one could assume a genuine *i*-stem **g^uón(h₂)-i-/*g^uen(h₂)-i-*, if only for the sake of explaining the Indo-Iranian forms.

As for compositional $^{\circ}jāni-$ (*dvijāni-* a “having two wives”, *bhadrajāni-* a “having a beautiful wife”, *yúvajāni-* a “having a young wife”, *vittajāni-* a “having found a wife”, *sumájjāni-* a “together with his wife”), a pre-form $*g^u on-i-$ (Darms apud Hardarson (1987, 130f.)) with Brugmann’s Law as well as a *vrddhi*-formation $*g^u ēn-i-$ (Darms, *ibid.*, Tremblay (1998, 106f.)) have been given as explanations, the latter usually in connection with Germ. $*kwēni-$ (Goth. *quens* etc.). The problem is that though all these reconstructions are phonetically possible pre-forms of the Indo-Iranian forms, they have so far failed to be convincingly connected in terms of nominal derivation¹⁷. Even if we accept Tremblay’s derivational chain $*g^u ón-/*g^u én- \rightarrow *g^u én-o- \rightarrow *g^u én-i-$ for a moment, we would have to accept 1.) a PIE root noun based on a few forms which can be explained otherwise, cf. Jasanoff *l.c.*, 2.) a *vrddhi*-derivation of this root noun which is not attested anywhere and does not have the meaning expected for such a formation 3.) an *i*-substantivization of said derivative¹⁸ which was then, for some reason, restricted to the use as a second compound member in Bahuvrīhi-compounds. Now, this is exactly the “hot spot” for morphological differentiation vis-à-vis the simplex, but it has to be motivated and morphologically plausible, and $^{\circ}jāni-$ always means “(having a) wife” and never “belonging to/pertaining to a/the woman/women” (as a *vrddhi*-derivative of this type should).

Another explanation has recently been proposed by Nussbaum, who argues in favor of a *vrddhi*-derivative $*g^u ēnh_2-i-$ made from proterokinetic $*g^u enh_2$ with “diminutive” semantics (cf. Nussbaum (2009)). He also hints at the possibility that both $^{\circ}jāni-/jāni-$ may go back to an \bar{e}/e -acrostatic paradigm (cf. section 1.2.2.), but this would require an explanation of the generalization of precisely the \bar{e} -grade variety as SMC.

Despite these difficulties, I have subsumed both *jāni-* and compositional $^{\circ}jāni-$ under the same entry, even though the derivational processes connecting them have yet to be discerned.

N.Sg.	jānī ¹⁹	/8	F	1	348,1;
	$^{\circ}$ jānis	/11	10	1	927,11;
	$^{\circ}$ jānis	/8	8	1	622,19;
A.Sg.	$^{\circ}$ jānim	/12	1	1	112,15;
D.Sg.	$^{\circ}$ jānaye	12/	1	1	156,2;
G.Abl.Sg.	jānyus	11/	10	1	836,3;
N.Pl.	jānayas	12\	1	1	85,1;
			10	3	866,10; 869,1; 950,7;
		11\	1	3	62,10; 71,1; 186,7;
			F	2	301,5; 315,5;
			10	2	844,7; 936,5;
		/8	F	1	415,3;
		$^{\circ}$ jānayas	/8	F	1
A.Pl.	jānīs	11/	1	1	167,7;
			F	1	542,3;
		8/	8	1	637,7;
I.Pl.	jānibhis	12\	F	2	227,3; 260,3;
			10	1	890,10;

¹⁷That is, there is no real form-meaning correlation. This state is now canonized in the entry in NIL, where pretty much every variety found in the various IE language is projected back to the proto-language.

¹⁸This is my interpretation of Tremblay’s table on p. 107, since he does not comment on this step himself.

¹⁹Lubotsky (1997, I, 557) cites the *devī*-inflection N.sg. *jānī* as a separate entry, but since the *i*-stem (going back to a laryngeal, in this case) is clearly older, I have treated the aberrant N.sg. as belonging to this paradigm (which in later Sanskrit was supplanted by the *devī*-inflection variety anyway).

		11\	F	2	491,13; 534,2;
D.Abl.Pl.	jānibhyas	11/	10	1	1009,3;
G.Pl.	jānīnām	12/	9	1	798,32;
		/11	F	1	400,8;
		/10	1	1	66,8;

jālpi- f “indistinct speech, murmur”, *jalp* “murmur, speak indistinctly”, probably an onomatopoeic root, EWA I, 580, and/or a loan, cf. Kuiper (1991, 92).

N.Sg.	jālpis	/11	8	1	668,14;
I.Sg.	jālp_iyā	/11	10	1	908,7;

jásuri- a “hungry”, *jas* “be exhausted, hungry”, EWA I, 581f.

A.Sg.	jásurim	/11	F	1	334,5;
		/8	F	1	415,7;
D.Sg.	jásuraye	11/	1	1	116,22;
			F	1	454,5;

jāgrvi- a “wary, alert”, *jṝ* “wake up” < **h₁ger*, EWA I, 574f., see section 2.1.3.

N.Sg.	jāgrvis	/12	1	1	31,9;
			F	3	236,12; 260,3; 365,1;
			9	2	783,1; 819,2;
		11/	F	2	273,1; 273,2;
			9	1	809,37;
		/11	9	1	809,2;
			10	1	860,1;
		/8	8	1	664,29;
			9	4	748,2; 756,3; 814,4; 819,6;
N.A.Sg.	jāgrvi	/8	8	1	698,1;
A.Sg.	jāgrvim	/12	F	1	262,5;
		/11	F	1	456,8;
		/8	F	1	271,8;
V.Sg.	jāgrve	/12	F	1	237,7;
		/8	F	1	258,3;
			8	1	701,23;

°**jāni-** f “birth, descendance”, only in RV III,17,3 *tisrá ājānār uśásas te agne* “you, Agni, are the descendant of three Uśas²⁰”. Both *jan* “beget” and *jñā* “know, recognize” could be underlying this compound. In the first case we would have to account for an unexpected lengthened grade (as if from **ǵēnh₁-i*²¹), in the second case we are faced with the problem that *jñā* has usually generalized full grade II (CReH), cf. EWA I, 601.

N.Pl.	° jānīs	11/	F	1	251,3;
--------------	----------------	-----	---	---	--------

jāmí- a < **ǵñh₁-mi*- “being siblings”, cf. YAv. °*zāmi-*, *jan* < **ǵēnh₁* “beget, give birth to, create”, EWA I, 586f.; NIL, 139ff. Compounds: *ājāmi-* a “unrelated”, *devājāmi-* a “pertaining to/characterizing the gods”, *vijāmi-* a “related”, *saptājāmi-* a “having seven siblings”, *sómajāmi-* a “related/similar to *sóma-*”.

²⁰“[D]rei Usas sind deine Mütter, Agni”, Geldner (1951, I).

²¹Although the root does have occasional Narten forms in other IE languages, e.g. Gr. γένεσις < **ǵēnh₁-ti-*.

N.Sg.	jāmís	/11	1	1	123,5;
			F	1	321,6;
		10/	1	1	65,7;
		8/	1	2	75,3; 75,4;
N.A.Sg.n.	°jāmis jāmí	/11	F	1	539,2;
		/11	F	1	288,9;
		10	1	1	836,4;
		8/	8	2	626,3; 681,4;
A.Sg.	jāmím	/11	10	2	836,9; 836,10;
		8/	F	1	373,4;
		12	1	1	111,3;
		/12	F	1	111,3;
°jāmim	jāmím	11/	F	2	300,5; 485,17;
		/11	1	1	124,6;
		9	1	1	808,22;
		8/	8	1	632,31;
D.Sg.	jāmáye	12/	1	1	111,3;
		F	1	1	598,6;
		11/	F	2	300,5; 485,17;
		/11	1	1	124,6;
N.A.Du.	jāmí	11/	F	1	265,2;
		12/	1	1	159,4;
G.L.Du.	jām _i yós	11/	1	1	185,5;
		/8	F	1	373,4;
N.Pl.	jāmáyas	/12	1	1	31,10;
		11/	F	2	291,3; 466,3;
		10	1	1	836,10;
		11\	9	1	801,4;
°jāmayas	jāmáyas	8/	1	1	23,16;
		/8	8	1	711,13;
		9	3	1	738,5; 777,1; 778,8;
		/12	10	1	918,10;
N.A.Pl.n.	jāmí	/11	F	1	466,3;
		/8	9	1	722,7;
		11/	F	1	588,3;
		10	1	1	834,7;
A.Pl.	jāmín °jāmín	/11	F	1	460,8;
		11/	10	1	895,12;
		/11	F	1	460,8;
		10	1	1	895,12;
I.Pl.	jāmíbhis	12/	9	1	780,4;
		/12	9	1	784,3;
		11/	1	2	71,7; 100,11;
		8/	9	1	749,4;
G.Pl.	°jāmibhis jāmínám	/8	8	1	681,14;
		9	1	1	740,4;
		11/	1	1	100,11;
		11/	F	1	235,11;
L.Pl.	jāmíṣu	/8	10	1	847,8;

jígarti- m “devourer”, *gṝ* “devour”, EWA I, 469f., 589f. *jígarti-* is explained as 3.sg. form of a reduplicated present stem of *gṝ* “devour” by AiG II,2, 638, § 472 following Liebert (1949, 55) to account for the full grade of the root, but this is awkward because there is no such present stem in the Rigveda.

A.Sg. *jígartim* 11/ F 1 383,4;

jíti- f “victory”, *ji* “defeat, win (over)”, no certain cognates outside Indo-Iranian, EWA I, 573f.

Compounds: *purójiti-* f “first victory, acquisition”.

A.Sg.	jítim	/12	10	1	879,11;
I.Sg.	°jītī	8/	9	1	813,1;

jívri- a “fragile, frail”, metathesized from *jírvi-* (AV), *jṝ* “grow old” < **ǵerh₂*, EWA I, 590; Pinault (1987-1988), section 2.1.3.

N.Sg.	jívris	/11	1	1	180,5;
A.Sg.	jívrim	8	8	1	1020,2;
G.Abl.Sg.	jívres	11/	1	1	170,10;
N.A.Du.	jívrī	12/	1	1	110,8;
			F	1	332,3;
		11/	10	1	911,27;
N.Pl.	jívrayas	11\	F	1	315,2;
		/8	8	1	665,20;

°jīti- f “damage, injury”, *jyā* “rob sbdy., be violent against sbdy.”, no cognates outside Indo-Iranian, EWA I, 602f. Compounds: *ájīti-* f “intactness”.

A.Sg.	°jītim	/11	9	1	809,30;
D.Sg.	°jītaye	11/	9	1	808,4;

jīri- m “running, flowing water”, cf. *jirá-* a “quick, lively” < **ǵ^uih₃-ro/i-*, **ǵ^uieh₃* “live”, EWA I, 593; NIL, 185ff.

L.Sg.	jīraú	8/	9	1	778,9;
N.Pl.	jīráyas	12/	F	1	208,3;
		11\	F	1	285,5;

jugurvāni- a “wanting, willing to praise”, *gṝ* “praise, honor, welcome” < **ǵ^uerH* (EWA I, 593), see section 2.1.2.2.

N.A.Du.	jugurvānī	/8	1	1	142,8;
----------------	-------------------	----	---	---	--------

júṣṭi- f “favor”, *jus̄* “like, enjoy” < **ǵeus*, EWA I, 599. Compounds: *ájusṭi-* f “displeasure, discontent”, *havyájusṭi-* f “enjoyment of the sacrificial libation”.

N.Sg.	°jusṭis	/11	F	1	444,2;
A.Sg.	júṣṭim	11/	10	1	940,1;
	°jusṭim	/11	1	1	152,7;
			F	1	581,4;
I.Sg.	júṣṭī	11/	F	1	549,4;
L.Sg.	°jusṭau	/11	1	1	63,5;
N.Pl.	júṣṭayas	/8	1	1	10,12;

jūtī- f “haste”, YAv. *°zūiti-*, *jū* “be quick, be in a hurry”, no certain cognates outside Indo-Iranian, EWA I, 580f. Compounds: *vṝṣajūti-* a “having the speed/haste of a horse”.

N.Sg.	°jūtis	8/	F	1	389,3;
--------------	---------------	----	---	---	--------

			8	1	653,10;
A.Sg.	jūtím	11/	F	1	334,9;
		/11	F	1	268,2;
			9	1	809,9;
I.Sg.	jūtí	8/	F	1	661,6;
	jūt _i yá	/8	F	1	246,3;
D.Sg.	jūtáye	/8	1	1	127,2;
I.Pl.	jūtíbhī	11\	1	1	116,2;
		/11	F	1	237,8;

jūrñi- f “glow, flame”, *jvar/jval* “suffer; burn”, EWA I, 597, 607. Compounds: *sujūrñi-* a “hot” (< *^h“having good heat”), see section 2.1.7.

N.Sg.	jūrñis	11/	F	1	555,1;
		8/	1	1	129,8;
			8	1	681,9;
	°jūrñis	11/	F	1	302,3;
			10	1	921,6 (?);

jūrñi- a “glowing”, see above.

N.Sg.	jūrñis	8/	1	1	127,10;
-------	--------	----	---	---	---------

jñāti- m “(close) relative”, *jñā* “know, recognize” < **ǵneh₃*, cf. Gr. γνωτός etc., EWA I, 599ff., 601f.; NIL, 154ff.

N.A.Du.	jñātí	11/	10	1	943,9;
N.Pl.	jñátáyas	12\	10	1	892,14;
		/8	F	1	571,5;
			10	1	911,28;

jyeṣṭhātāti- m “supreme power”, derived from *jyeṣṭhá-* “highest, most powerful”, see AiG II,2, 621f. and section 2.1.4.

A.Sg.	jyeṣṭhātātim	12/	F	1	398,1;
-------	--------------	-----	---	---	--------

°jri- a “extending, stretching”, *jri* “extend, range, stretch over” (only in Indo-Iranian), EWA I, 606. Compounds: *urujri-* a “extending, stretching widely”, *párijri-* a “stretching out in all directions”.

N.Pl.	°jrāyas	/8	8	1	679,4;
	°jrayas	/12	1	1	64,5;
			F	2	408,2b,d;
		11\	F	1	555,3;

tatanúṣṭi- m “one who is taking up a lot of space”, EWA I, 618f., built to the weak stem of the perfect participle of *tan* “stretch, span, expand, spread out” < **ten* according to Liebert (1949, 188f.).

A.Sg.	tatanúṣṭim	/12	F	1	388,3;
-------	------------	-----	---	---	--------

táturi- a “victorious”, $t\bar{r}$ “conquer, cross (over), overcome” < $*terh_2$, EWA I, 629ff., cf. section 2.1.2.3.

N.Sg.	táturis	12\	1	1	145,3;
		11/	F	1	465,2;
A.Sg.	táturim	/11	F	1	509,7;
		11\	F	1	463,2;
		/11	F	1	335,2;

1. $^{\circ}$ **tani-** (a) “spanning, expanding”, *tan* “stretch, span, expand, spread out” < $*ten$ (EWA I, 618f.). Compounds: $\bar{a}t\bar{a}ni-$ a “pervading” (Grassmann ⁶1996, 174; AiG II,2, 295; NIL, 690ff., esp. fn. 2).

N.Sg.	$^{\circ}$ tánis	/12	F	1	192,10;
-------	-------------------------	-----	---	---	---------

2. $^{\circ}$ **tani-** f “thunder, sound”, (*s*)*tan* “thunder, roar” < $*(s)tenh_2$ (EWA I, 619, EWA II, 752f.). Compounds: *saṃtaní-* f “noise, sound” (Grassmann ⁶1996, 1471; AiG II,2, 298).

N.Sg.	$^{\circ}$ tánis	11\	9	1	781,2;
		/8	F	1	427,7;
A.Sg.	$^{\circ}$ taním	11\	9	1	809,14;

tantí- f “rope”, *tan* “stretch, span, expand, spread out” < $*ten$, EWA I, 618f.; NIL, 690ff.

N.Pl.	tantáyas	11\	F	1	465,4;
-------	-----------------	-----	---	---	--------

tápuṣi- a “glowing”, *tap* “burn, be hot”, derived from *tápuṣ-* “heat” ?, EWA I, 623f., 625; AiG II,2, 304.

A.Sg.	tápuṣim	11\	F	1	264,17 (= 493,3);
		/8	1	1	42,4;

taráni- a “advancing, pushing forward”, $t\bar{r}$ “conquer, cross (over), overcome” < $*terh_2$, EWA I, 629ff., cf. section 2.1.2.2.

N.Sg.	taránis	12/	F	1	548,9;
		/12	1	2	112,4; 128,6;
			F	1	341,5;
		11\	F	1	579,4;
			10	1	914,16;
		/11	1	1	121,6;
			F	2	283,3; 542,4;
		8/	1	1	50,4;
			F	1	548,20;
N.A.Sg.n.	taráni	/8	F	1	245,3;
A.Sg.	taránim	11\	F	2	263,13; 341,7;
		8/	8	1	665,28;
V.Sg.	tarane	11\	F	1	442,5;
N.Pl.	taránayas	11\	F	2	300,12; 583,8;
I.Pl.	taránibhis	12\	8	1	669,8;
		/11	F	1	329,1;

°**taviṣi-** (a) “possessing strength”, *tū* “be strong, have power” < **teuH*, *taviṣá-* “strong, powerful”, EWA I, 638f. Only attested in the Bahuvrīhi compound *ánibhr̥ṣṭataviṣi-* “having unwaning strength” (said of Brahmaṇaspati and Ṛbhu), with the *i*-form instead of expected *táviṣī-* f “strength” < **teuHs-ih₂-* as second compound member (AiG II,1, 99).

N.Sg. °**taviṣis** 12\ F 1 216,4;
/8+ F 1 361,7;

tátrpi- a “nourishing”, *trp* “nourish oneself, become satiated/satisfied” < **terp*, EWA I, 634f., see section 2.1.2.3.

A.Sg. **tátrpim** /8 F 1 274,2;

°**tikti-** f “haste”, *tij* “be sharp; sharpen” < *(*s*)*teig*, EWA I, 668f.; NIL, 660. Compounds: *nítikti-* f “haste, hurry”, only in adverbial use in the I.sg.

I.Sg. °**tikti** 11/ F 1 445,5;

(**tují-**) f “procreation”. Probably to be connected with *túc-* “offspring” etc. rather than with *tuj* “hurl, push forward, set in motion”, EWA I, 652, 670, *tujáye* (RV V,46,7, “to beget offspring”) would then be associated with D.sg. *tujé* id.

D.Sg. **tujáye** 12\ F 1 400,7;

°**tují-** (a) “hurling”, *tuj* “hurl, push forward, set in motion” < *(*s*)*teug* (EWA I, 652, 670), only in *ātují-* a “hitting, striking” (AiG II,2, 297).

N.A.Du. °**tují** /8 F 1 582,18;

túji- m PN, to be connected with *tuj* “hurl, push forward, set in motion” < *(*s*)*teug*, *túgra-* PN etc. ? Mayrhofer tentatively suggests a connection via the Caland-system, *túji-* might then be a hypocoristic form of a Caland-PN, cf. EWA I, 653.

A.Sg. **tújim** 11/ F 1 467,4;
D.Sg. **tújaye** 12\ 10 1 875,4;

tuturváni- a “striving to win”, *tūrv* “overcome, defeat, be superior to”, Indo-Iranian, EWA I, 662, see section 2.1.2.2.

N.Sg. **tuturvánis** /12 1 1 168,1;

turí- f “advancement” (?), unclear, EWA I, 657.

D.Sg. **turyaí** /11 10 1 932,4;

turphári- unclear, EWA I, 657, Kuiper (1991, 40, 42f.) suggests a loan from Old Munda.

N.A.Du. **turphári** 11\ 10 2 932,6; 932,8;

turváni- a “overwhelming”, *tūrv* “overcome, defeat, be superior to”, EWA I, 662, see section

2.1.2.2.

N.Sg.	turvānis	12/	1	1	56,3;
		/12	1	1	130,9;
		/12-	10	1	858,5;
		/11	1	2	61,11; 186,3;
			F	1	316,1;
		/8	1	2	128,3; 130,9;
	F	1	389,3;		

turvīti- m PN. Mayrhofer (EWA I, 658) suggests an Indo-European etymology (← **turva-iti-* “having a victorious walk, gait”), which, however, presupposes a remodelling after *dabhīti-* (both names occur in RV I,112,23b). Kuiper (1991, 7), on the other hand, cites *Turvīti-* in a list of possible non-Indo-Iranian personal names in the RV, which is why I refrained from citing the occurrences under °*iti-*.

A.Sg.	turvītim	12/	1	2	54,6; 112,23;
		8/	1	1	36,18;
D.Sg.	turvītaye	12/	F	1	204,12;
		11/	1	1	61,11;
			F	1	315,6;

tūtuji- a “attacking”, *tuj* “hurl, push forward, set in motion”, EWA I, 653, 670, also see sections 2.1.2.3. and 2.1.7. (on accent opposition). Compounds: *ātūtuji-* a “slow, lagging behind”.

N.Sg.	tūtujs	/11	F	1	544,3;
		/8	F	1	328,2;
		/12	10	1	861,6;
		11/	F	1	461,8;
A.Sg.	°tūtujim	11/	F	1	544,3;

tūtuji- m “leader (?)”, see the entry above.

N.Sg.	tūtujs	/8	10	1	848,3;
--------------	---------------	----	----	---	--------

°**tūr̥ti-** f “overcoming, advancement”, *tṛ̥* “conquer, cross (over), overcome” < **terh*₂, EWA I, 629ff. Compounds: *prātūr̥ti-* a/f “advancing quickly; fight”, *viśvātūr̥ti-* a “overcoming everything”, *suprātūr̥ti-* a “advancing well”.

N.Sg.	°tūr̥tis	/11	F	1	194,8;
A.Sg.	°tūr̥tim	8/	1	1	40,4 (= 243,1);
D.Sg.	°tūr̥taye	8 (?)	1	1	129,2;
N.A.Du.	°tūr̥tī	/11	1	1	185,7;
N.Pl.	°tūr̥tayas	/8	8	1	633,29;
L.Pl.	°tūr̥tiṣu	/8	8	1	708,5;

tūr̥ṇi- a “quick”, *tvar* “be in a hurry” or *tṛ̥* “conquer, cross (over), overcome”, EWA I, 629ff., 684f.

N.Sg.	túrṇis	11/	10	2	899,4; 914,6;
		8/	F	1	245,5;
A.Sg.	túrṇim	12/	F	1	237,5;
		/12	F	1	285,2;
N.Pl.	túrṇayas	/8	1	1	3,8;

túrvi- a “superior”, to be connected with *túrv* “overcome, defeat, be superior to” or *tṝ* “conquer, cross (over), overcome” (**tṛh₂-u-i-* ?), AiG II,2, 296; EWA I, 662.

D.Sg.	túrvaye	/8	9	1	754,3;
-------	---------	----	---	---	--------

trkṣí- m PN, unclear, EWA I, 663, a possible loan according to Kuiper (1991, 92).

A.Sg.	trkṣím	12/	8	1	642,7;
L.Sg.	trkṣaú	12/	F	1	487,8;

trptí-/tr̄pti- f “satisfaction, repletion”, *trp* “nourish oneself, become satiated/satisfied” < **terp*, cf. Gr. τέρπις, Lith. *tar̄pti* etc., EWA I, 634f. Again, the varying accent may reflect an archaism, see the entry **cítti-** above.

N.Sg.	tr̄ptis	/8	9	1	825,10;
A.Sg.	tr̄ptím	/8	8	1	691,6;

tvīṣi- f “impetuosity, shine”, *tvīṣ* “be excited, impetuous, flare up, be aroused”, only in Indo-Iranian, EWA I, 686f.

N.Sg.	tvīṣis	12/	F	1	362,5;
A.Sg.	tvīṣim	/11	1	1	71,5;
		8/	9	1	751,3;
I.Sg.	tvīṣ,yā	11\	10	1	915,2;
A.Pl.	tvīṣīs	11/	9	1	783,9;

dadí- a “giving”, *dā* “give, donate” < **deh₃* (EWA I, 713f.), see section 2.1.2.3. Compounds: *ādadí-* a “taking (away), receiving”, *parādadí-* a “delivering, surrendering sth./sbdy.”, *saṃdadí-* a “connecting, holding together”.

N.Sg.	dadís	12/	8	2	666,15a,b;
		/12	1	1	110,7;
			F	2	228,1; 228,2;
			8	4	641,6; 641,17; 644,3; 666,15;
		11/	F	2	208,8; 320,1;
		/11	F	1	464,4;
		/8	1	2	15,10; 81,7;
			10	1	959,3;
	°dadís	/12	F	1	215,13;
		8/	8	1	666,8;
		/8	1	2	81,2; 127,6;
			9	1	811,7;
N.A.Du.	°dadí	/11	F	1	230,7;

dádhi- a “placing”, *dhā* “place, put/set down” < **d^heh₁* (EWA I, 783ff.), see section 2.1.2.3.

N.Sg. **dádhis** 11-/ 10 1 872,1;

dadhṛṣváṇi- a “bold”, *dhṛṣ* “be bold, approach, attack” < **d^hers*, cf. *dádhrṣi-*, EWA I, 780f.; AiG II,2, 906.

A.Sg. **dadhṛṣváṇim** /8 8 1 670,3;

°**dari-** a “splitting, breaking”, *dṝ* “split, break” < **der*, EWA I, 701ff. Compounds: *godari-* a “providing cattle” (by splitting the mountain, said of Indra).

V.Sg. °**dare** /8 8 1 701,11;

dárvi- f “spoon”, maybe an Indic derivative of *dáru-* “wood” (**do/ery-i-* ?), EWA I, 704.

N.Sg. **dárvis** 8-/ 10 1 931,10;

N.A.Du. **dárvī** 8/ F 1 360,9;

°**dāti-** f “gift”, *dā* “give, offer” < **deh₃*, Av. *dāiti-*, EWA I, 713ff.; NIL, 60ff. Compounds: *havyádāti-* a/f “(giving) the offering of a sacrificial libation”. The regular zero-grade *ti-* stem is attested in the compounds *bhágatti-*, *maghāti-* and *vásutti-* (cf. the separate entries), the SMC going back to **dh₃-ti-* (Gr. δόσις) with larygal loss in compounds, cf. Kuiper (1961), but the full grade variety °*dāti-* was reintroduced very early. Since this is a phonologically rather than morphologically caused alternation and a stem °*tī-* is difficult to argue for, I have kept these entries apart.

A.Sg. °**dātim** /12 F 1 236,8;

/11 F 3 409,10; 442,9; 488,28;

10 1 833,7;

8/ F 1 532,9;

D.Sg. °**dātaye** /12 8 1 655,9;

/8 F 4 380,4 (= 405,1); 405,5; 457,10; 489,2;

8 1 710,1;

I.Pl. °**dātibhis** /12 8 1 643,15;

/8 F 1 304,5;

8 2 639,13; 643,21;

dádhr̥vi- a “firm, able to support load”, *dhṛ* “hold, support” < **d^her*, EWA I, 778f., see section 2.1.3.

N.Sg. **dádhr̥vis** /11 F 1 507,3;

dádhr̥ṣi- a “bold, courageous”, *dhṛṣ* “be bold, advance, attack” < **d^hers*, EWA I, 718, 780f., see section 2.1.2.3.

N.Sg. **dádhr̥ṣis** /12 F 1 207,7;

A.Sg. **dádhr̥ṣim** 11\ F 1 313,8;

dásuri- a “sacrificing”, *dās* “give, offer, sacrifice” < **dek̄*, EWA I, 722f. Compounds: *ádāsuri-* a “godless” (“not sacrificing”).

N.Sg. **dásuris** /12 8 1 624,12;

°dāśuris /8 8 1 665,15;

dīti- f “binding, ties”, name of a goddess, backformation of *áditi-* f “having no ties” (personified as goddess Aditi), *dā* “bind” < **deh*₁, EWA I, 63, 716f., 724; Liebert (1949, 36f.). Although the simplex is clearly secondary to the compound form in this case, I am subsuming *áditi-* under this entry (instead of the other way round) to avoid confusion.

N.Sg.	dītis	8/	F	1	531,12;
	°dītis	12/	10	1	892,4;
		12\	F	4	192,11; 218,7; 398,11; 400,6;
			10	3	862,3; 891,1; 892,3;
		12-	10	1	889,3;
		/12	F	1	231,6;
			8	1	645,3;
			10	4	837,2; 890,13; 918,11; 958,6;
		11/	1	4	89,10a,b,d; 94,16 (= 95,11; 96,9; 98,3; 100,19; 101,11;
					102,11; 103,8; 105,19; 106,7; 107,3; 108,13; 109,8; 110,9;
					111,5; 112,25; 113,20; 114,11; 115,6; 809,58);
			F	1	551,9;
		11\	1	3	72,9; 89,10a,c;
			F	10	288,18; 297,20; 321,5; 403,3; 413,8; 492,11; 508,4; 567,2;
					576,8; 609,7;
		/11	1	5	89,10d; 106,7 (= 341,7); 107,2 (= 350,6); 153,3; 162,22;
			F	10	238,11 (= 518,11); 288,20; 335,3; 385,5; 396,2; 405,11;
					525,3; 554,4; 556,2; 556,4;
			8	1	668,2;
			9	1	793,5;
			10	1	838,8;
		8/	F	1	516,12 (= 516,17; 667,9);
			8	4	638,6a-c; 638,7; 667,9;
			10	1	898,5;
		/8	1	1	43,2;
			F	1	582,6;
			8	2	632,14; 645,10;
			10	2	898,4; 898,9;
V.Sg.	°dite	12\	10	1	890,5;
		/12	8	1	647,5;
			10	1	865,11;
		11/	F	1	218,14;
		11\	1	1	94,15;
			F	1	351,1 (= 578,4);
		/11	F	3	220,3; 492,5; 576,1;
			10	1	889,17 (= 890,17);
		/8	F	1	405,14;
			8	4	638,4; 676,10; 676,14; 676,18;
A.Sg.	dítim	11/	F	1	298,11;
	°dítim	/11	F	1	416,8;
		12\	1	2	89,3; 136,3;
		12-	10	1	889,10;
		/12	1	1	106,1;
			F	1	400,3;
			8	1	639,14;
			10	4	889,5; 891,9; 918,14; 926,1 (= 926,2-11);
		11/	F	1	492,3;
		11\	F	7	321,3; 351,3; 396,1; 423,3; 526,4; 534,8; 555,5;
		/11	1	1	152,6;
			F	4	298,11; 416,8; 491,1; 492,4;
			8	1	710,15;

D.Sg.	°ditaye	11\	1	3	24,1; 24,2; 24,15;
			F	1	299,8;
			10	2	913,18; 936,4;
		/8	F	1	436,6;
G.Abl.Sg.	°dites	12\	10	1	889,2;
		/12	1	1	166,12;
			F	1	598,10 (= 599,10);
			9	4	781,3; 783,5; 786,3; 786,5;
			10	1	837,1;
		11\	F	1	557,2;
		/11	1	2	113,19; 185,3;
			F	6	219,3; 308,4; 338,4; 576,5; 603,7; 604,7;
			9	1	808,15;
			10	2	831,7; 896,7;
		8/	10	1	898,4;
		/8	8	1	638,5;
			9	1	738,1;
			10	2	898,8; 1011,3;
N.Pl.	°ditayas	11\	F	1	568,1;

°diṣṭi- (a) “having guidance”, *diś* “point at, indicate” < **deṣk*, OAv. °*dišti*-, EWA I, 744ff. Only in the Bahuvrīhi-compound *smāddiṣṭi*- a “provided with guidance”.

N.Sg.	°diṣṭis	8/	F	1	279,5;
N.A.Du.	°diṣṭī	8/	10	1	888,10;
N.Pl.	°diṣṭayas	11/	F	1	534,23;
A.Pl.	°diṣṭīn	/11	F	1	504,9;

°dītī- f “shine”, *dī* “shine, glow” < **deih*₂, EWA I, 701. Compounds: *sudīti*- a/f “(having a) beautiful light, shine”.

A.Sg.	°dītīm	12/	F	1	236,13;
		11/	F	1	251,4;
		8/	F	1	261,10;
I.Sg.	°dītī	11/	F	1	517,21;
D.Sg.	°dītāye	8	8	1	680,14;
N.Pl.	°dītāyas	12/	F	1	400,6;
		/12	1	1	159,4;
		8/	8	1	706,12;
I.Pl.	°dītībhis	/12	F	1	362,4;
		8/	F	2	379,2; 489,3;
		/8	F	1	418,5;
			8	1	640,2;

°dīditi- f “shine”, *dī* “shine, glow” < **deih*₂, EWA I, 701, see section 2.1.1.3. Compounds: *sudīditi*- a/f “(having a) beautiful light, shine”.

A.Sg.	°dīditim	/12	F	1	243,1;
			8	1	639,4;

dīdivi- a “shining”, *dī* “shine, glow”, EWA I, 701, see section 2.1.2.3.

A.Sg.	dīdivim	/8	1	1	1,8;
--------------	----------------	----	---	---	------

dīdhiti- f “thought, meditation”, *dhi* “see, contemplate” < **d^heiH* / *d^heH-i*, but no certain

non-Indo-Iranian cognates, EWA I, 777f., see section 2.1.1.3.

N.Sg.	d̥dhitis	/12	1	1	186,11;
		11/	F	1	238,3;
		/8	F	1	372,4;
A.Sg.	d̥dhitim	11\	F	1	298,16;
		/11	F	1	265,1;
		/8	9	1	814,1 (= 814,8);
I.Sg.	d̥dhitī	/11	F	1	396,1;
I.Pl.	d̥dhitibhis	11\	F	1	517,1;

dúdhi- a “stubborn, obstinate”, *dudhrá-* id., no cognates outside Indic, EWA I, 731.

D.Sg.	dúdhaye	11\	F	1	477,2;
G.Abl.Sg.	dúdhes	12/	10	1	928,6;

dundubhí- m “(kettle)drum”, EWA I, 731; Kuiper (1991, 19).

N.Sg.	dundubhís	11\	F	1	488,31;
		/8	1	1	28,5;
V.Sg.	dundubhe	11/	F	1	488,29;
		11+\	F	1	488,30;

°duri- a “attentive”, *dṝ* “split, break” < **der*, *á* + *dar* “make accessible”, EWA I, 701ff.
Compounds: *ādurí-* a “attentive, paying attention”.

V.Sg.	°dure	/8	F	1	326,24;
-------	-------	----	---	---	---------

dṝti- m “leather pouch”, *dṝ* “split, break” < **der*, cf. Gr. δέρις, EWA I, 701ff., 741.

N.Sg.	dṝtis	12/	F	1	341,1;
		8/	F	1	605,2;
		/8	8	1	625,19;
A.Sg.	dṝtim	12/	F	1	341,3;
		11/	F	2	437,7; 619,2;
		8/	1	1	191,10;
G.Abl.Sg.	dṝtes	/8	9	1	713,8;
		12/	F	1	489,18;

°dṝpti- f “madness, insanity”, *dṝp* “be crazy, confused”, only attested in Indic, EWA I, 703.
Compounds: *prádṝpti-* f “madness, recklessness”.

N.Sg.	°dṝptis	/11	F	1	444,2;
-------	----------	-----	---	---	--------

dṝśatí- f “sight, appearance”, *dṝś* “see, appear (mid.)” < **derk̄*, EWA I, 704ff., see section 2.1.1.3.

N.Sg.	dṝśatís	/11	F	1	444,3;
-------	----------	-----	---	---	--------

(dṝśí-) Inf. of *dṝś* “see, appear (mid.)” < **derk̄*, EWA I, 704ff., see section 2.1.5.

D.Sg.	dṝśáye	12\	F	1	215,8;
		11\	F	3	434,5; 551,5; 604,2;
		9	1	803,6;	

		10	1	840,12;
/11	F	1	450,5;	
10/	F	1	485,8;	

°**dr̥ṣṭi-** f “sight, appearance”, *dr̥ś* “see, appear (mid.)” < **derk̑*, cf. Av. *dar̥šti-*, EWA I, 704ff.
Compounds: *sáṃdr̥ṣṭi-* f “sight, appearance”.

N.Sg.	° dr̥ṣṭis	11/	F	1	195,4;
		/8	F	1	457,25;
		5 (?)	F	1	306,5;
L.Sg.	° dr̥ṣṭau	12/	1	1	144,7 (= 890,11);
		/11	F	1	442,4;

devátātati- f “group of gods”, *devá-* “god”, see section 2.1.4.

A.Sg.	devátātīm	/12	1	1	141,10;
		11/	F	1	302,9;
		/11	F	4	253,2 (= 302,3); 253,4; 517,18; 555,1;
D.Sg.	devátātaye	/12	1	1	127,9;
			F	1	260,2;
			8	1	669,10;
		/8	1	1	127,9;
			8	3	623,5; 671,8; 710,1;
			9	3	727,2; 729,7; 777,27;
L.Sg.	devátātā		10	1	967,6;
		12/	1	2	34,5; 58,1;
		11/	F	1	554,7;
		/11	F	6	253,1 (= 879,1); 302,1; 445,1; 509,2; 518,5; 559,3;

dyotaní- f “brightness”, *dyut* “flare up, flash, gleam” < **dieu-t*, EWA I, 753f., see section 2.1.2.2.

A.Sg.	dyotaním	11/	F	1	292,1;
			10	1	838,7;

draví- m “cutter”, *dru* “cut down”, Indo-Iranian, EWA I, 756.

N.Sg.	dravís	11/	F	1	444,4;
-------	---------------	-----	---	---	--------

drāpí- m “coat”, maybe connected with **drep* “cut off”, EWA I, 758.

A.Sg.	drāpím	12/	F	1	349,2;
			9	1	798,14;
		11\	1	1	116,10;
		8/	1	1	25,13;
			9	1	812,9;

dhamaní- f “vein” (< *“(blow)pipe”), *dham* “blow” < **d^hemH*, EWA I, 775, see section 2.1.2.2.

A.Sg.	dhamaním	11\	F	1	202,8;
-------	-----------------	-----	---	---	--------

dharṇasí- a “strong”, *dhr̥* “hold, support, be firm” < **d^her*, EWA I, 778f.

N.Sg.	dharṇasís	11/	F	1	397,13;
		/8	9	3	714,2; 735,5; 749,2 (= 750,6);
N.A.Sg.n.	dharṇasí	/8	1	1	105,6;
A.Sg.	dharṇasím	12\	F	1	362,4;

/12	1	1	141,11;
8/	9	1	738,3;
/8	8	1	626,14;
	9	2	726,2; 811,5;

dharní- m “preserver”, *dhr* “hold, support, be firm” < **d^her*, EWA I, 778f.

N.Sg. **dharnís** /8 1 1 127,7;

dhā́sī- m/f “site, spring, refreshment”, etym. unclear, EWA I, 790f.

N.Sg.	dhāsís	/12	9	1	797,3;
A.Sg.	dhāsím	12/	1	1	140,1;
		11/	F	1	366,4;
		11\	F	1	522,2;
		/11	1	1	62,3;
			F	2	351,7; 395,17;
			10	1	856,1;
		8/	8	2	663,7; 663,29;
I.Sg.	dhāsínā	/11	F	2	299,9; 508,6;
G.Abl.Sg.	dhāsés	/11	1	1	122,13;
			F	3	241,1; 241,3; 291,1;
			10	1	915,11;

°**dhí-** m “placing, placement”, *dhā* “place, make, create sth.” < **d^heh₁*, EWA I, 783ff.; NIL, 99ff., esp. fn. 18 & 19. Probably reflects **d^hh₁-í-* rather than **d^hh₁-C* (NIL, l.c.; Klingenschmitt (1980, 213f., fn. 14), see section 2.1.2.1 above).

Compounds: *apidhí-* m “cover”, *ādhí-* m “token, pawn”, *iṣudhí-* m “quiver” (< “containing arrows”), *utsadhí-* m “container of water; well”, *udadhí-* m “cloud”, *upadhí-* m part of the wheel (cf. Klingenschmitt 1980, 214, fn. 15), *garbhadhí-* m “mating place” (= nest etc.), *nīdhí-* m “depository, treasury”, *parīdhí-* m “surrounding, defense”, *pratīdhí-* m part of the wheel, *pradhí-* m “wheel rim(s)” (cf. Koch (2003, 356), Klingenschmitt (1980, 214ff.)), *vṛṣandhi-* a “firmly connected” (cf. EWA II, 575f.; AzI II, 395f.), *śevadhí-* m “treasure”, *sandhí-* m “connection, putting together”.

N.Sg.	° dhís	11/	F	2	516,5; 583,7;
			10	1	934,7;
		11\	1	1	125,7;
		/11	10	1	956,3;
		/8	10	2	935,3; 1012,3;
A.Sg.	° dhím	12/	F	1	204,6;
			8	1	621,12;
		/12	1	1	130,3;
			F	1	215,6;
			10	1	964,6;
		11/	F	2	397,8; 585,3;
			10	1	928,7;
		11\	1	1	116,11;
		/11	1	1	88,4;
			F	4	267,6; 314,6; 549,9; 549,12;
			10	1	844,4;
		8/	F	1	610,12;
		/8	1	1	30,4;
	° dhim	11/	F	1	318,2;
G.Abl.Sg.	° dhés	/11	10	1	893,5;
		/8	10	1	921,3;

N.A.Du.	°dhí	11\	F	1	230,4;
		/11	F	1	230,4;
N.Pl.	°dháyas	11\	1	2	164,48; 183,4 (= 292,5);
		/8	10	2	911,8; 916,15;
A.Pl.	°dhín	12/	1	1	127,7;
			10	1	964,4;
		/12	1	1	52,5;
		11/	10	1	894,6;
		/11	1	1	33,3;
			9	1	808,11;
			10	2	934,2; 965,4;
		8/	9	1	819,19;
		/8	F	2	279,3; 326,15;
		I.Pl.	°dhíbhī	11\	10
G.Pl.	°dhīnāam	/8	8	1	649,6;
L.Pl.	°dhīṣu	11\	10	1	841,5;

°(d)hiti- f “placing, placement” (< *d^hh₁-ti-, cf. Gr. θέσις), dhā “put, place sth.” < *d^heh₁, EWA I, 783ff.; NIL, 99ff. Compounds: *nemádhiti*- f “distinction” (cf. EWA II, 56), *puróhiti*- f “the office/work of the house priest”, *mitrádhiti*- f “alliance”, *vanádhiti*- f “layer of wood”, *vásudhiti*- a/f “placing, giving goods; the placement of goods²²”, *asméhi*- f “our duty”, *deváhi*- f “divine order, laws set down by the gods”.

N.Sg.	°dhītis	/11	1	1	121,7;
		/12	F	1	599,4;
		11/	10	1	934,1;
A.Sg.	°dhītim	/11	F	1	576,12 (= 577,7);
		/12	1	1	128,8;
		/11	F	1	606,3;
		/8	F	1	304,2;
		11/	F	1	619,9;
D.Sg.	°dhītaye	11\	1	1	120,9;
L.Sg.	°dhītā	/11	1	1	72,4;
			F	2	474,4; 543,1;
		8/	10	1	919,13;
N.A.Du.	°dhītī	/11	F	1	265,17;
		/8	F	1	344,3;
V.Du.	°dhītī	11/	1	1	181,1;

dhītī- f “thought, contemplation”, dhī “see, behold, contemplate” < *d^heiH/d^heH-i, YAv. °dīti-, but no certain non-Indo-Iranian cognates, EWA I, 777f.; NIL, 120. Compounds: *ádbdhadhītī*- a “having untarnished thoughts, good intentions”, *ṛtádhītī*- a “having the right intentions”.

N.Sg.	dhītís	12/	1	2	110,1; 119,2;
		11/	F	1	319,8;
			10	1	857,3;
		/11	F	1	301,7;
			10	1	937,2;
		/10	1	1	68,5;
		8/	8	1	632,10;
A.Sg.	dhītīm	12/	F	1	456,9;
			9	1	788,4;
		/12	1	1	143,1;

²²The accent suggests that the adjectival (i.e. Bahuvrīhi) usage is the older one.

		11/	F	2	479,1; 580,4;
			9	1	809,34;
			10	1	834,7;
		/11	1	2	71,3; 77,4;
			F	3	222,7; 456,11; 529,1;
	°dhītim	/11	10	1	873,6;
I.Sg.	dhī́	11/	1	1	164,8;
		8/	F	1	379,3;
D.Sg.	dhī́táye	/8	1	1	41,5;
N.Pl.	dhī́táyas	12/	9	1	798,31;
		12\	1	1	144,5;
		/12	1	2	132,5; 139,1;
			10	1	890,2;
		11\	F	1	475,3;
			9	1	805,1;
		/8	1	2	25,16; 132,5(= 139,1);
			F	1	246,7;
			8	5	626,7; 626,8; 664,22; 1018,6; 1019,4;
			9	5	720,4; 727,8; 731,4(= 778,11); 811,4; 823,2;
			10	1	851,4;
	°dhī́tayas	11/	F	2	351,2; 492,10;
V.Pl.	°dhī́tayas	8/	F	1	405,2;
A.Pl.	°dhī́tīn	/11	F	1	492,3;
I.Pl.	dhī́tibhis	12/	1	1	164,36;
		/12	1	1	110,4; 161,7(= 332,4);
			F	3	286,6; 502,2; 582,10;
			9	1	780,7;
		11\	1	1	153,1;
		/8	1	1	22,14;
			F	4	247,5; 407,11; 455,1; 531,9;
			8	6	628,5; 628,19; 632,31; 1023,1; 669,4 (= 966,3); 711,16;
			9	5	721,4; 752,1; 774,17; 819,24; 823,2;
			10	1	852,2;
	°dhī́tibhis	11/	F	1	480,2;

dhūni- a “thunderous”, *dhvan* “make sounds, noises”, maybe onomatopoeic, EWA I, 801; Kuiper (1991, 92).

N.Sg.	dhū́nis	/12	F	2	388,5; 388,8;
		11/	1	2	79,1; 174,9 (= 461,12);
			F	1	572,8;
			10	1	915,5;
A.Sg.	dhū́nim	12/	10	1	939,9;
		11\	F	1	206,5;
			10	1	975,1;
		/11	F	3	206,9; 459,8; 535,4;
N.A.Du.	dhū́nī	/11	10	1	848,4;
N.Pl.	dhū́nayas	12\	1	2	64,5; 87,3;
			F	1	414,7;
			10	1	904,3;
		/12	10	1	921,3;
		11\	F	3	221,2; 507,10; 521,5;
G.Pl.	dhū́nīnaam	/8	F	1	441,3;
			8	1	640,14;

dhūti- m “causer of jolts, tremor”, *dhū* “shake, move about” < **d^heuH*, EWA I, 782f.

N.Pl.	dhū́tayas	/12	1	2	87,3; 168,2;
		/11	1	1	64,5;

V.Pl.	dhūtayas	/8	F	1	415,14;
		/12	F	1	408,4;
		11\	F	1	574,4;
		/8	1	3	37,6; 39,1; 39,10;
			F	1	489,20;
		8	1	640,16;	

dhūrtí- f “damage”, *dhvr̥* “damage, injure”, probably only Indic, EWA I, 802.

N.Sg.	dhūrtís	12/	8	1	647,15;
		11/	8	1	668,3;
		8/	1	1	18,3 (= 610,8);
G.Abl.Sg.	dhūrtés	/12-	1	1	128,7;
		11/	F	1	517,13;
		8/	1	1	36,15;
N.Pl.	dhūrtāyas	/8-	1	1	128,7;
		/8	8	1	665,9;

dhautí- f “river”, *dhāv* “run, flow” < **d^heu*, EWA I, 789f.

G.Pl.	dhautīnām	12/	F	1	204,5;
--------------	------------------	-----	---	---	--------

°dhrajati- (a) “possessing a way, flight”, *dhraj* “drift, glide, fly”, only in Indic, EWA I, 798, see section 2.1.1.3. Only attested in the Bahuvrīhi compound *citrádhrajati-* a “whose way is bright, shining”.

N.Sg.	°dhrajatis	11/	F	1	444,5;
--------------	-------------------	-----	---	---	--------

dhráji- f “wind gust”, *dhraj* “drift, glide, fly”, only Indic, EWA I, 798.

N.Sg.	dhrájis	11/	1	1	164,44;
A.Sg.	dhrájim	/8	10	1	962,2;
I.Sg.	dhráj,yā	/8	10	1	923,13;

dhṛúti- f “deceit”, to be connected with *drugh* “deceive” < **d^hrey(g)* rather than *dhvar* “damage, injure”, cf. EWA I, 760f., 802

N.Sg.	dhṛútis	/11	F	1	602,6;
--------------	----------------	-----	---	---	--------

dhruví- a “fixed”, *dhruvá-* id., *dhṛ* “hold, support, be firm” < **d^her*, EWA I, 798f. Compounds: *nídhruvi-* a “steadfast, faithful”.

N.Sg.	°dhruvis	/11	F	1	519,1;
		/8	8	1	649,3;
N.A.Sg.	°dhruvi	/8	8	1	640,22;
N.Pl.	dhruvāyas	11\	F	1	551,8;

dhvasáni- a “spraying”, *dhvaṁs* “spray, scatter” (< **d^huens* ? Only attested in Indic), EWA I, 799f., see section 2.1.2.2.

L.Sg.	dhvasānau	/12	1	1	164,29;
--------------	------------------	-----	---	---	---------

dhvasánti- m PN, probably belongs to *dhvaṁs*, see the entry above, EWA I, 799f.

A.Sg. **dhvasántim** 12/ 1 1 112,23;

námuci- m name of a demon, unclear, EWA II, 17; Kuiper (1991, 92).

A.Sg. **námucim** 12\ 1 1 53,7;
 11\ F 1 205,5;
 /11 F 1 535,7;
 10 1 899,7;
 G.Abl.Sg. **námuces** /11 F 2 384,7; 384,8 (= 461,6);
 /8 8 1 634,13;
 L.Sg. **námucāu** 8/ 10 1 957,4;

navatī- f “ninety” < $*(h_1)neun̄-ti-$, YAv. *nauuaiti-*, EWA II, 24f., see 2.1.1.2.

N.Sg. **navatís** /11 10 1 924,10;
 /8 F 1 344,4;
 A.Sg. **navatīm** 12\ 1 2 54,6; 130,7;
 /12 1 2 53,9; 155,6;
 10 1 875,8;
 11/ F 1 488,2;
 10 1 930,8;
 11\ 1 2 32,14; 121,13;
 F 1 615,5;
 /11 F 4 205,4; 210,6; 383,6; 535,5;
 10 1 924,11;
 8/ 1 1 80,8;
 /8 F 1 246,6;
 8 1 702,2;
 I.Sg. **navatī** 12\ 10 1 865,10;
navatyā 11\ F 1 209,6;
 A.Pl **navatīs** 11\ F 1 322,3;
 /8 1 1 84,13;
 9 1 773,1;
 G.Pl. **navatīnāam** /8 1 1 191,13;

nāviṣṭi- f unclear, EWA II, 26.

L.Sg. **nāviṣṭau** /8 8 1 622,17;

nābhi- f “nave, navel” < $*h_3nob^h-i-$ or $*h_3nēb^h-i-$, EWA II, 13f.; NIL, 385f., fn. 9. Compounds: *trinābhi-* a “having three naves”, *vṛṣanābhi-* a “having strong naves”, *sānābhi-* a “related” (“descending from the same navel”).

N.Sg. **nābhis** 12/ 9 1 786,4;
 11/ 1 1 104,4;
 F 1 306,8;
 10 4 836,4; 872,3; 887,18; 887,19;
 11\ F 1 340,5;
 /11 1 6 59,1; 59,2; 163,12; 164,33; 164,34; 164,35;
 F 2 354,1; 488,28;
 8 1 710,15;
 8/ 8 1 661,6;
 /8 1 1 105,9;
 °nābhis /11 1 1 164,13;
 8/ 10 1 959,5;
 N.A.Sg.n. °nābhi 11/ 1 1 164,2;
 A.Sg. **nābhim** 11/ F 1 448,2;

			10	1	831,3;
		/11	1	1	185,5;
			F	5	194,9; 231,1 (= 251,4); 231,4; 397,8; 401,2;
			10	1	950,2;
		8/	9	1	722,8;
I.Sg.	nābhinā	11\	F	1	480,4;
	°nābhinā	/8	8	1	640,10;
G.Abl.Sg.	nābhyās	8/	10	1	916,14;
L.Sg.	nābhā	12/	1	1	143,4;
			F	1	194,7;
			9	3	784,7 (= 798,8); 791,4; 794,3;
			10	2	888,4; 890,13;
		11/	F	2	238,4; 239,5;
		11\	10	1	827,6;
		/11	F	1	239,9;
		8/	1	3	43,9; 139,1; 142,10;
			F	1	263,4;
			8	2	632,32; 633,29;
			9	2	722,8; 724,4;
	nābhau	12/	10	1	908,6;
		11/	10	1	839,3;
N.Pl.	nābhayas	/12	9	1	785,1;
		/8	1	1	139,9;
	°nābhayas	11/	9	1	801,4;
		/11	10	1	904,4;

nāri- f “wife”, derived from *nār-* < **h₂ner-* “man”, EWA II, 19f. The *i*-stem *nāri-* (< **-ih₂-*) is clearly primary in this case (cf. AiG III, 184), although Nussbaum (2009) argues that it could in fact go back to a *vṛddhi* derivative in *-i-* built to athematic Iir. **Hnar-*, which was then adapted to the synchronically less marked *i*-feminines.

D.Abl.Pl.	nāribhyas	8/	8	1	686,8;
	nāribh _i yas	8	1	1	43,6;
L.Pl.	nāriṣu	/8	10	1	912,11;

nīrṛti- f “(goddess of) doom, destruction” < **nis-Hr₂-ti-*. Since Indo-Iranian inherited several roots from PIE which developed to **Har* (cf. Pinault (1999-2000, 464f.)), the assignment of the SMC to one of them is not quite unanimous. Mayrhofer (EWA II, 45) and Pinault, l.c., opt for **h₂er* “put together”, Werba (1997, 165) groups this lexeme around Ved. *r* “arrive” < **h₁er*. I have therefore kept *nīrṛti-*, *āvarti-* and *sāmṛti-* apart (see the respective entries), although they may be connected etymologically.

N.Sg.	nīrṛtis	/12	10	1	862,2;
		11\	F	1	395,17;
		/11	F	1	553,7;
			10	2	836,11; 885,1 (= 885,2-4);
		8/	1	1	38,6;
A.Sg.	nīrṛtim	12\	10	2	862,4; 902,4;
		11\	1	1	164,32;
		/11	1	1	24,9;
			F	1	515,2;
D.Sg.	nīrṛtyai	8/	1	1	990,1;
G.Abl.Sg.	nīrṛtes	/11	1	1	117,5;
			F	2	574,1; 620,9;
			10	3	844,10; 921,14; 987,2;

	nírṛtyās	11/	10	1	991,1;
N.Pl.	nírṛtīs	/12	10	1	940,2;
G.Pl.	nírṛtīnaam	/8	8	1	644,24;

°nīti- f “lead, leading”, nī “lead, guide” < *neiH, YAv. °nīti-, EWA II, 17ff. Compounds: ágranīti- f “the first lead (= sacrifice)”, ásunīti- f “leading, guidance of beings (into the nether-world)” (cf. NIL, 237 fn. 5), ṛjunīti- f “correct, right lead”, práṇīti- f “guidance, leadership, lead”, várpanīti- a “using a ruse”, vāmānīti- a “giving good guidance”, śárdhanīti- m “leader of the group”, sahásraṇīti- a “having a thousands ways, leads”, súnīti- a/f “(granting) good leading”, sunīti- a/f id., supráṇṇīti- a “granting good leading, leadership”.

N.Sg.	°nītis	11/	1	1	73,1;
			F	1	488,7;
			9	1	783,7;
			10	1	895,1;
		/11	F	4	268,3a,b; 298,13; 488,7;
		8/	F	1	489,20;
			8	1	677,11;
V.Sg.	°nīte	11/	10	1	885,6;
		/11	F	2	235,16; 249,4;
		11+ /	10	1	885,5;
A.Sg.	°nītim	/11	10	4	838,4; 841,14; 842,2; 889,10;
		/10	F	1	202,14;
I.Sg.	°nīť	8/	1	1	90,1;
		11/	1	1	91,1;
			F	4	285,7; 300,14; 544,3; 548,15;
		/11	F	1	396,18 (= 397,17; 430,5; 431,5);
		8/	F	1	486,1;
			8	1	669,11;
L.Sg.	°nītau	/11	F	3	218,5; 218,13; 249,1;
N.Pl.	°nīáyas	/12	10	1	904,2;
	°nīayās	/12	8	1	647,12;
			10	1	841,11;
		/8	F	1	486,3 (= 632,21);
			10	1	952,4;
I.Pl.	°nītibhis	12/	F	1	214,4;
		/12	10	1	889,13;
		11/	10	1	930,5;
L.Sg.	°nītiṣu	/12	1	1	114,2;
		/8	8	1	626,22;

nīđi- m “nest mate”, derivative of nīđá- < *ni-zd-ó- “nest” (cf. ní+sad “sitting down”), EWA II, 49f., see section 2.1.6.

N.Pl.	nīđáyas	/12	10	1	918,6;
--------------	----------------	-----	----	---	--------

nṛťi- f “dance”, nṛť “dance”, only in Indic, EWA II, 21f.

D.Sg.	nṛťáye	11\	10	1	844,3;
L.Sg.	nṛťaú	11/	10	1	855,2;

nemí- f “wheel rim”, unclear, EWA II, 56; Koch (2003, 355). Compounds: áriṣṭanemi- a “whose wheel rim is undamaged”, sánemi- a “having a wheel (rim)”, híraṇyanemi- a “having a golden wheel (rim)”.

N.Sg.	nemís	12/	1	1	141,9;
		11/	1	1	32,15;
		8/	F	2	196,3; 367,6;
		8	8	1	654,3;
N.A.Sg.n.	°nemis	/11	1	1	89,6;
	°nemi	12/	1	1	164,14;
		11/	1	2	62,9; 169,3;
			F	1	554,7;
		10/	F	1	572,9;
		8/	9	2	816,6; 817,6;
		5	F	1	306,7;
V.Sg.	°neme	11/	F	1	287,17;
A.Sg.	nemím	11/	10	1	887,16;
		8/	F	1	548,20;
			8	3	666,23; 684,5; 706,12;
	°nemim	11/	1	1	180,10;
			10	1	1004,1;
N.Pl.	nemáyas	/8	1	1	38,12;
	°nemayas	/8	1	1	105,1;

paktí- f “cooking, cooked meal”, *pac* “cook” < **pek^u*, cf. OCS *peštъ* “oven”, Gr. πέψις etc., EWA II, 64; NIL, 548ff.

N.Sg.	paktís	11/	F	2	320,5; 470,4;
A.Sg.	paktím	11/	F	1	321,6;
D.Sg.	paktáye	11\	F	1	321,7;
A.Pl.	paktís	12/	F	1	548,8;
		11/	F	2	320,7; 383,11;

pañktí- f “group of five” < **penk^u-ti-*, OCS *pętъ*, EWA II, 63, see section 2.1.1.2.

A.Pl.	pañktís	11/	10	1	943,8;
-------	---------	-----	----	---	--------

pañí- m name of a demon (pl.: and his followers), unclear origin (a tribal name?), EWA II, 70; Kuiper (1991, 19).

N.Sg.	pañís	11/	1	1	33,3;	
		/11	1	1	180,7;	
		/8	F	1	415,8;	
A.Sg.	pañím	/12	F	2	492,14; 502,1;	
		11\	F	1	485,22;	
				10	1	893,6;
		/11	1	1	93,4;	
		8/	8	2	665,14; 684,7;	
		/8	F	1	485,22;	
				10	1	982,3;
I.Sg.	pañínā	11\	1	1	32,11;	
			F	1	321,7;	
G.Abl.Sg.	pañés	12/	1	1	83,4;	
				F	1	388,7;
		/12	1	1	182,3;	
				10	1	918,3;
		11\	F	1	454,3;	
		/11	F	1	292,2;	
		8/	F	2	494,3; 494,6;	
L.Sg.	pañáú	/8	8	1	706,2;	
N.Pl.	pañáyas	12\	1	1	151,9;	

		11\	1	1	124,10;
			F	2	347,3; 461,4;
				10	2 934,7; 934,8;
A.Pl.	pañín	/12	8	1	646,10;
		11/	1	1	184,2;
			F	2	480,2; 522,3;
		/11	F	2	474,2; 535,9;
		8/	8	1	673,2;
				10	1 886,6;
		/8	8	1	675,10;
V.Pl.	pañáyas	11\	10	5	934,2; 934,4; 934,6; 934,10; 934,11;
I.Pl.	pañíbhī	11\	F	1	354,4;
D.Abl.Pl.	pañíbhyas	/8	9	1	734,7;
G.Pl.	pañīná	12/	F	1	215,6;
		/11	F	1	525,2;
		8/	F	1	494,7;
	pañīnáam	12\	9	1	823,2;
		/8	F	2	486,31; 494,5;

páti- m “lord; husband” < **pó/éti-*, Av. *paiti-*, Gr. *πόσις* etc., EWA II, 73f.; Thieme (1995, 1059ff.). In Indo-Iranian, the reflexes seem to point to two different accent/ablaut-structures which correlate with different meanings: when *páti-* means “lord, master” it is inflected according to the “default” *i*-stem inflection (G.sg. *pátes*, I.sg. *pátya*, D.sg. *°pátaye* in *bṛhaspátaye* (RV IX,85,6), N.pl. *pátayas*), in the meaning “husband” we find the zero-grade suffix corresponding to the inflection of *ávi-* and *arí-* (D.sg. *pátye*, L.sg. *pátiau*). However, this cannot be interpreted as a reflex of ID, because this is obviously a secondary Indo-Iranian development based on the differentiation of the two meanings “master” and “husband”. As already pointed out by Wackernagel/Debrunner (AiG II,2, 142f.), *páti-* meaning the latter became associated with kinship terms of the type *pítár-* “father” etc. and adopted some inflectional features of this class. A possible formal interface for this process was the I.sg. *pátyā* (cf. *pitrā*), to which other zero-grade suffix formations could be built. That this was a rather late development is shown by the fact that the characteristic G.sg. ending *-us* (< **-rs*) of the *pítár-* class is found only once in the Rigveda (in the notoriously late tenth book, RV X,18,8). Similarly, the L.sg. *pátiau* occurs only twice (RV IX,82,4; X,159,3).

Tremblay (1998, 2003), however, in fact reconstructs an ID chain starting from a root noun **pot-* (cf. Lith. *viešpats* < **uo/eik̃-(s)-pot-* “lord”) “ability, power” (?), from which he derives a concrete agent noun via the suffix **-i-* which supposedly expresses a being having the qualities of the base (“maître”), from which a proterokinetic adjective (“maître de”) is then derived, giving the familiar Indo-Iranian G.sg. Ved. *-es*/Av. *-ōiš*. This is difficult to maintain since, as argued above in section 2.4., the proterokinetic suffix structure of the weak singular stem must have been dominant (at least) already in early Indic due to the productivity of the *ti*-stems²³, and the proterokinetic-looking inflection of *páti-/paiti-* should therefore not be projected back to the proto-language on the basis of Indo-Iranian alone. Besides, at least for Vedic one cannot really argue that the compound use is linked to the “proterokinetic” inflection in a morphologically meaningful way and certainly not in the way expected, i.e. as an exocentric/possessive derivative. In fact, as Tremblay states himself later (2003, 246), the compounds with *°páti-/°paiti-* are juxtapositions, not possessive compounds (or going back to such). The traditional analysis is therefore to be preferred.

²³Although Tremblay (1998, 29f., fn. 48) doubts this line of argument.

Compounds: *aśvapati-* m “lord of horses”, *ājīpati-* m “lord of the race”, *indrābṛhaspati-* “Indra and Bṛhaspati”, *indrābrahmanaspati-* “Indra and Brahmanaspati”, *urvarāpati-* m “lord of the farmland”, *ṛtāspati-* m “lord, protector of the law”, *ṛtupati-* m “lord of the correct sacrifice”, *gaṇāpati-* m “leader of the group”, *gāthāpati-* m “master of the (sacrificial) song”, *grhāpati-* m “master, lord of the household”, *gōpati-* m “owner, lord of the cattle”, *g(a)nāspati-* m “husband of a goddess”, *jāspati-* m “lord, head of the household”, *jāspāti-* m “the family and its head of household”, *dākṣapati-* m “master of what is correctly done”, *dāmpati-* m “master, head of the house(hold)”, *nidhāpati-* m “master of nets, traps”, *nṛpāti-* m “lord, leader of the men”, *pāripati-* m “protecting the surroundings”, *pūrpāti-* m “lord of the stronghold”, *prajāpati-* m “lord of the progeny”, *bṛhaspāti-* m PN (cf. EWA II, 232f.), *madapati-* m “lord of the intoxicating drink”, *mitrapati-* m “protector of the friends, allies”, *medhāpati-* m “lord of the sacrifice”, *yajñāpati-* m “lord, instigator of the sacrifice”, *rāthaspāti-* m “lord, protector of the chariot”, *rayipāti-* m “lord of the wealth”, *rādhaspati-* m “lord of the offerings, gifts”, *vānaspāti-* m “tree” (< “lord of the woods”), *vāsupati-* m “lord of the goods”, *vājapati-* m “lord, owner of the spoils of victory”, *viśpāti-* m “master of the clan, head of household, *pater familias*”, *vrājāpati-* m “lord of the pen, enclosure” (EWA II, 594), *śácīpāti-* m “lord of strength”, *śrāvayātpati-* a “rendering one’s master (father) famous”, *sātpati-* m the first compound member remains unclear, cf. EWA II, 690, *sādaspāti-* m “protector of the dwelling”, *sindhupati-* m “master of the (heavenly) streams”, *sōmapati-* m “lord of the *sōma-*”, *svadhāpati-* m “lord of the sacrificial drink”, *svāpati-* m “one’s own master”, *suvarpati-* m “lord of the (bright) sky”, *havīspati-* m “lord of the sacrificial libation”.

N.Sg.	pātis	12/	9	6	784,4; 787,2; 798,5; 798,11; 798,32; 798,33;
			10	1	848,3;
		/12	1	3	53,2; 101,5; 145,1;
			F	11	214,17; 215,2; 215,4; 215,5; 215,8; 215,9; 215,11;
					215,13; 216,1 (= 216,2-5); 217,4; 405,12;
			8	4	633,8; 707,4-6;
			10	5	849,3; 874,1; 879,9; 891,1; 954,7;
		11/	1	1	116,25;
			F	9	241,3; 265,4; 265,18; 312,7; 351,4; 351,5; 353,3;
					477,4; 499,4;
			10	5	836,3; 893,7; 937,3; 975,4; 1006,1;
		11\	F	3	542,3; 551,5; 551,10;
			10	1	947,1;
		/11	1	3	52,13; 149,1; 153,4;
			F	1	395,12;
			10	3	900,6; 925,6; 931,2;
		/10	1	2	66,8; 68,7;
		8/	1	1	44,9;
			F	1	486,16;
			8	4	633,9; 664,16; 689,9; 704,3;
			9	5	727,5; 811,6; 813,5-7;
			10	3	850,3; 911,28; 911,30;
		/8	1	3	18,4; 40,3; 40,5;
			F	1	516,17;
			8	2	639,37; 684,4;
			9	5	717,1; 723,8; 740,1; 743,2; 826,2;
			10	9	852,6; 852,7; 911,39; 911,40; 912,11; 978,2; 985,2;
					988,5; 999,3;
		/8-	10	1	898,2;
	°pātis	12/	1	2	139,10; 161,6;

		F	2	214,13; 400,5;	
		9	1	793,4;	
		10	5	862,5; 890,4; 890,15; 918,10; 1008,1;	
	/12	1	2	128,7; 166,5;	
		8	2	640,5; 1023,4;	
		10	2	954,7; 987,4;	
	11/	1	4	62,3 (= 894,11); 190,2; 190,7; 190,8;	
		F	11	194,10; 346,1; 346,4; 346,5; 514,1; 514,2; 514,3a,d; 613,2; 613,4; 613,7;	
		10	18	840,3; 868,11 (= 869,11; 870,11); 893,3-5; 893,8; 894,3-9; 894,12; 924,7; 934,6; 934,11; 936,10;	
	11\	1	1	60,2;	
		F	2	316,1; 585,1;	
	/11	1	3	60,4 (= 72,1); 89,6; 95,6;	
		F	5	200,4; 229,10; 231,6; 523,4; 554,6;	
		9	1	809,24;	
		10	5	830,4; 890,10; 919,7; 929,8; 935,5;	
	8-/	F	1	404,5;	
	/8	1	8	26,7; 27,12; 37,8; 90,8; 90,9; 91,6; 105,17; 128,7;	
		F	3	287,20; 326,17; 571,5;	
		8	3	643,13; 645,16; 669,19;	
		9	2	724,7; 820,10;	
		10	4	843,13; 961,1; 967,2; 999,5;	
	8	9	1	717,11;	
	12\	1	1	54,7;	
		F	1	192,4;	
	/12	1	2	101,4; 130,1;	
		F	5	192,12 (= 917,10); 349,2; 398,13; 469,3; 489,8;	
		8	1	668,19;	
		9	1	795,4;	
		10	2	869,9; 911,43;	
	11/	1	1	174,1;	
		F	2	320,1; 454,3;	
		10	1	995,4;	
	11\	1	2	60,4; 100,6;	
		F	3	268,7; 381,1; 614,6;	
		10	4	834,9; 853,8; 934,3; 948,1;	
	/11	1	1	60,4;	
		F	5	265,21; 313,6; 456,13; 493,5; 561,3;	
		10	2	857,4; 870,1;	
	/8	1	5	12,6 (= 531,2; 711,1); 12,8; 36,5; 91,5; 130,1;	
		F	6	305,4; 311,3; 326,22; 457,19; 497,2; 532,5;	
		8	5	634,2; 639,36; 664,18; 664,24; 671,7;	
		9	1	717,9;	
		10	1	1010,1;	
V.Sg.	pate	12/	F	1	215,15;
		9	1	820,9;	
		/12	F	5	192,3; 214,1; 214,5; 214,9; 214,11;
		9	1	795,1;	
	11/	F	5	214,19 (= 215,16); 353,2; 570,1-3;	
	/11	F	1	613,9;	
		8	2	639,7; 669,9;	
	8/	8	1	637,14;	
		10	1	992,3;	
	/8	1	9	11,2; 18,1; 18,3; 18,5; 26,1; 29,2; 30,5; 40,1; 131,4;	
		F	7	285,10; 360,5; 360,9; 389,5; 486,10; 494,1; 571,1;	
		8	7	626,21; 643,12; 665,20; 699,5; 701,30; 702,31; 706,6;	
		9	5	743,6; 748,6; 816,5; 817,5; 825,2;	
		10	5	967,1; 981,2; 990,1; 990,4; 1000,1;	
	°pâte	12/	9	1	792,1;

	°pate	12/	1	1	106,5;
			F	13	214,2-4; 214,6-8; 214,10; 214,12; 214,14-16;
					214,18; 215,1;
				8	2 641,3; 1023,6;
				10	1 926,5;
		12\	1	1	102,8;
			F	2	192,1; 192,7;
				8	2 641,3; 1023,6;
		/12	1	1	53,6;
			F	4	192,11; 228,3; 346,10; 487,3;
				8	3 641,3; 671,8; 712,7;
		/12+	10	1	876,2;
		/12	8	1	670,14;
		11/	1	1	190,5;
			F	15	221,4; 221,9; 238,10; 242,1; 242,6; 242,11;
					346,2b,d; 346,3; 346,6; 346,11; 396,8; 488,20;
					488,26; 613,10 (= 614,7);
				10	7 894,2; 896,10; 897,1; 924,1; 924,3; 929,4; 947,10;
		11\	1	1	165,3;
				10	1 887,22;
		/11	1	2	170,5a,b;
			F	6	223,1; 264,19; 264,21; 456,19; 472,1; 546,1;
				8	1 670,17;
				10	5 828,1; 870,2; 873,1; 938,9; 938,10;
		8/	F	2	197,4; 296,4;
				8	1 634,2;
				10	1 850,2;
		/8	1	4	13,11; 28,6; 142,11; 188,10;
			F	15	242,3; 274,3; 274,4; 327,7; 360,5; 376,4; 359,10;
					394,1 (= 641,3); 432,5; 443,10; 485,1 (= 485,2-3);
					486,9; 486,21; 492,13; 531,7;
				8	12 632,8; 632,18; 633,12; 643,14; 646,12; 656,1 (=
					656,2-6); 657,1; 677,1; 670,5; 678,16; 693,7; 702,5;
					657,2-6; ²⁴
A.Sg.	pátim	4	8	5	
		12/	1	1	56,2;
				10	3 858,3; 870,4; 892,13;
		12\	F	1	456,1;
		/12	1	1	89,5;
			F	5	217,3; 400,3; 557,1; 560,1; 582,15;
				8	1 647,1;
				10	2 869,1; 918,14;
		11/	1	4	62,11; 71,1; 116,10; 117,7;
			F	6	200,5; 273,1; 366,3; 395,8; 396,14; 521,5;
				9	1 809,22;
				10	1 887,7;
		11+/ 11\	10	1	907,7;
			1	1	60,5;
			F	1	391,3;
				10	1 928,7;
		/11	1	1	127,8;
			F	1	613,3;
				9	1 801,3;
				10	1 836,10;
		8/	F	1	485,5;
				8	1 678,2;
				9	1 738,4;
				10	2 911,45; 971,2;
		/8	1	4	9,4; 11,1; 38,13; 105,2;
			F	2	275,5; 485,4;

²⁴Cf. Oldenberg (1912, 106).

			8	3	644,14; 644,18; 677,4;
			9	2	726,7; 777,1;
			10	5	911,7; 911,12; 911,29; 971,1; 985,1;
		8	1	1	18,6;
	°pátim	12/	F	4	237,8; 260,2; 405,12; 456,8;
			8	1	630,2;
			10	3	839,4; 861,11; 891,10;
		12\	1	1	164,1;
			F	1	236,10;
		/12	1	2	31,11; 106,6;
			F	2	192,8; 489,17;
			8	1	635,13;
			10	1	918,1;
		11/	1	1	190,1;
			F	8	254,5; 346,7; 396,7; 397,12; 526,4; 613,5; 613,6; 613,8;
			10	5	873,6; 893,9; 893,10; 894,1; 927,11;
		11\	1	1	71,8;
			F	2	358,3; 442,8;
			10	1	870,3;
		/11	F	1	334,2;
			10	1	933,5;
		8/	F	1	296,6;
			8	1	664,26;
			9	1	717,10;
		/8	1	2	12,2; 14,3 (= 967,4);
			F	2	247,5; 296,5;
			10	2	967,3; 967,5;
	°patim	12\	8	2	641,10; 1022,6;
		/12	1	1	127,8;
			F	3	214,1; 362,1; 362,2;
			8	1	1021,6 (= 670,10);
		11\	F	2	386,11; 534,4;
			9	1	809,34;
			10	1	873,1;
		/11	1	3	76,3; 173,10; 185,8;
			F	8	224,12; 270,9; 307,5; 358,1; 467,2; 487,1; 490,8; 517,1;
			10	2	893,8; 1005,2;
		8/	1	1	43,4;
			8	1	706,11;
		/8	1	3	9,9; 11,1; 43,4;
			F	6	379,5; 379,6; 436,7; 455,4; 457,42; 494,2;
			8	4	622,38; 678,4a,c; 683,10;
			9	1	747,5;
			10	3	886,2; 944,6; 992,1;
I.Sg.	pátyā	11/	10	2	911,27; 911,36;
		/11	10	1	911,24;
	pát,yā	/8	10	1	911,22;
	pátinā	/8	F	1	353,1;
	°pátinā	11/	8	1	705,15;
			10	1	894,10;
D.Sg.	pátye	11/	1	2	61,2; 124,7 (= 299,2; 897,4; 917,13);
			10	2	836,7; 911,20;
		/8	10	1	911,9;
	°pátaye	12/	9	1	797,6;
G.Abl.Sg.	pátes	12/	F	2	215,14; 217,2;
		/8	9	1	747,6;
	pátyus	11/	10	1	844,8;
	°pátes	12/	F	1	215,10;
			10	1	993,3;

		11/	1	1	190,4;
			F	1	336,1;
			10	1	956,4;
L.Sg.	pátyau	12/	9	1	794,4;
		8/	10	1	985,3;
	°pátau	12/	F	1	456,2;
		/8	8	1	629,5;
	°patau	/12	10	1	996,1;
		/8	10	1	845,3;
N.A.Du.	pátī	/12	1	1	119,5;
			F	2	222,4; 417,3;
			8	2	642,14; 646,6;
			10	2	866,14; 919,6;
		11/	F	1	339,6;
		8/	F	2	422,5; 434,4;
		/8	1	3	23,3; 23,5; 136,3 (= 232,6);
			8	1	625,5;
	°pátī	/12	F	1	620,6;
		11/	F	1	555,2;
		/11	10	1	932,4;
		/8	1	1	21,5;
			F	1	345,5;
	°patī	/12	10	1	891,2;
		11/	F	3	230,2; 357,2; 580,2;
			10	1	921,12;
		/11	10	2	836,5; 894,2;
		8/	F	1	419,2;
			8	1	651,5;
		/8	F	1	501,6;
			9	1	731,2;
			10	2	911,32; 988,4;
V.Du.	patī	/12	1	2	34,6; 47,5;
			8	5	642,4; 642,6; 1028,3; 1028,5; 696,5;
			10	3	866,4; 866,12; 866,13;
		/8	1	2	3,1; 120,6;
			F	2	343,3; 429,8;
			8	2	625,11; 628,16;
			10	2	911,25; 957,4;
	°patī	11\	F	1	587,4;
		/11	F	4	215,12; 510,3; 583,1; 583,5;
		/8	1	1	28,8;
			F	5	345,1-4; 345,6;
			9	1	731,2;
N.Pl.	pátayas	11\	F	7	337,10 (= 520,7); 346,6 (= 409,10; 660,12; 668,13; 947,10); 347,10 (= 488,12; 801,7; 807,5; 957,6); 353,2; 403,4; 524,3; 551,12;
A.Pl.	°pátīn	12/	10	2	890,8; 891,11;
		/12	8	1	647,2;
		11/	1	1	157,5;
			F	3	268,10; 395,8; 396,16;
		/8	1	1	39,5;
			F	2	361,4; 438,3;
			10	1	886,9;
	°patīn	/11	F	1	492,4;
I.Pl.	°pátibhis	11/	F	1	550,23;
D.Abl.Pl.	pátibhyas	12/	10	1	866,10;
		11/	10	1	936,5;
		8-/	10	1	911,38;
	°pátibhyas	12/	F	1	488,7;
G.Pl.	°pátīnaam	/8	8	1	643,25;

pádi- m unclear, EWA II, 79.

A.Sg. pádim 11\ 1 1 125,2;

papí- a “drinking”, *pā* “drink” < **peh*₃, EWA II, 113f., see section 2.1.2.3.

N.Sg. papís 11\ F 1 464,4;

pápurī- a “filling”, *pṝ* “fill” < **pleh*₁, EWA II, 89f. The alternation *pápurī-*/ *páprī-* goes back to (optional) laryngeal loss in composed/reduplicated forms (in this case **pa-pṝ(H)-i/i-*), cf. Kuiper (1961, 27f.) and section 2.1.2.3. above.

N.Sg. pápuris /8 1 1 46,4;

N.A.Sg. pápuri /8 F 1 487,5;

A.Sg. pápurim 12\ 1 1 125,4;

/11 F 1 319,3;

°paptanī- f “flight”, *pat* “fly, fall” < **pet* (EWA II, 71f.), see section 2.1.2.2. Compounds: *supaptanī-* f “quick flight”, cf. Oldenberg (1909, 181).

I.Sg. °paptanī 12/ 1 1 182,5;

1. pápri- a “helping (across), saving”, *pṝ* “cross over, assist, preserve” < **per*, EWA II, 85f., see section 2.1.2.3.

N.Sg. pápris 8/ 8 1 636,11;

A.Sg. páprim /11 1 1 91,21;

2. pápri- a “filling”, *pṝ* < **pleh*₁ “fill”, EWA II, 89f., see 2.1.2.3. and the entry **pápurī-** above.

N.Sg. pápris /12 1 1 52,3²⁵;

/11 F 1 491,13;

I.Sg. pápriṇā 12\ F 1 214,10;

parśāṇi- a “crossing over, driving across” (Grassmann ⁶1996, 793), to be connected with *pṝ* “crossing over, assist, preserve” (EWA II, 85f.), AiG II,2, 207, see section 2.1.2.2.

A.Sg. parśāṇim /8 1 1 131,2;

paví- m “wheel band; point (of an arrow, etc.)”, etym. unclear, EWA II, 107; Koch (2003, 355f.). Compounds: *kr̥ṣṇápavī-* a “having black wheel bands”, *dadr̥śāṇápavī-* a “having a visible wheel band”, *vīḍupaví-* a “having strong wheel bands”.

N.Sg. pavís 11\ F 1 416,2;

/8 F 1 495,3;

°pavis 11/ F 1 524,2;

A.Sg. pavím 11\ 10 1 1006,2;

²⁵Kuiper (1961, 28, fn. 27) rejects the translation “filling” for this attestation, but without giving an alternative translation. He also hints at the possibility that the attestations of 2. *pápri-* may belong to 1. *páprī-* after all, but since this has no consequence on the morphological problem I am investigating, I have kept the two entries apart.

		/8	9	1	762,1;
I.Sg.	pavyá	12/	F	1	449,5;
		11/	1	1	88,2;
		8/	F	1	406,9;
G.Abl.Sg.	°paves	/11	10	1	829,6;
N.Pl.	paváyas	12/	1	1	34,2;
		12\	1	1	139,3;
		11\	1	1	180,1;
			F	1	385,5;
			10	1	853,6;
I.Pl.	pavíbhis	12\	1	1	64,11;
		11\	F	1	585,1;
	°pavíbhis	12/	8	1	640,2;
		11/	F	1	412,6;
D.Abl.Pl.	pavíbhyas	/11	1	1	168,8;
L.Pl.	paviṣu	12\	1	1	166,10;

pāñí- m “hand; hoof”, etym. unclear, EWA II, 117f., listed as a possible loan by Kuiper (1991, 92). Compounds: *dravátpāñi-* a “having quick hooves”, *prthúpāñi-* a “with open arms”, *mádhupāñi-* a “carrying the sweetness (of Soma) in one’s hand”, *vīḍupāñi-/vīḍúpāñi-* a “having strong hooves”, *vīṣapāñi-* a “having strong hooves”, *supāñi-* a “having good hands”, *híraṇyapāñi-* a “having golden hands, hooves”.

N.Sg.	°pāñís	11/	F	1	288,12
		/11	F	1	267,6;
		10/	F	1	550,20;
	°pāñis	11/	F	3	288,11; 491,8; 512,4;
		/11	F	2	229,2; 517,14;
V.Sg.	°pāṇe	11/	F	1	554,2;
A.Sg.	°pāñim	11/	F	1	490,9;
		/11	F	1	561,4;
	°pāñim	/12	10	1	867,3;
		8/	1	1	22,5;
N.A.Du.	pāñí	12/	F	1	512,1;
		/11	F	1	317,9;
	°pāñí	/11	1	1	71,9 (= 290,7);
	°pāñī	/11	F	1	589,4;
V.Du.	°pāñī	/11	1	1	109,4;
		8/	1	1	3,1;
N.Pl.	°pāñayas	12/	1	1	35,9;
		/12	F	1	516,7;
I.Pl.	pāñíbhis	/12	F	1	222,2;
	°pāñíbhis	/8	1	1	38,11;
	°pāñibhis	/8	8	1	627,27;
		8-/	8	1	625,35;

pārṣṇi- f “heel”, probably a *vṛddhi*-derivative of Ir. **paršnā-* < **persneh₂-*, EWA II, 123f.

I.Sg.	pārṣṇīyā	11/	1	1	162,17;
I.D.Abl.Du.	pārṣṇibhyām	8/	10	1	989,4;

piśáci- m name of a demon, unclear, EWA II, 135, maybe a loan, cf. Kuiper (1991, 92).

A.Sg.	piśácim	8/	1	1	133,5;
-------	---------	----	---	---	--------

pīṭí- f “drink”, *pā* “drink” < **peh₃*, cf. OCS *piti*, Gr. *πόσις*, EWA II, 113f. Compounds: *pūrvápīti-* f “the first drink”, *sápīti-* a “connected to the drinking (of Soma)”, *sómapiṭi-* f “the

drinking of Soma”.

N.Sg.	pītís	11/	F	1	430,3;
		/11	F	1	331,2;
	° pītis	/11	10	1	938,1;
A.Sg.	pītím	/12	1	1	134,6;
			10	1	926,2;
		11/	F	2	329,11; 330,1;
			10	1	930,3;
		11\	F	1	614,2;
		/11	F	2	205,1; 205,2;
		/10	F	1	202,17;
		8/	8	1	691,6;
		8	1	1	134,6;
			F	2	343,2; 405,6;
			9	1	730,3;
I.Sg.	pīt_iyá	/8	1	1	46,13;
D.Sg.	pītáye	12\	1	1	55,2;
		/12	1	2	137,2; 166,7;
			F	3	332,2; 509,10; 548,4;
			9	2	786,9; 790,4;
		11\	F	1	481,2;
			10	2	855,6; 930,6;
		/8	1	6	5,6; 16,3 (= 276,4; 637,15; 701,5; 706,11; 724,2); 22,1 (= 23,2; 345,5; 425,3; 500,10; 685,6; 703,10-12); 47,9 (= 694,1-9); 137,2 (= 729,8); 137,3;
			F	7	276,8; 276,9; 344,1 (= 344,2-4); 345,2; 405,1; 429,6; 575,5;
			8	9	621,25 (= 655,23); 632,12; 652,24; 653,13; 654,10; 665,22; 685,3; 688,7; 706,8;
			9	7	737,1; 742,5 (= 757,1; 762,5; 776,12); 744,2 (= 750,2; 755,2; 777,8); 749,1; 750,6; 774,8; 777,14;
			10	1	835,4;
	° pītaye	/12	1	5	44,9; 48,12; 92,18; 111,4; 134,1;
			F	2	426,1 (= 426,2); 426,3;
			8	2	623,17; 670,1;
			10	1	927,12;
		/8	1	16	2,3; 8,10; 14,1 (= 641,4); 114,6 (= 457,44); 16,1; 16,8 (= 702,20); 21,3 (= 345,3); 22,9; 22,12; 23,4; 23,7; 23,10; (= 703,3; 703,9); 9,9 (= 623,7); 134,1; 135,1; 137,3;
			F	11	232,1; 232,21; 275,1; 276,3; 342,3 (= 621,24); 342,7; 343,1; 343,3 (= 642,8); 405,3; 501,9 (= 658,7-9); 582,17;
			8	5	628,5; 633,27; 662,4 (= 662,5-6); 685,4; 712,14;
			10	1	912,2;
L.Sg.	pītá	8/	9	1	820,2;
	pītau	/11	F	2	468,1; 468,2;
N.Pl.	pītáyas	11/	F	1	330,5;
I.Pl.	° pītibhis	/12	8	1	621,23;

°**pīti**- f “protection”, *pā* “protect” < **peh₂/3*²⁶, EWA II, 112f. Compounds: *nṛpīti*- f “protection of the men”.

D.Sg.	° pītaye	/8	F	1	531,14;
L.Sg.	° pītau	/11	F	1	536,8;

púramdhi- f “wealth, abundance of blessings”, OAv. *parəndi*-. Probably derived from **plh₁*- “abundance”, but should be kept apart from °*dhi*- (< *dhā* “put, place”), cf. EWA II, 145f.

²⁶**peh₃*(*i*): EWA II, 112, **peh₂*(*i*): LIV², 460.

Compounds: *smátपुराण्धि-* a “(provided) with wealth, abundance”.

N.Sg.	पूराण्धि	12/	F	1	222,4;		
		11/	F	4	322,7; 323,2; 490,14; 551,2;		
		/11	1	3	116,13; 117,19; 181,9;		
			F	3	295,1; 330,2; 396,5;		
			9	1	805,4;		
			10	1	911,36;		
		A.Sg.	°पूराण्धि पूराण्धि	8/	8	1	645,6;
				11/	10	1	938,5;
				/11	1	2	116,7; 180,11;
					F	6	229,10; 323,3; 462,9; 525,6; 552,8; 555,4;
	9			1	809,36;		
I.Sg.	पूराण्धि _i या	/8-	1	1	134,3;		
		/12	F	1	192,3;		
			9	1	822,3;		
			10	2	891,13; 891,14;		
		8/	8	1	678,1;		
		/8	F	2	296,11; 389,8;		
			8	1	1 701,15;		
			8	F	1 548,20;		
		D.Sg.	पूराण्धि _{ay} e	/12	10	1	865,7;
		L.Sg.	पूराण्धि _i याम	/8	1	1	5,3;
N.A.Du.	पूराण्धि	/11	9	1	802,4;		
N.Pl.	पूराण्धि _s	/11	1	1	123,6;		
			F	1	395,6;		
A.Pl.	पूराण्धि _s	12/	10	1	865,2;		
		/11	1	1	158,2;		
			F	3	318,10; 346,11 (= 580,5; 581,5; 613,9); 583,5;		

पुरुषान्ति- m PN, the SMC might be connected to *san* “win, gain” with compositional laryngeal loss, cf. EWA II, 696f., the name could then go back to a Bahuvrīhi-compound “gaining/winning much”.

A.Sg.	पुरुषान्ति _m	/12	1	1	112,23;
G.L.Pl.	पुरुषान्ति _i यो _s	/8	9	1	770,3;

पुष्टि- f “growth, blooming”, *puṣ* “bloom”, no certain cognates outside Indo-Iranian, EWA II, 171f. Compounds: *पुरुवारापुष्टि-* a “granting wealth full of treasures”.

N.Sg.	पुष्टि _s	/11	F	1	312,15;
		/11-	F	1	195,4;
		10/	1	1	65,5;
A.Sg.	°पुष्टि _s पुष्टि _m	/11	1	1	96,4;
		12/	F	1	204,4;
		12-/	8	1	1028,7;
		11/	1	2	77,5; 122,7;
			F	2	329,2; 504,6;
		/11	8	1	668,6;
D.Sg.	पुष्टि _{ya} i	8/	F	2	364,3; 443,1;
		11/	10	1	932,4;
G.Abl.Sg.	पुष्टि _i याi	/8	10	1	931,5;
		/11	F	2	337,10; 395,20;
L.Sg.	पुष्टि _{au}	/11	F	1	395,3;
		10	1	887,24;	

N.Pl.	puṣṭáyas	11\	F	1	218,12;
A.Pl.	puṣṭís	12/	F	1	203,5;
G.Pl.	puṣṭínáam	8	10	1	852,7;
L.Pl.	puṣṭíṣu	/12	1	1	166,8;

pūrtí- f “present, reward”, *pr* “give, offer” < **perh*₃, EWA II, 90f.

N.Sg.	pūrtís	11/	10	1	933,3;
A.Sg.	pūrtím	/11	F	1	454,6;
N.Pl.	pūrtáyas	/8	10	1	848,9;

pr̥tsutí- f “attack, fight”, EWA II, 160, a *ti*-hypostasis of the L.pl. *pr̥tsú* (*pr̥t*- f “fight”) according to AiG II,2, Nachtr., 67.

N.Sg.	pr̥tsutís	11\	1	1	169,2;
L.Sg.	pr̥tsutaú	/12	10	1	864,1;
A.PL.	pr̥tsutís	/12	1	1	110,7;
		11\	F	1	358,1;

pr̥ṭhi- m PN, maybe a hypocoristic of a Caland-PN, cf. the *s*-stem *pr̥áthas*- and *pr̥thá*- “flat” (< **pr̥thrá*- ?), EWA II, 161. Kuiper (1991, 92) on the other hand, lists this as a possible loan.

A.Sg.	pr̥ṭhim	/12	1	1	112,15;
-------	---------	-----	---	---	---------

pr̥śni- a “dotted, colorful” < **pr̥k̂-ni*-, belongs to the Caland-system, cf. Gr. περκνός, Ved. *pr̥śat*-, etc., EWA II, 164.

N.Sg.	pr̥śnis	/12	9	1	795,3;
		11/	1	1	168,9;
			F	6	414,5; 507,3; 551,13; 619,4; 619,6; 619,10;
			10	1	931,10;
		/11	F	3	299,10; 401,3; 507,1;
		10/	F	1	572,4;
A.Sg.	pr̥śnim	8	10	1	1015,1;
		12/	1	1	160,3;
		11/	1	1	164,43;
G.Abl.Sg.	pr̥śnes	8/	F	1	406,16;
		11/	F	1	412,5;
		/11	F	3	301,7; 301,10; 447,4;
	pr̥śnyās	12/	F	2	193,4; 225,10;
		8/	F	1	489,22;
		12\	F	1	225,2;
N.Pl.	pr̥śnayas	/8	1	1	84,11 (= 678,3);
			8	2	626,19; 627,10;

pr̥ṣṭí- f “rib” < **pr̥ṣk̂*^o, cf. *párśu*- “rib”, EWA II, 165.

A.Pl.	pr̥ṣṭís	11/	10	1	913,10;
-------	---------	-----	----	---	---------

paúrukutsi- m PN “descendant of *Párukutsa*” (EWA I, 365, EWA II, 149), Thieme (1995, 351, fn. 42), see section 2.1.6.

A.Sg.	paúrukutsim	11/	F	1	535,3;
-------	-------------	-----	---	---	--------

°**prati-** a “resisting, making up for” (adv. *prāti* “against, towards”), EWA II, 176f. Compounds: *apratí-* a “irrestistible” (< “*kein ‘Gegen’ habend”, Mayrhofer l.c.), *tuvipratí-* a “making up for many”.

N.Sg.	° prátis	11\	F	1	386,3;
N.A.Sg.n.	° pratí	/12	F	1	599,4;
		11/	F	1	615,5;
A.Sg.	° pratím	8 (?)	1	1	30,9;
L.Sg.	° pratá	/8	8	1	652,16;
N.A.Pl.n.	° pratí	/11	F	2	485,14; 539,3;
	° pratí	/12	1	1	53,6;
		/8	F	1	735,7;
	° pratíni	12\	8	1	699,5;
		11/	F	1	210,4;
		/11	F	3	313,19; 472,4; 601,3;

práṣṭi- m “side-horse (horse harnessed to the side of a chariot), companion”, EWA II, 185f. Since there is wide variety of conflicting etymologies (< **pra-sth₂-ti-*, *sthā* ? *pársu-* “rib” ?, etc., cf. Mayrhofer l.c. for an overview), I have treated this lexeme as a simplex.

N.Sg.	práṣṭis	8/	1	1	39,6;
			8	1	627,28;
I.Pl.	práṣṭibhis	11\	1	1	100,17;

prásiti- f “advancement, trajectory”, EWA II, 186. Although this goes clearly back to a prepositional government compound, the verbal root underlying °*siti-* was no longer productive in Indic, which is why I chose to treat *prásiti-* as a simplex (even though the formation is transparent in this case).

N.Sg.	prásitis	12\	F	1	216,3;
			10	1	918,4;
		11\	F	1	447,5;
		/11	F	1	519,4;
A.Sg.	prásitim	12\	10	1	866,10;
		11\	F	1	318,7;
			10	1	913,15;
		/11	F	2	300,1a,c;
			10	1	913,11;
L.Sg.	prásitau	12\	F	1	441,6;
		11\	F	1	562,4;
		/11	F	1	620,13;
			10	1	860,14;
N.Pl.	prásitayas	12\	F	1	548,13;

prátardani- m PN “descendant of *Pratardana*”, see section 2.1.6.

N.Sg.	prátardanis	11/	F	1	467,8;
--------------	--------------------	-----	---	---	--------

preṇí- a unclear, EWA II, 191.

A.Sg.	preṇím	/12	1	1	112,10;
--------------	---------------	-----	---	---	---------

platí- m PN, maybe a hypocoristic of a composed name with *prati-*/*plati-* in the FMC, EWA

II, 194; Kuiper (1991, 92) lists it as a possible loan.

G.Abl.Sg. **platés** 11/ 10 1 889,17 (= 890,17);

pláyogi- m PN “descendant of *Playoga*”, see section 2.1.6

N.Sg. **pláyogis** 11/ 8 1 621,33;

plāśí- m part of the entrails (?), unclear, EWA II, 196; Kuiper (1991, 92).

D.Abl.Sg. **plāśíbhyas** 8/ 10 1 989,3;

plúṣi- m “flea”. Although there are cognates in several other IE languages, the reconstruction of a preform is made difficult by the irregular changes these items have undergone due to taboo, cf. EWA II, 197f.

N.A.Du. **plúṣī** /8 1 1 191,1;

babhrí- a “carrying, bearing”, *bhr̥* “carry, bear, bring” < **b^her*, EWA II, 246ff., see section 2.1.2.3.

N.Sg. **babhris** 11/ F 2 235,12; 464,4;

balí- m “contribution, levy, tribute”, may belong to *bhr̥* (cf. the common phrase *balím bhr̥*, but this could also be due to popular etymology), EWA II, 216; NIL, 15ff., fn. 35. Kuiper (1991, 92) lists it as a possible loan.

A.Sg. **balím** 11/ F 2 355,10; 534,19;
/10 1 1 70,9;
/8 8 1 709,9;

bhaktí- f “distribution”, *bhaj* “assign, allot” < **b^hag*, EWA II, 241f.; NIL, 1f.

D.Sg. **bhaktáye** /8 8 1 647,11;

bhagátti- f “gift” < **bhaga-dH-ti-*, *dā* “give” < **deh₃*, with compositional laryngeal loss in the SMC (cf. the entry °*dāti-* above), EWA I, 713ff.; NIL, 60ff.; Kuiper (1961, 25).

A.Sg. **bhagáttim** 8/ 9 1 777,17;

°**bhári-** (a) “carrying, bearing”, *bhr̥* “carry, bear, bring” < **b^her*, EWA II, 246ff.; NIL, 15ff., see section 2.1.2.1. Compounds: *sahobhári-* a “bringing strength”.

N.Sg. °**bháris** /12 F 1 398,3;

bhují- f “granting of pleasure”, *bhuj* “grant pleasure, be useful” < **b^heug*, EWA II, 275f.

A.Sg. **bhujím** /8 8 1 711,6;
D.Sg. **bhujyaí** /11 10 1 932,4;
V.Du. **bhújī** 8/ 8 1 628,2;

°**bhuji-** a “bending, curving, winding”, *bhuji* “bend, wind” < **b^heug^(h?)*, probably only in Indo-Iranian, EWA II, 274f. Compounds: *dásabhujī-* a “curving tenfold”, *śatābhujī-* a “curving, bending a hundredfold”.

N.Sg.	° bhujis	12/	1	1	166,8;
		/11	1	1	52,11;
		/8	F	1	532,14;

bhurváṇi- a “restless, wild”, *bhr̥* “move about, shake, be restless” < **b^herH²⁷*, EWA II, 250f.; see section 2.1.2.2.

N.Sg.	bhurváṇis	/12	1	1	56,1;
N.A.Sg.n. ²⁸	bhurváṇi	/12	1	1	134,5;
		/8	1	1	134,5;

bhūti- f “welfare”, *bhū* “become, be” < **b^huH²⁹*, cf. Gr. φύσις, OCS *byti*, Lith. *būtis* etc., EWA II, 255ff.; NIL, 46ff. Compounds: *ánānubhūti-* f “lack of respect towards the gods”, *āprabhūti-* f “non-violence”, *abhībhūti-* a/f “superior, superiority”, *ābhūti-* f “eagerness”, *pāribhūti-* f “superiority, power”, *prābhūti-* a/f “superior (being)”, *vībhūti-* a “powerful, outstanding”.

N.Sg.	° bhūtis	11/	F	1	462,1;
		8/	1	1	30,5;
		/8	8	1	636,8;
N.A.Sg.n.	° bhūti	/12	10	1	902,2;
		/11	F	2	317,1; 337,4;
V.Sg.	° bhūte	/12	1	1	53,3;
			10	1	910,6;
		/11	F	1	460,6;
			10	1	957,1;
A.Sg.	bhūtīm	/12	1	1	161,1;
	bhūtim	12\	8	1	1028,7;
	° bhūtim	/11	1	1	118,9;
			F	3	334,1; 334,9; 458,4;
		8/	8	2	669,6; 670,6;
I.Sg.	° bhūtī	12/	10	1	950,7;
		12\	F	1	350,3;
	° bhūtīyā	12/	10	1	910,6;
D.Sg.	° bhūtaye	/8	8	1	661,1;
L.Sg.	° bhūtau	/11	F	1	253,3;
N.A.Du.	° bhūtī	11/	F	1	337,7;
N.Pl.	° bhūtayas	/12	1	1	166,11;
		/8	1	1	8,9;
A.Pl.	° bhūtīs	11/	F	1	488,17;
I.Pl.	° bhūtībhis	/8	F	1	582,10;

bhūmi-, *ī^d*- f < **b^huH-mi-* “earth” < **b^huH* “become, be” (see the entry **bhūti-** above), cf. OAv. *būmī*, the *mi-* derivative is attested only in Indo-Iranian, the *devī-* inflection is secondary and probably due to analogy with *pr̥thivī-* “earth”, EWA II, 268; NIL, 46ff. Compounds: *dyāvābhūmi-* f “sky and earth”.

²⁷But see LIV², 81 for other possible roots.

²⁸Used as an adverb, cf. Oldenberg (1909, 138).

²⁹**b^heuh₂*: EWA II, 256, **b^heh₂*: LIV², 98ff.

N.Sg.	bhúmis	12/	1	1	87,3;
			10	1	958,6;
		12-/	10	1	958,1;
		/12	F	1	413,2;
		11/	F	2	313,2; 520,5;
		11\	F	2	202,7; 488,20;
		8/	F	1	489,22;
			8	1	640,5;
			10	2	911,7; 916,14;
			/8	10	1
A.Sg.	bhúmī	8	9	1	773,10;
		bhúmim	12/	1	2
			F	1	413,4;
	11/		F	3	322,2; 439,4; 508,6;
			10	2	885,3; 907,2;
	/11		F	2	264,9; 353,8;
			10	3	844,10; 853,13; 968,5;
	8/		1	1	164,51;
			F	1	438,1;
		8	1	634,5;	
	10	3	884,3; 916,1; 916,5;		
V.Sg.	bhúme	8	10	1	844,11;
I.Sg.	bhúm _i yā	/12	10	1	901,3;
		/11	1	1	161,14;
G.Abl.Sg.	bhúm _i yās	/8	1	1	80,4;
		12/	F	1	599,3;
		10	1	901,2;	
		11/	1	2	62,5; 164,4;
			F	1	205,7;
		10	2	894,4; 940,10;	
		8/	10	1	845,8;
L.Sg.	bhúm _i yām	8/	1	1	39,4;
		bhúmyām	11/	1	1
N.A.Du.	°bhúmī	12/	10	1	891,4;
		11/	10	1	907,3;
V.Du.	°bhūmī	11/	F	1	351,1 (= 578,4);
		10	1	838,4;	
N.Pl.	bhúmayas	/8	8	1	626,15;
N.Pl.	bhúmīs	11/	F	1	603,5;
		8/	8	1	679,5;
A.Pl.	bhúmīs	12/	1	1	102,8;
		11/	F	1	218,8;
		8/	8	1	661,9;

bhūri- a < **b^huH-ri-* “much, many” < **b^huH* “become, be” (see the entry **bhūtī-** above), OAv. *būiri-*, EWA II, 268f.; NIL, 46ff. This is one of the problematic cases in which we have an adjective in *(C)i-* instead of expected *(C)a-*. However, as Pinault (1998b) has argued at length, in this case we can be relatively confident in assuming that *bhūri-* goes back to a substantive. *A priori* arguments in favour of this are 1. the suffixal alternation in the comparative (*bhūyas-*) and superlative (*bhūyis̥tha-*) typical of Caland-adjectives in *Ca-* which suggests that *bhūri-* supplanted an earlier **bhṛá-*, 2. the “substantival” root accent, 3. the 22 Rigvedic compounds (most of them Bahuvrīhis) with *bhūri-* as first compound member (cf. Pinault, l.c. 89-91). Pinault then goes on to sketch out the development of the adjectival usage via the predicative I.sg. (*-*ih*₁# > -*i*#, then used as an adverb) on the one hand and appositive constructions in the (n.) N.pl. (“substantif épithète”, l.c. 114) on the other hand. It remains to be seen whether a similar analysis is possible for the other synchronic

i-adjectives as well.

N.A.Sg.	bhūri	12/	1	1	57,5;
			8	1	643,21;
		12\	1	1	48,9;
		/12	F	1	278,3;
			8	1	666,25;
			10	1	926,7;
		11/	1	2	165,7; 185,9;
			F	4	273,8; 300,9; 442,12; 538,6b;
			10	1	834,9;
		11\	F	1	292,9;
			10	2	872,3; 951,3;
		/11	1	5	33,3; 73,4; 103,5; 124,12 (= 505,6); 154,6;
			F	10	220,5; 252,4; 265,9; 288,15; 291,1; 307,2; 316,10;
					383,14; 454,5; 512,4;
			10	3	868,8; 874,7; 905,1;
8/	1	3	10,2; 48,2; 81,2;		
	F	2	328,20c; 488,19;		
	8	2	665,2; 1024,1;		
8	1	3	81,2; 81,6; 120,10;		
	F	2	328,20a,b;		
	8	3	652,8; 665,38; 671,10;		
A.Sg.	bhūrim	11/	1	1	185,2;
		/11	F	2	312,8; 316,8;
G.Abl.Sg.	bhūres	11/	F	2	224,12; 273,8;
		11-\	1	1	61,15;
		/11	1	2	96,7; 184,3;
			F	13	219,1; 221,5; 224,9; 270,10; 454,2; 501,1; 512,6;
					520,6; 537,8; 576,5; 609,2; 611,2; 616,2;
		8/	8	2	652,14; 665,42;
N.Pl.	bhūrayas	/12	1	1	55,8;
N.A.Pl.n.	bhūri	12/	10	1	939,9;
		/12	8	1	639,20;
		/12+	8	1	706,15;
		11/	F	3	357,10; 520,2; 538,6a;
		/11	F	3	517,17; 524,5; 572,23;
			8	1	709,2 (= 909,7);
			9	1	803,6;
			10	2	946,5; 946,6;
		8/	8	3	631,5; 671,12; 699,4;
	bhūrṇi	12/	1	1	166,10;
		11/	1	1	165,7;
			F	4	253,4; 254,3; 313,19; 535,4;
I.Pl.	bhūribhis	/12	10	2	837,5; 864,4;
		8/	8	1	679,14;
L.Pl.	bhūrṇiṣu	/8	8	1	665,34;

bhūrṇi- a “wild”, *bhur* “move about, shake, be restless” < **b^herH* (see **bhurváṇi-** above), EWA II, 250f.

N.Sg.	bhūrṇis	11/	F	1	603,2;
		10/	1	1	66,2;
A.Sg.	bhūrṇim	12/	F	1	237,5;
			8	2	621,20; 637,15;
D.Sg.	bhūrṇaye	11\	F	1	602,7;
		/8	9	1	763,4;
N.Pl.	bhūrṇayas	/12	1	1	55,7;

	8	1	645,15;
	9	1	785,4;
/8	8	1	708,1;
	9	3	727,3; 729,1; 753,1;

bhṛtí- f < **b^h_r-ti-* “keep, support, bringing”, *bhṛ* “carry, bear, bring” < **b^her*, YAv. °*bəṛəiti-*, OHG *burt*, Lith. *birti* etc., EWA II, 246ff.; NIL, 15ff. Compounds: *idhmábhṛti-* a “bringing firewood”, *upábhṛti-* f “the bringing forth”, *durbhṛti-* f “meagre keep”, *prábhṛti-* f “offering”, *sábhṛti-* a “proffering food”.

N.Sg.	° bhṛtis	11\	F	1	461,13;
A.Sg.	bhṛtīm	12/	9	1	815,1;
		8/	8	1	675,11;
	° bhṛtim	/12	F	1	215,1;
		11\	F	1	270,1;
I.Sg.	° bhṛtī	/8	1	1	128,2;
D.Sg.	bhṛtyaí	/11	10	1	855,4;
	° bhṛtáye	11\	F	1	517,22;
L.Sg.	bhṛtyām	11/	1	1	84,16;
	° bhṛtā	/11	F	1	386,5;
	° bhṛtau	/11	F	2	386,7; 554,2;
N.Pl.	° bhṛtayas	11\	F	1	508,7;

bhṛmí- m or f “officiousness”, EWA II, 272, see section 2.1.7.

N.Pl.	bhṛmáyas	11\	F	1	296,1;
-------	-----------------	-----	---	---	--------

bhṛmí- a “impatient, officious”, EWA II, 272, see section 2.1.7.

N.Sg.	bhṛmis	11/	1	1	31,16;
		8/	F	1	328,2;
A.Sg.	bhṛmim	12/	F	1	225,1;
		11/	F	1	572,20;

bhṛṣṭí- f “point, spike”, probably to be connected with **bṛś* “sharpen”, but no undisputed cognates outside Indic, cf. EWA II, 273, 277: *bhraṁś*; NIL, 4ff., fn. 1. Compounds: *cáturbhṛṣṭi-* a “quadrangular”, *tigmábhṛṣṭi-* a “having sharp edges”, *piśáṅgabhṛṣṭi-* a “having golden points”, *sahásrabhṛṣṭi-* a “having a thousand edges, points”.

N.Sg.	bhṛṣṭís	12/	1	1	56,3;
	° bhṛṣṭis	12/	9	2	795,5; 798,40;
		/11	F	1	301,3;
		8/	1	1	80,12;
A.Sg.	° bhṛṣṭim	12/	1	1	85,9;
			F	1	388,2;
		11/	F	1	458,10;
		8/	1	1	133,5;
		/8	10	1	884,3;

(°**bhogí-**) “enjoyment”, *bhuj* “grant pleasure, be useful” < **b^heug*, EWA II, 275f. Compounds: *ābhogí-* f “(for) the enjoyment (of food)” (only as D.sg. in infinitival use).

D.Sg.	° bhogáye	11/	1	1	113,5;
-------	------------------	-----	---	---	--------

°**bhrāṣṭi-** f “flare, flaring”, *bhrāj* “glitter, gleam” < **b^hreH*(₁)*ḡ*, EWA II, 279f. *vībhrāṣṭi-* f “flaring up, shine”.

A.Sg. °**bhrāṣṭim** 12+\ 1 1 127,1;

maghātti- f “receiving of goods” < **maghā-dH-ti-*, *dā* “give” < **deh*₃, with compositional laryngeal loss in the SMC (cf. °**dāti-** above), EWA I, 713ff.; EWA II, 289f.; NIL, 60ff.; Kuiper (1961, 25).

D.Sg. **maghāttaye** /12 8 2 644,10; 679,9;
/8 F 2 333,8; 433,5;
8 1 665,15;
10 1 982,2;

mañi- m “necklace, jewelry worn around the neck” < **monh*₂-*i-*, related to OHG *mana* “mane”, Lat. *monīle* “necklace” etc. according to EWA II, 293f.

I.Sg. **mañínā** 11\ 1 1 33,8;

matí- f < **mṇ-ti-* “thought, contemplation”, *man* “think” < **men*, cf. Av. °*maiti-*, Lat. *mēns*, Lith. *mintis* etc., EWA II, 296f., 305f. Compounds: *átimati-* f “high spirits”, *ádabdhavrat-apramati-* a “taking care of the inviolable laws”, *ánumati-* f “consent”, *arámati-* f “righteous attitude” (EWA I, 110), *codayánmati-* a “inspiring contemplation”, *dásapramati-* a “granting tenfold care, protection”, *durmatí-* f “ill will”, *devasumatí-* f “benevolence of the gods”, *prámati-* f “care, protection”, *bṛhanmati-* a “possessing great insight”, *mahemati-* a “generous, noble-minded” (see AiG II,1, 45), *sumatí-* f “benevolence”. Furthermore, *abhímāti-* f “attack, ambush” is now generally connected with *man* rather than *mā* “measure”, but with “metrical lengthening” in analogy to °*māti-* f “measure” (AiG II,2, 630; Liebert (1949, 43f.); EWA II, 296f.), which is why the attestations are cited in this entry.

N.Sg.	matís	12/	F	2	398,9; 620,6;	
				9	1	781,2;
		12\	F	1	449,1;	
		/12	1	1	141,1;	
			F	1	411,1;	
			9	1	781,1;	
		11/	F	2	273,1; 289,8;	
		11\	10	1	873,6;	
		/8	1	1	142,4;	
			F	3	421,5c,d; 582,8;	
		8	3	626,34; 638,7; 683,7;		
		10	1	859,2;		
	° matís	12\	8	1	642,4;	
			10	1	866,12;	
		/12	1	3	89,2; 114,9; 131,7;	
			F	1	575,4;	
			8	2	695,4; 712,9;	
		11\	F	4	224,14; 235,23 (= 239-241,11; 249,7; 256,5; 257,5); 339,7 (= 340,7); 346,11;	
			10	1	857,6;	
		/11	1	3	24,9; 107,1; 121,15;	
		F	6	225,15; 249,6; 264,7; 573,4; 586,2; 586,5;		
		9	1	800,7;		

		10	F	1	572,9;	
		8/	F	1	419,4;	
				10	1	969,4;
		/8	1	1	131,7;	
				8	1	676,15;
				10	1	960,5;
	$^{\circ}$ matīs	12\	1	3	31,10; 31,14; 94,1;	
				10	1	926,5;
		/12	1	1	31,9;	
				10	3	890,15; 918,4; 926,11;
		11/	F	1	229,4;	
		11\	1	2	31,16; 109,1;	
			F	1	220,2;	
		/11	F	4	200,1; 517,6; 545,4; 550,21;	
		8/	8	1	651,12;	
		/8	F	1	486,4;	
	$^{\circ}$ mātiś	/11	10	1	895,5;	
N.A.Sg.n.	$^{\circ}$ mati	/12	F	1	362,6;	
	$^{\circ}$ māti	8/	F	1	377,4;	
A.Sg.	matīm	12/	1	2	136,1; 143,1;	
				10	1	917,14;
		/12	1	1	57,1;	
			F	1	215,1;	
				9	1	819,18;
				10	1	917,8;
		11/	1	1	33,13;	
			F	3	260,8; 520,1; 604,1;	
				8	1	1028,6;
		/11	F	1	616,2;	
		8/	10	1	851,10;	
		/8	1	2	6,6; 105,15;	
				8	3	626,31; 626,32; 629,16;
				9	2	733,7; 744,3;
				10	1	945,5;
	$^{\circ}$ matīm	12\	1	3	114,3; 114,9; 151,7;	
			F	1	456,9;	
		/12	1	2	156,3; 166,6;	
			F	1	234,3;	
				8	1	1020,5;
				10	1	866,13;
		11\	1	3	73,6; 73,7; 117,23;	
			F	15	238,1; 267,11; 291,6; 300,8; 307,6; 387,1; 395,18;	
					443,11; 492,12; 522,6; 534,4; 540,6 (= 541,6); 555,1;	
					576,11; 616,2;	
				9	2	808,2; 809,26;
				10	1	837,7;
		/11	1	1	171,1;	
			F	7	235,15; 267,12; 300,6; 355,10; 381,3; 503,7; 547,10;	
				10	3	924,5; 974,3; 1008,1 (= 1008,2-3);
		/8	1	1	129,6;	
			F	2	424,1; 498,5;	
				8	3	622,21; 638,10 (= 1001,2); 651,7;
	$^{\circ}$ matim	12/	1	1	141,2;	
		12\	10	1	849,7;	
		/12	1	1	129,5;	
				8	1	639,29;
				10	1	918,5;
		11\	1	1	33,1;	
			F	4	291,6; 312,18; 609,3; 609,4;	
		/11	1	1	71,1;	
			F	4	397,6; 408,6; 552,8; 558,3;	

	$^{\circ}$ mātim	/11	10	2	910,3; 928,4;
		8/	8	1	645,15;
V.Sg.	mate	/8	8	1	677,2;
	$^{\circ}$ mate	/12	8	3	666,19; 669,7; 670,7;
		11/	10	1	885,6;
		/8	8	3	633,11; 654,7; 666,19;
			9	1	751,1;
I.Sg.	matí	/12	F	2	215,9; 215,13;
			8	1	1020,3;
			9	2	783,3; 784,1;
			10	1	837,6;
		11/	1	1	165,1;
		8/	9	2	756,2; 775,21;
		/8	1	1	82,2 (= 645,24);
			8	1	626,39;
			9	3	719,6; 732,3; 776,10;
	$^{\circ}$ matí	12\	1	1	53,5;
			F	1	297,2;
			9	1	786,1;
		11\	1	1	31,18;
			F	1	396,4;
			10	1	855,8;
		/8	F	1	379,3;
D.Sg.	matyá	11/	F	1	412,5;
	$^{\circ}$ matáye	11\	1	1	158,2;
			F	1	470,1;
	$^{\circ}$ mātaye	/8	8	1	623,2;
G.Abl.Sg.	$^{\circ}$ matyās	/11	10	1	993,3;
L.Sg.	$^{\circ}$ mataú	12\	8	1	623,2;
		11\	F	3	235,21 (= 293,4; 488,13; 957,7); 293,3; 534,3;
			10	1	840,6;
		/11	1	1	98,1;
			F	4	442,10; 536,8; 557,4; 623,2;
			8	1	668,12;
			10	1	986,5;
		/8	8	1	664,24;
N.Pl.	matáyas	12\	F	1	441,1;
			9	5	784,6; 797,7; 797,11 (= 798,31); 798,46; 818,11;
			10	2	869,1; 917,12;
		11\	1	3	62,11; 165,4; 186,7;
			F	3	277,2; 451,2; 526,3;
			9	1	807,4;
			10	1	833,2; 937,1;
		8/	F	1	275,5;
	$^{\circ}$ matáyas	12\	F	1	223,5;
		11\	F	2	517,22; 534,20;
	$^{\circ}$ mātayas	/8	1	1	25,14;
A.Pl.	matís	/12	1	1	114,1;
			9	1	784,5;
		11/	F	1	545,3;
			9	1	807,1;
	$^{\circ}$ matís	/12	9	1	782,5;
		/11	10	2	846,10; 873,7;
		/8	8	1	688,9;
	$^{\circ}$ mātīs	/12	8	1	644,26;
		/11	10	2	844,9; 942,6;
		8/	F	2	258,1; 296,15;
I.Pl.	matíbhis	12\	F	2	214,6; 214,10;
			8	2	629,6; 643,23;
			9	7	780,7; 787,4; 796,5; 798,24; 815,1; 817,2; 819,24;
			10	1	890,15;

		11\	1	1	60,5;
			F	15	209,1; 264,20 (= 284,4); 277,3; 299,16; 434,1; 446,1; 463,2; 464,6; 475,5; 528,3; 553,2; 555,6; 585,6; 593,6; 594,2;
				9	3 808,15; 809,32; 809,35;
				10	6 832,5; 833,2; 890,16; 893,9; 914,5; 949,1;
	°matībhis	12/	8	1	646,9;
		12\	F	1	207,8;
			8	1	642,6;
		/12	8	1	642,2;
		11\	F	2	319,2; 573,5;
G.Pl.	matīnām	12/	9	2	788,4; 798,19;
		/11	1	2	61,3; 184,2;
			F	9	239,3; 280,4; 283,3; 397,9; 458,2; 510,2; 510,3; 510,4; 529,1;
			9	2	808,5; 809,37;
	°matīnām	11\	10	1	915,17;
	matīnāam	8/	10	1	852,4;
		/8	1	3	46,5; 46,7; 86,2;
			F	2	328,15; 485,2;
			9	2	722,6; 815,4;
	°matīnāam	/12	1	2	129,8; 129,11;
		/8	1	5	3,11; 4,3; 17,4; 129,8; 129,11;
			8	1	666,19;
L.Pl.	°mātiṣu	/8	F	1	271,7;

°mathí- a “robbing”, *math* “rob, snatch away” < **me(n)th₂*, EWA II, 298f. Compounds: *urāmáthi-* a “robbing lambs”, *vastramáthi-* a “robbing clothes”, *havirmáthi-* a “robbing the sacrificial meal”.

N.Sg.	°máthis	/12	8	1	675,8;
A.Sg.	°máthim	/11	F	1	334,5;
	°máthīnām	12/	F	1	620,21;

mandí- a “enjoyable, intoxicating”, *mad* “enjoy, be intoxicated with” < **mad*, probably secondary to the *in*-stem *mandín-*, EWA II, 299f.

A.Sg.	mandím	8/	1	1	9,2;
-------	--------	----	---	---	------

márīci- f “particle/beam of light” (< **h₂mor-ih₂-X* ?), to be connected with Gr. Μαῖρα (name of a star), μαρμαίρω “glitter, shine”, but the formation is unclear, EWA II, 321; Peters (1980, 221f.)

A.Pl.	márīcīs	8/	10	1	884,6;
G.Pl.	márīcīnām	12/	10	1	1003,1;

°māti- f “measure”, *mā* “measure, assign” < **meh₁*, EWA II, 341ff. Compounds: In some cases, a clear distinction from *matí-* f “thought” is difficult, cf. *úpamāti-* f which Grassmann connects with *man-* (Grassmann 1996, 256), while Liebert (1949, 49) gives a translation “assignment, measure” from the root *mā*, which is why the attestations are cited under this entry, as well as *ásamāti-* a “incomparable, having no match”, which is relatively unambiguous.

N.Sg.	°mātis	/11	F	1	339,4;
-------	--------	-----	---	---	--------

V.Sg.	°māte	/11	8	1	669,11;
A.Sg.	°mātim	/11	10	1	887,21;
			10	1	886,2;
N.Pl.	°mātayas	/11	F	1	319,3;
		/8+	8	1	660,9;
L.Pl.	°mātiṣu	/8	10	1	886,5;

mití- f “building, construction”, *mi* “build, erect, fix” < $*(H)meḷ(H)$, EWA II, 314. Compounds: *súmiti-* f “good construction, build”.

I.Sg.	°mitī	8-/	F	1	242,3;
N.Pl.	mitáyas	11\	F	1	551,7;

mithatí- f “hostility”, *mith* “be hostile, quarrel” < $*meḷth_2$, EWA II, 375f.; Liebert (1949, 53); see also section 2.1.1.3.

I.Sg.	mithatyá	11/	F	1	564,3;
N.A.Du.	mithatí	11\	F	1	609,5;
A.Pl.	mithatís	11\	F	1	466,2;
		/11	F	1	466,9;

múni- m “seer, wise one”, possible IE cognates, but the etymology remains disputed, EWA II, 362.

N.Sg.	múnis	11/	F	1	572,8;
		8/	10	1	962,4;
		/8	10	1	962,5;
N.Pl.	múnayas	8/	10	1	962,2;
G.Pl.	múnīnaam	8	8	1	637,14;

°múri- (m) “obstacle, obstruction”, *mṛ* “obstruct” (< $*merH$?), EWA II, 321. Compounds: *āmúri-* “obstacle”.

A.Sg.	°múrim	/12	8	1	706,10;
--------------	---------------	-----	---	---	---------

muṣṭí- m/f < $*mus-ti-$ “fist” (< $*\text{“the closing”}$), $*meḷs$ “close (intr.)”, cf. YAv. $°muṣti-$, Gr. $\acute{\alpha}\mu\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}$ < $*\eta\text{-}mus-ti(h_1)\#$ “withouth closing (one’s mouth)”, adverbialized in the meaning “in one draught”, cf. Janda (1998); EWA II, 363.

N.Sg.	muṣṭís	11/	F	1	488,30;
--------------	---------------	-----	---	---	---------

meḍí- a “rustling, crackling”, probably onomatopoeic (EWA II, 375) or/and a loan, Kuiper (1991, 27).

A.Sg.	meḍím	11/	F	2	260,9; 303,11;
--------------	--------------	-----	---	---	----------------

mení- f “anger, revenge”, OAv. *maēini-*, probably to be connected with *mī* “exchange” < $*h_2meḷ$, EWA II, 379.

A.Sg.	mením	11/	10	1	853,11;
--------------	--------------	-----	----	---	---------

°**yají-** a “offering, sacrificing”, *yaj* “sacrifice, worship” < **H₂iaġ* (EWA II, 392f.), AiG II,1, 224.
Compounds: *āyají-* a “bringing, procuring”.

A.Sg.	° yajím	12/	8	1	643,17;
N.A.Du.	° yajī	8/	1	1	28,7;

yāti- m clan name, maybe from *yam* “hold, steer, direct” (only in Indo-Iranian), EWA II, 396, 399f.; Liebert (1949, 43, 131), but *yat* “place oneself” has also been suggested (Liebert (1949, 131)). Since the interpretation is not clear, I have separated this item from compositional °*yati-*, although they may turn out to belong to the same root.

N.Sg.	yátis	12-\	9	1	783,7;
D.Sg.	yátaye	11\	F	1	529,1;
N.Pl.	yátayas	/8	8	1	626,18; 898,7;
D.Abl.Pl.	yátibhyas	12/	8	1	623,9;

°**yāti-** f “direction, guidance”, *yam* “hold, steer, direct” (EWA II, 399f.), but see **yāti-** above.
Compounds: *āyati-* f “connection”, *údyati-* f “offering”, *parāyāti-* “unklar” (AiG II,2, 637), “fortstrebend” (Grassmann ⁶1996, 783, s.v. *yat*), *práyati-* f “offering” (AiG II,2, 300).

N.Sg.	° yátis	/11	9	1	783,7;
	° yatis	/11	10	1	955,5;
		/8	1	1	139,9;
A.Sg.	° yatim	12\	8	1	678,18;
		11\	1	1	126,5;
		/11	1	1	190,3;
I.Sg.	° yatī	/11	1	1	109,2;

yayāti- m PN, unclear, maybe to be connected with *yat* “place oneself”, EWA II, 402; AiG II,2, 292; Kuiper (1991, 92).

G.Abl.Sg.	yayátes	12/	10	1	889,1;
------------------	----------------	-----	----	---	--------

yayí- a “hurrying”, *yā* “drive, move” < *(*H*)*ieh₂*, EWA II, 407f.; see section 2.1.2.3.

N.Sg.	yayís	12/	F	1	441,5;
		/8	F	1	427,7;
A.Sg.	yayím	12/	1	1	51,11;
		/12	1	1	87,2;
I.Sg.	yayínā	12\	10	1	918,5;

°**yukti-** f “the harnessing”, *yoj* “harness” < **ǵeug*, EWA II, 417f.; NIL, 397ff. Compounds: *ṛtáyukti-* f “right, correct connection, conjunction” (NIL, 398), *práyukti-* f “span, team of horses”, *sváyukti-* a “self-harnessing”.

N.Sg.	° yuktis	/11	1	1	153,2;
A.Sg.	° yuktim	/11	10	1	887,10;
I.Sg.	° yukti	/11	F	1	452,1;
			10	1	856,1;
I.Pl.	° yuktibhis	12/	1	1	119,4;

		/8	1	1	50,9;
L.Pl.	°yuktiṣu	/12	1	1	151,8;

°**yuti-** f “negligence”, *yu* “repel, fend off”, only in Indo-Iranian, EWA II, 403f. Compounds: *práyuti-* f “carelessness, negligence”, and probably also *víyuti-* “separation” (?) (L.sg. °*tā* in RV IV,7,7 and X,61,12), cf. Oldenberg (1909, 273), but since this analysis is uncertain I have left this lexeme aside.

I.Sg.	°yutī	12\	10	1	863,12;
--------------	--------------	-----	----	---	---------

yudhyāmadhí- m PN, the FMC belongs to *yudh* “fight”, but the segmentation is unclear, EWA II, 418f.; Oldenberg (1912, 23); AiG II,2, Nachtr., 27 (*yudhyāma-dhí-*).

A.Sg.	yudhyāmadhím	11/	F	1	534,24;
--------------	---------------------	-----	---	---	---------

yúyudhi- a “pugnacious”, *yudh* “fight” < **H₂eu₂d^h*, EWA II, 418f.; see section 2.1.2.3.

N.Pl.	yúyudhayas	12\	1	1	85,8;
			10	1	941,4;

yuvatí- a/f < **h₂iú-H₂-ti-* “young (one)”, f of *yúvan-* “young”, probably originally an abstract “(possession of) youth” (cf. Ved. *áyu-* n “life” < **h₂o₂iú-* etc.), although Liebert (1949, 189) doubts this, EWA II, 413f.; NIL, 277ff.; cf. section 2.1.1.3.

N.Sg.	yuvatís	12\	10	2	844,10; 901,8;
		/12	F	1	415,9;
		11\	1	2	113,7; 118,5;
			F	2	434,6; 596,2;
		/11	1	3	123,2; 123,10; 124,11;
			F	6	295,1; 314,8; 356,1; 401,1; 517,6; 593,1;
			10	2	940,3; 1009,2;
A.Sg.	yuvatím	/11	1	1	167,6;
			10	2	830,4; 1004,3;
V.Sg.	yuvate	/11	F	1	356,2;
G.Abl.Sg.	yuvatyás	12\	10	1	866,11;
L.Sg.	yuvatyám	/11	10	1	887,6;
N.A.Du.	yuvatí	/11	1	2	62,8; 185,5;
			F	1	288,7;
G.L.Du.	yuvatyós	/11	F	1	490,2;
			10	1	829,7;
N.Pl.	yuvatáyas	11\	1	1	95,2;
			F	7	226,4; 226,11; 235,6; 288,14; 289,16; 356,4; 508,7;
			10	1	856,6;
A.Pl.	yuvatís	/11	F	1	315,7;
I.Pl.	yuvatíbhís	12\	9	1	798,16;
		11\	10	1	856,5;

yúyudhi- a “pugnacious”, *yudh* “fight” < **H₂eu₂d^h*, EWA II, 418f.; see section 2.1.2.3.

N.Sg.	yúyudhis	/11	10	1	975,4;
--------------	-----------------	-----	----	---	--------

yúyuvi- a “keeping away, restraining sth./sbdy.”, *yu* “keep away, hold off, restrain sth./sbdy.”, only in Indo-Iranian, EWA II, 403f.; see section 2.1.2.3.

N.Sg. *yūyuis* /8 F 1 404,3;

yōni- m “seat, site, lap”, only in Indo-Iranian, EWA II, 419f.; AiG II,2, 740. Compounds: *kārṇayoni-* a “having the ear as a lap/starting point” (said of arrows which are drawn back up to the ear), *kṛṣṇáyoni-* a “having a black lap”, *ghṛtáyoni-* a “whose site is rich in (sacrificial) butter” (said of gods), *divíyoni-* a “sky-born” (< “having one’s (mother’s) lap in the sky”, said of Agni), *pṛśadyoni-* a “whose site is dripping (fat)”, *satyáyoni-* a “having truth for one’s seat”, *sáyoni-* a “related, sharing the same (mother’s) lap”, *sādádýoni-* a “sitting down on one’s seat”.

N.Sg.	yónis	11/	1	1	104,1;	
			F	2	299,2; 540,1;	
			10	1	951,7;	
		/11	1	1	164,33;	
			F	2	194,11; 287,4;	
		8/	F	1	432,5;	
		8	F	1	263,10;	
			11/	F	1	396,1;
			/11	1	1	164,30 (= 164,38);
			10	1	914,7;	
A.Sg.	yónim		F	1	315,2;	
		12/	8	1	649,2;	
			9	3	782,7; 783,6; 794,1;	
			10	3	891,7; 922,2; 949,2;	
		12\	9	2	792,2; 819,4;	
		/12	1	1	140,1;	
			10	2	894,4; 917,4;	
		11/	F	6	239,7; 267,3; 267,4; 401,3; 520,5; 613,4;	
			9	1	809,45;	
			10	4	843,11b,c; 925,2; 974,5;	
	°yonim	/11	1	2	113,1; 124,8;	
			F	4	229,8; 346,2; 456,16; 586,1;	
			10	3	844,7; 860,11; 933,9;	
		8/	F	1	421,2 (= 776,20);	
			9	5	713,2; 714,2; 737,2 (= 749,2); 750,6; 752,2;	
			10	2	988,4; 1010,1;	
		/8	F	1	457,35 (= 744,4; 776,11);	
			9	2	773,21 (= 777,19); 776,17 (= 778,12);	
		8	F	3	296,13 (= 720,3; 776,22); 375,4d,e;	
			9	5	731,3; 737,6 (= 762,4); 774,4; 813,14; 813,15;	
	10	1	988,1 (= 988,2);			
G.Abl.Sg.	yónes	/12	F	1	362,6;	
		11/	F	1	397,12;	
		/11	F	1	238,2;	
L.Sg	yónā	11/	F	1	200,3;	
		/11	F	1	226,10;	
	yónā	12/	1	1	144,4;	
			9	4	784,6; 785,1; 798,6; 798,25;	
			10	1	891,8;	
		11/	1	1	164,32;	
			F	2	288,6; 297,12;	
			10	1	927,11;	
		10/	1	1	65,4;	
		8/	8	1	629,21;	
			9	2	774,8; 774,15;	
			yónau	12/	1	1
	11/	1	1	63,4;		

			F	3	235,7; 235,11; 312,10;
			10	5	834,3; 836,7; 911,24; 927,3; 949,6;
		11\	10	1	872,6 ³⁰ ;
		/11	1	4	79,3; 104,7; 174,4; 178,2;
			F	4	263,8; 297,11; 313,14; 519,5;
			9	1	804,2;
			10	3	857,6; 887,6; 896,6 (= 936,6);
		10/	1	1	66,5;
		/10	1	1	149,2;
		8/	F	2	296,18; 457,41;
			9	3	725,9 (= 751,6); 737,3; 740,3;
N.A.Du.	°yonī	12/	1	1	159,4;
		/8	F	1	422,2;
N.Pl.	°yonayas	/12	F	1	215,8;
	°yonīs	/11	F	1	235,6;
A.Pl.	°yonīs	/11	F	1	211,7;
			10	1	856,10;
L.Pl.	yóniṣu	/12	F	1	227,4;
			10	2	866,11; 889,15;
		11\	10	1	949,5;
		/8	1	1	15,4;

rám̐hi- f “hurry”, *ram̐h* “run, hurry” < **h₁leng^{uh}*, EWA II, 421f.; NIL, 243ff.

N.Sg.	rám̐his	/11	10	2	921,3; 1004,3;
I.Sg.	rám̐h_iyā	/12	F	1	297,3;
			10	1	922,4;
		/8	F	1	297,3;
			9	3	714,1; 718,8; 818,3;
N.Pl.	rám̐hayas	/12	9	1	798,47;

°rakṣi- a “protecting”, *rakṣ* “protect” < **h₂leks*, EWA II, 422f. Compounds: *pathirákṣi-* a “protecting the path(ways)”, *paśurákṣi-* a “protecting the livestock”.

N.Sg.	°rákṣis	/11	F	1	490,12;
N.A.Du.	°rákṣī	/12	10	1	840,11;

rají- m name of a demon, unclear, may belong to **ráji-** below, EWA II, 427; Kuiper (1991, 93).

A.Sg.	rajím	11/	F	1	467,6;
--------------	--------------	-----	---	---	--------

ráji- f “direction”, *raj* “stretch, extend in a straight line” < **h₃reĝ*, cf. *rāji-* f “line, row” (MS+), together pointing to acrostic **h₃ró/éĝ-i-*, cf. Schaffner (2001, 425); EWA II, 425.

I.Sg.	ráj_iyā	11\	10	1	926,12;
N.A.Du.	rajī	11/	10	1	931,2;

ránti- f “delight”, *ran* “enjoy, be pleased”, only in Indo-Iranian, EWA II, 427f.

N.Pl.	rántayas	/11	F	1	534,10;
		/8	9	1	814,5;

³⁰ *Virātsthānā* with a rest at the fifth place (cf. Arnold (1905, 320)), which Van Nooten/Holland do not restitute in this case.

rándhi- f “submission”, *randh* “be defeated, succumb”, maybe to be connected with **lend^h* “lower (oneself)” according to LIV², 412f.; EWA II, 431f.

A.Sg. rándhim /11 F 1 534, 18;

rábhi- f part of a chariot, *rabh* “grip, seize”, maybe related to Gr. (ἀμφι)λαφής “extensive”, EWA II, 434f.; LIV², 411f. Compounds: *surabhí-* a “fragrant”. Despite the unclear semantic connection (“gripping” → “gripping smell” ?) I have followed Mayrhofer in grouping these lexemes together, even though the simplex and the SMC may be independent derivations from the same root³¹ (i.e. a verbal abstract *rábhi-* “the seizing, gripping” vs. a (synchronic) SMC-verbal adjective *°rabhi-* “smelling” < **“gripping”* ?).

N.Sg.	rábhis	/8	8	1	625,29;
	°rabhís	11\	1	1	162,12;
		/11	9	1	809,19;
			10	1	879,3;
N.A.Sg.n.	°rabhí	11\	10	1	896,4;
A.Sg.	°rabhím	11\	10	1	933,9;
		/11	F	1	470,3 (= 949,7);
		/8	10	1	972,6;
L.Sg.	°rabhaú	/11	F	1	355,6;
N.A.Pl.n.	°rabhīni	11\	F	1	517,18;
		/11	10	1	841,12;
	°rabhí	8/	F	1	335,6;

rayí- m/f < **ró/éh₁i-* “wealth”, EWA II, 438f. Compounds: *ṛdhádr(ay)i-* a “happily reaching wealth” (cf. below), *bṛhád(ay)i-* a “possessing great wealth” (cf. below), *maṁḥayádrayi-* a “giving wealth”, *sanádrayi-* a “bestowing wealth”.

This paradigm deserves special attention. The N.sg. *rayís* < **ró/éh₁is* and A.sg. *rayím* < **ró/éh₁im* should have given monosyllabic forms through contraction following the loss of the intervocalic laryngeal³². Apparently, a new strong stem *ray-* was created when the glide *y* of the weak stem was reanalyzed as part of the root rather than as a suffix, giving a synchronic root *rāy-/ ray-*. It is puzzling, however, that the lengthened grade of the root was not introduced into the strong stem as well; but if the strong stem *rayí-* and the weak stem *rāy-* were analyzed as suppletive early enough there was probably no need for “paradigm levelling”.

The lengthened grade of the I.sg. *rāyá* < **reh₁íéh₁*, D.sg. *rāyé* < **reh₁íéi* and G./Abl.sg. *rāyás* < **reh₁íés* reflects the expected compensatory lengthening in the context **VHC*. Furthermore, the genitive and dative show the same “open” inflection as *ávi-* and *arí-* do, but this is understandable if the paradigm was synchronically analyzed as a root noun³³ rather than as an *i*-stem (in which case we would, of course, expect the default *°es*, *°aye* to be introduced).

³¹The accent is not decisive in this case, since although a Bahuvrīhi **“having a good grip”* should be accented **surábhi-* (if we want to assume an original identity with *rábhi-*), *surabhí-* may as well be analyzed as determinative compound (“smelling good”), in which case oxytone accentuation (which in any case was spreading to possessive compounds already in the RV, cf. AiG II,1, 294) would be expected.

³²Schindler (1973, 155) touches upon this problem, but without giving a reason for *ray-* rather than *rāy-*. The A.sg. *rām* has been shown by Schindler (1972b, 41) to belong to a root noun of *rā* “give” rather than to a suppletive stem to *rayí-*.

³³That is, it was at least partly associated with the “diphthong” stems *naú-* “ship”, *gaú-* “cow; cattle” (on the prehistory of these cf. Schindler (1973)).

The analysis of *rayí-* as basically an *o/e*-acrostatic stem with preserved “open inflection” due to the influence of the long-diphthong-stems goes back to Szemerényi (1956). Recently, however, diverging paradigms have been set up, most notably by Tremblay (1998, 33f.) who groups *rayí-* with his “acrokinetic” (“rhizokinetique”) type³⁴ of the structure strong stem R(e)-S(ø)-D(ø), weak stem R(ø)-S(ø)-D(e). But this type is only based on the evidence of a few (Indo-Iranian) words whose peculiarities may well be explained as remodellings of the more “traditional” accent/ablaut-types within the individual IE languages (Widmer (2004, 56ff.), specifically for *rayí-* Neri (2003, 35f.)), as in the case of *rayí-* (which, incidentally, is not mentioned by Tremblay in his later discussion of the “anakinetic” type, cf. Tremblay (2003, 233f.)).

Of particular interest is the fact that we seem to find deviations from this paradigm in some oblique forms of *rayí-* in the second member of possessive compounds (i.e. exactly where we would expect ID forms to turn up). These are

- D.sg. *bṛhádraye* “possessing great wealth” in RV I,57,1a: *prá máñhiṣṭāya bṛhaté bṛhádraye* “to the most generous great [Indra], who has great wealth³⁵”. Formally, *°raye* might go back to **rh₁-éi-ei*, which would be the expected D.sg. of a proterokinetic derivation of acrostatic **ró/éh₁i-*. But this is not the only possible explanation. First of all, *bṛhádraye* forms the cadence of a Jagatī verse, where a iambic sequence is obligatory. Expected **bṛhádṛāye* (that is, with the D.sg. of the simplex) would give a highly anomalous cadence ◡ — — —, which the poet may have sought to avoid. On the other hand, the creation of an “Augenblicksbildung” ending in *°raye* to fit the metre would be suspicious too, especially since we would then have to assume that 1) the oblique cases were still analyzed as belonging to an *i*-stem synchronically, 2) speakers were then able to productively form an internally-derived-looking weak stem of this form. But as a matter of fact step 1) alone cannot be assumed at all, since even native grammarians group the oblique cases of *rayí-* around a fictional stem *rāi-* of the “diphthong stem”-type *gau-*, *nau-* rather than associating them with the old *i*-stem. Wackernagel/Debrunner (AiG III, 149) assume a haplology **bṛhádṛayaye* > *bṛhádraye*, which presupposes an original segmentation *ray+aye* with a “default” D.sg. desinence. Theoretically, one could imagine an analogical weak stem introduced into the paradigm of *rayí-* that would indeed have this structure:

N.sg.	<i>agn+ís</i>	N.sg.	<i>ray+ís</i>
D.sg.	<i>agn+áye</i>	D.sg.	<i>ray+X, X = áye</i>

However, there is no positive evidence that such an analogy was ever carried out, which means that **bṛhádṛayaye* is the classical *argumentum ex silencio*.

Tremblay (1998, 33f.) and Widmer (2004, 65, fn. 79) assume that *-raye* may simply reflect *°réh₁-i-ei* with laryngeal deletion in compounds (cf. Kuiper (1961)), thus resulting in *°ré-i-ei* > Ved. *°raye*. This would suggest that the compound was formed well before laryngeals disappeared in Indo-Iranian, an assumption that can be neither confirmed

³⁴This corresponds to what Schaffner (2001, 84ff.) rather more hesitantly sets up as “Amphikineticischer Typ II(?)”.

³⁵Geldner (1951, I, 73): “Dem freigebigsten hohen (Indra) von hohem Reichtum”; Dōyama (Witzel and Gotō (2007, 107)): “Dem freigebigsten hohen (Indra), der hohen Reichtum hat”.

nor refuted. Thus, *bṛhádṛaye* remains a very unclear possible instance of ID, although it has to be stressed that it turns up exactly where we would expect a proterokinetic *i*-stem internally derived from an acrostatic stem to appear: in the second member of a possessive compound (cf. the example *mitá-jñu-* above).

- N.pl.³⁶ *ṛdhádrayas* “happily reaching wealth”³⁷ in RV VIII,46,23a: *dása śyāvā ṛdhádrayo* “ten dark brown [horses], who happily reach wealth ...”³⁸. This poses basically the same problem as above: The expected N.pl. *rāyas* (< **ró/éh₁ies*) would violate the structure of this Gāyatrī cadence. Apart from ID (*°rayas* < *°rh₁-éi-es*), compositional laryngeal loss remains a possible explanation, especially since *ṛdhádrayas* appears to be a *Bharadvāja*-type compound (a verbal governing compound with an *-at*-stem as FMC) and therefore not the type where we would expect ID to occur primarily. As evidence for ID goes, *ṛdhádrayas* is even more problematic than *bṛhádṛaye* is.
- *sūrí-* “lord of the sacrifice”: separate entry, see below.

N.Sg.	rayís	12/	F	2	192,12;332,5;		
				8	1	1020,10;	
				10	1	943,1;	
		11/	F	9	296,3; 298,5; 298,7; 307,4; 454,1; 456,12 (=520,9); 461,1; 462,1; 600,3;		
				/11	F	1	509,7;
			10/	F	1	66,1;	
		8/	F	2	127,9; 128,1;		
				F	2	455,5;531,5;	
		/8		9	1	717,3;	
				F	2	379,7;548,21;	
		/8-		8	2	651,11; 1020,9;	
				9	1	813,7;	
		/8		10	1	845,3;	
				F	1	404,5;	
		A.Sg.	°rayís rayím	/8	9	2	764,1; 764,5 (= 779,1);
				12/	F	6	34,5; 47,6; 48,13; 129,7; 141,11; 159,5;
				F	6	216,2; 221,11; 332,8; 346,10; 449,5; 532,9;	
				8	1	666,19;	
				9	2	784,8; 819,21;	
				10	4	841,11; 866,13; 902,4; 993,1;	
		12 \	F	4	193,6; 349,7; 469,2; 511,6;		
		9	1	798,41;			
		10	1	64,2;			
		/12	1	1	162,22;		
		8	1	706,3;			
		11/	F	36	34,12; 58,6; 85,12; 116,3; 116,19; 117,23;		
					210,5; 231,6; 235,19; 248,6; 285,5; 288,13; 289,22;		
					308,2; 330,10; 331,6; 340,6; 347,10; 358,7; 358,11;		
					395,5; 396,18 (= 397,17; 430,5; 431,5); 408,14; 442,3;		
					446,7; 447,7; 451,5; 490,15; 505,4; 506,6; 509,5; 509,6;		
					509,8; 517,24; 521,9; 555,6; 558,6; 591,2; 600,4; 608,3;		
					608,4; 613,10 (= 614,7);		

³⁶Grassmann (Grassmann⁶1996, 290) assumes a G.sg. of a personal name, but this would yield exactly the same problem, since we would have to explain a G. *°rayas* instead of *°rāyas*.

³⁷Cf. Thieme (1971, 1, 168).

³⁸Geldner (1951, II, 365): “Zehn dunkelbraune Mathraroße, den Lauf gewinnende Renner mit geradem Schweife, wendeten im Kreise um.”

			9	5	799,6; 805,4; 805,5; 809,21; 809,44;
			10	1	841,7;
		11\	1	3	60,1; 64,15; 92,8;
			F	6	206,5; 330,2; 434,3; 488,6; 592,7; 593,6;
			9	1	780,10 (= 871,12);
			10	1	917,15;
		/11	1	1	169,4;
			F	9	195,8; 329,8; 332,9; 378,2; 387,6; 517,5; 536,7; 552,7; 553,6;
			10	2	873,1 (= 873,2-8); 1009,1;
		10/	F	1	202,13;
		/10	1	1	68,6;
		8/	1	4	12,11 (= 773,6); 30,22 (= 850,1); 79,9 (= 500,9); 133,7;
			F	5	232,9; 345,1; 363,7 (= 377,2); 440,6; 457,20;
			8	12	623,11; 626,9 (= 774,12; 775,12; 779,6); 627,13; 633,5; 633,12; 643,12; 644,3; 663,15; 669,11; 680,3; 680,6; 704,8;
			9	13	716,8; 716,10; 723,9; 724,9; 743,1; 752,3; 752,5; 775,1; 775,23; 777,30; 778,21; 810,1; 813,9;
		/8	10	2	911,41; 960,4;
			1	3	8,1; 79,8; 97,1;
			F	9	198,1; 258,5; 279,4; 333,5; 333,8; 364,7; 374,1; 377,1; 457,28;
			8	10	625,10; 625,15; 625,36; 644,28; 660,1; 684,11; 684,12; 702,21; 702,34; 704,9;
			9	11	716,7 (= 752,6; 812,2); 719,9; 725,5; 731,6 (= 755,4; 775,11); 732,4; 741,6; 747,1; 760,3; 810,4; 814,3; 818,9;
			10	4	845,1; 847,4; 966,5; 982,3;
		8	1	1	1,3;
			F	1	457,29;
			8	1	699,4;
		11/	F	1	490,4;
		12/	1	2	48,16; 53,5;
			F	1	250,6;
			8	1	644,15;
		11/	1	1	71,6;
			F	11	298,9; 301,15; 338,10; 357,6; 384,1; 446,5; 460,13; 461,6; 490,13; 559,5; 611,4;
			10	1	868,9;
		/11	F	7	257,2; 454,3; 456,11; 459,7; 459,11; 476,1; 588,5 (= 589,5);
		8/	1	1	48,1;
			F	5	304,6; 327,12 (= 706,6); 364,1; 404,2; 582,8;
			8	3	625,32; 646,7; 666,5;
			10	1	919,10;
		12\	1	2	129,9; 129,10;
		/8	10	1	919,13;
		12\	10	1	948,3;
		11/	F	1	583,9;
		8/	10	1	845,7;
		13/	8	1	706,13;
		12/	8	3	643,16; 644,12; 680,14;
			10	2	889,15; 902,2;
		/12	9	1	798,45;
		11/	1	2	54,11; 120,9;
			F	17	194,4; 249,3; 253,1; 287,11; 298,11; 369,5; 396,15; 397,1; 423,3; 442,2; 458,14; 534,6; 536,6; 543,5; 602,7; 606,3a,b;
			9	1	809,6;
I.Sg.	°rayim rāyā				
	raayā				
	rāyīnā rāyiyā rayyā				
D.Sg.	rāyé				

			10	3	885,2; 887,22; 942,1;
		11-/	1	1	73,8;
		11\	F	2	400,4; 525,6;
		/11	1	4	84,17; 113,5; 116,9; 189,1;
			F	3	396,16; 490,14; 534,2;
			8	1	668,2;
			10	1	938,10;
		10/	F	1	550,18;
		8/	1	5	5,3; 9,6; 10,6; 100,16; 142,10;
			F	8	327,11; 360,3; 374,4; 404,1; 404,5; 418,6; 433,1; 486,30;
			8	3	624,15; 627,18; 712,4;
			9	2	757,3 (= 776,3); 775,16;
		8	F	1	548,9;
			9	1	722,1;
	raayé	11/	F	1	395,11;
	°raye	/12	1	1	57,1;
G.Abl.Sg.	rāyás	12/	1	2	91,23; 166,3;
			F	6	193,12; 215,15 (= 408,13); 250,1; 332,6; 456,3; 489,9;
			8	1	643,9;
			10	5	861,7; 862,7; 869,3; 948,8; 973,4;
		12-/	8	1	1028,7;
		/12	F	1	192,10;
		11/	1	4	51,14; 72,8; 96,6 (= 965,3); 125,1;
			F	31	202,12; 218,17 (= 219,11; 220,7); 231,4; 253,3; 264,18; 270,10; 288,21; 298,20; 313,11; 316,8; 317,4; 329,10; 337,10 (= 520,7); 369,1; 387,10; 395,5; 403,4; 445,8; 464,10; 477,4; 491,11; 520,6; 524,3; 536,9; 544,5 (=545,5; 546,5); 550,24; 556,3; 572,15; 609,2; 611,2; 613,4;
			10	3	843,9; 848,15; 856,12;
		11\	F	2	553,5 (= 706,15); 591,5;
		/11	1	2	33,1; 73,9;
			F	14	200,5; 300,6; 308,3; 317,10; 325,5; 366,3; 369,5; 395,8; 396,5; 463,3; 534,3; 546,1; 576,11; 616,2;
			8	1	668,7;
			9	1	801,7;
			10	1	973,5;
		8/	1	1	4,10 (= 652,13);
			F	4	422,3; 485,2; 496,2; 496,3;
			8	5	623,22; 1020,6; 1021,6; 1025,2; 704,4;
			9	2	745,6; 747,2;
			10	1	967,6;
		/8	1	1	17,3;
		8	1	2	24,5; 138,3;
			F	1	495,8 (= 646,22; 666,6; 1022,1);
			8	1	667,4;
	rāayas	11/	F	1	337,10;
		/11	F	1	460,5;
		10/	1	1	68,10;
	raayás	12/	1	1	36,12;
		/8	8	1	680,4;
N.Pl.	rāyas	12/	1	1	31,10;
			F	1	408,7;
		11/	1	3	98,3; 123,13; 169,5;
			F	4	442,5; 477,1; 550,23; 553,8;
		/11	1	1	62,12;
			F	4	396,8; 477,5; 534,20; 551,2;
			10	1	943,5;
		8/	F	2	250,1; 304,7;
		8-	F	1	344,1;

		8	F	1	455,3;	
	rāayas	11\		1	167,1;	
	°rayas	/8		8	666,23;	
A.Pl.	rāyás	/12	F	1	236,15;	
		11/		1	2	73,10; 149,1;
			F	4	290,6; 452,6; 453,6; 573,6;	
				9	1	806,3;
		/11		1	1	113,4;
			F	2	316,7; 390,4;	
		8/		1	1	127,11;
			F	2	379,3; 548,19;	
				8	2	624,16; 643,27;
				10	1	967,2;
		/8		8	1	701,9;
		8		1	1	81,7;
			F	1	250,3;	
				9	1	773,26;
				10	1	919,6;
	rāyas	12/		8	1	1021,10;
		/11	F	2	488,9; 550,2;	
		8/		10	1	966,4;
I.Pl.	rayíbhīś	12\		1	1	64,10;
G.Pl.	rayīṇám	11/	F	1	212,6;	
		/11		1	5	60,4 (=72,1); 60,5; 73,4; 96,7; 181,1;
			F	14	200,4; 229,10; 231,1; 241,3; 288,16; 346,6 (= 409,10; 660,12; 668,13; 947,10); 357,8; 390,1; 442,8; 448,2; 472,1; 501,13; 521,5; 526,5;	
				9	1	809,24;
				10	4	831,1; 871,5; 873,2; 932,7;
		/10		1	2	68,7; 70,5;
		/8		8	1	666,2;
	rayīṇám	12\		9	1	814,4;
		/8		1	1	46,2 (=628,12);
				8	2	639,8; 684,4;
				9	2	759,5; 813,6;
		8		6	1	488,19;
	rāyám	12/		9	1	820,13;

raśmí- m “rein”, only in Indic, EWA II, 441; Koch (2003, 363). Compounds: *iṣṭáraśmi-* a “with reins as wished for”, *pāñcaraśmi-* a “having five reins”, *prācīnaraśmi-* a “whose reins are pointing, directing forward”, *yatáraśmi-* a “whose reins are held by the driver”, *vṛṣaraśmi-* a “having strong reins”, *saptáraśmi-* a “having seven reins”, *sáraśmi-* a “having the same reins”, *suraśmí-* a “having good reins”, *sūryaraśmi-* a “having the sun’s beams”, *syūmaraśmi-* PN (“having straps for reins”).

N.Sg.	raśmís	11\		1	1	35,7;
		/11		10	1	955,5;
	°raśmis	11/	F	2	203,12; 346,4;	
				10	1	965,1;
		/11		1	1	122,13;
			F	1	209,1;	
		8/		1	1	35,3;
A.Sg.	raśmím	/12		10	1	919,9;
		11/		1	1	123,13;
			F	2	318,8; 387,3;	
		/11		9	1	809,33;
		8/		8	1	652,23;
		8	F	1	361,3;	

			8	1	627,8;
	°raśmim	12/	10	1	862,8;
		11/	10	1	862,6;
		/11	1	1	146,1;
			F	2	231,3; 485,24;
			10	1	834,8;
V.Sg.	raśme	8	F	1	373,5;
I.Sg.	raśmínā	/8	8	1	645,18;
		12\	1	1	135,9;
			9	1	781,6;
		/12	F	2	409,3; 516,6;
			9	1	798,6;
			10	1	917,4;
		11/	F	1	470,2;
		11\	1	2	59,3; 109,7;
			F	2	241,9; 309,4;
		8/	1	1	105,9;
			F	2	196,2; 348,5;
			9	1	776,7;
D.Sg.	°raśmaye	/12	1	1	112,16;
L.Sg.	°raśmau	8/	8	1	1021,2;
N.Pl.	°raśmayas	11/	F	1	416,4;
		/11	F	1	485,19;
A.Pl.	raśmín	12/	1	2	141,11; 144,3;
			8	1	655,21;
		11/	1	1	109,3;
		/11	10	1	956,7;
		8/	1	1	28,4;
I.Pl.	raśmíbhīḥ	12/	1	1	87,6;
			9	1	823,3;
		12\	F	1	435,4;
			9	1	798,32;
		/12	1	1	136,2;
			10	1	861,5;
		11/	F	2	518,1; 552,1;
			9	1	809,23;
		11\	1	3	92,12; 123,12; 124,8;
			F	5	310,2; 310,3; 358,4; 563,4; 593,3;
		/11	10	1	903,5;
		8/	9	1	778,27;
		/8	1	6	19,8; 47,7 (= 137,2; 433,8; 710,2); 49,4; 84,1; 132,3; 136,2;
			F	2	348,7; 433,8;
			8	3	632,9; 663,32; 681,16;
			9	3	753,5; 773,8; 812,8;
			10	1	958,6;
L.Pl.	raśmíṣu	/ 12	1	1	134,4;
		/8	1	1	134,4;

rāti- f “gift, offering; goddess of generosity”, *rā* “give, offer” < **reh*₁, Av. *rāiti-*, EWA II, 442f., 446f. Compounds: *ánarśarāti-* a “whose offerings are not offending”, *ārāti-* f “(goddess of) malevolence” (*“non-gift”), *citrārāti-* a “having extraordinary gifts”, *piśaṅgarāti-* a “bringing golden gifts”, *pūṣarāti-* a “receiving *Pūṣan*’s gifts”, *mām̐hiṣṭharāti-* a “having generous offerings”, *vibhūtarāti-* a “giving excellent gifts”, *viśṣṭarāti-* a “whose gifts are spilling forth”, *śróturāti-* a “listening to sbdy.”, *sārāti-* a “giving the same offerings”, *surāti-* a “giving good gifts”, *svādurāti-* a “giving sweet gifts, rewards”.

N.Sg. **rātis** 12/ 1 3 89,2; 139,5; 168,7;

			8	2	639,19; 644,9;
			10	1	892,10;
		/12	1	1	34,1;
		11/	F	1	504,4;
			10	1	921,17;
		11\	1	1	117,1;
		/11	1	2	122,7; 184,4;
			F	3	264,7; 499,1; 541,3;
			10	1	1006,1;
		8/	1	1	139,5;
			F	2	392,1; 486,32;
			8	2	633,4; 701,29;
			10	2	959,3; 969,4;
	°rātis	11/	1	1	122,10;
		/11	1	1	122,6;
			8	1	668,3;
			10	1	860,14;
		8/	F	1	198,2;
V.Sg.	°rāte	11/	F	1	385,2;
A.Sg.	rātīm	12/	F	2	192,16 (= 193,13); 236,4;
			8	1	710,8;
			10	1	966,5;
		12\	8	1	643,28;
		11/	1	2	60,1; 162,2;
			F	4	313,5; 479,1; 554,5; 572,18;
		11\	10	1	1004,2;
		/11	1	1	169,4;
			F	3	301,2; 330,10; 504,8;
		8/	8	2	629,16; 680,8;
		/8	8	1	688,5;
		8	F	1	296,11;
	°rātīm	12/	1	1	52,3;
			8	2	639,2; 708,4;
			10	1	889,12;
		11/	F	1	300,4;
D.Sg.	rātāye	/8	F	1	364,6;
G.Abl.Sg.	°rātes	/8	8	1	680,1;
	°rāt,yās	12\	9	2	791,3a,b;
L.Sg.	rātaú	11/	F	1	517,20 (= 517,25);
		/11	F	3	387,9; 541,4; 553,8;
		/11-	F	1	491,9;
N.A.Du.	°rātī	/11	F	1	503,5;
V.Du.	°rātī	/11	F	1	503,11;
N.Pl.	rātāyas	/12	1	1	132,2;
		/8	1	4	11,3; 11,8; 29,4; 132,2;
			8	2	1018,5; 671,1 (= 671,2-12; 708,4);
	°rātāyas	/8	8	1	677,14;
	°rātayas	12/	F	1	214,5;
		/12	F	3	214,9; 599,3; 599,5;
			8	1	647,17;
			9	1	793,4;
			10	1	891,4;
		11/	F	3	226,6; 229,9; 356,6;
		/11	9	1	791,1;
			10	1	904,3;
		8/	1	1	43,8;
		/8	1	2	23,8 (= 232,15); 29,4;
			F	2	433,4; 489,16 (= 500,8);
			8	3	629,1; 647,14; 680,4;
			10	4	883,1; 911,32; 959,3; 1000,2;
A.Pl.	°rātīs	/11	1	1	116,21;

			F	6	252,1; 322,7; 323,2; 346,11; 445,5; 517,7;
			9	2	808,15; 809,10;
		/10	F	1	485,9;
		8/	8	1	659,2;
		/8	F	4	258,1; 407,14; 457,27c,d;
			8	1	631,3;
	°rātiis	/8	8	1	659,2;
I.Pl.	rātibhis	/12	8	1	639,29;
		11/	F	1	253,2;
		/8	1	1	11,6;
L.Pl.	rātīṣu	/12	8	1	624,19;
		/8	8	2	639,12; 654,18;

rāśí- f “group, heap, herd”, only in Indo-Iranian, EWA II, 449.

N.Sg.	rāśís	8/	F	1	496,3;
A.Sg.	rāśím	11/	F	1	316,8;
			9	1	799,9;
N.Pl.	rāśáyas	11\	8	1	705,8;

°riṣṭi- f “damage”, *riṣ* “be damaged”, no undisputed outer-Indo-Iranian cognates, EWA II, 462f. Compounds: *áriṣṭi*- f “intactness”.

A.Sg.	°riṣṭim	/11	F	1	212,6;
-------	---------	-----	---	---	--------

rīti- f “stream”, *ri* “stream, flow, run” < * $H_{(3)}$ re \tilde{t} H, EWA II, 437f.

N.Sg.	rītís	12/	F	1	215,14;
		/11	F	2	230,5; 454,1;
A.Sg.	rītím	12/	F	1	402,4;
		/11	9	1	820,10;

ruruṣāṇi- a “willing to break sth.”, from the desiderative stem of *ruj* “break” < * $leug/\hat{g}$, EWA II, 465; see section 2.1.2.2.

A.Sg.	ruruṣāṇim	/8	9	1	760,2;
-------	-----------	----	---	---	--------

vakṣāṇi- a “beneficial, supportive” or “leading”, *vakṣ* “grow” or *vah* “go, drive/draw a waggon, lead”, EWA II, 485ff., 535ff.; AiG II,2, 207; see section 2.1.2.2.

N.Sg.	vakṣāṇis	/8	8	1	672,4;
-------	----------	----	---	---	--------

vāṅkri- f “rib”, *vañc* “stagger, waver” < * $u_{\tilde{e}}enk$, cf. *vakrá*- “bent”, Weiss (1996, 204f.); EWA II, 492f.

A.Pl.	vāṅkrīs	11/	1	1	162,18;
-------	---------	-----	---	---	---------

vádhri- a “castrated, gelding”, only in Indic, etym. unclear, EWA II, 498f. The adjectival use of *vádhri*- is “pour le moins incertain” (Pinault (1998b, 90)), the Bahuvrīhi-PN *saptáavadhri*- “owning seven geldings” calls for a substantive in the second compound member, and of the six simplex attestations only three are rendered by Geldner as adjectives. Combined with the accent, this may hint to an analysis similar to that of *bhūri*- above, i.e. as an original substantive whose secondary adjectival usage developed from the type of appositional

constructions described by Pinault (1998b, 114f.).

N.Sg.	vádhris	11/	1	1	32,7;
	°vádhris	8/	8	1	682,9;
A.Sg.	°vádhrim	8/	F	1	432,5;
I.Sg.	vádhrinā	/8	10	1	928,12;
D.Sg.	°vádhraye	/12	10	1	865,9;
		/8	F	1	432,6;
N.Pl.	vádhrayas	/12	8	1	666,30;
		11\	1	1	33,6;
		/8	8	1	666,30;
A.Pl.	vádhrīm	12/	F	1	216,3;

°váni- a “gaining, winning”, *van* “win” < **u_{en}*, EWA II, 499. Compounds: *upamātiváni-* a “accepting the call”, *rjuváni-* a “going straight ahead”, *vasuváni-* a “winning goods”, *vṛṣṭiváni-* a “winning rain”.

N.Sg.	°vānis	/12	F	1	395,15;
		/11	F	1	395,16;
A.Sg.	°vānim	/11	F	1	517,23;
		10	1	1	924,7;

vartaní- f “track, way”, *vṛt* “turn (intr.)” < **u_{ert}*, EWA II, 518f. Compounds: *krṣṇāvartani-* a “having a black rail, track”, *gāyatrāvartani-* a “turning (moving) in/like a hymn”, *ghṛtāvartani-* a “whose track, way is rich in fat”, *dvivartani-* a “having two tracks, ways”, *raghūvartani-* a “rolling fast”, *rudrāvartani-* a “treading magnificent paths”, *vṛjināvartani-* a “fallacious” (“treading twisted tracks”), *hiraṇyavartani-* a “having golden paths, tracks”.

N.Sg.	vartanís	/8+	10	1	970,4;
	°vartanis	/12	9	1	793,2;
		11/	F	1	585,1;
		/11	10	1	887,20;
		/8	F	1	502,7;
			8	1	646,18;
A.Sg.	vartaním	12/	F	1	341,3;
			10	1	891,6;
		11\	F	1	534,16;
		/11	F	1	241,2;
		/8	1	1	25,9;
			F	1	415,9;
			8	1	672,8;
			10	2	998,1; 998,4;
	°vartanim	12\	8	1	643,19;
		/12	1	1	31,6;
		/8	8	2	629,8; 658,6;
I.Sg.	vartaní	/11	1	1	53,8;
N.A.Du.	°vartanī	12\	8	1	696,5;
		/8	1	1	92,18;
			F	2	429,2 (= 625,11; 628,1); 429,3;
			8	1	642,14;
V.Du.	°vartanī	/12	8	1	642,1 (= 865,11);
		/8	1	1	3,3;
I.D.Abl.Du.	vartaníbhyām	/11	F	1	585,3;
N.Pl.	vartanáyas	11\	10	1	831,4;
A.Pl.	vartanís	/12	1	1	140,9;

11/ F 1 315,2;

vavrí- m “hiding place”, *vṛ* “surround, restrain, lock in”, only in Indo-Iranian, the PIE etymology remains disputed, EWA II, 512f., see section 2.1.2.3. Compounds: *vívavri-* m “hiding place, cover”.

N.Sg.	vavrís	11/	10	1	830,4;
		8	F	1	373,1;
A.Sg.	vavrím	12/	9	1	783,2;
		/12	1	1	164,29;
		11/	1	1	164,7;
			9	1	781,9;
			10	1	831,5;
		/11	1	1	116,10;
		8/	1	1	46,9;
			F	1	428,5;
I.Sg.	vavríṇā	/12	1	1	54,10;
G.Abl.Sg.	vavrés	/11	F	1	338,1 (= 338,2);
		8/	F	1	373,1;
N.A.Du.	°vavrī	/11	10	1	925,5;

váṣṭi- a “benevolent”, *vaś* “wish for, want, desire” < * $\underline{\text{u}}\hat{\text{e}}\hat{\text{k}}$, the unexpected full grade of the root is explained by Liebert (1949, 47) as influence (or even substantivization) of the 3.sg. present. On the other hand, there are some lengthened-grade verbal forms in Hittite and Greek suggesting a Narten root, cf. LIV², 672f.; EWA II, 527f.

N.Pl. **váṣṭayas** /8 F 1 433,5;

vasatí- f “stay; nest”, *vas* “stay at, inhabit” < * $h_2\underline{\text{u}}\text{es}$, EWA II, 531f.; see section 2.1.1.3.

N.Sg.	vasatís	/11	F	1	444,3;
		/8	10	1	923,5;
A.Sg.	vasatím	/11	1	1	33,2;
			F	1	356,6;
		/8	10	1	953,4;
I.Sg.	vasatyá	/10	1	1	66,9;
G.Abl.Sg.	vasatés	/11	1	1	124,12 (= 505,6);
L.Sg.	vasataú	/11	1	1	31,5;
		/8	9	1	774,15;
A.Pl.	vasatís	/8	1	1	25,4;

vasútāti- f “(sum of) goods, wealth”, derived from *vásu-* n “good thing, blessing”, see section 2.1.4.

N.Sg.	vasútātis	/11	1	1	122,12;
A.Sg.	vasútātim	/11	1	1	122,5;

vásutti- f “reception of goods” < * $H\underline{\text{u}}\text{asu-dH-ti-}$, *dā* “give” < * deh_3 , with compositional laryngeal loss in the SMC (cf. °**dāti-** above³⁹), EWA I, 713ff.; NIL, 60ff.; Kuiper (1961, 25).

³⁹But in this case the SMC might also reflect *dhā*, cf. Geldner *apud* Kuiper (1961, 25).

D.Sg. *vásuttaye* /8 8 1 670,7;
9 1 756,6;

váhni- a/m “pulling, drawing sth.; draft animal”, *vah* “go, drive/draw a waggon, lead” < * $\underline{ue}g^h$, EWA II, 535ff.

N.Sg.	<i>váhnis</i>	12/	1	1	160,3;		
			10	1	837,6;		
		12\	8	1	643,3 ⁴⁰ ;		
		/12	F	1	208,4;		
		/12-	1	1	129,5 ⁴¹ ;		
		11/	F	1	265,1;		
			9	1	801,1;		
			10	1	887,9;		
		11\	F	1	523,5;		
			10	1	927,11;		
		/11	1	3	76,4; 113,17; 184,1;		
			F	5	265,1; 239,1; 254,1; 317,6; 452,2;		
			9	1	809,34;		
		8/	1	1	128,4;		
			F	2	404,4; 457,9 (= 532,9);		
			8	1	703,1;		
			9	4	721,6; 732,6; 748,2; 820,10;		
			8-/	1	129,5;		
			8	9	1 776,19;		
		A.Sg.	<i>váhnim</i>	12/	10	1	941,3;
11/	1			1	60,1;		
	F			1	235,1;		
	9			2	803,1; 808,17;		
/11	F			1	265,2;		
	10			1	927,10;		
8/	F			1	245,4 (= 532,12);		
	8			1	663,20;		
	9			1	777,28;		
V.Sg.	<i>vahne</i>			8	9	1	732,5;
D.Sg.	<i>váhnaye</i>	12\	F	1	212,2;		
G.Abl.Sg.	<i>váhnes</i>	/11	F	1	480,1;		
N.A.Du.	<i>váhni</i>	11/	F	1	589,4;		
		8/	8	1	628,12;		
N.Pl.	<i>váhnayas</i>	12\	F	1	228,3;		
		/12	F	2	215,13; 598,4;		
			10	2	940,2; 964,1;		
		11\	F	1	240,2;		
		8/	8	1	632,15;		
		/8	1	4	3,9; 14,6; 20,8; 48,11;		
			F	2	433,4; 498,3;		
			8	2	623,23; 626,2;		
		I.Pl.	<i>váhnibhis</i>	12\	10	1	919,9;
				11/	F	1	473,3;
11\	F			1	591,5;		
/8	1			2	6,5; 44,13;		

vāvahi- a “moving quickly”, *vah* “go, drive/draw a waggon, lead” < * $\underline{ue}g^h$, EWA II, 535ff.;

⁴⁰Van Nooten/Holland (1994, 359; 638) restitute a catalectic 12-syllable line with a “rest” after the fourth syllable, a trisyllabic scansion of *váhnis* as suggested by Grassmann ⁶1996, 1245f. is thus unnecessary and would in any case be difficult to motivate.

⁴¹5f & g are catalectic verses according to Arnold (1905, 161 and 294). Again, there is no need for trisyllabic *váhnis* (*pace* Grassmann, l.c.).

see section 2.1.2.3.

N.Sg. **vāvahis** /8 9 1 721,6;

vimśatī- f “twenty” < $*(d/h_1)ui-h_1k̑m̑ti-$, YAv. *vīsaiti-*, Lat. *uīginti*, Gr. (Ion.-Att.) εἴκοσι etc., EWA II, 550f.; see section 2.1.1.2.

N.Sg. **vimśatís** /11 1 1 164,11;
 /8 1 1 80,9;
 A.Sg. **vimśatím** 11\ F 1 534,11;
 /11 F 2 381,2; 468,8;
 /10 8 1 666,31;
 /8 8 1 666,22;
 10 2 912,14; 912,23;
 I.Sg. **vimśatyā** 11/ F 1 209,5;

vívici- a “distinguishing”, *vic* “separate, sieve, shake”, only in Indo-Iranian, EWA II, 576f.; see section 2.1.2.3.

A.Sg. **vívicim** 12\ F 1 362,3;
 /12 8 1 1019,6;

viṣṭī- f “service”, *viṣ* “act, execute, perform”, no clear cognates outside Indic, EWA II, 565f., 585f. Compounds: *párivīṣṭi-* f “service”, *trivīṣṭi-* (f) “three times” (only attested in adverbial use in the I.sg.).

I.Sg. **viṣṭí** 8 1 1 20,4;
 °**viṣṭí** 11/ F 1 302,4;
 8/ F 1 311,2;
 °**viṣṭī** 11/ F 1 329,2;
 I.Pl. **viṣṭíbhis** /12 1 1 92,3;

vītī- f “sacrificial meal, feast”, *vī* “pursue, seek, strive for sth.” < $*ueiH$, EWA II, 509f. Compounds: *gáurivīti-* m PN (“having cows for one’s feast”), *devávīti-* f “feast for the gods”, *ráthavīti-* m PN.

N.Sg. °**vītis** /8 F 1 415,19;
 A.Sg. **vītím** /11 9 1 809,25;
 8 9 1 713,4;
 °**vītīm** /11 1 1 113,12;
 F 1 583,6 (= 600,6; 601,5);
 9 1 801,7; 809,21;
 10 1 879,3;
 8/ 8 1 677,13;
 I.Sg. **vītí** 12/ 8 1 1023,6;
 11/ F 1 447,1;
 9 1 803,2 (?);
 11-/ F 1 457,46;
 11\ 9 1 809,49 (?);
 8/ 9 2 721,2; 773,1;
 D.Sg. **vítāye** /12 1 3 135,1; 135,3; 142,13;
 F 1 193,6;
 11/ F 1 573,2;

		/11	F	2	413,8; 584,2;
		/8	1	6	5,5; 13,2; 74,4; 74,6; 135,3 (= 135,4); 135,4;
			F	6	247,4; 380,2 (= 532,4); 405,5; 457,10; 457,44; 494,10;
			8	5	640,10; 640,16; 669,4; 702,22; 710,7 (= 710,10);
			9	4	718,9; 774,23; 816,3; 817,3;
	°vītaye	/12	F	2	214,7; 509,10;
			9	1	782,9;
		11\	10	1	861,14;
		/11	10	1	892,12;
		/8	1	1	12,9;
			F	3	255,2; 456,18; 457,7;
			9	11	718,6; 725,2; 725,3; 732,1; 757,1; 758,1 (= 779,17); 766,4; 776,15; 777,18; 818,7; 819,12;
G.Abl.Sg.	°vītes	/11	F	1	383,11;
		/11-	10	1	832,3;
L.Sg.	°vītau	/11	F	3	251,5; 396,10; 535,4;
			9	3	808,14; 809,2; 809,33;
		/8	F	1	415,18;
I.Pl.	°vītibhis	/12	8	1	1023,6;

vṛkāti- m “wolf-like robber, wolf”, *vṛka-* “wolf”, EWA II, 570f.; Liebert 1949, 179f.; see section 2.1.1.2.

N.Sg. **vṛkātis** /11 F 1 337,4;

°**vṛkti-** f “turning, offering”, *vṛj* “turn, lay down, scatter sth.” < **h₂uerg*, EWA II, 516f. Compounds: *nāmovṛkti-* f “respectful scattering”, *svāvṛkti-* f “one’s own offering”.

A.Sg. °**vṛktim** /11 10 1 957,2;
I.Pl. °**vṛktibhis** /8 10 1 847,1;

°**vṛti-** f “exclusion, containment”, *vṛ* “surround, restrain, lock in, exclude”, only in Indo-Iranian, the PIE etymology remains disputed, EWA II, 512f. Compounds: *ápāvṛti-* f “closure, hiding place”.

A.Sg. °**vṛtim** /12 8 1 675,3;

vṛddhi- f “invigoration”, *vṛdh* “multiply, cause to grow (act.); grow (mid.)”, only in Indo-Iranian, EWA II, 520f.

N.Pl. **vṛddhayas** /8 1 1 10,12;

vṛṣṭi- f “rain”, *vṛṣ* “rain” < **h₂uers*, EWA II, 522ff.; NIL, 356f. Compounds: *svāvṛṣṭi-* a “having/keeping the rain to oneself”, cf. Oldenberg (1909, 51).

N.Sg. **vṛṣṭis** 12/ F 1 417,1;
10 2 849,4; 869,7;
11/ 1 1 152,7;
F 2 439,3; 454,1;
9 1 801,1;
8/ F 1 610,1;
8 1 1 38,8;
A.Sg. **vṛṣṭim** 12/ F 2 409,5; 417,2;
9 1 820,10;

		11/	F	6	218,15; 322,2; 412,3; 416,3; 437,6; 556,6;
				9	2 808,14; 809,17;
				10	2 924,3; 924,10;
		/11	1	1	116,12;
			F	1	580,2;
				9	1 781,9;
		8/	1	1	39,9;
			F	1	197,5;
				9	4 720,8 (= 751,2); 777,3; 777,24; 812,3;
		8	8	1	632,6;
				9	2 761,1; 761,3;
	°vr̥ṣṭim	12/	1	2	52,5; 52,14;
I.Sg.	vr̥ṣṭī	8/	F	2	196,6; 407,5;
	vr̥ṣṭīyā	12\	F	1	417,4;
		/12	8	1	641,18;
G.Abl.Sg.	vr̥ṣṭés	12/	9	1	786,3;
		8/	9	1	753,3;
N.Pl.	vr̥ṣṭáyas	/12	F	1	225,2;
				8	1 645,6;
				10	1 901,3;
		11\	F	1	617,5;
		8/	9	1	729,2;
		/8	F	4	407,2; 407,6; 407,10; 438,3;
				9	3 734,2; 769,1; 774,28;
I.Pl.	vr̥ṣṭíbhī	/12	F	1	413,5;
		11\	1	1	164,52;
			F	1	572,13;
		/8	8	1	627,16;

vr̥ṣṇí- m **h₂urs-n-i-/*h₂urs-ni-* “ram”, YAv. *varšni-*, EWA II, 575f.; NIL, 722ff. (**u_̣ers*), see section 2.1.7.

N.Sg.	vr̥ṣṇís	8	1	1	10,2;
I.Sg.	vr̥ṣṇínā	/8	8	1	626,6;

vr̥ṣṇi- a “strong, manly”, EWA II, 575f., see the entry above and section 2.1.7.

N.A.Sg.	vr̥ṣṇi	8	F	1	389,4;
				8	2 623,10; 627,23;

védi- f gras scattered around of the place of sacrifice, etym. unclear, maybe **uo-sd-i-* (**sed* “sit, be seated”), EWA II, 581; NIL, 590ff., fn. 11.

N.Sg.	védīs	11/	1	1	164,35;
		/11	F	1	551,7;
A.Sg.	védīm	12/	8	1	639,18;
		11/	F	1	576,9;
		/11	F	1	385,12;
				10	1 887,2;
		/8-	1	1	170,4;
L.Sg. (?)	védī	11/	F	1	442,10;
		/11	F	1	194,4;

vaídadašvi- m PN “descendant of *Vidadašva*”, see section 2.1.6.

N.Sg.	vaídadašvis	8/	F	1	415,10;
-------	-------------	----	---	---	---------

vyāti- m “steed” ?, unclear, EWA II, 590; AiG II,2, 294.

A.Pl.	v_iyātīm	/12	1	1	155,6;
		8/	8	1	678,13;
G.Pl.	v_iyātīnaam	/8	F	1	328,17;

°**vyathi-** a “ambling, staggering”, *vyath* “saunter, stagger, amble”, no IE cognates, EWA II, 591. Instead of a simplex *vyāthi-* (Grassmann ⁶1996, 1358), Hoffmann (AzI I, 154ff.) and Mayrhofer (l.c.) assume an *s*-stem *vyāthis-* (< **u̯ieth*₂-*s-* ? Cf. LIV², 696), occurring seven times in the N.Sg. in the RV. For a discussion of the attestations see Oldenberg (1909, 111ff.), who does not completely exclude the possibility of a simplex in *i-*. Compounds: *avyathī-* a “walking firmly, not staggering”, *kr̥ṣṇāvyathī-* a “having a black way/stagger” (said of *Agni*).

N.Sg.	° vyathís	/12	F	1	469,3;
		11/	F	1	195,7;
		/11	1	1	117,15;
		/8	9	1	760,3;
I.Sg.	° vyathī́	11/	10	1	853,21;
A.Pl.	° vyathís	11/	10	1	857,10;
I.Pl.	° vyathíbhis	12\	1	1	112,6;
		/11	F	1	585,7;
L.Pl.	° vyathíṣu	/8	8	1	622,24;

vratāti- f “creeper, climbing plant”, probably to be connected with *vṛt* “turn”, EWA II, 595.

G.Abl.Sg.	vratátes	8/	8	1	660,6;
------------------	-----------------	----	---	---	--------

śakúni- m “bird”, etym. unclear, EWA II, 603; Kuiper (1991, 44, 93).

V.Sg.	śakune	12\	F	4	234,2a,c,e; 234,3;
		/11	F	1	233,1;

śakúnti- m “bird”, see above.

V.Sg.	śakunte	/11	F	1	233,3;
N.Pl.	śakúntayas	/12	F	1	234,1;

śakti-/śákti- f “strength, power”, *śak* “be able to, have the power to” (< **kek*^(u) ? Verbal forms are attested in Indo-Iranian only), EWA II, 600f., 603. This is one of the cases where a *ti*-stem apparently preserves both barytone and oxytone accentuation, see the entry **cítti-** above. Compounds: *suśákti-* f “easy feat”.

N.Sg.	śaktís	12/	1	1	83,3;
		/11	F	2	318,8; 536,10;
	° śáktis	12/	F	1	548,21;
A.Sg.	śaktīm	11/	F	2	230,7; 339,3;
		/11	F	1	291,3;
	śáktim	8/	10	1	960,6;
I.Sg.	śaktí́	11\	F	1	584,8;
	śáktī́	11/	1	1	31,18;
A.Pl.	śaktís	11/	1	1	109,3;
			F	1	265,14;
I.Pl.	śáktibhis	11\	10	1	914,10;
		/8	10	1	851,5;

śátri- m PN, unclear, maybe belongs to *śátru-* m “enemy”, but this has no clear etymology either, EWA II, 607; Kuiper (1991, 93).

A.Sg. **śátrim** 11/ F 1 388,9;

śám̐tāti- f “blessings, wellbeing”, *tāti-* derivative of the particle *śám* “blessing” (etym. unclear), EWA II, 609f., see section 2.1.4.

N.A.Sg. **śám̐tāti** 8/ 8 1 638,7;
N.A.Du. **śám̐tāti** 12/ 1 1 112,20;
I.Pl. **śám̐tātibhis** /8 10 1 963,4;

śárāṇi- f “disobedience”, *śṝ* “break, shatter (intr.), interrupt sth.” < **kerh*₂, EWA II, 617f.; see section 2.1.2.2.

A.Sg. **śárāṇim** 11\ 1 1 31,16;

śálmali- m type of tree, etym. unclear, EWA II, 622f., a possible loan according to Kuiper (1991, 65).

A.Sg. **śálmalím** /11 10 1 911,20;
L.Sg. **śálmalaú** 11/ F 1 566,3;

śásti- f “song of praise”, *śam̐s* “praise, proclaim” < **kems*, Av. *sasti-*, EWA II, 599f. Compounds: *abhíśasti-* f “curse, bad luck”, *ásasti-* f “hatred, curse, ill will”, *prásasti-* f “eulogy, praise”, *suśásti-* a/f “(deserving) good praise”.

N.Sg.	śástis	11/	F	1	299,15;
	°śástis	/11	10	1	930,10;
A.Sg.	°śástis	8/	8	1	626,22;
	śástim	11/	F	1	299,3;
	°śástim	11/	F	1	411,7;
			10	1	1008,1 (= 1008,2-3);
			/11	1	181,1;
				F	4 264,1; 357,7; 522,1; 538,3;
			/11-	F	1 202,12;
I.Sg.		10/	1	1	70,9;
		8/	F	1	232,16;
	°śástí	/11	1	1	186,1;
D.Sg.			F	1	508,3;
	°śástaye	12/	9	1	782,6;
		/12	8	1	639,26;
		11/	1	2	122,11; 174,4;
		/11	F	1	357,12;
		/8	1	3	21,3; 23,19; 74,6;
			F	3	352,5; 393,4; 610,3;
G.Abl.Sg.			8	1	632,15;
	°śastes	/12	10	1	865,6;
		/11	1	2	71,10; 93,5;
			F	1	529,2;
			10	2	856,7; 930,9;
		8/	F	1	483,4;
			8	1	675,14;
	/8	1	1	91,15;	

N.Pl.	$\circ\acute{s}astáyas$	/12	F	1	400,6;
	$\circ\acute{s}astayas$	/8		1	1 26,9;
			F	1	486,3 (= 632,21; 660,9);
				8	2 639,19; 665,33;
A.Pl.	$\circ\acute{s}astīs$	8		9	1 714,8;
		/12		8	1 698,2;
		/11		1	1 100,10;
			F	2	509,6; 534,5;
		8/	F	1	489,17;
		/8-	F	1	344,2;
I.Pl.	$\acute{s}astībhis$	11/		1	1 186,3;
	$\circ\acute{s}astībhis$	/12	F	1	260,6 (= 407,11);
				10	1 966,3;
		/8		1	1 20,7;
			8	2	625,24; 643,6;
	$\circ\acute{s}astibhis$	12/	F	1	456,2;
		11/		1	1 148,3;
		/8	F	2	363,6; 370,1;
		8	3	639,29; 661,2; 683,2;	
		9	1	722,3;	

$\circ\acute{s}iti-$ f “sharpening”, $\acute{s}\bar{a}$ “sharpen” < $*\hat{k}eh_3(i)$ (verbal forms are attested in Indo-Iranian only), EWA II, 627; NIL, 411ff. Compounds: $n\acute{i}\acute{s}iti-$ f “sharpening”.

A.Sg.	$\circ\acute{s}itim$	11\	F	2	454,4; 456,11;
		8/	F	1	443,5;
I.Sg.	$\circ\acute{s}itī$	12\		8	1 639,14;

$\circ\acute{s}i\acute{s}vi-$ a “growing”, $\acute{s}\bar{u}$ “swell, grow (strong)” < $*\hat{k}euh_1$, EWA II, 623f., 641; AiG II,2, 293; see section 2.1.3. Compounds: $s\acute{u}\acute{s}i\acute{s}vi-$ a “growing well”.

A.Sg.	$\circ\acute{s}i\acute{s}vim$	/10		1	1 65,4;
--------------	-------------------------------	-----	--	---	---------

$\circ\acute{s}i\acute{s}ti-$ f “instruction”, $\acute{s}\bar{a}s$ “instruct, direct, rule” < $*\hat{k}eHs$, EWA II, 632f. Compounds: $s\acute{u}\acute{s}i\acute{s}ti-$ f “good instructions”.

L.Sg.	$\circ\acute{s}i\acute{s}tau$	/11		1	1 173,10;
--------------	-------------------------------	-----	--	---	-----------

$\acute{s}ucantī-$ m PN, the segmentation is not quite clear ($\acute{s}uc-antī-$? AiG II,2, 211f.), Wackernagel/Debrunner suggest a backformation from a fem. present participle in $-antī$, AiG III, 183.

A.Sg.	$\acute{s}ucantīm$	12/		1	1 112,7;
--------------	--------------------	-----	--	---	----------

$\acute{s}ūci-$ a “bright, gleaming”, $\acute{s}uc$ “shine, glow, burn” < $*\hat{k}euk$, EWA II, 655f. This was a highly productive Caland root in Indo-Iranian⁴², cf. Ved. $\acute{s}ukr\acute{a}-$ “bright” (Av. $suxra-$ “red”), the root noun $\acute{s}ūc-$ f “flame”, $\acute{s}óka-$ m “light” and the s -stems $\acute{s}oci\acute{s}-$ n “flame” and $\circ\acute{s}okas-$ (in $sah\acute{u}sra\acute{s}okas-$ “having a thousand flames”). $\acute{s}ūci-$ occurs in 12 compounds as the first member of compound, never as the second and thus looks like the classical Caland-FMC. As for its adjectival simplex use, one fairly common explanation is the reanalysis of the first compound member of these possessive compounds as a (neuter) adjective rather than as a substantive

⁴²Which, however, may have been restricted to this branch of IE, since the only non-Indo-Iranian evidence (Gr. $\acute{\chi}\acute{\omega}\chi\acute{o}\varsigma$ “swan”) is doubtful, see Nussbaum (1976, 13).

(AiG II,1, 61, this strategy was also applied by Karl Hoffmann and Jochem Schindler (in class) to explain some of the *i*-adjectives found in other IE daughter languages.).

N.Sg.	śúcis	12/	8	1	633,19;
			9	2	782,8; 784,4 (= 798,13);
		/12	1	2	141,4; 141,5;
			F	5	192,1; 192,14; 365,1; 449,1; 456,1;
			9	2	787,4; 797,4;
			10	1	869,9;
		11/	1	1	180,3;
			F	5	218,13; 297,7; 355,3; 611,2; 613,7;
			10	1	855,1;
		11-/	1	1	91,3 (= 800,8);
		11\	F	3	239,7; 526,1; 620,16;
			10	1	843,10;
		/11	1	1	160,1;
			F	1	519,9;
		10/	8	1	649,5;
		/10	1	1	66,2;
		8/	1	3	127,7; 142,3 (= 736,6); 142,9;
			F	3	198,4; 361,8; 531,10;
			8	3	622,9; 664,21b,c;
			9	1	736,7;
		/8	F	2	196,4; 365,3;
			8	1	664,21;
			9	1	721,3;
N.A.Sg.n.	śúci	/12	1	1	140,11;
		11/	1	2	71,8; 121,5 (= 887,11);
			F	4	297,6; 298,16; 451,2; 492,1;
		11-/	F	1	297,19;
		/8	9	1	779,12;
		5	F	1	306,6;
A.Sg.	śúcim	12/	F	2	236,14; 456,7;
			9	1	817,4;
		12\	F	1	236,15;
		/12	1	1	140,1;
		11/	1	1	72,3;
			F	6	226,3; 358,3; 572,12; 606,2; 607,4; 609,1;
		11\	F	1	563,1;
		8/	F	1	296,5;
			8	1	710,10;
		/8-	8	1	711,4;
			/12	1	1
V.Sg.	śuce		F	1	489,3;
		11/	F	1	447,3;
		/8	F	1	605,3;
			8	1	663,13;
I.Sg.	śúcinā	11\	F	1	226,8;
		/8	F	1	196,4;
D.Sg.	śúcaye	11\	F	2	235,10; 557,6;
N.A.Du.	śúcī	8/	F	1	352,5;
			10	1	911,12;
N.V.Pl.	śúcayas	12\	1	3	64,2; 134,4; 134,5;
			F	1	192,13;
			8	2	623,3; 1021,10;
			10	1	950,7;
		11\	1	2	72,3; 181,1;
			F	15	218,2; 218,9; 226,3; 347,2; 347,9; 447,3; 447,4; 507,4; 507,11; 518,2; 565,2; 565,3; 572,12; 573,5; 606,1;

		8/	1	1	5,5;
		/8	8	1	664,17;
N.A.Pl.n.	śúcī	11/	F	1	572,12;
	śúcīni	/11	F	1	224,13;
I.Pl.	śúcibhis	11\	F	2	355,3; 503,2;
D.Abl.Pl.	śúcibhyas	/11	F	1	572,12;
G.Pl.	śúcīnām	/11	F	1	572,12;
	śúcīnaam	/8	1	1	30,2;
			9	1	764,5;

śúpti- f < *(s)k̑up-ti- “shoulder”, YAv. *supti-*, EWA II, 647.

L.Sg. śúptau /12 1 1 51,5;

śúśukvāni- a “gleaming”, śuc “shine, glow, burn” < *k̑euk, EWA II, 655f.; a variety of śúkvan- according to AiG II,1, 224, cf. also AiG II,2, 906.

N.Sg. śúśukvānis /12 8 1 643,5;

°śúśukṣāṇi- a “gleaming”, only in āśúśukṣāṇi- a “wishing/willing to shine forth”, from the desiderative stem of śuc “shine, glow, burn” < *k̑euk, AiG II,2, 207; see section 2.1.2.2.

N.Sg. °śúśukṣāṇis /12 F 1 192,1;

śrúti- f “hearing”, YAv. °srūiti-, OCS *sluti*, EWA II, 666f.; NIL, 425ff. The simplex occurs only as the infinitive of śru “hear” < *k̑leu. Compounds: úpaśruti- f “attention, grant”.

A.Sg.	°śrutim	/8	1	1	10,3;
I.Sg.	°śruti	/8	8	2	628,5; 654,11;
D.Sg.	śrúti,yai	12\	F	1	193,7;
		11\	8	1	705,3;
			10	1	937,3;

śruṣṭi- f “obedience”, śrus “obey” < *k̑leus, OAv. °sruṣti-, ON *hlust* etc., EWA II, 672; NIL, 432ff. Compounds: viśváśruṣti- a “answering, paying attention to all”.

N.Sg.	śruṣṭis	11/	F	1	556,1;
			10	1	927,3;
		/11	1	1	178,1;
	°śruṣṭis	8/	1	1	128,1;
A.Sg.	śruṣṭim	/12	1	1	166,13;
			F	1	223,3;
		11/	F	2	534,6; 534,10;
		/11	F	2	205,9; 284,2;
		10/	1	1	67,1;
		/10	1	1	69,7;
I.Sg.	śruṣṭí	12/	F	1	332,4;
			8	1	643,18;
		11/	F	6	194,9; 200,4; 205,8; 454,1; 509,1; 555,4;
		8/	F	1	243,8;
			8	1	643,14;
			9	1	818,1;
		8	8	1	696,6;
	śruṣṭíd	8/	10	1	846,6;
D.Sg.	śruṣṭáye	11\	F	1	229,2;

L.Sg. śruṣṭáú 12/ F 1 204,9;

śréṇi- f < *śray-*ani*- “row, line, group”, śri “lean (on)” < *kleṇi, EWA II, 665, 670. Van Nooten/Holland restitute śráyṇi- in RV I,126,4, X,95,6 and X,142,5 without commenting on it, but śri is clearly an *aniṭ*-root and we should therefore assume an *ani*-stem (and not a *ni*-stem) and an underlying trisyllabic structure, since there is no metrical distraction of -e-, cf. Malzahn (2006).

N.Sg. śráy_aṇis 11\ 10 1 921,6;
/11 10 1 887,20;
A.Sg. śráy_aṇim /11 1 1 126,4;
N.Pl. śráy_aṇayas 11\ 10 1 968,5;
A.Pl. śráy_aṇis 12\ F 1 413,7;
I.Pl. śráy_aṇibhis 11\ F 1 334,6;

śróṇi- f < *klouni- “hip, buttocks”, YAv. *sraoni*-, Lat. *clūnis*, Lith. *šlaunis* etc., EWA II, 671f.

I.D.Abl.Du. śróṇibhyām 8/ 10 1 989,4;

śvitīcí- a “white”, śvit “be white, bright” < *kueit, a Caland-root, cf. śvitrá- “white”, śiti° < *śviti° (YAv. *spiti*-) in śiti-pád- a “having white feet”, EWA II, 679; NIL, 434ff. śvitīcí- is derived from śvity-áñc-/śvitīc- “bright” (*“white-wards”).

N.Pl. śvitīcāyas 11/ 10 1 872,7;

°saktí- f “persecution”, sañj “cling to” < *seg, cf. Lith. *sėgti*, EWA II, 688f.; NIL, 604f.

N.Sg. °saktís 8/ 10 1 911,28;

ṣaṣṭí- f < *sueks-ti- “sixty”, YAv. *xšuuashti*-, OCS *šestь*, EWA II, 681; Miyakawa (1999); see section 2.1.1.2.

N.Sg. ṣaṣṭís 11/ 1 2 126,3; 164,48;
F 2 534,14b,c;
8 1 705,8;
A.Sg. ṣaṣṭím 12/ 1 1 53,9;
8 1 624,20;
11/ F 1 467,6;
9 1 809,53;
8/ 8 1 624,29;
I.Sg. ṣaṣṭi_iyā 11/ F 1 209,5;

sakṣāṇi- a “victorious”, sah “defeat, overcome” < *seḡ^h (or *sac* “follow” < *sek^u ?), EWA II, 717f.; AiG II,2, 207; see section 2.1.2.2.

N.Sg. sakṣāṇis /12 F 1 222,4;
8 1 644,26;
/8 9 1 822,1;
A.Sg. sakṣāṇim /12 1 1 679,8;
9 2 783,4; 790,3;
/8 8 1 679,8;
N.A.Du. sakṣāṇī /12 8 1 642,15;

°**satti-** f “sitting”, *sad* “sit” < **sed*, EWA II, 692f. Compounds: *nīṣatti-* f “inactivity” (“sitting down”).

N.Sg. °**sattis** 11/ F 1 317,9;

satyatāti- f “truth”, from *satyá-* a “existing, true”, AiG II,2, 621; see section 2.1.4.

V.Sg. **satyatāte** /11 F 1 300,14;

sádhri- m PN, probably connected to *sadhryāñc-* “directed towards sth.”, EWA II, 695.

G.Abl.Sg. **sádhres** /11- F 1 398,10;

saní- m “winning, procurement, gain”, *san* “win, gain” < **senh*₂, EWA II, 696f. Compounds: *ūrjasani-* a “bestowing power”, *goṣáñi-* a “winning, procuring cows”, *pituṣáñi-* a “granting, giving food”, *vājasáni-* a “gaining booty”, *hṛdamśáni-* a “winning someone’s heart”.

N.Sg.	sanís	8/	8	1	632,12;
	° sánis	11/	9	1	822,11;
		/11	10	1	897,10;
		/8	9	1	773,14;
V.Sg.	° sane	/11	F	1	445,4;
A.Sg.	saním	12/	F	2	225,7; 511,6;
		/11	F	1	235,23 (= 239,11; 240,11; 241,11; 249,7; 256,5; 257,5);
	° sánim	8/	1	2	18,6; 27,4;
			9	1	744,6;
		/8	F	2	381,4; 502,6;
		12/	F	1	285,2;
D.Sg.	sanáye	11/	10	1	917,15;
		/8	F	1	494,10;
		12\	F	1	222,3;
		11\	1	5	30,16; 31,8; 116,12; 116,21; 124,7;
			F	3	316,3; 467,8; 595,5;
N.Pl.	sanáyas	9	2	804,1; 808,20;	
			10	1	856,11;
		11\	1	1	100,13;
			F	1	264,21;
D.Abl.Pl.	saníbhyas	12/	10	2	861,4; 866,8;
		8/	8	1	644,28;
		/8	8	2	636,3; 671,11;
G.Pl.	sanínám	/8	8	1	625,37;

sápti- f “seventy” < **septm-ti-*, YAv. *haptāiti-*, EWA II, 700; see section 2.1.1.2.

A.Sg. **saptatím** /12 10 1 919,15;

I.Sg. **saptatyá** 11\ F 1 209,5;

G.Pl. **saptatínám** /8 8 2 639,37; 666,26;

sápti- m “team of horses”, EWA II, 700f. Mayrhofer suggests an analysis as a *ti-* derivative of *sap* “honor, care for”, but a non-*vr̥ddhi-* denominal *i-* derivative of *saptá-* “seven” seems equally possible (see section 2.1.6), the original meaning would then have been “team of seven horses”, cf. AiG II,2, 304. Compounds: *yuyujānasapti-* a “whose horses have been harnessed”.

N.Sg. **sáptis** 11/ F 1 22,7;

				9	2	782,10; 808,9;
		11\	9	1		808,16;
		/11	F	1		559,2;
				10	1	832,2;
		8/	9	2		815,6; 818,12 (= 819,11);
A.Sg.	sáptim	11/	10	1		906,1;
		11\	1	1		61,5;
		/11	F	1		256,1;
		8/	8	1		663,25;
				9	1	741,2;
				10	1	982,1;
G.Abl.Sg.	sáptes	/11	1	1		162,1;
N.A.Du.	sáptī	/11	F	1		269,2;
		8/	F	1		500,3;
				8	1	653,18;
				10	1	886,6;
	°saptī	/11	F	1		503,4;
N.Pl.	sáptayas	12/	10	1		968,2;
		12\	1	2		47,8; 85,6;
				8	2	624,14; 666,7;
		/12	1	1		85,1;
		/8	9	2		733,4; 777,26;
V.Pl.	saptayas	/8	8	1		640,23;
I.Pl.	sáptibhis	12\	8	1		633,13;

sámṛti- f “encounter with the enemy, fight” < **sam-Hṛ-ti-*, Grassmann ⁶1996, 1484; AiG II,2, 635, also see the entry **nírṛti-**.

N.Sg.	sámṛtis	/11	F	2		312,17; 576,10;
A.Sg.	sámṛtim	/11	1	1		32,6;
G.Abl.Sg.	sámṛtes	/12	8	1		710,4;
L.Sg.	sámṛtā	12\	1	1		31,6;
				9	1	783,8;
	sámṛtau	12\	F	1		388,6;
		/8	1	1		127,3;
				F	1	361,2;

sarvātāti- f “entirety, wholeness”, from *sarvá-* a “everything, all”, EWA II, 711; AiG II,2, 621; see section 2.1.4.

A.Sg.	sarvātātim	12/	10	1		926,1 (= 926,2-11);
		/11	F	1		288,11;
				10	1	862,14;
D.Sg.	sarvātātaye	/12	1	1		106,2 (= 861,11);
		11\	9	1		808,4;
		/8	F	2		497,6c,d;
L.Sg.	sarvātātā	11/	10	1		900,3;
		/11	1	1		94,15;
				F	6	288,19; 322,3; 423,3; 453,2; 534,19; 573,7;
		8/	F	1		456,18;

sásni- a “winning repeatedly”, *san* “win, gain” < **senh₂*, EWA II, 696f.; see section 2.1.2.3.

N.Sg.	sásnis	11/	F	1		249,5;
		/11	F	1		209,1;
		8/	9	2		736,4; 773,20;
N.A.Sg.n.	sásni	/11	10	1		946,2;

A.Sg.	sásnim	12\	10	1	864,4;
		11/	10	1	965,6;
		8/	F	1	389,1;
I.Sg.	sásninā	/12	F	1	214,10;
N.A.Dual	sásnī	8/	8	1	658,1;

sásri- a “running”, *sr* “run” < **sel*, EWA II, 705f.; see section 2.1.2.3.

N.Sg.	sásris	/11	10	1	925,4;
-------	--------	-----	----	---	--------

sáhuri- a “victorious”, *sah* “defeat, overcome” < **seġ^h*, EWA II, 717f., 720; NIL, 600ff. Nussbaum in his detailed account of the relation between Gr. ὄχυρός/ἔχυρός and Ved. *sáhuri*- argues that both may be analyzed either as **ro*-adjectives derived from a *u*-stem (**so/eġ^hu-ro/i-*) or as *o*-adjectives derived from a proterokinetic heteroclitic in *-r/n-* (**so/eġ^hur-o/i-* > **so/eġ^hur-o/i-*), although the latter may be preferable, Nussbaum (1998b, 536). To explain the Vedic *i*-stem, Nussbaum evokes the Caland process **h₂ek-ró-* → **h₂ó/ék-ri-*, but does not comment on the fact that *sáhuri-* turns out as an adjective. However, the pair Gr. ὄχυρός/ἔχυρός: Ved. *sáhuri-* looks too much like the other examples of “*i*-stem nominalizations” cited by Weiss (1996, 205) to be a coincidence (note also the accent), which means that the adjectival usage of *sáhuri-* must be a purely Indic development.

N.Sg.	sáhuris	12\	F	1	212,3;	
				10	1	918,8;
		/11	F	2	334,7; 574,4;	
				10	1	909,4;
A.Sg.	sáhurim	/11	8	1	666,20;	
V.Sg.	sahure	/12	10	1	910,5;	
		11\	10	2	909,6; 910,2;	
		/11	F	1	318,9;	
		/11	F	1	501,1;	

sāmvaraṇi- m PN “descendant of *Samvaraṇa*”, see section 2.1.6.

L.Sg.	sāmvaraṇau	/8	8	1	1020,1;
-------	------------	----	---	---	---------

sātī- f < **snh₂-ti-* “gain, acquisition, attainment”, *san* “win, gain” < **senh₂*, EWA II, 696f. Compounds: *arkásāti-* f “reaching, conquering of the light”, *árṇasāti-* f “battle” (*“gaining of the turmoil”), *kṣétrasāti-* f “acquisition, conquering of land”, *góṣāti-* f “fight for cattle, gaining of cattle”, *tokásāti-* f “attainment of offspring”, *dyumnásāti-* f “attainment of strength”, *dhánasāti-* f “acquisition of booty, treasure”, *nṛṣāti-* f “capturing of men”, *medhásāti-* f “attainment of the sacrificial meal”, *vájasāti-* “attainment of goods or booty (in battle)”, *śúrasāti-* f “battle” (“attainment of heroes”), *s_uvarṣāti-* f “fight for/attainment of the sun”.

N.Sg.	sātís	12/	1	1	168,7;	
A.Sg.	sātīm	12/	1	2	111,3b,c;	
		12\	1	2	111,3a,b;	
				8	1	643,29;
		/11	1	1	111,5;	
				9	2	781,9; 809,25;
				8	1	6,10;
D.Sg.	sātáye	12\	1	1	111,4;	
		/12	1	5	102,3; 138,4; 102,5; 130,6; 143,6;	

		F	1	599,6;	
		9	1	780,7;	
		10	3	861,10; 864,1; 889,9;	
	11/	F	1	611,3;	
	11\	F	3	288,17; 501,13; 583,5;	
		9	1	800,2;	
	/11	F	4	265,19; 270,1; 290,6; 460,2;	
	8/	F	1	497,5;	
	/8	1	2	4,9; 130,6;	
		F	4	359,4; 363,7; 393,3; 531,9;	
		8	3	623,5; 625,9; 665,9;	
		9	2	719,9; 768,3;	
		10	2	919,10; 969,5;	
	°sātaye	12\	F	1	236,7;
		/12	1	2	129,1; 130,1;
			F	2	222,3; 400,7;
			8	1	647,13;
			9	1	822,1;
			10	2	892,7; 927,12;
	/8	1	1	130,1;	
		F	7	271,5; 389,6 (= 626,37; 654,4); 418,6; 494,1; 494,4; 498,1; 610,5 (= 683,12);	
			8	11	623,18; 624,18 (= 697,6); 628,21; 629,13; 633,3; 660,2e,f; 678,1; 689,2; 696,6; 711,3;
			9	4	725,3 (= 754,3); 725,4; 725,6; 755,6 (= 819,23);
			10	2	847,4; 976,4;
	/8+	F	1	582,1;	
L.Sg.	sātá	12/	1	1	112,22;
		11/	1	1	131,3;
			F	1	451,3;
	8/	F	1	487,1;	
	8	9	1	778,18;	
	°sātā	12/	1	1	31,6;
			10	3	864,1; 889,14; 973,3;
		/12	1	1	157,2;
	11/	F	6	312,9; 458,8; 459,6; 474,4; 535,3; 543,1;	
			9	1	800,2;
			10	1	925,3;
	/11	F	1	609,5;	
	8/	1	2	131,1; 131,6;	
		F	2	333,6; 610,6;	
		8	1	693,7;	
	sātaú	11/	F	3	221,5; 552,8; 576,11;
		11\	F	1	467,1;
	/11	1	2	169,2; 180,8;	
		F	8	210,4; 320,2; 451,6; 460,7; 461,5; 467,2; 537,7; 546,2;	
			10	2	887,24; 900,1;
	10/	F	1	485,9;	
	8/	1	1	36,17;	
	°sātau	/12	8	1	712,3;
			10	2	890,6; 976,4;
	/11	1	5	34,12 (= 112,24); 63,6; 100,7; 110,9; 174,7;	
		F	18	211,8; 264,22 (= 265,22; 266,17; 268-270,11; 272,10; 273,9; 277,8; 282-284,5; 915,18; 930,11); 288,4; 312,18; 316,2; 320,4; 337,11; 387,1; 387,7; 456,15; 460,12; 461,4; 464,2; 467,1; 467,3; 474,2; 507,8; 551,1; 564,2;	
			9	1	809,19;
			10	2	861,14 (= 889,14); 893,9;
	/8	8	2	636,4; 680,5;	
			10	1	851,9;
A.Pl.	sātís	8/	8	1	625,9;

I.Pl.	°sātibhis	/12	8	1	640,16;
L.Pl.	sātīṣu	/12	F	1	598,9;

sānasí- a “profitable, rewarding”, *san* “win, gain” < **senh*₂, maybe from **sāsaní-*, cf. the long-vowel reduplicating stems discussed in section 2.1.2.3., EWA II, 723.

N.Sg.	sānasís	/12	9	1	797,5;
		/8	1	1	175,2;
			9	2	812,4; 818,2;
N.A.Sg.n.	sānasí	/8	1	1	75,2;
			F	1	293,6;
A.Sg.	sānasím	/12	10	1	889,14;
		/8	1	1	8,1;
			F	1	311,6 (= 711,12);
			8	1	641,2;
			9	1	818,3;
			10	2	966,4; 966,5;
N.A.Du.	sānasí	11/	F	1	609,2;

°sāmi- a < **sēmi-* “half”, Gr. ῥῆμ^o, Lat. *sēmi*^o, OHG *sāmi*^o etc., maybe a *vṛddhi*-derivative of **sem-* “one”, cf. section 2.1.6., EWA II, 725. Compounds: *ásāmi-* a “not half, complete”.

N.A.Sg.	°sāmi	12/	1	1	39,10;
			10	1	922,5;
		/11	F	2	460,2; 479,5;
			10	2	848,3; 900,3;
		8/	1	2	39,9; 39,10;
		/8	1	1	25,15 (= 848,2);
I.Pl.	°sāmibhis	12/	1	1	39,9;

sāra^hi- m “companion sharing the same chariot, charioteer” (< “belonging to the same chariot”, a *vṛddhi*-derivative of *sarátha-* a “driving the same chariot”), cf. section 2.1.6.; AiG II,2, 303. Compounds: *susāra^hi-* m “good charioteer”, *índrasāra^hi-* a “sharing a chariot with *Indra*”.

N.Sg.	sāra ^h is	/12	1	1	144,3;
		11\	10	1	928,6;
		/8	1	1	158,6;
			F	1	498,6;
	°sāra ^h is	/12	F	1	516,6;
	°sāra ^h is	78	F	1	342,2 (= 344,2);
D.Sg.	sāra ^h aye	/11	F	2	210,6; 461,5;
N.Pl.	sāra ^h ayas	12\	1	1	55,7;

sāvra^hni- m PN “descendant of *Savarna*”, see section 2.1.6.

G.Abl.Sg.	sāvra ^h nes	11/	10	1	888,11;
------------------	------------------------	-----	----	---	---------

sāsahí- a “victorious”, *sah* “defeat, overcome” < **segh*^h, EWA II, 717f.; see section 2.1.2.3. Compounds: *viśāsahí-* a “victorious, overcoming (competitors)”.

N.Sg.	sāsahís	/12	1	1	102,9;
			F	3	213,3; 214,11; 250,4;

		11\	1	1	100,3;
		/11	1	1	171,6;
		/8	F	1	271,6;
			8	1	632,9;
			9	1	716,8;
			10	2	959,4; 971,5;
	°sāśahís	/8	10	2	985,1; 1000,5;
A.Sg.	sāśahím	/12	1	1	102,1;
			8	3	670,3; 670,12; 679,4;
		/8	8	1	635,4;
	°sāśahím	/8	10	1	992,1;

siktí- f “outpour”, *sic* “pour (out)” < **seik^u*, EWA II, 744f.

D.Sg. siktáye /12 10 1 926,11;

siśāsáni- a “striving to procure”, *ani*-derivative of the desiderative stem of *san* “win, gain” < **senh₂*, AiG II,2, 207; cf. section 2.1.2.2.

N.Sg. siśāsánis 12/ 10 1 879,11;

1. °*suti*- f “brew, mixture”, *su* “press”, YAv. °*hūiti*-, etymological connections with other IE branches are disputed, EWA II, 713f. Compounds: *āsuti*- f “drink, brew, refreshment”, *ghṛtāsuti*- a “having molten fat/butter for a drink”, *bhūryāsuti*- a “granting many refreshments”, *sarpírāsuti*- a “whose drink is molten butter”, *sómasuti*- f “the pressing of Soma”.

N.Sg.	°sutís	/12	1	1	156,1;
		/12+	8	1	621,26;
	°sutis	/12	10	1	895,2;
		/8	F	1	198,6;
			8	1	702,18;
V.Sg.	°sute	/8	F	2	361,9; 375,2;
A.Sg.	°sutím	/12	F	1	192,14;
		/11	1	1	104,7;
			F	1	613,7;
	°sutím	/11	F	1	609,6;
		/8	8	1	683,2;
N.A.Du.	°sutī	/8	1	1	136,1 (= 232,6);
			8	1	649,9;
V.Du.	°sutī	11/	F	1	510,6;

2. °*suti*- (a) “giving birth”, *sū* “give birth to” < **suH*, EWA II, 714f. (**seu_H*); NIL, 617f. Only attested in the Bahuvrīhi-compound *súṣuti*- a “having a good/easy birth”. The short root vowel (instead of expected *°*sūti*-, cf. AV *sūti*-) stems from compositional laryngeal loss, Kuiper (1961, 24).

A.Sg. °*sutim* 12/ 10 1 865,7;

súṣvi- m (a) “(the one who is) pressing Soma”, *su* “press”, EWA II, 713f., cf. 1. °*suti*- above. Compounds: *ásuṣvi*- a “not pressing Soma”.

A.Sg.	súṣvim	11/	F	1	464,9;
		11\	1	1	61,15;
		/11	F	1	464,2;

D.Sg.	súṣvaye	11/	F	1	321,7;
		11\	F	2	320,2; 464,3;
		8/	9	1	733,2;
G.Abl.Sg.	súṣves	11/	F	1	321,6;
	°suṣves	11/	F	1	321,6;
A.Pl.	°suṣvīn	11/	F	1	485,11;
		/11	F	1	320,5;

°sūti- f “rush”, sū “urge on, drive, set in motion” < *seyH (EWA II, 715f.), only in the compound *pāriṣūti-* f “surrounding, clasp, predicament”.

N.Sg.	°sūtis	/12	9	1	797,8;
G.Abl.Sg.	°sūtes	/12	1	1	119,6;

sūri- m “lord, patron (of the sacrifice)”, EWA II, 741. Mayrhofer, following Szemerényi (1956, 175, fn.5) suggests a Bahuvrīhi *h₁su-h₁ri-⁴³ with a form of *rayi-* as second compound member (the meaning would then be something like “having good wealth”). But the fact that *sūri-* inflects according to the default *i*-stem scheme described above (D.sg. °*rāye*, G.sg. °*rés* instead of °*rāye*, °*rāyas*) cannot be taken as unambiguous evidence for ID. Of course, *sūri-* is exactly the type of compound where ID would be expected:

1. acrostatic *rōh ₁ i- “wealth”	→	2. internally derived proterokinetic *reh ₁ i-/ *rh ₁ -éġ- in Bahuvrīhi compounds
D. *reh ₁ -ġ-éġ > rāyé	→	D. °rh ₁ -éġ-eġ > ° <i>rāye</i>
G. *réh ₁ is → *reh ₁ -ġ-és > rāyás	→	G. °rh ₁ -éġ-s > ° <i>rés</i> etc.

So the inflection of *sūri-* shows exactly the type of suffix ablaut we would expect if we assume that this was a possessive compound whose second member of compound was internally derived from an *o/e*-acrostatic stem. On the other hand, this inflectional pattern corresponds to the default *i*-stem inflection that was generalized under the influence of the proterokinetic *ti*-stems. This makes it difficult to decide whether we are dealing with an archaism (that is, the preservation of an ID-induced proterokinetic inflection) or with an assimilation of the inherited inflection (whichever that may have been) to the productive *i*-stem pattern (particularly since there is reason to doubt that *sūri-* was still analyzed as a compound rather than a simplex noun in Vedic). The alternative etymology suggested by Thieme (1938, 159), who connects the second compound member with *arī-* “stranger”, essentially poses the same difficulties, since the G.sg. of *arī-*, *aryás*, has “open inflection” just like the G.sg. of *ávi-* and *rayi-* and might therefore be suspected to have once been acrostatic as well. In this case, the same derivational pattern as sketched out above would apply, and since both proterokinetic weak stems *rh₁-éġ- (*rayi-*) and *Hr-éġ- (*arī-*, cf. EWA I, 741) would have developed to **rayV*/**reC* in Vedic, an analysis of the semantics of the attestations in their context is the only way to figure out which of the two lexical items underlies *sūri-*. Morphologically, the two explanations are equal.

A rather more thorough attempt at etymologizing *sūri-* has been made by Pinault, who,

⁴³ Apparently from < *°rh₁i- with laryngeal metathesis, an assumption which Pinault (1999-2000, 430f.) criticizes for its lack of parallels. However, as Heiner Eichner reminds me (p.c.), this difficulty could be overcome by assuming a laryngeal-onset root (e.g. *Hrēh₁i-, not necessarily the same as Szemerényi’s *H₂rēh₁-i-, cf. Pinault l.c., 431).

based on a philological investigation of the relevant passages, posits a Bahuvrīhi compound **su-Hr-ī-*, the SMC being an action-noun *i*-stem from the root **H₂er-* “attribuer⁴⁴” (Pinault 1999-2000, 467). The meaning would then be “having/giving good retribution, reward” and denote the patron of the ritual in his function of rewarding the poet for the composition of his hymns. This is phonologically more satisfying than **su-rh₁-i-* because we do not have to postulate an ad-hoc laryngeal metathesis (or otherwise unmotivated laryngeal onset) and semantically more convincing than Thieme’s “having a good host”. However, the formation of such a “Bahuvrīhi” is not unproblematic: The normal formation “having good X-ness” is clearly of the structure *su-X-ti-*: cf. *sukīrti-*, *sudīti-*, *súṣuti-* etc. (although synchronically these are vacillating between the older Bahuvrīhi-usage and determinative compounds). The type *ni-dhí-*, *prati-ṣthí-* etc. to which Pinault compares **su-Hr-ī-* is synchronically always associated with a (preverb+)verbal paradigm (which *sūr-í-* is not), cf. 2.1.2.1 above. Still, Pinault’s account is the most detailed so far and makes it clear that a connection of *sūr-í-* with *ray-í-* is far from being the only (or indeed a) plausible solution. I have therefore refrained from citing the Rigvedic attestations as instances of the “compound inflection” of *ray-í-*.

N.Sg.	sūrís	/12	8	1	679,13;		
			10	1	993,4;		
			11/	1	1	153,2;	
		/11	F	2	470,5 (= 478,5); 517,23;		
			1	4	122,8; 180,6; 181,4; 186,3;		
			F	1	464,10;		
		8/	10	1	907,6;		
			1	1	176,4;		
			8	1	679,15;		
		8	F	1	197,4;		
			8	2	625,39; 666,24;		
			9	1	779,2;		
		A.Sg.	sūrím	/12	1	1	119,3;
				11/	1	1	173,7;
				11\	1	1	61,3;
8/	F			1	486,33;		
D.Sg.	sūrāye	/12	1	1	31,7;		
		/8	F	1	381,4;		
G.Abl.Sg.	sūrés	/11	1	2	122,11; 122,12;		
		F	2	265,14; 387,8;			
N.Pl.	sūrāyas	12\	10	1	839,1;		
			F	1	193,12;		
		/12	10	1	904,6;		
			1	2	141,3; 141,8;		
		8	F	2	192,16 (= 193,13); 193,11;		
			8	1	669,6;		
		10	3	891,4; 892,2; 892,11;			
			11/	1	2	73,5; 73,9;	
		11\	F	1	466,7;		
			1	1	125,7;		
		/8	F	2	325,5; 606,6;		
			1	4	22,20; 48,4; 97,3; 97,4;		
V.Pl.	sūrayas	11\	F	11	360,2; 364,3; 364,6; 370,5; 371,5; 406,16; 420,6; 433,7;		
			532,7; 582,13; 590,5;				
			8	2	630,4; 703,7;		
			9	2	810,12; 811,3;		
			F	1	330,6;		

⁴⁴Cf. LIV², 270f.

A.Pl.	sūrín	/8	F	1	333,7;
		/12-		10 2	941,5; 941,9 (?);
		11/		1 1	173,8;
I.Pl.	sūrībhis		F	3	485,18; 519,8; 573,7;
		/11		1 1	54,11 (= 887,22);
			F	6	226,6; 449,7; 458,14; 478,4; 554,3; 583,10 (= 585,8);
		/12	F	1	548,15;
				10 2	849,3; 941,7;
		11/		1 2	51,15; 186,6;
			F	2	395,15; 396,4;
		11\	F	2	467,7; 608,4;
		/11	F	1	504,11;
		8/		8 1	638,4;
D.Abl.Pl.	sūrībhyas	/8	F	2	396,15; 582,9;
				8 1	646,12;
		12/	F	1	597,6 (= 633,12 (?));
		11/		1 1	180,9;
			F	6	195,9; 445,8; 509,7; 517,24; 534,21; 546,4;
L.Pl.	sūrīṣu	/12	10	1	973,3;
		11\	F	2	535,7; 600,3;
		8/	F	1	440,6;
				9 1	810,8;
		/8	F	2	433,6; 488,19;
				8 1	646,1;

°**sr̥ṣṭi-** f “creation, emanation”, *sr̥j* “release, let go of” < **selg* (EWA II, 709). Compounds: *vīsr̥ṣṭi-* f “created world”.

N.Sg.	° sr̥ṣṭis	11/	10	1	955,7;
		/11+	10	1	955,6;

sóbhari- m PN, unclear, EWA II, 747f.

V.Sg.	sóbhare	/12	8	2	640,19; 642,2;
		/11	8	1	639,2;
A.Sg.	sóbharim	/8	8	1	625,26;
N.Pl.	sóbharayas	/8	8	1	639,32;
G.Pl.	sóbhariṇaam	/12	8	1	640,8;

stí- m < **h₁s-tí-* “relative, dependent”, *as* “be” < **h₁es*, Av. *sti-*, EWA II, 759; NIL, 235ff., esp. fn. 2.

A.Pl.	stín	/11	F	1	535,11;
				10 1	974,4;

°**sti-** f “standing”, *sthā* “stand, remain” < **steh₂* (EWA II, 764ff.), NIL, 637ff., reflecting a *ti-* abstract **sth₂-ti-* with compositional laryngeal loss. Compounds: *úpasti-* m “servant” (EWA I, 222; NIL, 640), *párisṭi-* f “obstruction, obstacle” (EWA II, 93; NIL, 640), furthermore *abhīṣṭi-* f “help” and *abhiṣṭi-* m “patron, helper” according to NIL, 637ff., but see the separate entries above.

N.Sg.	° stis	12/	8	1	697,6;
		10/	1	1	65,3;
		8/	10	1	923,23;

L.Sg.	°stau	/11	F	1	535,7;
N.Pl.	°stayas	/8	10	1	923,23;
L.Pl.	°stiṣu	/12	10	1	973,3;

stutí- f “praise, prayer”, *stu* “praise, speak solemnly” < **steu*, YAv. °*stūiti-*, EWA II, 757f. Compounds: *ānuṣṭuti-* f “song of praise”, *ūpastuti-* f “praise”, *dúṣṭuti-* f “bad hymn”, *duṣṭuti-* f id., *páriṣṭuti-* f “praise”, *pūrv;yáṣṭuti-* f “first, best song of praise”, *prátiṣṭuti-* f “praise”, *práṣṭuti-* f “praise”, *sadháṣṭuti-* a/f “(receiving) equal praise”, *suṣṭuti-* f “good hymn, praise”.

N.Sg.	°stutís	12/	1	1	53,1;	
		/12	F	1	435,1;	
		11/	F	2	320,1; 396,14;	
		11\	F	1	607,2;	
		11-\	F	1	574,6;	
		/11	F	1	504,8;	
		8/	F	1	296,7;	
		/8	1	1	17,9;	
		°stutis	12/	8	1	621,16;
			/12	F	1	599,7;
				10	1	890,11;
			11/	1	2	153,2; 158,4;
			/8	F	1	610,1;
				8	1	672,8;
A.Sg.	stutím	11/	10	1	857,5;	
		/12	F	2	207,1; 228,6;	
	°stutím		8	2	1021,8; 696,4;	
			9	1	797,7;	
		10	1	917,13;		
	11/	F	1	538,5;		
		8	1	705,12;		
	11\	1	2	117,12; 118,7;		
		F	2	224,8; 354,10;		
	/11	F	4	339,1; 397,10; 493,16; 574,3;		
	/8	1	1	7,7;		
		F	3	420,3; 457,6; 502,7;		
		8	9	621,16; 625,30 (= 628,6); 626,32; 632,31; 654,1; 658,6;		
				663,2; 684,6; 712,14;		
	9	3	774,3; 777,3; 778,22;			
	10	1	1014,2;			
°stutim	12/	8	1	679,13;		
	/12	8	1	655,19;		
	11/	1	2	148,2; 190,3;		
		F	1	340,6;		
	8/	F	1	352,5;		
	/8	1	1	17,9;		
		8	8	621,16; 624,6; 633,33; 644,17; 647,11; 671,1; 677,7;		
			693,4;			
I.Sg.	°stutí	12/	F	1	548,21;	
			9	1	783,8;	
		/12	F	1	223,4;	
		11/	F	2	272,8; 397,2;	
		/11	F	1	530,2;	
	°stutī	11/	F	1	224,4;	
		°stuti	/8	F	1	372,5;
			°stut,yá	11/	8	1
		8/		8	1	636,3;
		L.Sg.	°stutau	/12	10	1
V.Du.	°stutī	/8	8	1	658,4;	

N.Pl.	stutáyas	11\	F	1	475,1;
	°stutáyas	12\	10	1	917,12;
A.Pl.	stutís	11\	F	2	253,3; 615,7;
		/8	1	1	84,2;
	°stutís	/12	8	1	655,20;
I.Pl.	°stutíbhī	/8	8	1	637,4;
		11\	F	2	456,6; 606,7 (= 607,7);
G.Pl.	°stutīnāam	/8	10	2	852,2; 852,3;
		/8	8	1	647,15;

°sthī- f “standing”, *sthā* “stand” < **steh*₂, probably reflects **sth*₂-*i*- rather than **sth*₂-*C*, EWA II, 764ff.; NIL, 637ff., esp. fn. 18; see also section 2.1.2.1. Compounds: *pratiṣṭhī*- f “resistance”.

N.Sg. °sthī 11/ F 1 459,12;

sthivī- unclear, EWA II, 767; a possible loan according to Kuiper (1991, 93).

D.Abl.Pl. sthivībhyas /11 10 1 894,3;

sthūri- (a) “one-horse (chariot etc.)”, EWA II, 769. Compounds: *ásthūri*- a “not one-horse”. The adverbial usage and the compound type (privative, lit. “having no X”) implies that this is actually a substantive (cf. the ἄναλις-type in 2.1.6.), and the connection with *sthūrā*- a “strong, big” is tempting, although semantically unsatisfactory (Mayrhofer l.c.).

N.A.Sg. sthūri 11/ 10 1 957,3;
°sthūrī 11/ F 1 456,19;

snīhiti- f “striking down”, *snih* “stay down” < **sneig*^{uh}, EWA II, 772. Both *snīhiti*- and *snéhiti*- are “secondary” *ti*-stems (see section 2.1.1.2.) built to the causative stem *sneháya*- “make sbdy. stay down”, with *snīhiti*- actually being a “compromise” between the normal zero-grade of the root and the causative root grade of *snéhiti*- (thus Hoffmann, AzI II, 448ff. in his detailed account of these forms).

L.Pl. snīhitīṣu 8/ 1 1 74,2;

snéhiti- f “striking down”, see the entry above.

A.Pl. snéhītīs 11/ 8 1 705,13;

sphātī- f “growth, thriving”, *sphā* “growing fat” < **sp*^(h)*eh*₁, cf. OCS *spěti* etc., EWA II, 776f.

A.Sg. sphātīm 8 1 1 188,9;

sraktī- f “point, jag”, YAv. *sraxti*-/*θraxti*-, further connections are unclear, EWA II, 783. Compounds: *nāvasrakti*- a “consisting of nine parts” (said of a verse).

A.Sg. °sraktīm 8/ 8 1 685,12;
A.Pl. sraktīs 11/ F 1 534,17;

srutī- f “way, path”, *sru* “flow, run” < **sreu*, cf. Gr. ῥύσις etc., EWA II, 784f.; NIL, 630ff.

N.Sg. sрутís /8 1 1 46,11;

A.Sg.	srutím	/12	F	1	204,12;
		11/	10	1	858,7;
G.Abl.Sg.	srutés	/8	1	1	42,3;
L.Sg.	srutá	/8	8	1	700,1;
N.A.Du.	srutí	11/	10	1	914,15;
N.Pl.	srutáyas	12\	9	1	790,2;
		11\	F	1	465,4;

svádhitī- f “axe”, unclear, EWA II, 790.

N.Sg.	svádhitis	/12	10	1	918,15;
		11/	1	1	162,20;
		11\	F	2	242,6; 242,11;
		/11	1	1	162,18;
			F	2	386,10; 519,9;
			9	1	808,6;
			10	1	915,7;
		8/	F	1	361,8;
			8	1	711,19;
A.Sg.	svádhitim	/12	F	1	236,10;
		/11	F	1	230,7;
L.Sg.	svádhitau	11\	1	1	162,9;

°svani- a “sounding, ringing”, *svan* “sound, ring” < **su_uenh₂*, EWA II, 790f. Compounds: *tuviṣváṇi-* a “(re)sounding mightily”, *mahiṣváṇi-* a id.

N.Sg.	°svánis	/12	1	2	58,4; 127,6;
			F	2	208,6; 410,7;
G.Pl.	svánīnaam	/8	8	2	666,18c,d;

svarī- a “sounding, roaring”, *svar* “roar, sound, sing” < **su_uer* (EWA II, 792f.), AiG II,2, 297.

N.Sg.	svarís	11/	1	1	61,9;
G.Pl.	svarīṇām	11/	10	1	894,7;

svastī- f/n “blessing, well-being” < **h₁su_u-ṇs-tī-* “(having a) good/blessed return/ homecoming”, cf. *nas* “return (home) unscathed” < **nes*, EWA II, 796f.

N.Sg.	s_uvastís	11/	F	1	272,9;
			10	1	889,16;
		/11	10	1	885,7;
N.A.Sg.	svastí	11/	10	1	840,11;
		8/	F	2	405,14c,d;
			8	1	636,11;
		8+/	F	1	405,15;
	s_uvastí	12/	F	4	405,11a-d;
			10	5	861,3 (=861,4-12); 889,15a-d;
		11/	1	4	89,6a-d;
			F	2	265,20; 488,11;
			10	1	833,1;
		/11	1	3	116,6; 116,8; 117,15;
			F	7	200,6; 206,5; 224,3; 229,9; 445,8; 461,6; 488,8;
			9	1	809,36;
		8/	F	4	287,20; 370,5; 405,14a,b;
A.Sg.	svastím	/11	10	1	925,12;
	s_uvastím	11/	F	3	220,3; 351,3; 443,11;
		/11	F	1	463,10;

I.Sg.	s_uvastí	8/	F	1	497,6;
		12/	F	2	405,12 (?); 405,13; (?)
		11/	1	1	174,9 (= 461,12); (?)
			F	5	307,6 (?); 358,11 (?); 396,4; 396,15; 461,6;
			8	1	668,8;
D.Sg.	svastáye s_uvastáye		10	1	885,6;
		8/	8	1	651,11 (?);
		11/	9	1	808,4;
		12/	F	2	405,12a,d;
		/12	1	2	35,1; 89,5;
			F	6	193,6; 244,8; 382,2; 405,12c; 405,13b,c;
			8	1	638,20;
			9	1	787,5;
			10	16	862,12; 889,3-14; 891,10; 892,1; 892,14;
		/12-	F	1	405,13a;
		11/	F	2	264,18; 335,4;
			10	2	1004,1; 1004,2;
		11\	F	1	555,2;
		/8	1	3	1,9; 22,12 (= 223,8); 97,8;
			F	6	327,11; 371,5; 404,5; 418,6; 456,18; 498,6;
	8	1	651,11;		
	9	1	776,30;		
	10	1	952,5;		
L.Sg.	s_uvastaú	/11	F	1	229,1;
I.Pl.	s_uvastíbhī	/12	F	1	407,14;
		11/	1	1	189,2;
		11\	F	1	517,20 (= 517,25; 519,10; 520,10; 523,7; 524,7; 525,6; 527,5; 528-530,3; 535,11; 536,10; 537,10; 538,9; 539-541,6; 542-546,5; 550,25; 551,15; 552,9; 553,8; 555-557,7; 558,6; 559,5; 561-564,4; 567,3; 569,3; 570,3; 572,25; 573,7; 574,6; 576,12; 577,7; 578,6; 579,6; 580,5; 581,5; 583,10; 584,9; 585,8; 586,7; 587,6; 588,5; 589,5; 591,8; 592,7; 593,6; 594,5; 595,5; 596,3; 600,5; 601,5; 602,8; 603,7; 604,7; 606,7; 607,7; 608,5; 609,8; 611,6; 613,10; 614-616,7; 617,6; 802,6; 809,3; 809,6; 891,15; 892,15; 948,8);

(°hati-) f < *g^{uh}n-ti- “slaying, killing”, *han* “slay, kill” < *g^{uh}en, YAv. °*ĵaiti-*, Lith. *giñti/ginti* etc., EWA II, 800f. Compounds: *áhati-* f “intactness”.

D.Sg. °*hataye* 11\ 9 1 808,4;

hári- a < *ĝ^helh₃-i- “yellow, greenish”, EWA II, 805f. Also a very prolific Caland root, found in YAv. *zairi-/zāiri-* “yellow”, Gr. χλωρός, OHG *gelo* etc. Vedic also preserves the zero-grade *i*-abstract derived from the base of Gr. χλωρός in *hīri*° < *ĝ^hlh₃-ri- (cf. *hīriśmaśru-* “having a golden beard”). *hári*° occurs in 18 compounds as the FMC in the Rigveda, more than half of which are synchronically possessive compounds.

N.Sg.	háris	12/	9	7	781,3; 782,8; 783,1; 788,1; 792,3; 798,11; 798,45;	
				10	1	922,3;
		12\	9	1	798,42;	
		/12	9	10	780,2; 781,5; 784,5; 798,6; 798,31; 798,33; 798,44; 815,2; 815,4; 819,10;	
				10	1	922,3;
		11/	1	1	95,1;	
			F	1	526,1;	
	9	4	805,1; 807,2; 808,24; 809,9;			

		11\	9	4	804,1; 807,1; 809,6; 809,18;
		/11	10	1	905,6;
		8/	9	10	715,3; 715,9; 719,6; 731,3; 745,4; 749,2 (= 750,6); 769,2; 777,12; 779,4; 813,15;
		/8	F	1	278,3;
			9	10	714,6; 717,4; 717,9; 720,6; 739,6; 746,4; 754,1; 777,25 (= 818,13); 813,16; 823,1;
A.Sg.	hárim	12/	9	3	784,1; 798,25; 798,27;
			10	1	922,2;
		11/	1	1	121,8;
			9	2	801,3; 808,2;
		11\	10	1	927,10;
		/10	9	2	821,12; 821,21;
		8/	9	6	738,5 (= 742,5; 744,2; 750,2; 751,6; 762,3); 765,4 (= 775,17); 774,18; 777,8; 811,2; 812,7;
		/8	F	1	278,4;
			9	1	810,7;
V.Sg.	háre	8/	9	1	776,14;
	hare	/8	9	2	737,1; 825,5;
D.Sg.	háraye	11\	10	1	922,11;
G.Abl.Sg.	háres	8/	9	1	778,25;
N.A.Du.	hári	12/	1	3	55,7; 111,1; 161,6;
			F	3	207,6; 294,2; 410,6;
			8	2	633,27; 707,9;
			10	5	849,2; 849,3; 875,2; 919,8; 922,2;
		12\	10	1	920,9;
		/12	1	2	82,6; 121,8;
			8	5	624,11; 624,14; 632,15; 632,25 (= 632,26; 632,27); 653,11;
			9	1	794,1;
			10	5	922,1; 922,6-9;
		11/	1	6	63,2; 162,21; 165,4; 174,4; 177,1; 181,5;
			F	15	209,3; 209,7; 266,1; 269,1; 269,2; 269,4; 269,5; 277,4; 329,10; 331,5; 381,2; 397,5; 461,9; 481,1; 535,6;
			10	2	931,2; 940,9;
		11\	10	1	986,1;
		/11	1	1	177,4;
			F	1	552,4;
			10	1	870,2;
		10/	F	2	202,6; 202,7;
		8/	1	5	5,4; 6,2; 16,2; 28,7; 84,6;
			F	1	498,3;
			8	8	621,25; 622,27; 623,17; 633,10; 652,29 (= 702,24); 665,39; 677,15; 679,7;
		/8	1	5	10,3; 20,2; 81,3; 82,1 (= 82,2-5); 84,3;
			F	2	311,8; 328,15;
			8	7	626,45 (= 652,30); 632,28; 633,23; 633,31; 634,12; 637,2; 654,9;
		8	1	1	84,2;
I.D.Abl.Du.	háribhyām	12/	1	1	54,3;
		11/	1	1	177,3;
			F	1	394,4;
			10	2	930,1; 942,4;
		11-/	F	1	202,17;
		11\	F	1	209,4;
		/11	1	3	35,3; 63,9; 76,3;
			F	9	264,2; 264,6; 269,7; 277,2; 384,1; 390,5; 464,1; 464,4; 539,3;
			10	1	930,6;
		8/	F	3	275,1; 276,1; 548,4;

				8	1	626,36;		
G.L.Du.	háribh _i yām	/8	F	1		311,7;		
		12\	F	1		279,2;		
				8	1	653,4;		
		11\	F	1		312,11;		
N.Pl.	hárayas	/8	1	1		7,2;		
		12\	F	1		488,18;		
			8	3			621,24; 1018,8; 1019,8;	
			9	1			790,2;	
			10	3			922,6; 922,7a,b;	
		/12	9	1			791,1;	
		11/	F	1			485,19;	
		11\	1	2			101,10; 164,47;	
			F	9			277,6; 284,2; 287,4; 312,1; 478,1; 478,2; 481,3;	
							540,3; 544,1;	
						9	1	808,2;
						10	1	938,2;
I.Pl.	háribhis	8/	8	4		653,14; 663,4; 674,4; 678,5;		
		/8	1	1		16,1;		
			F	1			342,3;	
			8	2			626,42; 666,7;	
			9	1			818,1;	
		12\	1	1			52,8;	
			F	2			278,1; 278,5;	
			8	1			1019,7;	
			10	4			922,1; 922,2; 922,7; 922,8;	
		11\	1	1			101,10;	
			F	6			209,5; 209,6; 277,3; 316,2; 325,1; 545,2;	
			10	1			938,4;	
8/	1	1			16,4;			
	F	1			278,5;			
/8	F	2			278,1; 279,1;			
G.Pl.	háriṇaam		8	2		654,1; 702,31a (= 702,31c; 702,32, 702,33);		
		12/	10	1		849,1;		
		11/	F	1			387,2;	
		8/	8	1			645,23;	
		/8	F	1			344,5;	
			8	3			644,17; 653,12; 666,1;	
		8	8	1			644,14;	
			9	1			817,5;	

hársi- m or f “joy, excitement”, *hr̥ṣ* “be joyful, excited”, continues both PIE *ǵ^hers “freeze (with fear etc.)” and *ǵ^(u)hers “enjoy” EWA II, 807f. Only attested in adverbial use in the I.sg. (“excited, with excitement”).

I.Sg. hárs_iyā /12 1 1 56,5;
/8 8 1 677,14;

°**huti-** f “pouring out, libation”, *hu* “sacrifice, pour out the sacrificial libation” < *ǵ^hey, Av. °*zuiti-*, EWA II, 808f. Compounds: *ánāhuti-* f “neglect of the (sacrificial) libations”, *áhuti-* f “sacrificial libation”, *ūrjáhuti-* a “receiving generous, powerful libations”, *práhuti-* f “sacrifice”.

N.Sg. °hutiṣ /11 10 1 878,2;
8/ 8 1 659,4;
/8 1 1 105,5;
10 1 847,2;
A.Sg. °hutim 12/ 1 1 31,5;

		/12	1	1	135,8;
			F	1	228,6;
			8	1	639,18;
			10	1	863,4; 889,12;
		11/	F	1	442,9;
		11\	F	1	606,2;
		8/	8	1	643,21;
		/8	1	1	93,3;
			F	3	262,6; 443,5; 582,19;
I.Sg.	°hutī	/8	8	1	639,5;

°**hūti-** f “invocation”, *hū* “call, invoke” < * $\hat{g}^h_{ue}H$ (* $\hat{g}^h_{eu}H$?), EWA II, 809ff. Compounds: *īndrahūti-* f “invocation of Indra”, *devāhūti-* f “invocation of the gods”, *dyumnāhūti-* f “plea for strength”, *pūrvāhūti-* f “first invocation, prayer of the day”, *bhārahūti-* a/f “(uttering a) war-cry; song of praise”, *yāmāhūti-* f “invocation through prayers”, *sāhūti-* a/f “(receiving) equal invocations”.

N.Sg.	°hūtis	/11	F	2	479,2; 506,5;
				10	2 844,3; 954,3;
A.Sg.	°hūtim	/11	1	1	122,2;
			F	2	479,1; 530,3;
			10	2	879,3; 915,16;
I.Sg.	°hūtī	/11	F	2	224,4; 543,4;
	°hūtyā	/11	10	1	889,11;
D.Sg.	°hūtaye	/12	1	1	129,2;
			F	1	402,4;
	°hūt,yai	/8	8	1	659,4;
L.Sg.	°hūtau	/12	10	1	939,7;
		11/	F	1	505,5;
		/11	1	1	123,2;
			F	6	312,9; 467,8; 493,4; 514,2; 551,5; 555,2;
			8	1	672,12;
			10	1	943,3;
V.Du.	°hūtī	8/	1	1	93,9;
N.Pl.	°hūtayas	/12	10	1	870,6;
I.Pl.	°hūtibhis	/12	1	1	129,7;
			8	1	1022,7;
			9	1	780,7;
		/8	1	3	12,12; 45,10; 129,7;
			F	1	530,1;
			9	1	684,5;
L.Pl.	°hūtiṣu	/12	F	1	599,7;
		/8	F	1	415,15;
			8	1	628,18;

hetī- f “weapon”, *hi* “throw, spur, help”, only in Indo-Iranian, EWA II, 802f. Compounds: *tigmāheti-* a “possessing sharp weapons”.

N.Sg.	hetís	11/	F	2	224,14; 469,7;
				10	2 991,2; 991,3;
		/11	10	1	915,12;
		8/	8	1	676,20;
V.Sg.	°hete	/11	F	1	300,4;
A.Sg.	hetím	11/	F	1	516,14;
			10	1	968,3;
		/11	1	2	103,3; 121,10;

			F	2	264,17 (= 493,3); 503,9;
I.Sg.	hetī	/11	F	1	459,10;
G.Abl.Sg.	hetyās	11/	10	1	913,19;
N.A.Du.	°hetī	/11	F	1	515,4;
N.Pl.	hetāyas	12\	8	1	1019,2;
		11\	1	1	190,4;
A.Pl.	hetīs	8/	8	1	670,16;

hrādūni- f “hail, storm”, only in Indo-Iranian, etym. unclear, EWA II, 823f.

A.Sg. hrādūnim /11 1 1 32,13;

°hri- a “ashamed”, *hri* “be ashamed”, only in Indic, EWA II, 823. Compounds: *áhri-* a “unashamed, reckless”.

N.Pl. °hrayas /8 9 1 766,1;

°hruti- f “persecution”, *hvr̥* “stagger” < **ǵʰu̯er*, EWA II, 824f. Both *°hruti-* and *°hvṛti-* (see below) go back to **ǵʰu̯r̥-ti-*, with the variety *hru-C* reflecting the Indo-European metathesis rule **u̯RC/#* > **RuC/#* (cf. Mayrhofer 1986, 161f.), as shown by Hoffmann (AzI III, 749-760). The variant *hvr̥-C* was secondarily restituted, probably for euphonic reasons (Hoffmann l.c., 756). Compounds: *abhíhruti-* f “persecution”.

G.Abl.Sg. °hrutes /12 1 1 166,8;

°hvṛti- f “staggering”, cf. the entry above. Compounds: *párihvṛti-* f “persecution”.

N.Sg. °hvṛtis /12 F 1 598,7;

A.Sg. °hvṛtim /12 9 1 791,2;

Chapter 4

Conclusion

With respect to the question of possible traces of internal derivation in Vedic *i*-stem paradigms, we must conclude that *rayí-/brhádraye* is still the only case which arguably goes back to a derivation acrostatic substantive → proterokinetic adjective. The attested suffix variants of *páti-*, on the other hand, reflect an Indo-Iranian paradigm split rather than an inherited suffixal variation, and the other inherited *o/e*-acrostatic stems show no variation at all, even though it was precisely this class that was a priori most suspicious with respect to the phenomenon treated here (judging from the evidence of the inherited *u*-stems, e.g. *krátu-*, *vásu-* etc.).

However, as the *u*-stems also show, we should expect substantival abstracts as the starting point of this type of derivation. As I have argued, the only abstract *i*-substantives found in Vedic are - apart from being a very small group - clearly associated with the Caland system and its suffixal adjective formations. Thus, even if we found more “Caland abstracts” occurring in Vedic as simplex nouns than we actually do, we would not expect proterokinetic adjectives to be derived from these, since that process would be likely to be “blocked” by the existence of the Caland adjectives these *i*-abstracts had been built to in the first place. The productive way of forming an (*i*-inflection) abstract in Vedic was clearly using the suffix *-ti-* (see 2.1.1) which in PIE was inflected according to the proterokinetic scheme. This also holds for compounds: *i*-abstracts in the SMC of possessive compounds are synchronically stems in *-ti-*, which are irrelevant to the present question.

Of course, *ti*-stems participated in ID, and for now I have also left out possible instances of derivations of the type 1. proterokinetic → hysterokinetic and 2. proterokinetic → amphikinetic, although the evidence from other IE languages suggests that a systematic investigation of these derivational types might be worthwhile. Type 1., for example, is evidenced by Lat. *uātēs* “seer, prophet”, reflecting a hysterokinetic *ti*-stem $*\underline{u}eh_2-t\acute{e}(\acute{i})+s$ derived from proterokinetic $*\underline{u}eh_2-ti-$ continued by MHG *wuot* in the analysis of Schaffner (1999, 191ff.). A very similar process may underly the semantically closely related Gr. μάντις “seer” with its conspicuous concrete semantics and derivatives apparently reflecting a suffix $*-eu-$, e.g. μαντεύεσθαι “prophesy sth.”, μανήιος “prophetic” (as if from $*-\bar{e}ui\acute{i}o-$)¹. Now, a hysterokinetic Greek A.sg. $*mant\bar{e}n < *mn\grave{o}-t\acute{e}-m$ ($< **-\acute{e}i-m$) would indeed look just like the archaic A.sg. of stems in $-\acute{e}u\acute{s}$ (cf. Ζῆν, etc.) and on this basis may have undergone remodelling in its secondary derivatives. Both formally and semantically, an underlying derivation $*m\acute{e}n-ti-$ “sight, prophesying” → $*mn\grave{o}-t\acute{e}i-$ “seer” (a concretization? Or possessive “having sight” ?) would exactly parallel

¹Martin Peters, in class.

Schaffner's Latin example.

As for type 2., an example might be furnished by Toch.B *yesti* < **u̯és-toi-* “clothing” and Lat. *uestis* < **u̯és-ti-*, Malzahn (2002).

Returning to the process under discussion, it seems like the two focal points for ID,

1. simplex nouns: substantival vs. adjectival use
2. use as a simplex noun vs. use as a SMC

do not apply to the Vedic *i*-stems, since of the groups discussed above, the relevant items for 1. are associated with the Caland system and hence have other means of adjectival derivation. There is, of course, also the group of verbal abstracts in *i-* of the type *kr̥ṣí-* etc., but these may actually reflect PIE proter- or hysterokinetic abstracts and do not occur as second compound members in any case. In the case of 2. we find that an abstract *i*-stem in the SMC of a possessive compound is usually a *ti*-stem (synchronically, the complex is interpreted as a determinative/ verbal governing compound, see 2.1.1) and thus of no relevance for the phenomenon we are looking for, either.

If we therefore conclude that PIE did not have *i*-adjectives, we still have to explain the *i*-adjectives found in Vedic. Leaving aside the reduplicated verbal adjectives of the type *cákri-* (2.1.2.3), whose PIE status is as yet unclear, we are left with the following Indic (*C*)*i*-stems, all displaying the typical Caland morphology:

- **-mi-**: *bh̥mí-*, *jāmí-*
- **-ni-**: *júr̥ni-*, *túr̥ni-*, *p̥ṣ̥ni-*, *bh̥r̥ni-*, *váhni-*, *v̥ṣ̥ni-*
- **-ri-**: *úsri-*, *jásuri-*, *dásuri-*, *bh̥úri-*, *vád̥hri-*, *sáhuri-*, *sth̥úri-*
- **-i-**: *dúd̥hi-*, *dhruví-*, *súci-*, *hári-*

Of these, *bh̥úri-*, *vád̥hri-* and *sth̥úri-* have preserved clear traces of substantival usage even synchronically (see the respective entries). *v̥ṣ̥ni-* may have been influenced by *v̥ṣ̥an-* (see 2.1.7) and a number of others (*úsri-*, *dúd̥hi-*, *dhruví-*) are restricted to a few attestations in the Rigveda.

jásuri-, *dásuri-* and *sáhuri-* are, following Nussbaum (1998b), best analyzed as derivatives of abstract *u*-stems (cf. *jásu-* “exhaustion”, *°dásu-* “offerings”), although we would actually expect the suffix *-ro-, from which at a later stage a substantivization in *-ri- could have been derived.

In explaining the unexpected adjectival value of these (*C*)*i*-formations there seem to be two strategies. The “traditional approach”, which has already been mentioned above (cf. the entry **súci-**) argues in favor of analyzing these adjectives as first compound members of Caland compounds, that is, as abstract substantives which came to be used as adjectives in Indo-Iranian, either due to a reanalysis or through hypocoristic shortening (with personal names a possible starting point, cf. the entry **p̥ṛ̥thi-**). Such a reanalysis could be motivated by the fact that abstracts in *-i-* where synchronically clearly associated with verbal roots and almost exclusively restricted to simplex usage (the few exceptions are cases like *j̥r̥i-* and *gir̥i-*), neither of which is true for the Caland FMCs.

An alternative strategy has been proposed by Vine (2006), following a paper by Nussbaum (2004). Nussbaum suggests that within the category of *Ci*-derivatives of *Co*-adjectives we should in fact distinguish between masculine endocentric and feminine abstract substantivizations, with the former showing “a tendency to develop further as “weak adjectives” ” (Vine 2006, 155). Combined with Pinault’s analysis of Ved. *bhúri-*, this would imply that the adjectival value of these substantivizations goes back to inner-Indo-Iranian appositional usage.

To decide whether one of these explanations can be given preference, a thorough (philological) analysis of all the attestations of these *i*-stems and their syntactic roles as well as the syntax of the Vedic Caland compounds would be necessary, which due to the restricted space (and time) available I have not been able to provide.

All in all, with regard to the acrostatic → proterokinetic type of ID, the Vedic *i*-stems are interesting only in as much as they do not have it. This can be explained in part with the function of *i*-abstracts in the Caland system, although the many open questions surrounding this complex still merit further research.

Appendix: Comments on metrical distribution

In the following, I will discuss some of the more interesting distributional facts of the *i*-paradigm. I am concentrating on the I., D. and G./Abl.sg., since it is the weak stem of the singular paradigm where synchronically most of the interesting variation is found. In the tables below, the distribution of the suffixal allomorphs is given with respect to their position in the verse and their occurrence as a simplex and/or second compound member (cf. 3.1). I have simplified these tables by leaving out the (few) hyper- and catalectic verses, but will give them in footnotes.

	I.sg.f.						I.sg.m.			
	-ī ²		-i		-(<i>i</i>)yā		-inā		-yā	
	simpl.	comp.	simpl.	comp.	simpl.	comp.	simpl.	comp.	simpl.	comp.
12/	8	5	2	/	/	1	3	/	5	/
12\	1	6	/	/	1	/	4	/	2	/
/12	6	1	/	/	9	/	8	/	/	/
11/	17	13	/	1	6	2	1	3	17	/
11\	3	3	/	/	6	/	12	/	1	/
/11	38	5	8	10	3	1	2	/	8	/
/10	/	/	/	/	1	/	/	/	/	/
8/	21	5	1	/	1	1	2	/	12	/
/8	5	2	/	5	15	3	10	2	2	/
8	2	/	/	/	1	/	/	/	/	/
	101	40	11	16	43	8	42	5	47	∅

The I.sg.f. in $-ī/-i$ is almost exclusively restricted to feminine *ti*-stems (only two are made from other *i*-stems). As for $-yā$, it has already been pointed out that here the distinction between heavy and light root syllables becomes important for distinguishing between “genuine” $-yā$ and the newly introduced *devī*-inflection I.sg. (see 2.4). The two cases where a disyllabic suffix follows a light syllable (*tvīś_iyā*, X,89,2 and *rāj_iyā*, X,100,12) are both found after the caesura of a Triṣṭubh verse, thus giving a regular break $\smile -$. On the other hand, those cases where $-yā$ occurs after a heavy syllable tend to form cadences of eight- and twelve-syllable verses where the structure $\smile - \smile x$ is most suitable. This is particularly evident in cases where several I.sg. allomorphs of the same stem are attested as in the case of *ūtī*-. The

²Simpl. 11-/: 1.

I.sg. $\bar{u}t_iy\acute{a}$ occurs four times, always in the cadence of an eight-syllable verse, whereas out of the 55 attestations of $\bar{u}t\acute{a}$, 35 are found in Triṣṭubh-cadences (of the rest, 19 attestations occur in the metrically less consistent openings of eight-, eleven- and eleven-syllable verses). Such “quasi-complimentary” distributions are even more conspicuous in other categories (see below).

The distribution of the I.sg.m. allomorphs is influenced by the fact that out of the 47 attestations of $-y\bar{a}$, 39 belong to *rayí-* and therefore most likely reflect an inherited $*-\dot{i}eh_1$. Since this “open class” suffix was less liable to be influenced by the disyllabic variety of the feminine \bar{i} -stems, the attested m. I.sg. forms in $-y\bar{a}$ are almost exclusively of the structure — — and therefore tend to be found in the openings where no iambic structure is required. The two forms in $-iy\bar{a}$ ($\bar{u}rm_iy\acute{a}$, I,184,2 and $p\acute{a}t_iy\bar{a}$, X,85,22) are attested in the “later” books and reflect what has been said about the distribution of disyllabic $-iy\bar{a}$ above (although two attestations are, of course, not much to go by): $\bar{u}rm_iy\acute{a}$ is found in 11\ (this could be a regular Sievers form), $p\acute{a}t_iy\bar{a}$ in /8 is most likely analogical to the feminine disyllabic I.sg.

	D.sg.f.				D.sg.m.			
	-aye ³		-(i)yai		-aye ⁴		-ye ⁵	
	simpl.	comp.	simpl.	comp.	simpl.	comp.	simpl.	comp.
12/	2	2	/	/	4	2	5	/
12\	9	1	1	/	4	/	/	/
/12	81	36	/	/	12	4	1	/
11/	10	4	1	/	10	2	28	/
11\	26	14	2	/	31	/	2	/
/11	13	2	5	/	5	/	9	/
10/	/	/	/	/	/	1	/	/
/10	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
8/	2	/	/	1	7	/	18	/
/8	153	108	1	1	28	1	1	/
8	/	3	/	/	/	/	/	/
	297	170	10	2	101	10	64	∅

Due to the iambic structure of the D.sg.m.f. suffix *-aye*, most attestations are 12\, 11\ and /8. The complete lack of Sievers varieties is due to the fact that all D.sg. attestations of *-ye* belong to *páti-* and *rayí-*, none of which show the appropriate context. Note again the opposite distribution of the two varieties: *-aye*: 11\, /12, /8 vs. *-ye*: 8/, 11/.

As for the analogical D.sg.f. *-iyai*, nine of the ten Rigvedic attestations are found in the books I, VIII and X, suggesting that the influence of the feminine \bar{i} -stems was a relatively late tendency.

³Simpl. /11+: 1, /12-: 1, comp. /8+: 1.

⁴Simpl. /11+: 1, 11+\: 1.

⁵Simpl. 11-/: 1, 12+: 1.

	G.Abl.sg.f.				G.Abl.sg.m.			
	-es ⁶		-(i)yās		-es ⁷		-yas ⁸	
	simpl.	comp.	simpl.	comp.	simpl.	comp.	simpl.	comp.
12/	1	/	2	/	23	2	28	/
12\	/	1	1	2	1	/	/	/
/12	4	11	/	/	4	/	1	/
11/	3	/	5	1	29	3	67	/
11\	/	1	/	/	1	/	5	/
/11	3	25	/	1	43	2	41	/
10/	/	/	/	/	/	/	1	/
8/	3	3	1	/	26	1	36	/
/8	3	7	1	/	3	2	6	/
8	/	/	/	/	/	2	/	/
	17	49	10	4	127	12	187	∅

Again, the f. G.Abl.sg. *-yās* starts to occur only in the later books (12 out of 14 attestations occur in books I, IX and X). The m. “open class” inflection is only represented by *rāyās*, *aryās* and *avyas*, all metrically — x (depending on the onset of the following word) and therefore easier to accommodate at the beginning of the verse. As for the attestations in Triṣṭubhcadences, 33 of 41 occupy the last two positions of the cadence where — x is strictly required, cf. Gippert (1999, 106ff.).

⁶Simpl. /12-: 1, /8-: 1, comp. /11-: 1.

⁷Simpl. /11-: 1.

⁸Simpl. 12-/: 1, /8-: 1.

References

- Arnold, E. Vernon. 1905. *Vedic Metre in its Historical Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Balles, Irene. 1997. Reduktionsformen in langen Wortformen als Ursprung morphologischer Doppelformen im Urindogermanischen: die Suffixformen $*-\underset{\sim}{i}o-$ and $*-\underset{\sim}{i}o-$. *Die Sprache* 39/2:141–167.
- Balles, Irene. 2003. Die lateinischen Adjektive auf *-idus* und das Calandsystem. In *Indogermanisches Nomen. Derivation, Flexion und Ablaut*, ed. E. Tichy/ D. Wodtko/ B. Irslinger, 9–29. Bremen: Hempen.
- Balles, Irene. 2006. *Die altindische Cvi-Konstruktion. Form, Funktion, Ursprung*. Bremen: Hempen.
- Balles, Irene. 2009. The Old Indic cvi construction, the Caland system, and the PIE adjective. In *Internal Reconstruction in Indo-European. Methods, Results and Problems*, ed. J.E. Rasmussen/ Th. Olander. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum.
- Bammesberger, Alfred. 1989. Das Aufkommen \check{r} -stämmiger Abstraktbildungen im Slavischen. *HS* 102:107–113.
- Barschel, Bernd. 1986. Zur Vorgeschichte der altindischen reduplizierten Verbaladjektive auf *-i*. In *Sanskrit and World Culture. Proceedings of the Fourth World Sanskrit Conference of the International Association of Sanskrit Studies*, ed. W. Morgenroth, Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des alten Orients 18, 305–310. Berlin.
- Beekes, Robert S.P. 1987. Indo-European Neuters in *-i*. In *Festschrift for Henry Hoenigswald on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. G. Cardona/ N.H. Zide, 45–56. Tübingen: G. Narr.
- Caland, Willem. 1892. Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Avesta. *KZ* 31:256–273.
- Caland, Willem. 1893. Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Avesta. *KZ* 32:589–595.
- Das, Rahul Peter. 1995. The Hunt for Forgeign Words in the Rigveda. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 38:207–238.
- Debrunner, Albert. 1954. *Altindische Grammatik*, volume II,2: Die Nominalsuffixe. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Debrunner, Albert. 1957. *Altindische Grammatik. Nachträge zu Band II, 1*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

- Geldner, Karl Friedrich. 1951. *Der Rig-Veda aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt*, volume I-III. Cambridge, Mass. [Harvard Oriental Series 33-35].
- Gippert, Jost. 1999. Neue Wege zur sprachwissenschaftlichen Analyse der vedischen Metrik. In *Compositiones Indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler*, ed. H. Eichner/ H.C. Luschützky. Prague: Enigma Corporations.
- Grassmann, Hermann. 1996. *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda. 6., von Maria Koziánka überarb. und erg. Aufl.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Hardarson, Jón Axel. 1987. Das uridg. Wort für "Frau". *MSS* 48:115–137.
- Heidermanns, Frank. 1993. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der germanischen Primäradjektive*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Hoffmann, Karl. 1975. *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik*, volume I, ed. J. Narten. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Hoffmann, Karl. 1976. *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik*, volume II, ed. J. Narten. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Hoffmann, Karl. 1992. *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik*, volume III, ed. S. Glauch/ R. Plath/ S. Ziegler. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Jacobsohn, Hermann. 1928. Sublimen. *Glotta* 16:48–61.
- Jamison, Stephanie W. 1987. Linguistic and Philological Remarks on some Vedic Body Parts. In *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill*, ed. R. Gusmani/ A. Morpurgo-Davies/ K. Strunk/ C. Watkins, 66–91. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.
- Jamison, Stephanie W. 1988. The Quantity of the Outcome of Vocalized Laryngeals in Indic. In *Die Laryngaltheorie und die Rekonstruktion des indogermanischen Laut- und Formensystems*, ed. Alfred Bammesberger, 213–226. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Janda, Michael. 1998. Die hohle und die geschlossene Hand im Indogermanischen. *Die Sprache* 40/1:1–25.
- Jasanoff, Jay H. 1989. Old Irish *bé* 'woman'. *Ériu* 40:135–141.
- Klingenschmitt, Gert. 1980. Zur Etymologie des Lateinischen. In *Lautgeschichte und Etymologie*, 208–222. Wiesbaden.
- Koch, Anke. 2003. Die Rekonstruktion des Streitwagens bei den Indoariern im Zeitalter des Rigveda (ca.1500-1000 v.Chr.). In *Altertumswissenschaften im Dialog. Festschrift für Wolfram Nagel zur Vollendung seines 80. Lebensjahres*, ed. R. Dittmann/ Chr. Eder/ B. Jacobs, 345–368. Münster: Ugarit.
- Krisch, Thomas. 2006. *RIVELEX. Rigveda-Lexikon. Unter Mitarbeit von Christina Katsikadeli, Stefan Niederreiter und Thomas Kaltenbacher*, volume I. Graz: Leykam.
- Kuiper, Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus. 1942. Notes on Vedic Noun-Inflexion. In *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde* 5, 161–256.

- Kuiper, Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus. 1961. Zur kompositionellen Kürzung im Sanskrit. *Die Sprache* 7:14–31.
- Kuiper, Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus. 1991. *Aryans in the Rigveda*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Kuiper, Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus. 1995a. On a Hunt for ‘Possible’ Objections. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 38:239–247.
- Kuiper, Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus. 1995b. Foreign Words in the Rigveda. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 38:261.
- Liebert, Gösta. 1949. *Das Nominalsuffix -ti- im Altindischen*. Lund: Håkan Ohlsson.
- Lubotsky, Alexander. 1997. *A R̥gvedic Word Concordance*, volume I & II. New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- Macdonell, Arthur Antony. 1910. *A Vedic Grammar*. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.
- Malzahn, Melanie. 2000. Die nominalen Flexionsendungen des idg. Duals. *HS* 112:204–226.
- Malzahn, Melanie. 2002. Toch. B *yesti nāskoy* und der Narten-Charakter der idg. Wurzel **ues* “Kleidung anhaben”. *Die Sprache* 43/2:212–220.
- Malzahn, Melanie. 2006. Kunstsprachliches und Archaisches in der rigvedischen Metrik am Beispiel von *distrahiert* zu *messendem e*: Neue Evidenz für alte Laryngalpräsenz. In *La Langue Poétique Indo-Européenne. Actes du Colloque de travail de la Société des Études Indo-Européennes*, ed. G.-J. Pinault/ D. Petit, 225–290. Leuven: Peeters.
- Matzel, Klaus. 1990. *Gesammelte Schriften*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1974. Ein neuer Beleg zu der indogermanischen Sippe für “Halsschmuck”. In *Antiquitates Indogermanicae. Gedenkschrift für Hermann Güntert*, ed. M. Mayrhofer/ W. Meid/ B. Schlerath/ R. Schmitt, 289–291. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck [IBS 12].
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1986. *Indogermanische Grammatik*, volume I, 2. Halbband: Lautlehre [Segmentale Phonologie des Indogermanischen]. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1992. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, volume I. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1996. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, volume II. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Meißner, Torsten. 1998. Das “Calandsche Gesetz” und das Griechische - nach 100 Jahren. In *Sprache und Kultur der Indogermanen. Akten der 10. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft*, ed. W. Meid, 237–254. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck [IBS 93].
- Miyakawa, Hisashi. 1999. Kann altindisch *ṣaṣṭi-* doch auch “sechs” bedeuten? In *Gering und doch von Herzen. 25 indogermanistische Beiträge Bernhard Forssman zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. J. Habisreiter/ R. Plath/ S. Ziegler, 183–189. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

- Narten, Johanna. 1968. Zum “proterodynamischen” Wurzelpräsens. In *Pratidānam: Indian, Iranian and Indo-European studies presented to F.B.J. Kuiper on his 60th birthday*, ed. J.C. Heestermann, 68–88. The Hague: Mouton.
- Neri, Sergio. 2003. *I Sostantivi in u- del Gotico*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck [IBS 108].
- Nussbaum, Alan J. 1976. *Caland’s “Law” and the Caland-System*. Unpublished Harvard Ph.D. dissertation.
- Nussbaum, Alan J. 1986. *Head and Horn in Indo-European*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Nussbaum, Alan J. 1998a. *Two Studies in Greek and Homeric Linguistics*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Nussbaum, Alan J. 1998b. Severe problems. In *Mír Curad. Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*, ed. J. Jasanoff/ H.C. Melchert/ L. Oliver, 521–538. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck [IBS 111].
- Nussbaum, Alan J. 1999. **Jocidus*: An account of the Latin adjectives in *-idus*. In *Compositiones Indogermanicae: In Memoriam Jochem Schindler*, ed. H. Eichner/ H.C. Luschützky. Prague: Enigma.
- Nussbaum, Alan J. 2004. Cool **-ēd-*: The Latin *frīgēdō* and Greek ἀλγηδών, τρηεδών, and ῥίγηδανός Types. Paper presented at the “23rd East Coast Indo-European Conference” (Virginia Polytechnic Institute) .
- Nussbaum, Alan J. 2009. So How’s the Little Woman? Genitivals, diminutives, and PIE **g^wénh₂* etc. Paper presented at the GSAS Workshop on Indo-European Linguistics (Harvard University) .
- Oettinger, Norbert. 1995. Griech. ὀστέον, heth. *kulēi* und ein neues Kollektivsuffix. In *Verba et Structurae. Festschrift für Klaus Strunk*, ed. H. Hettrich et. al., 211–228. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck [IBS 83].
- Oettinger, Norbert. 1999. Der Ablaut des *i*-Kollektivums oder: idg. **méli-t* ‘Honig’, gr. **ἄλι-τ* ‘Gerste’, heth. **péri* ‘Haus’. In *Gering und doch von Herzen. 25 indogermanistische Beiträge Bernhard Forssman zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. J. Habisreiter/ R. Plath/ S. Ziegler, 207–214. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Oldenberg, Hermann. 1909. *R̥gveda. Textkritische und exegetische Noten, erstes bis sechstes Buch*. Berlin.
- Oldenberg, Hermann. 1912. *R̥gveda. Textkritische und exegetische Noten, siebentes bis zehntes Buch*. Berlin.
- Peters, Martin. 1980. *Untersuchungen zur Vertretung der indogermanischen Laryngale im Griechischen*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Peters, Martin. 1989. *Sprachliche Studien zum Frühgriechischen*. Unpublished habilitation thesis, Vienna.

- Peters, Martin. 2002. Review of Ivanov, V.V./ Vine, B. (ed.), *UCLA Indo-European Studies*, Vol. I. University of California, Los Angeles, Program in Indo-European Studies. *Die Sprache* 39/3, 1997[2002] = *Indogermanische Chronik* 35/3: 94–129.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 1980. Instrumental et adverbe prädicatif (en marge de “Genetiv und Adjektiv”). *LALIES* 1:31–33.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 1987-1988. Védique *jírvi-/jívri-*. *Indologica Taurinensia* 14:313–338.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 1998a. Le nom indo-iranien de l’hôte. In *Sprache und Kultur der Indogermanen*, ed. W. Meid, 451–477. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck [IBS 93].
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 1998b. Védique *bhūri-*, un ancien substantif. *Bulletin des Études Indiennes* 16:89–121.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 1999-2000. Le nom primitif de la rétribution rituelle en védique ancien. *Bulletin des Études Indiennes* 17-18:427–476.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2003. Sur les thèmes indo-européens en *-u-: dérivation et étymologie. In *Indogermanisches Nomen. Derivation, Flexion und Ablaut*, ed. E. Tichy/ D. Wodtko/ B. Irslinger, 153–188. Bremen: Hempen.
- Praust, Karl. 1998. *Studien zu den indogermanischen Nasalpräsentien*. Unpublished master thesis, Vienna.
- Rasmussen, Jens Elmegård. 2009. Internal reconstruction applied to Indo-European: where do we stand? In *Internal Reconstruction in Indo-European. Methods, Results and Problems*, ed. J.E. Rasmussen/ Th. Olander. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum.
- Rau, Jeremy. 1998. PIE **uóidu-/ *uéidu-* and its Derivatives. *Die Sprache* 40/2:133–160.
- Rau, Jeremy. 2009. Vedic Sanskrit *aśítī-* ‘80’. *MSS (2003[2009])* 63:139–144.
- Remmer, Ulla. 2006. *Frauennamen im Rigveda und im Avesta. Studien zur Onomastik des ältesten Indischen und Iranischen*. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Renou, Louis. 1967. *Études Védiques et Pāṇinéennes*. Paris: De Boccard.
- Rieken, Elisabeth. 2005. Neues zum Ursprung der anatolischen *i*-Mutation. *HS* 118:48–74.
- Rix, Helmut. 2001. *Lexikon der Indogermanischen Verben. Bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp und Brigitte Schirmer*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2 edition.
- Scarlata, Salvatore. 1999. *Die Wurzelkomposita im R̥g-Veda*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Schaffner, Stefan. 1999. Die Götternamen des Zweiten Merseburger Zauberspruchs. *Die Sprache* 41/2:153–205.
- Schaffner, Stefan. 2001. *Das Vernersche Gesetz und der innerparadigmatische grammatische Wechsel des Urgermanischen im Nominalbereich*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck [IBS 103].

- Schindler, Jochem. 1969. Die idg. Wörter für "Vogel" und "Ei". *Die Sprache* 15:144–167.
- Schindler, Jochem. 1972a. L'apophonie des noms-racines indoeuropéens. *BSL* 67/1:31–38.
- Schindler, Jochem. 1972b. *Das Wurzelnomen im Arischen und Griechischen*. Unpublished dissertation, Würzburg.
- Schindler, Jochem. 1973. Bemerkungen zur Herkunft idg. Diphthongstämme und zu den Eigentümlichkeiten ihrer Kasusformen. *Die Sprache* 19:148–157.
- Schindler, Jochem. 1976. On the Greek type ἰπεύς. In *Studies in Greek, Italic and Indo-European Linguistics offered to Leonard R. Palmer on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. A. Morpurgo Davies/ W. Meid, 349–352. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck [IBS 16].
- Schindler, Jochem. 1980. Zur Herkunft der altindischen *cvi*-Bildungen. In *Lautgeschichte und Etymologie. Akten der V. Fachtagung der indogermanischen Gesellschaft*, ed. M. Mayrhofer/ M. Peters/ O.E. Pfeiffer, 386–393. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Schindler, Jochem. 1986. Zu den homerischen ῥοδοδάκτυλος-Komposita. In *O-o-pe-ro-si: Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. A. Etter, 393–401. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Schindler, Jochem. 1987. Zur avestischen Kompositionslehre: *aš*- 'groß'. In *Festschrift for Henry Hoernigswald on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. G. Cardona/ N.H. Zide, 337–348. Tübingen: G. Narr.
- Schindler, Jochem. 1994. Alte und neue Fragen zum indogermanischen Nomen. In *In Honorem Holger Pedersen (Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Kopenhagen 1993)*, ed. J.E. Rasmussen, 397–400. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Schindler, Jochem. 1997. Zur internen Syntax der indogermanischen Nominalkomposita. In *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy*, ed. E. Crespo/ J.L. García Ramón, 537–540. Madrid/Wiesbaden: Ediciones UAM/ Reichert.
- Schlerath, Bernfried. 1988. Nochmals zu den *cvi*-Bildungen. In *Studia Indogermanica et Slavica, Festgabe für Werner Thomas*, ed. P. Kosta, 37–47. München.
- Schmidt, Johannes. 1885. Der locativus singularis und die griechische i-deklination. *KZ* 27:287–309.
- Schulze, Wilhelm. 1933. *Kleine Schriften*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Solmsen, Felix. 1909. *Beiträge zur Griechischen Wortforschung*. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.
- Specht, Franz. 1935. Eine Eigentümlichkeit indogermanischer Stammbildung. *KZ* 62:216–235.
- Specht, Franz. 1944. Zur Bedeutung des Ariernamen. *KZ* 68:42–52.
- Stüber, Karin. 2000. Zur Herkunft der altindischen Infinitive auf *-sáni*. *MSS* 60:135–167.
- Stüber, Karin. 2007. Zur Entstehung des Motionssuffixes idg. **-ih₂-*. *IJDL* 4:1–24.

- Szemerényi, Oswald. 1956. Latin *rēs* and the Indo-European long-diphthong stem nouns. *KZ* 73:167–202.
- Thieme, Paul. 1938. *Der Fremdling im R̥gveda. Eine Studie über die Bedeutung der Worte ARI, ARYA, ARYAMAN und ĀRYA*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- Thieme, Paul. 1971. *Kleine Schriften*, volume I,1 & 2. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Thieme, Paul. 1995. *Kleine Schriften*, volume II. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Tremblay, Xavier. 1996. Un nouveau type apophonique des noms athématiques suffixaux de l'indo-européen. *BSL* 91/1:97–145.
- Tremblay, Xavier. 1998. *Études sur les noms suffixaux athématiques de l'Avesta*. Unpublished dissertation, École pratique des haute études.
- Tremblay, Xavier. 2003. Interne Derivation: “Illusion de la reconstruction” oder verbreitetes morphologisches Mittel? In *Indogermanisches Nomen. Derivation, Flexion und Ablaut*, ed. E. Tichy/ D. Wodtke/ B. Irslinger, 231–259. Bremen: Hempen.
- Tremblay, Xavier. 2004. Die Ablautstufe des Lokativs der akrostatischen Nomina. In *Per Aspera ad Asteriscos: Studia Indogermanica in Honorem Jens Elmegård Rasmussen sexagenarii Idibus Martiis anno MMIV*, ed. A. Hyllested/ A.R. Jørgensen/ J.H. Larsson/ Th. Olander, 573–590. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck [IBS 112].
- Van Nooten, Barend A., and Gary B. Holland, ed. 1994. *Rig Veda. A Metrically Restored Text with an Introduction and Notes*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Ventris, Michael, and John Chadwick. 1973. *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*. Cambridge University Press, 2 edition.
- Vine, Brent. 1999. Latin *-īnāre/ -īnārī*. *UCLA Indo-European Studies* 1:71–84.
- Vine, Brent. 2006. An alleged case of “inflectional contamination”: on the *i*-stem inflection of Latin *civis*. *Incontri Linguistici* 29:139–158.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1897. *Vermischte Beiträge zur griechischen Sprachkunde*. Basel.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1905. *Altindische Grammatik*, volume II,1: Einleitung zur Wortlehre, Nominalkomposition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wackernagel, Jacob, and Alfred Debrunner. 1930. *Altindische Grammatik*, volume III: Nominalflexion, Zahlwort, Pronomen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Weiss, Michael. 1996. Greek $\mu\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ ‘countless’, Hittite *mūri-* ‘bunch (of fruit)’. *HS* 109:199–214.
- Werba, Chlodwig H. 1997. *Verba IndoArica. Die primären und sekundären Wurzeln der Sanskrit-Sprache. Pars I: Radices Primariae*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

- Widmer, Paul. 2004. *Das Korn des weiten Feldes*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck [IBS 111].
- Widmer, Paul. 2005. Der altindische *vr̥k̥*-Typus und hethitisch *nakk̥*: Der indogermanische Instrumental zwischen Syntax und Morphologie. *Die Sprache* 45:190–208.
- Witzel, Michael, and Toshifumi Gotō, ed. 2007. *Rig-Veda. Das heilige Wissen. Erster und zweiter Liederkreis. Aus dem vedischen Sanskrit übersetzt und herausgegeben von Michael Witzel und Toshifumi Gotō unter Mitarbeit von Eijirō Dōyama und Mislav Ježić*. Frankfurt am Main/ Leipzig: Verlag der Weltreligionen.
- Wodtko, Dagmar S., and Britta Irslinger/Carolin Schneider, ed. 2008. *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.

English abstract

The scope of this thesis is the investigation of one particular aspect of PIE nominal internal derivation in Vedic, the derivation of proterokinetic adjectives from acrostatic abstract nouns. Since a number of inherited Vedic *u*-stems shows a consistent variation between “open” and “closed” inflectional endings that may be explained as going back to just such substantive: adjective pairings, one could assume that the *i*-stems would also have preserved such a pattern if it had existed in PIE. However, a first analysis of the attested Vedic *i*-stems and the metrical distribution of their inflectional endings shows that there is no systematical variation to be found. This goes both for the simplex attestations and the stems attested as second compound members (which have to be taken into consideration because SMCs were inflected like an internal derivative of the underlying athematic simplex stem in PIE). The only possible exception is *rayí-* “wealth”, which may preserve traces of a proterokinetic stem **rh₁-eĭ-* (derived from acrostatic **ró/éh₁-i-*) in the compounds *brhádraye* (D.sg.) and *ṛdhádrayas* (N.pl.).

These findings confirm the general assumption that PIE did not have primary-looking *i*-adjectives. This may be connected to the fact that PIE *i*-abstracts (from which we would expect internally derived adjectives) were integrated in the Caland system and associated with its suffixal adjectives in **-ro-*, **-mo-*, **-no-* etc., which may have blocked the process of internal derivation from these formations.

On the other hand, we do find a number of *i*-adjectives in Vedic, which accordingly have to be explained as Indo-Iranian innovations. Within these, two groups have to be distinguished, a) *(C)i*-adjectives clearly associated with the Caland system and b) reduplicated adjectives synchronically associated with the perfect stem (e.g. *cákri-*). While the former most likely continue reanalyzed Caland abstracts, the PIE status of the second group is uncertain and needs further study beyond the Vedic material.

Deutsche Zusammenfassung

Das Ziel dieser Arbeit ist es, ein Teilgebiet der uridg. nominalen internen Derivation anhand eines begrenzten Corpus genauer zu untersuchen. Ausgehend von gewissen Suffixalternativen in den Paradigmen einiger vedischer *u*-Stämme, die auf ein altes Nebeneinander eines akrostatischen (neutralen) Substantivs und eines davon intern abgeleiteten proterokinetisch flektierten Adjektivs hindeuten, soll geklärt werden, ob ein ähnliches Ableitungsschema bei den ansonsten ähnlich flektierten *i*-Stämmen vorgelegen haben könnte. Dabei muss einerseits untersucht werden, ob es in der Simplexflexion der *i*-Stämme eine ähnliche Distribution zwischen “offener” und “geschlossener” Flexion gibt wie bei den *u*-Stämmen, andererseits müssen alle komponierten *i*-Stämme einbezogen werden, da die Hinterglieder von Possessivkomposita im Indogermanischen ebenfalls wie ein internes Derivat des zugrundeliegenden Simplex flektierten.

Da die Strukturanforderungen der vedischen Metrik Archaismen bewahren können, besteht der größte Teil der Arbeit aus einer genauen Analyse der belegten *i*-Stämme nach metrischen Gesichtspunkten. Eine erste Auswertung zeigt allerdings, dass es bei den *i*-Stämmen keine systematische Suffixvariation gibt und dass auch komponierte *i*-Stämme nicht grundsätzlich von der Simplexflexion abweichen. Besonders die Klasse der ererbten *i*-Stämme, die synchron nicht mit Verbalwurzeln assoziiert sind (z.B. *pāti*- “Herr; Gatte”, *ávi*- “Schaf”, *agní*- “Feuer”) weist im Gegensatz zu ererbten *u*-Stämmen (*vásu*- “Gut”, *krátu*- “Kraft” etc.) keine Spuren interner Derivation auf.

Einzige Ausnahme bleibt *rayí*- “Reichtum”, das in den Komposita *bṛhádṛaye* (D.Sg.) und *ṛdhádṛayas* (N.Pl.) einen proterokinetischen schwachen Stamm $*rh_1-ej-ej$, abgeleitet von akrostatischem $*ró/éh_1-i-$, im Hinterglied fortsetzen könnte.

Diachron könnte das Fehlen intern derivierter *i*-Adjektive darauf zurückzuführen sein, dass indogermanische *i*-Abstrakta in erster Linie mit den Adjektiven des Caland-Suffixverbands assoziiert waren und daher keine intern derivierten Adjektive bildeten, was auch das Fehlen von *i*-Adjektiven in der Grundsprache erklären könnte. In diesem Fall müssen allerdings einzelsprachlich auftretende *i*-Adjektive erklärt werden. Im Vedischen sind hier zwei Gruppen zu unterscheiden: Einerseits klar mit dem Caland-System assoziierte Bildungen, die sekundär aus den Vordergliedern von Caland-Bahuvrīhis reanalysiert worden sein könnten (bzw. in einigen Fällen wohl auf appositiv verwendete abstrakte Substantive zurückgehen), andererseits die reduplizierten Verbaladjektive des Typs *cákri*-, deren uridg. Status aber noch zu klären ist und einer sprachübergreifenden Untersuchung bedarf.

Lebenslauf

Persönliche Daten

Name	Laura Grestenberger
Geburtsort	Wien
Geburtsdatum	2.12. 1985
Wohnort	Wien

Ausbildung

1996-2004	BRG Laaerbergstraße 1100 Wien, Abschluss mit Auszeichnung
2004-2009	Studium der Sprachwissenschaft (Indogermanistik) an der Universität Wien
Sommer 2006	Leiden Summer School in Indo-European Linguistics
SoSe 2007	ERASMUS-Semester in Rom, Università La Sapienza

Lehrtätigkeit

SoSe 2008 & 2009	Tutorium zur Vorlesung "Einführung in die Indogermanistik"
------------------	--

Vorträge

WS 2008	36. Österreichische Linguistiktagung: "Zur internen Derivation: Die vedischen <i>i</i> -Stämme"
---------	---

Institutsaufgaben

2005-2007	Studienvertreterin der Sprachwissenschaft
WS 2008	Organisation der 36. Österreichischen Linguistiktagung

Auszeichnungen

2006 & 2009	Leistungsstipendium der Universität Wien
2007	ERASMUS-Mobilitätsstipendium