
ROBERTA MELAZZO

Suffixes of *Bahuvrīhi* in the *R̥g Veda**

As is well known, *bahuvrīhi* compounds are secondary adjectives with possessive meaning¹. The word formation rule (WFR) of these compounds will generally be (1).

$$(1) \quad []_x []_y \text{!noun} \rightarrow [[]_x []_y \text{!noun} + \text{suffix}]_{\text{adjective}}$$

The rule specifies that when two members unite to form a *bahuvrīhi* compound, the second one is necessarily a noun and a suffix must be recognized which causes it to become an adjective. No restriction, or almost none, constrains the choice of the grammatical category of the first member. It can be a noun, a root noun², an adjective, a pronoun, a nominal form of a verb, a preposition, an adverb, or even a particle or prefix. *Bahuvrīhi*s can thus include the following types: N + N, A + N, Pron + N, Ptc + N, Prep (or Adv) + N, Part + N, and Pref + N. As for the stem of the compound as a whole, the most common suffix is the zero (henceforth \emptyset) suffix. This is the case for the following types³.

N + N

agnīrūpa- “having the colour of fire”

[*agnī-* “Agni”, “fire” (m.) + *rūpā-* “shape”, “colour” (n.)]

10.84.1d (*agnīrūpāḥ*).

* I would like to thank my three anonymous referees for their insightful comments and suggestions.

¹ According to MACDONELL (2000 [1910]: 170-175), the term ‘possessive’ is probably the most appropriate for *bahuvrīhi* compounds in the vast majority of cases, although in some instances a more comprehensive sense of “connected with” better indicates the relation between the substantive and the *bahuvrīhi* compound agreeing with it. See also what WACKERNAGEL (1957: 273) says on this matter. One of the most difficult problems concerning *bahuvrīhi* compounds is that of their accentuation. Stated generally, the rule is that they accent the first member, but there is many an exception to this rule. Here I will avoid this issue, which is partly dealt with in MELAZZO (2008) and MELAZZO and MELAZZO (in print).

² Also including forms like *śrūt-* made with a determinative *-t-* added to the root *śru* “hear”; and *śrūt-* is united, for instance, with *kārṇa-* “ear” in *śrūtkārṇa-* “having listening ears” (7.32.5a, 1.44.13a, 1.45.7c, 8.45.17b, 10.140.6c).

³ Henceforth the members of a compound are specified as follows: nouns are quoted in their stem forms with the classification as masculine (m.), feminine (f.) or neuter (n.), adjectives are cited in their stem form, pronouns are given in their neuter form and verbs are mentioned in their root form.

mitrámahas- “having an abundance of friends”

[*mitrá-* “friend” (m. or n.) + *máhas-* “greatness”, “abundance” (n.)]

6.3.6b (*mitrámahāḥ*); 1.44.12a, 1.50.11a, 1.58.8b, 2.1.5b, 4.4.15d, 6.2.11a, 6.14.6a, 6.5.4b, 7.5.6b, 8.19.25b, 8.44.14a, 8.60.7c, 10.37.7c, 10.110.1c (*mitramahāḥ*).

A + N

aruṇāśva- “having sorrel horses”

[*aruṇā-* “reddish”, “light-brown”, “golden” + *āśva-* “horse” (m.)]

5.57.4c (*aruṇāśvāḥ*).

ugrádhanvan- “having a mighty bow”

[*ugrá-* “mighty”, “powerful” + *dhánvan-* “bow” (n.)]

10.103.3d (*ugrádhanvā*).

Pron + N

tvāvasu- “whose wealth is you”

[*tvā* enclitic accusative form of *tvám* “you”, + *vasu-* “goods”, “wealth” (n.)]

7.32.14a (*tvāvasum*).

svákṣatra- “having dominion over oneself, master of oneself”

[*svám* “own” + *kṣatrā-* “dominion”, “power” (n.)]

1.54.3b, 5.35.4c (*svákṣatram*); 5.48.1b (*svákṣatrāya*); 1.165.5b (*svákṣatrebhiḥ*).

Ptc + N

gūrtāmanas- “having a pleasing mind, friendly, sympathetic”

[*gūrtā-* “welcome”, “pleasing”, perfect passive participle from *gur* “approve”, “assent to”, + *mānas-* “mind”, “thought”, “soul”, “inclination”, “mood” (n.)]

6.63.4c (*gūrtāmanāḥ*).

dyutādyāman- “whose course is gleaming”

[*dyutāt-* “gleaming”, aorist participle from *dyut* “gleam”, “shine”, + *yāman-* “going, course, march” (n.)]

6.49.4c (*dyutādyāmā*); 5.80.1a, 10.93.12b (*dyutādyāmānam*).

Prep (or Adv) + N

ātyūrmi- “having the wave beyond oneself, overflowing”

[*āti* “over”, “beyond” + *ūrmí-* “wave”, “billow” (m.)]

9.17.3a (*ātyūrmiḥ*).

ādeva- “to whom the gods stay near, having the gods nearby”

[*ā* “near” + *devā-* “god” (m.)]

4.1.1e and f (*ādevam*); 2.4.1d (*ādeve*); 7.92.4b (*ādevāsaḥ*).

āntivāma- “having wealth before oneself”

[*ānti* “before”, “in front of”, “opposite to” + *vāmā-* “wealth” (n.)]

7.77.4a (*āntivāmā*).

viśvátaspad- “whose foot is everywhere”

[*viśvátas* “everywhere” + *pád-* “foot” (m.)]

10.81.3b (*viśvátaspāt*).

Pref. + N

anabhīśú- “reinless”

[*an-*, privative or negative prefix, + *abhīśú-* “rein” (m.)]

1.152.5a, 4.36.1a, 6.66.7c (*anabhīśúh*).

sujoyótis- “quite radiant”

[*su-* “well”, “indeed”, “thoroughly” + *joyótis-* “light”, “brightness”, “radiance” (n.)]

3.20.1c, 6.50.2a (*sujoyótisāh*); 10.89.15d (*sujoyótisāh*).

For the formations just mentioned above and others which exhibit the same behaviour WFR (2) is available.

$$(2) \quad []_x []_y \text{!noun} \rightarrow [[]_x []_y \text{!noun} + \emptyset \text{ suffix}]_z \text{adjective}$$

WFR (2) is definitely a transcategorization or conversion rule and describes a change in the lexical category in the absence of an overt suffix. Transcategorization or conversion is a common process in English (Marchand, 1969) as well as in most languages. Examples (3) and (4) show it in Italian and in English respectively.

$$(3) \quad [\text{giovane}]_A \rightarrow [\text{giovane}]_N$$

$$(4) \quad [\text{water}]_N \rightarrow [\text{water}]_V$$

No formal mark in the words distinguishes the noun *giovane* “boy” from the adjective *giovane* “young” in Italian or the verb *water* “pour or sprinkle water on” from the noun *water* “liquid without colour, smell or taste that falls as rain, is in lakes, rivers and seas, and is used for drinking, washing, etc.”.

Thus, in general, the *bahuvrīhis* in the *Ṛg Veda* are formed without specific suffixes. In certain cases, however, suffixes are employed in the formation of alternatives to \emptyset -suffix *bahuvrīhis*. In other cases, only suffixed formations are found and a corresponding non-suffixed form does not exist. Upon closer examination, formations with an evident suffix – discussed and at times defined by Wackernagel (1957: 101-123) as pleonastic – could reveal certain linguistic procedures adopted for metrical reasons, at least in the *Ṛg Veda*.

Such a case is found in the only *Ṛg Veda bahuvrīhi* ending in *-ka*: *tryāmbaka*, “having three mothers”, “three-mothered.” This sole *bahuvrīhi* is found in the accusative in a hymn dedicated to the Maruts, the gods of storms, written in *anuṣṭubh* meter. The first hemistich of this *anuṣṭubh* meter, which consists of four octosyllabic verses, is 7.59.12a-b.

tryāmbakaṃ yajāmahe

sugāndhim puṣṭivārdhanam

“To the Three-mothered (*tryāmbaka*) we are offering,
(to him) sweet-smelling (and) increasing prosperity”.

In this stanza *tryāmbakam* is an appellative referred to the god Rudra, but this is of little importance because its adjective function and its possessive value is clear. The form **tryamba-* is not attested elsewhere, but this, too, is of little importance, since it could not have been used in this context. The accusative **tryambam* would be expected here, derived from the stem **tryamba-*, but this would produce one syllable less in the first octonary of the *anuṣṭubh* stanza⁴. Wackernagel (1957: 102) indirectly confirms this *en passant*. He notes that in *Ṛg Veda* 10.86.8b the form *prthuṣṭo* is used rather than *prthuṣṭuke*. This is a feminine vocative case of the *bahuvrīhi* compound mentioned here below.

prthuṣṭuka- “with a large lock of hair”

[*prthú-* “large” + *stúkā-* “curl”, “braid”, “lock” (f.)]

2.32.6a (*prthuṣṭuke*).

In *prthuṣṭuke* the final *-ke* is motivated by the lexematic form of the second term of the compound. Despite this, *-ka-* has been interpreted as a suffix, and not as an integral part of the lexeme, thus being eliminated.

A second suffix that Wackernagel (1957: 121) defines as pleonastic is *-in*, which is only scarcely attested. One example is *mahāhastin*, which means

⁴ One of the unknown reviewers disputes my translation of *tryāmbaka-*. In his opinion, this compound should not be rendered as “three-mothered”. It “should” mean “three-eyed” instead – hence *-ambaka-* would not be constituted by *amba-* “mother” + the suffix *-ka-* but would simply correspond to the noun *ambaka-* “an eye”. Should *tryāmbaka-* be understood as “three-eyed”, this compound would be right for Rudra. This god was in fact to be replaced by Śiva, who was thought to be endowed with three eyes.

Although the reviewer does not say it explicitly, he surely refers to the entry *अम्बक* *ambaka* of Monier-Williams’s dictionary where «(cf. *try-ambaka*)» can be read. Pace the unknown reviewer, the fact remains that this is how this epithet is generally and authoritatively interpreted in its sole occurrence in the *Ṛg Veda*. The translation that Grassmann gives of it in his dictionary of the *Ṛg Veda* corresponds to mine. Furthermore, according to Geldner’s comments on *ṚV* 4.3.1 and 5.3.3, Rudra can be perfectly well identified with Agni, who is notoriously *trimātár-* “three-mothered”. Additionally, for his part, Bargaigue (1963: 36) agrees with Geldner when he affirms that the epithet *tryāmbaka-* undoubtedly includes both Rudra and Agni. Furthermore, under the entry *त्र्य try* in Monier-Williams’s dictionary *tryambaka* is also registered and this word is said to have probably meant “three-mothered” originally. This is also what MACDONELL (2000: 74) asserts when he writes that the meaning of *tryāmbaka-* appears to be “he who has three mothers” in allusion to the threefold division of the universe. In the light of what precedes, then the idea is quite far from odd that *tryāmbaka-* “three-mothered”, once used to describe Rudra, could be identified with, i.e. re-interpreted as, the homophonous epithet meaning “three-eyed” and qualifying Śiva, when the latter god substituted the former.

“with large hands”. What is particular about this suffix is that there are various cases of compounds with *mahā-* as a first term or with *hasta-* as a second which are constructed without it.

mahāgayā- “with a large house”

[*mahā*, *mahant*, *māhas-* “great”, “large” + *gāya-* “house”, “home” (m.)]
9.66.20c (*mahāgayām*).

mahāpadā- “with (i.e. taking) big steps”

[*pād-* “step”, “foot” (m.) + *-a*]
10.73.2c (*mahāpadēna*).

mahāmanas- “with a great mind, having a great soul”, name of a king (m.)

[*mānas-* “mind”, “thought” (n.)]
10.103.9c (*mahāmanasām*).

mahāmahivrata- “using or governing with great power”

[*vrāta-* “order”, “command”, “law”, “reign”, “obedience” (n.)]
9.48.2b (*mahāmahivratam*).

mahāvadha- “having a great weapon”

[*vadhā-* “killer”, “assassin”, “lethal weapon” (m.)]
5.34.2c (*mahāvadhāḥ*), 5.83.2b (*mahāvadhāt*).

mahāvasu- “possessing great goods”

[*vāsu-* “goods”, “wealth” (n.)]
7.82.2b (*mahāvasū*).

mahāvrāta- “having / leading a great rank”

[*vrāta-* “rank” (m.)]
3.30.3b (*mahāvrātah*).

mahāsena- “with great arrows”

[*sēnā-* “arrow” (f.)]
7.34.19b (*mahāsenāsah*).

ākraivihasta- “without bloody hands”

[*a-* privative or negative prefix, + *kravis-* originally “coagulated blood”, then “raw flesh” (n.) + *hāsta-* “hand” (m.)]
5.62.6a (*ākraivhastā*).

iṣuhasta- “with an arrow in one’s hand”

[*iṣu-* “arrow” (f.)]
10.103.2d (*iṣuhastena*); 10.103.3a (*iṣuhastaiḥ*).

uttānāhasta- “with open hands”

[*uttānā-* “stretched out”, “spread out”, “lying on the back”, “concave”]
6.16.46d, 6.63.3c (*uttānāhastah*); 3.14.5b, 10.79.2d (*uttānāhastāḥ*).

khādihasta- “with hands that are donned with bracelets and rings”

[*khādī-* “rings”, “brooch” (m.)]
5.58.2a (*khādihastam*).

grāvahasta- “having the stones of the soma in one’s hand”

[*grāvan-* “soma pressing stone” (m.)]

1.15.7b (*grāvahastāsaḥ*).

ghṛtāhasta- “with butter in one’s hand”

[*ghṛtā-* “(clarified) butter” (n.)]

7.16.8a (*ghṛtāhastā*).

niktāhasta- “with clean hands”

[*niktā-* “clean”, perfect passive participle from *nij* “to wash oneself”]

4.45.5c (*niktāhastāḥ*).

bhadrahasta- “with a lucky hand”

[*bhadrá-* “good”, “lucky”, “brilliant”, “splendid”, “favorable”]

1.109.4c (*bhadrahastā*).

vājrahasta- “with a thunderbolt in one’s hand”

[*vājra-* “thunderbolt of Indra” (m.)]

1.173.10b, 2.12.13d, 2.19.2a, 6.29.1c, 7.21.4d, 8.2.31b (*vājrahaṣṭāḥ*);
8.24.24b (*vājrahasta*); 3.32.3c, 5.33.3c, 6.17.1c, 6.46.2a and 5c, 7.19.5a,
7.32.4c, 8.90.4c (*vajrahasta*); 6.22.5a, 7.32.3a (*vājrahaṣṭam*);
1.109.8a (*vajrahaṣṭā*); 8.7.32a (*vājrahaṣṭaiḥ*).

vidyúddhasta- “with a light in one’s hand”

[*vidyút-* “which lights”, “lighting” (f.)]

8.7.25a (*vidyúddhaṣṭāḥ*).

hīraṇyahasta- “with golden hands”

[*hīraṇya-* “gold” (n.), “golden”]

1.35.10a (*hīraṇyahastāḥ*); 1.116.13d, 1.117.24a (*hīraṇyahastam*).

Other cases with the suffix *-in* are *śatagvín-*, “with a hundred cows”, “hundred-fold”, and *sūyavasín-* meaning “full of grass”, “full of meadows”. As for the former, **śatagva-* is not found, but is plausible if compared to formations such as the following⁵:

atithigvá- “whose guests are something like herds of cattle”, name of a mythical hero tied to Indra (m.)

[*átithi-* “guest” (m.) + *gu-*, weak *ablaut* form alternating with *gó-* “bull”, “cow”

(m. or f.), + *-a*]

⁵ The translation I am proposing of the compounds ending in *gva-* suggests that cattle might have indicated quantities of units. This translation is based on Bloomfield’s etymological hypothesis quoted and approved by WACKERNAGEL (1957: 109). Grassmann expresses a different opinion in the specific entries in his dictionary. J.L. García Ramón (personally communicated to me) agrees with him. Should their opinion be accepted, the compounds having *gva-* as a second member could not be counted as *bahuvrīhis*.

1.53.10c, 1.112.14a, 4.26.3d, 6.18.13b, 8.53.2a, 10.48.8a (*atithigvám*);
 1.51.6b, 1.130.7d, 6.26.3d, 7.19.8d (*atithigvāya*);
 1.53.8b, 2.14.7c, 6.47.22c (*atithigvāsyā*).

nāvagva- “made of nine, counting nine” name of a mythical group (m.)

[*nāva*: “nine”]

9.108.4a, 10.62.6c (*nāvagvah*); 4.51.4c (*nāvagve*); 1.33.6b, 5.45.7b, 5.45.11b,
 6.6.3c, 6.22.2a, 10.14.6a, 10.61.10a, 10.108.8b (*nāvagvāḥ*);
 5.29.12a (*nāvagvāsaḥ*); 1.62.4b, 3.39.5a (*nāvagvaiḥ*).

In any case, my hypothesis is confirmed by the couple given here below.

dāśagva- name of an *āṅgira* (m.)

[*dāśan* “ten”]

4.51.4c (*dāśagve*); 8.12.2a (*dāśagvam*); 10.62.6c (*dāśagvah*);
 2.34.12a (*dāśagvāḥ*); 5.29.12b (*dāśagvāsaḥ*); 1.62.4d, 3.39.5c (*dāśagvaiḥ*).

daśagvín- “made of ten”, “tenfold”

8.1.9a (*daśagvínah*)⁶.

As for *sūyavasín*-, only one form of its paradigm occurs in the *Ṛg Veda* next to five different forms of the paradigm of *sūyávasa*- used as a noun in *Ṛg Veda* 7.18.4, in 1.42.8 and in 6.28.7, and simply as an adjective in 1.190.6 and in 2.27.13.

The distribution of these attested formations might be explained in these terms.

The singular accusative *śatagvínam* is attested in four different places. In 9.67.6, the first verse of the stanza is the same as the first verse of the stanza in 9.65.17. In these cases, should **śatagvam* be substituted for *śatagvínam*, a syllable would essentially be lost, ruining the *gayatri* meter of the hymn in 4.49.4, 9.65.17, and 9.67.6 and the *jagatī* meter in 1.159.5.

I think that the hypothesis I advance is confirmed by 7.99.3a-b, where there is *sūyavasínī*, the nominal dual feminine form of *sūyavasín*-. This is the only occurrence with this word formation which statistically seems overpowered by the other, that is *sūyavasa*-.

irāvaṭī dhenumātī hí bhūtām
sūyavasínī mānuṣe daśasyā

“Yes! May you (sky and earth) be full-of-food, filled-with-milk,
 with-a-good-meadow for Manu”.

⁶ Here the same reviewer whom I mentioned in fn. 4, observes that *dāśagva*- and *daśagvín*- cannot be connected with one another, since the former is a proper name and the latter an adjective. For my part, I would reply that adjectives can be used as the proper names of those whom they describe – and this is what commonly happens in Indo-European languages.

Here also, substituting *sūyavase*, a form of the paradigm for *sūyavasa-*, for *sūyavasīnī*, there would be a syllable less in the calculation of the *triṣṭubh* meter. Here it is worth noting that the other type, *sūyavasa-*, is not only attested as an adjective in 2.27.13a-b, which is in the older part of the *Ṛg Veda*, but is also found in 1.190.6a-b, which is much newer.

śúcīr apāḥ sūyāvasā ádabdhāḥ
úpa kṣeti vṛddhāvayāḥ suvīrah

“The Shining lives, undeceived, in the waters sided by full meadows,
with blooming vigour, with excellent offspring”.

supraítuḥ sūyāvaso ná pánthāḥ
durniyántuḥ páripṛito ná mitráḥ

“Easy-to-cross like paths with-beautiful-meadows,
difficult-to-hold-back like a fondled friend”.

The same goes for the evidence of *sūyavasa-* used as a noun: there are two of them in the more ancient stanzas (6.28.7a-b and 7.18.4a-b) and one among the more recent (1.42.8a-b-c).

prajāvatīḥ sūyāvasaṃ riśántīḥ
śuddhā apāḥ suprapāṇé píbantīḥ

“(You [Indra’s cows] are) rich in offspring, grazing a grass-filled meadow,
drinking pure water from a good drinking place”.

dhenúṃ ná tvā sūyāvase dúdukṣann
úpa bráhmāṇi sasṛje vásiṣṭhah

“Wishing to milk you, bountiful of milk in a grass-filled meadow,
Vasiṣṭha has freed his enchanting words”.

abhí sūyāvasaṃ naya
ná navajvāro ádhvane
pūṣann ihá krátuṃ vidadḥ

“Guide towards the beautiful meadow, you, without a new disturbance,
to the path, O Puṣan, find here a solution”.

The choice of the suffix *-in-* might therefore depend on metrical considerations. In the language of the *Ṛg Veda*, the *-in-* suffix used to form *bahuvrīhis* was certainly employed as a ‘useful’ alternative to *-a-*. It would then have been diffused during the later period, but this does not mean that it could not have been used previously for metric reasons. This is the case of the only attested form of the paradigm of *mahāhastín-* in 8.81.1a-b-c.

*ā tū na indra kṣumāntaṃ,
citṛaṃ grābhāṃ sām grbhāya
mahāhasṭī dākṣiṇena*

“Oh! But, Indra, a handful abounding-in-food (and) splendid, let us grab,
you large-handed, with (our) right (hand)”.

First of all, since there is one confirmed piece of evidence, the existence, albeit remote, of the latent formation of **mahāhasta-* cannot be excluded. In any case if **mahāhasto* were substituted for *mahāhasṭī*, nothing would change in the verse from a metric point of view, except perhaps the contiguity of the accents of the two words.

The hypotheses that I am presenting may agree with those proposed by Agnes Korn (2000), who analyzed those *bahuvrīhis* in the *Ṛg Veda* which can present the suffix *-ya-* with the effect that *suhāsta-* “with beautiful hands”, has for example the same meaning as *suhāstya-*, the former being substituted with the latter for metrical reasons. This same alternation is in *hiraṇyakeśya-* “with a golden mane, with golden hair”, *viśvādevya-* “concerning all the gods”, *sumitrya-* “having good friends”, *viśvāvārya-* “provided with all goods”, “propitious”. The only attested forms with *-ya-*, however, are *dirghajihvyā-* “with a long tongue”, *supitrya-* “having excellent parents”, *mayūraśepya-* “having the tail of a peacock”, and *mādhuhastya-* “with sweetness or honey in one’s hand”⁷. For the latter as for the former, an analogous reasoning to mine is plausible. In Korn’s opinion, the formations in *-ya-* are one syllable longer than those in *-a-*. Reasons relating to the constraints of the meter might have caused the poets to choose the former or the latter each time. Lubotsky (2004) criticizes Korn’s work in many respects. Interestingly enough, however, he does think that the Vedic poets did not really stretch the lines or formulas, but rather used the parallelism of *-a-* and *-ya-* suffixes with the purpose of creating nonce-forms which were longer by one syllable.

A group of *bahuvrīhi* compounds is formed with a noun in *-ā* as a second member. Their derivation is only apparently more problematic. The conversion is only for the feminine gender. For the masculine and the neuter it is useful to think of a formula such as the following.

$$(5) \quad []_x []_y \text{!noun} \rightarrow [[]_x []_y \text{!noun} + a \text{ suffix}]_z \text{adjective}$$

⁷ A pair of items taken into account by Korn, viz. *suvidatṛiya-* “benevolent, propitious” and *amitṛiya-* “unfriendly”, are a bit more problematic from the perspective of those who think that a *bahuvrīhi* compound may be counted as such if, and only if, both its members are also found as separate words and its second member is definitely a noun. In point of fact **vidatra*, which can be derived from *suvidatṛiya-*, is not found as a single word while *mitṛiya-* of *amitṛiya-* does exist as a separate word but is an adjective.

As can be seen, derivation (5) involves the suffixation of the stem with *-a-*, thus forming an adjective. In it, the second member of the compound undergoes a vowel cancellation according to (6):

(6) $-ā \rightarrow \emptyset / \text{---} + a$

As (6) establishes, long *-ā-* is cancelled when the suffix *-a-* is adjoined in these few cases that I have chosen from many dozens.

citradīśika- “looking brilliant”

[*citrā-* “brilliant”, “bright”, “clear”, “bright coloured” + *dīśikā-* “look”, “appearance” (f.) + *-a*]
6.47.5a (*citradīśikam*).

ṛtājya- “with a tight string”

[*ṛtā-* “proper”, “right”, “apt”, “truth”, “righteousness” (n.) + *jyā-* “bow string” (f.) + *-a*]
2.24.8a (*ṛtājyena*).

dvidhāra- “forming two streams”

[*dvi* = *dvā* “two” + *dhārā-* “stream” (f.) + *-a*]
10.30.10a (*dvidhārāḥ*).

nirmāya- “powerless, weak”

[*nīs* “away from”, “out of” + *māyā-* “art”, “extraordinary or supernatural power” (f.) + *-a*]
10.124.5a (*nirmāyāḥ*).

Another set of items is to be considered now.

atirātrā- “lasting past the night”

[*āti* “over”, “beyond” + *rātrī-* “night” (f.) + *-a*]
7.103.7a (*atirātrē*).

apiśarvarā- “next to the night”

[*āpi* “at”, “in”, “near” + *śarvarī-* “star-spangled night” (f.) + *-a*]
3.9.7d, 8.1.29c (*apiśarvarē*).

aprasāstā- or *āprasāsta-* “not worthy of praise, without fame”

[*a-*, privative or negative prefix, + *prāsasti-* “praise”, “laudation”, “glory” (f.) + *-a*]
1.167.8b (*āprasāstān*); 2.41.16c, 4.28.4b (*aprasāstāḥ*).

kavāsakhā- “with poor companions, selfish”

[*kavā* = *kava* “poor” + *sākhi* “companion”, “friend” (m. or f.) + *-a*]
5.34.3d (*kavāsakhāḥ*).

puruprasāstā- “having abundant praise”

[*purū-* “much”, “abundant” + *prāsasti-* “praise”, “laudation”, “glory” (f.) + *-a*]
1.73.2c, 6.34.2b, 8.103.12b (*puruprasāstāḥ*); 8.12.14c, 8.71.10d (*puruprasāstām*);
10.66.7b (*puruprasāstā*).

When they are taken into account, rule (6) can be rewritten as in (7).

$$(7) \quad V \rightarrow \emptyset / \text{---} + a \quad (V = -\bar{a}, -\bar{i}, -i)$$

Long $-\bar{a}$ - and long or short $-\bar{i}$ - became \emptyset when $-a$ - was suffixed to the stem. It seems, then, that when the second member of the compound was feminine, it took up the thematic vowel a which was used to form masculine adjectives. The only case which seems not to fit this scheme is *suhārda*-. Wackernagel (1957: 101) believes that the second member $-hārda$ derives from a hypothetical $*hārda$ -⁸ not attested as an independent word. This hypothesis is not unlikely, but this theory is based on many assumptions like all those that need to refer to unattested forms. Furthermore it is not implausible to think that even the neutral *hārdi*-, like the previous feminine forms, could have taken the $-a$ stem of the masculine gender. See the examples I have already given above.

There are a few other cases in which the second member of the compound, made of a noun in $-a$, is subject to a rule of suffixation of the theme in $-i$ -. It is difficult to say if it is possible to determine a particular semantic value of the suffixed $-i$ -. According to Wackernagel (1957: 105), the suffix $-i$ of the second member of the *bahuvrīhis* was Indo-European. He cites Av. *avimiθri* “enemy of Indra”, *dawramaēši* “having few sheep”, Gr. *ἄνελκς* “weak”, “pacific”, *ἀμισθί* “without payment”, Lat. *trilinguis* “who speaks/has three tongues”, *semianimis* “half alive”, “dying”, *inermis* “without arms”, “unwarlike”, *cognominis* “with the same name”. However present, the suffix is surely not particularly significant in the *Ṛg Veda*. Besides *durgbhi*-, which is uncertain, the examples here presented are more or less equally distributed in the more ancient and more recent books of the collection of hymns. It is possible, however, to make some considerations. Examining *Ṛg Veda* 10.146.6 and considering that there is the possibility of *bahuvrīhis* with $-gandha$ instead of $-gandhi$ as a second member as in the case of *pūnyagandha*- in 7.55.8c “good-smelling”, it is clear that the near-rhyme effect (homeoteleuton) in *āñjanagandhiṃ surabhīm* as opposed to that in *bahvannām ākṛṣīvalām* would have inhibited the formation of $*āñjanagandha$ -, which would have given $*āñjanagandhaṃ surabhīm$, creating a less appreciable effect.

āñjanagandhiṃ surabhīm
bahvannām ākṛṣīvalām
prāhām mṛgāñām mātāram
araṇyānīm aśaṃsiṣam

“Smelling of ointment, perfumed, bountiful of food, not having to plough,
 this mother of the forest’s wild animals, Araṇyāni, I have praised”.

⁸ This form could derive from IE. $*kērd$ -.

In 1.162.15a-b the use of *dhūmāgandhir* instead of *dhumāgandho* allows a sort of ‘rhymed’ echo to *tvāgnir*, including the noun *agniḥ*, which agrees with *dhūmāgandhir*.

mā tvāgnir dhvanayīd dhūmāgandhir
mókhā bhrājanty abhī vikta jāghriḥ

“the fire which perfumes with smoke must not hide you,
 the burning cauldron must not turn over spraying”.

It is also worth noting that in both these last instances one of the two words endings of the ‘rhymed’ couples is stressed. So, *āñjanagandhiṃ surabhīm* and respectively *bahvannām ākṛṣīvalām* follow each other in 10.146.6, and *tvāgnir* is separated from *dhūmāgandhir* by *dhvanayīd* in 1.162.15. Moreover, in *bahvannām ākṛṣīvalām* and *tvāgnir ... dhūmāgandhir* the first word of each couple receives the stress on the last syllable, whereas in *āñjanagandhiṃ surabhīm* it is the second word that has a stressed ending.

The same near-rhyme effect between two words divided by a third, as in 1.162.15, is evident in 1.58.4a-b.

vī vātajūto atasésu tiṣṭhate,
vṛthā juhūbhiḥ sṇyā tuviśvánīḥ

“wind-driven (he) is spreading himself in the shrubs,
 at pleasure with (his) tongues (like) with a sickle”.

Here, however, *tuviśvánīḥ* certainly does not agree with *juhūbhiḥ*, while *sṇyā* has the same ending as *vṛthā*, which precedes *juhūbhiḥ*. Furthermore the crosswise placement of the stresses in *āñjanagandhiṃ surabhīm* and *bahvannām ākṛṣīvalām* of 10.146.6 pairs up with the diagonal arrangement of the two couples of words agreeing with one another, *vṛthā sṇyā* and *juhūbhiḥ tuviśvánīḥ* respectively.

Honestly, there are also cases which have not given me the same results, for example 2.17.6 and 5.56.7, which belong to the more ancient section of the *R̥g Veda*. It is likely that the suffix, which Wackernagel has clearly stated belonged to Ancient Indo-European, was gradually losing ground⁹.

⁹ Once again the unknown reviewer to whom I already referred twice argues that my suggestion is founded on the proposition that *-i-* formations are a sign of ancientness – which would be a *petitio principii*. Here suffice it to say that it is a matter of common knowledge that the thematic inflection is more recent than the athematic. This point is expounded in RENO (1952 : 102) more clearly than elsewhere. And now I should like to make a final remark about that which I would describe as my unknown reviewer’s main criticism. He repeatedly insists on claiming that the data that are accounted for in

Furthermore, in 10.1.5 *prátyardhi-* “to whom the half belongs”, “equalized”, is the first of the accusatives in agreement with *agním*, in addition to the previous ones in *-am* in agreement with *hótāram*.

hótāraṃ citrāratham adhvarásya
yajñásya-yajñasya ketúm rúsantam
prátyardhiṃ devásya-devasya mahnā
śrīyā tv āgním átithiṃ jánānām

“Hotṛ, splendid chariot of sacred service, luminous banner of every sacrifice,
 equalized to a god for your grandeur, for your splendour, you,
 Agni, are guest of the people”.

To finish, equally interesting is 5.52.10a-b in which the sequence of plural nominatives referred to the Marut appear (*āpathayo vípathayaḥ ántaspathā ánuopathāḥ*).

āpathayo vípathayaḥ
ántaspathā ánuopathāḥ

“(like) those-who-are-on-the-path, those-who-walk-on-the-border-of-the-path,
 those-who-are-in-the-middle-of-the-path, those-who-are-along-the-path”.

The first couple of these adjectives make up the first octosyllabic verse of the *anuṣṭubh* stanza, and the last two constitute the second verse. The former is represented by forms of the paradigm of *āpathi-* and *vípathi-* respectively, with *-pathi-* as a second member, and the latter by *ántaspatha-* and *ánupatha-*, with *-patha-* as a second member. My conclusions are that the suffix *-i-* of the mother language continued to lose ground gradually, as can be noted especially through this example. Indeed, the *bahuvrīhi* adjectives formed with it were necessarily used so as to reach the required number of syllables to fulfil the meter, which would not have been possible with the usage of **āpatha* and **vípatha*.

If my research proves to be right, then the usage of *-i-* suffixed forms in the recent *Ṛg Veda* hymns, in addition to when they are used for the reasons I have described before, could be considered an archaizing feature used to heighten the register so as to attain a more sacral language.

this paper are too scanty to draw any conclusion. I reply for my part that maybe the data are not large in amount, but they are indeed all that are available. I worked on the construction of my hypothesis starting from what I had collected thanks to a close scrutiny of the entire *corpus* of the hymns of the *Ṛg Veda*.

References

- AUFRECHT, T. (1968), *Die Hymnen des Rigveda*, 2 Teile, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- BERGAIGNE, A. (1963), *La religion védique d'après les hymnes du Rig-Veda*, Champion, Paris.
- GELDNER, K.F. (2003), *Der Rig Veda: aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt und mit einem laufenden Kommentar versehen*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge [first edition Geoffrey Cumberlege Oxford University Press, London; Otto Harrassowitz, Leipzig, 1951].
- GRASSMANN, H. 1999⁷, *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited, Delhi.
- KORN, A. (1998), *Metrik und metrische Techniken im Rgveda. Streckformen in Trimeter-Versen*, Leykam, Graz.
- LUBOTSKY, A. M. (1997), *A Rigvedic Word Concordance*, I-II, American Oriental Society, New Haven.
- LUBOTSKY, A. M. (2004), *Rez. zu Korn, Agnes (1998), Metrik und metrische Techniken im Rgveda. Streckformen in Trimeter-Versen*, Leykam Verlag, in «Kratylos», 49, pp. 177-181.
- MACDONELL, A.A. (2000), *Vedic Grammar*, Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, New Delhi [first edition Trübner, Strassburg, 1910].
- MACDONELL, A.A. (2002), *Vedic Mythology*, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited, Delhi [first edition Strassburg, 1898].
- MARCHAND, H. (1969), *The Categories and Types of Present Day English Word Formation*, Beck, München.
- MELAZZO, L. and MELAZZO, R. (in print), *A proposito della collocazione dell'accento su certi composti del tipo bahuvrihi in vedico e in greco antico*, in *Atti del VII Incontro Internazionale di Linguistica Greca: la morfologia del greco tra tipologia e diacronia*, Cagliari 13-15 settembre 2007, Franco Angeli, Milano.
- MELAZZO, R. (2008), *I bahuvrihi nel Rg Veda. Alcuni problemi con proposte di soluzione*, PhD Diss. University of Macerata.
- MONIER-WILLIAMS, M. (1995), *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, Delhi, Private Limited [repr. I ed. Oxford 1899].
- RENOU, L. (1952), *Grammaire de la langue védique*, IAC, Lyon.
- WACKERNAGEL, J. and DEBRUNNER, A. (1957), *Altindische Grammatik*, II.1, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen.