Máté Ittzés*

Action nouns in Vedic support-verb constructions with *kṛ*

Abstract: Action nouns can be formed from verbal roots in Vedic Old Indo-Aryan following various derivational patterns. The question is whether, and to what extent, such nouns, if derived from the same underlying root, can be considered equivalent or synonymous. It has been argued by several scholars that deverbal *-ti*-stem and *-tu*-stem action nouns were functionally-semantically different in Proto-Indo-European and ancient Indo-European languages such as Greek, Latin and the Indo-Iranian languages basically preserved this distinction. In this context, Benveniste pointed out that support-verb constructions in Ancient Greek, as a rule, involved -σι-stems (< *-ti-*) as nominal hosts and not -τυ-stems (< *-tu-*). The present paper shows that the same distribution of the two types of action nouns can be observed in the support-verb constructions of Early Vedic as well, a fact that nicely corroborates the assumption of their fundamental functional-semantic difference. It may be expected that further research will be able to reveal similar distinctions between other types of action nouns on the basis of analogous distributional patterns.

Keywords: Vedic language; action noun; support-verb construction; allomorphy

---

*Corresponding author: Máté Ittzés, Department of Indian Studies, Eötvös Loránd University, Múzeum krt. 6–8/A, H-1088, Budapest, Hungary, E-mail: ittzes.mate@btk.elte.hu. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0061-6361

1 Introduction: suffixal allomorphy in the action nouns of Vedic[1]

It is well known that so-called action nouns[2] can be derived from verbal roots in Vedic[3] Old Indo-Aryan in various ways, e.g. by means of suffixes such as *-ti-* (e.g. *sthā* 'to stand' → *sthíti-* 'standing'), *-ana-* (e.g. *dṛś* 'to see' → *dárśana-* 'seeing'), *-a-* (e.g. *bhuj* 'to enjoy' → *bhóga-* 'enjoyment') or *-as-* (e.g. *av*[i] 'to favour, to help' → *ávas-* 'favour'), to name a few. The question is whether, and to what extent, such nouns, if derived from the same underlying root, can be considered equivalent or synonymous.

Theoretically it could be the case that the differences in derivation are conditioned by phonological or, to be more precise, phonotactic constraints, in the sense that some root structures might be compatible only with certain derivational suffixes. We might imagine restrictions such as that roots ending in coronals are permitted to form action nouns only by means of suffixes beginning with dental plosives, for instance. That would be a case that is similar to the synchronic distribution of the synonymous suffixes *-mat-* and *-vat-* ('provided with') in Early Vedic, of which *-mat-* is restricted first of all to stems ending in *-u-*, *-ū-* and *-uṣ-* as well as to *gó-* 'cow' (i.e. stems that originally ended in *u, *ṷ or *uš in Proto-Indo-Iranian):[4] see, e.g., *vā́javat-* 'accompanied by victory prizes' versus *gómat-* (< Proto-Indo-Iranian **gaṷ-mat-*; cf. Avestan *gaomant-*) 'accompanied by/rich in cattle'.[5]

---

2 For the time being, I am using the general term "action noun" for all kinds of deverbal nouns that express verbal predicative notions (i.e. types of eventualities) in an abstract way in a nominalised form. I am going to return to this concept in more detail later in my paper.
3 I am using this expression referring first of all to Early Vedic, i.e. the language of the Rigveda. In the periodisation of Vedic I follow Kümmel (2000: 5–6; based mainly on Witzel 1989).
4 However, already Early Vedic shows undeniable evidence for an analogical extension of the suffix variant *-mat-* outside its original domain (e.g. in *-ṛ*-stems, *-iṣ*-stems, etc.). On the two suffixes and their distribution see the exhaustive survey by Wackernagel and Debrunner 1954: 871–894.
5 There is, of course, a crucial difference between the two patterns. The action noun suffixes mentioned above are obviously etymologically unrelated, while the suffixes *-mat-* and *-vat-* have a common origin. To be more precise, the variant *-vat-* < Proto-Indo-Iranian **-ṷat-* was inherited from Proto-Indo-European (**-ṷent-*; cf. Gk. -ϝεντ-) and was dissimilated to **-mat-* in Proto-Indo-Iranian following stems in **u, *ṷ* and *uš (cf. Wackernagel and Debrunner 1954: 880).

However, it is well known that various types of action nouns can be derived from one and the same verbal root. To mention just one example, the -*ana*-stem *dárśana*- (RV 1.116.23c) and the root noun *dṛ́ś*- (RV 5.52.12d) are both derivatives of the root *dṛś* 'to see' in Early Vedic and yet another derivative is added to them later in Middle Vedic (*dṛ́ṣṭi*- Br+).[6] This fact indicates that the use of the suffixes does not depend on the phonological properties of the root itself. It follows that, from a synchronic point of view, either 1. the suffixes under investigation are functionally equivalent (i.e. mere allomorphs) and the derivatives entirely synonymous, or 2. the suffixes are in some way functionally different (i.e. the derivatives "do not mean exactly the same"), and this difference may and should be demonstrated by carefully analysing the contexts in which the various derivatives occur.

In the allomorphy scenario, it may of course be partly due to chance that some suffixes only occur with specific roots, but diachronic factors related to productivity may determine their synchronic coexistence and distribution too (cf. Irslinger 2009; Panagl 1982). As is well known, derivational suffixes in general often tend to become less productive or entirely non-productive in the course of time and gradually give way to new formatives (on this process see e.g. the overview of Wachter 1997: 7–14). Among action nouns, root formations surely belong to an older stratum than -*ana*-stems, for instance (cf. Panagl 1982: 229–230, following Schindler 1972, on the rapidly decreasing productivity of root nouns in the function of action nouns in Old Indo-Aryan after the period of the Rigveda).

The second situation mentioned above would be similar to the much discussed problem of the two types of Vedic agent nouns in -*tar*-. As shown by various authors, these deverbal nouns differ synchronically in Vedic not only in formal terms (i.e. as regards their accentual properties and syntactic behaviour),[7] but also from a functional-semantic point of view. According to Tichy,[8] root-accented agent nouns express "general" agentivity, while the suffix-accented type is "situative". Other authors define the difference otherwise, but most of them agree that the two types can be distinguished in functional-semantic terms.[9]

---

6 Cf. Mayrhofer (1992–2001: I, 705). See also the hapax legomenon (RV 6.3.3a) *dṛśatí*- 'look, appearance', but this is not an action noun in the strict sense.

7 One of the two types is root-accented, the other one suffix-accented (e.g. 'giver': *dā́tar*- vs. *dātár*-), otherwise their inflection is the same in Vedic. Agent nouns of the former type regularly govern an accusative object, while the latter usually have an objective genitive modifier. See, e.g., Tichy (1995: 19–20, 47–61 [on accent and inflection], 82–84 [on syntax]).

8 Tichy (1995: 376–379 and passim). See also Tichy's (2004: 80) succinct characterisation of the PIE bases of two types.

9 Beside Tichy's influential monograph (Tichy 1995) see the treatments by Keydana (2023); Kim (2005); Kiparsky (2016); Lowe (2017: 97–108); Lühr (2021); etc.

2 Deverbal nouns with suffix *-ti- versus *-tu- in Indo-European languages

An important attempt to specify the semantic properties of the various types of action nouns and the particular functions of their derivational suffixes was made by Benveniste (1948), who offered a thorough survey of the usage of the deverbal action nouns derived by means of the suffixes *-ti- and *-tu- and their descendants in Greek, Latin, and Indo-Iranian (to a lesser extent also Gothic and Celtic). Benveniste (1948: 112) drew the conclusion that action nouns derived by means of suffix *-ti- indicate the action "objectively", i.e. being realised outside the subject as a finished accomplishment without continuity. By contrast, nouns in *-tu- denote the action as "subjective", i.e. emanating from the subject's predestination or internal disposition.[10]

Benveniste's theory has been criticised from various aspects. Firstly, it has been pointed out (e.g. Shipp 1968: 30; cf. Risch 1974: 38–41) that the use of the derivational suffixes -σι- (< *-ti-) versus -τυ- (< *-tu-) by Homer depends on the primary or secondary (first of all, denominative) character of the underlying verb, respectively, rather than on the semantic factors claimed by Benveniste. Another difference of the two types in Greek is that the suffix -σι- forms both simple and compound nouns, while -τυ- only simple ones (e.g. Risch 1974: 39–40; Shipp 1968: 30; cf. also Lazzeroni 1997: 75, 76; a similar behaviour of the related suffixes with regard to composition can be observed in other languages too).

Nouns in -σι- have also been argued to be nominalisations of inherently momentaneous processes, while those in -τυ- of duratives (e.g. Chantraine 1964). Finally, Lazzeroni (1997) made a remarkable case in a broader Indo-European context for interpreting *-ti- in its prototypical manifestation as the sign of transitive nominalisation and *-tu- as the sign of intransitive nominalisation and taking the objective-subjective values merely as epiphenomena of the basic opposition related to transitivity (cf. Schmitt 2015 [2016]: 188). While these objections do not completely refute that different action noun suffixes may have different semantic properties (for possible concepts and criteria together with examples cf. Irslinger 2009: 228), they clearly reveal that the objective-subjective distinction claimed by Benveniste cannot be maintained in its original formulation (cf. also Keydana 2013: 248–249).

---

10 Cf. Rix (1979: 736), according to whom the specific meaning of *-tu- is "potentieller Sachverhalt (Möglichkeit, Fähigkeit, Lust zu…" [potential state of affairs (possibility, ability, desire for)]. Note also that Benveniste treats the agent noun suffixes along the same lines, and connects the agent noun suffix *-tor- to the action noun suffix *-ti- and *-ter- to *-tu- (Benveniste 1948: 112).

Seiler (1986) also investigated the same two types of action nouns (*-ti- and *-tu-stems), building to some extent upon the observations of Benveniste, but modifying them in accordance with his own theory of the "linguistic apprehension" of objects. Seiler starts off by pointing out that a predicative notion can be abstracted by means of nominalisation in various ways, depending on to what extent the arguments of the underlying predicate are presented. If all the arguments surface beside the verbal abstract, the strategy is maximally individualising, if none of the slots of the arguments are filled, the strategy is maximally generalising. All strategies are instances of the technique called "Abstraktion" [abstraction], but differ in the degree of generalising/individualising, which is a gradual property that can be represented on a continuum. Seiler also points out that in the absence of explicit arguments, the nominalised predicate often refers to one of the arguments and not to the event itself (cf. e.g. Germ. *Darstellung* 'das, was dargestellt ist' [illustration; the thing which is illustrated]; *Wohnung* 'das, wo man wohnt' [dwelling; the place where one dwells]; see also Eng. *the building of the house by the workers* vs. *building* 'what has been built'). Consider the examples of Seiler (1986: 63–64) involving the German verb *zerstören* 'to destroy' and its derivatives, among which (2a) is maximally individualising and (2c) maximally generalising:

(1)   *x zerstört y → die Zerstörung von y durch x* [x destroys y → the destruction of y by x]

(2)   a. *Die Zerstörung Karthagos durch die Römer hatte weitreichende Folgen.* [The destruction of Carthage by the Romans had far-reaching consequences.]
        b. *Die Zerstörung Karthagos hatte weitreichende Folgen.* [The destruction of Carthage had far-reaching consequences.]
        c. *Zerstörung ist eine Tätigkeit und zugleich ein Resultat.* [Destruction is both an activity and a result.]

Seiler argues that the abstract suffix *-ti- was used in Proto-Indo-European for deriving action nouns used in the individualising strategy (such as example [2a]), while *-tu- in the generalising one (such as example [2c] above). The latter is the reason why *-tu-stem deverbal nouns are, by way of "topicalisation" of various arguments, very often lexicalised as locatival nouns (*nomina loci*), result nouns (*nomina rei actae*) etc. rather than action nouns (*nomina actionis*) in the strict sense.[11]

Stüber's (2002: 217–244) approach to deverbal abstracts is similar to Seiler's. She reserves the term "Verbalabstrakt" [verbal abstract] for cases when the deverbal

---

11 This feature may point to their becoming non-productive earlier than *-ti-stems.

noun represents or recapitulates an entire sentence including the predicate as well as the arguments (in the sense of Porzig's [1942] concept "Name für Satzinhalt" [name for sentence content]) and speaks of action nouns if the deverbal noun abstracts the predicate of a sentence in itself. She concludes that Proto-Indo-European deverbal nouns in *-ti- were originally genuine *nomina actionis* in this sense, while those in *-tu- had the function of verbal abstracts and could also operate as *nomina rei actae*, *instrumenti* or *loci* by way of topicalisation.

3 Support-verb constructions with action nouns in *-ti-*

As regards the Greek suffixes -σι- (< *-ti-) and -τυ- (< *-tu-), Benveniste (1948: 82–83) points out that it is the deverbal nouns derived by means of -σι- (i.e. the "objective" suffix in his disputable theory) that regularly form periphrastic constructions with the "operative" verb ποιέω, which is the "verbe actualisateur par excellence" [the genuine actualising verb]. See the following examples mentioned by Benveniste (1948: 83):

(3) ὁ   δέ,   ὡς ἡμέρη   τάχιστα   ἐπέλαμψε,
     he:NOM PTCL as day:NOM most_quickly shine_forth:AOR.3SG
     ζήτησιν   **ἐποιέετο**   τῶν   νεῶν
     searching:ACC   make:IPF.MID.3SG DEF.ART.GEN.PL ship:GEN.PL
     'As soon as day broke, he made a search (cf. ζητέω 'to seek, search') of his ships.'
     (Herodotus 6.118)

(4) ἐπιτείνεσκε   δὲ   ἐπ' αὐτήν, ὅκως   μὲν
     stretch_over:FREQ.IPF.3SG PTCL on it:ACC   whenever PTCL
     ἡμέρη   γένοιτο,   ξύλα   τετράγωνα,
     day:NOM become:AOR.OPT.MID.3SG log:ACC.PL square:ACC.PL
     ἐπ' ὧν   **τὴν**   **διάβασιν**   **ἐποιεῦντο**
     on which:GEN.PL DEF.ART.ACC crossing:ACC make:IPF.MID.3PL
     οἱ   Βαβυλώνιοι
     DEF.ART.NOM.PL   Babylonian:NOM.PL
     'Each morning, she laid square-hewn logs across it, on which the Babylonians crossed (lit. made the crossing; cf. διαβαίνω 'to cross over').'
     (Herodotus 1.186)

The constructions which Benveniste refers to are prototypical examples of "support verb constructions" or "function verb constructions".[12] I define support-verb constructions (henceforth also abbreviated as SVC) as light-verb constructions of the N+V type,[13] i.e. consisting of a deverbal or predicative noun, the so-called nominal host (for the term cf. Mohanan 1997: 433), which embodies the lexical meaning of the expression and is the syntactic object argument of the verb, and a semantically reduced or bleached light verb, which conveys the grammatical information and virtually no lexical semantics (even if it may sometimes contribute semantic notions that go beyond the purely grammatical kind), filling together the predicate slot of the clause. The category of support-verb constructions itself is far from being homogeneous (cf. Kamber 2008: 21–28; Vincze 2008), but rather to be conceived as a continuum that ranges from constructions behaving more like free syntagms to those that have more in common with idiomatic expressions.

The delimitation of the categories is a controversial issue and there are many tests which are applied throughout the secondary literature. For the sake of simplicity, I am mentioning here two tests that regularly give grammatical results for support-verb constructions, but not for the other two neighbouring categories (cf. Vincze 2008: 288–294, who uses the term "semi-compositional constructions" for what we call SVCs): 1. the test of "variativity": Is it possible to replace the whole construction by a derivationally related simple verb?; 2. the test of the "omission of the verb": Is it possible to recover the meaning of the construction when the verb is omitted? Although according to Vincze the applicability of one of these tests alone is sufficient for a multi-word expression to qualify as a support-verb construction, prototypical items, of which the nominal host is a verbal action noun, pass both. Consider as a prototypical example the Old Indo-Aryan (Epic Sanskrit) phrase *praveśanaṃ cakre* MBh 2.4.1a 'entered (lit. made entering)', which is equivalent to the etymologically related simple verb form *praviveśa*, and the meaning of which can be

---

12 It seems that the SVCs in examples (3) and (4) are merely stylistic variants of the corresponding simple verbs (cf. Panagl 1982: 231 on the "nominal style" of Herodotus and Thucydides). See, however, below on the general question whether SVCs and corresponding simple verbs can be regarded as synonymous and equivalent or not.

13 The literature on support-verb constructions (and light-verb constructions in general) is vast, thus I will not attempt to give an overview of the history of research or an exhaustive survey of the current state of affairs. I only point out that, in my understanding (pace Mel'čuk 2022), SVCs form a subset of the category of light-verb constructions, which also includes various other constructions such as e.g. the V+V type (called "compound verb" in the South Asian context). For a first orientation on "the light verb jungle" see Butt (2010) beside many other influential papers of hers. Another question which I leave aside here is whether PP+V constructions should also be acknowledged as belonging to the category of SVCs or not (note that in the German tradition PP+V constructions such as *zur Aufführung bringen* [to bring to performance, to bring to stage] count as "Funktionsverbgefüge" in the same way as e.g. N+V *einen Vortrag halten* [to give a lecture]).

fully reconstructed if the verb is omitted (i.e. the construction is in fact about entering [*praveśana-*]).

In my opinion, the use of -σι- (< *-*ti*-) stems in Greek support-verb constructions observed by Benveniste can be explained by the fact that (as per Stüber's view mentioned above) such deverbal derivatives may have originally been nominalisations of verbal predicates without their arguments (i.e. *nomina actionis* in the narrow sense and not verbal abstracts comprising entire "Satzinhalte"), and this may have made them suitable for use in SVCs, in which the nominal host prototypically has a generic, non-referential reading.[14]

The question to be treated in this paper is whether the observations of Benveniste concerning Greek support verb constructions, which are in accordance also with Seiler's (1986: 66) remarks on Latin deverbal nouns in -*tion*-, can be applied to Vedic as well. In other words, are there any restrictions or preferences in the use of the different deverbal action nouns in Vedic support verb constructions? Are there derivatives which do occur in support verb constructions, and are there others which are conspicuously absent or banned in this function?

For the time being, let us have a look at the use of the suffixes -*ti*- and -*tu*- in Early Vedic[15] and see firstly, whether deverbal nouns derived by these suffixes do in fact occur in constructions headed by the verb *kṛ*, which is also the support verb *par excellence* of Vedic, and secondly, whether such constructions can be regarded as support verb constructions in the sense specified before.

4 The Early Vedic material

4.1 Deverbal *-tu*-stems with *kṛ* in the Rigveda

An exhaustive survey of the Rigvedic material[16] reveals that deverbal nouns in -*tu*- are in fact attested a number of times in the function of the object complement of the transitive verb *kṛ*, but such phrases are never support verb constructions, since in them the verb *kṛ* retains its lexical meaning 'to create, make ready, prepare, arrange'.

---

14 Non-referentiality is the reason why the nominal host of prototypical SVCs regularly cannot be pronominalised, relativised or anaphorised (cf. e.g. Mohanan 1997: 451–453; Winhart 2005: 9). However, constructions that lie at the edges of the SVC-continuum can of course behave differently. Note also that the test based on this feature is not universally accepted (see e.g. Langer 2005: 189–190).
15 For a detailed overview of the material see Wackernagel and Debrunner 1954: 622–642, 645–669).
16 The survey has been carried out by means of Lubotsky's *Rigvedic word concordance* (1997: 434–446; s.v. √*kṛ*-). It is obvious that SVCs as such are not very numerous in the Rigveda and most of them are in fact hapax legomena not only in Early Vedic, but also Vedic in general.

The first example is *gātúṁ kṛ*,[17] which is attested 8 times in the Rigveda. The noun *gātú-* is a *-tu*-stem derivative of the root *gā* 'to go'. In two passages the noun has an attribute with spatial meaning, *ūrdhvá-* 'rising upwards, upright, high' and *urú-* 'wide', which immediately indicates that *gātú-* here is a locatival noun with a concrete meaning ('course, path; i.e. on which one goes') and not a *nomen actionis* ('going').

(5) *ūrdhvó   vāṁ   **gātúr**   adhvaré   **akāri***
     upright:NOM you:DAT.DU path:NOM   sacrifice:LOC make:AOR.PASS.3SG
     'High above has the path for you two been created in the rite.' (JB)
     'Aufwärts ist bei dem Opfer euer beider Weg bereitet.' (G)
     (Rigveda 3.4.4a)[18]

(6) *urúṁ   no   **gātúṁ   kṛṇu**   soma*
     wide:ACC   we:DAT.PL   path:ACC   make:IMP.2SG   Soma:VOC
     mīḍhᵤvaḥ
     bountiful:VOC
     'Make a wide course for us, o Soma the rewarder.' (JB)
     'Schaff uns breite Bahn, du belohnender Soma.' (G)
     (Rigveda 9.85.4d)

Other passages, which speak about preparing or establishing a path or road for someone else (put in the dative or the locative case) confirm this conclusion even in the absence of any attributive modifier. A representative example is (7):[19]

(7) *yátrā   **cakrúr**   amṛtā   **gātúm**   asmai*
     where   make:PRF.3PL   immortal:NOM.PL path:ACC   this:DAT
     'Where the immortals have made a way for him' (JB)
     'Dort wo ihm die Unsterblichen den Weg bereitet haben' (G)
     (Rigveda 7.63.5a)

Remember also that in such cases the individual who is the agent of going on the road that is referred to by *gātú-* (i.e. the individual in the dative or locative case) is different from the subject of the verb *kṛ*, while in prototypical support verb constructions the subject of the support verb and the agent of the deverbal nominal host are identical (cf., however, below on causative constructions). Namely, *gātúṁ kṛ* as a

---

17 On this phrase see also the article by Alex Roy in the present volume of the journal.
18 Rigveda quotations follow van Nooten and Holland's (1994) metrically restored text. "G" following the German translation of a given Rigvedic passage refers to the translation of Geldner (1951), while "JB" following the English translation refers to that of Jamison and Brereton (2014).
19 See also RV 1.71.2c (locative *asmé* 'for us'); 4.51.1d (dative *jánāya* 'for the people').

SVC would mean '"to do the going", to go', i.e. the person who "does" and the person who "goes" would be the same.

The single instance of *gātúṁ kṛ* which might at first sight be amenable to a SVC interpretation involves the middle participle of the verb:

(8)   *ā́*   *yé*   *víśvā*   *svapat₍yā́ni*
      onto   who:NOM.PL   all:ACC.PL   with_good_offspring:ACC.PL
      tasthúḥ /   **kṛṇvānā́so**   *amṛtatvā́ya*   **gātúm**
      stand:PRF.3PL   make:PTCP.MID.NOM.PL   immortality:DAT   path:ACC
      'Those who mounted upon (those actions [=sacrifice]) that bring good
      descendants, making themselves a way toward immortality' (JB)
      'Während sie lauter gute Nachkommenschaft erlangten und sich zur
      Unsterblichkeit den Weg bereiteten' (G)
      (Rigveda 1.72.9ab [b = 3.31.9b])

However, instead of taking this phrase as a SVC meaning 'going (lit. "doing the going") toward immortality' I follow the usual explanation (as seen also in the translations given above) and interpret this construction similarly to the passages mentioned before, i.e. 'making themselves (cf. the middle voice of the participle)[20] a way/preparing their way/path toward immortality'. Namely, in my opinion, it is more probable that the subjects of the sentence, most likely the gods, are preparing their access or road to heaven and immortality when they embark on sacrificing rather than going immediately to heaven.[21]

Another noun in *-tu-* which is attested with *kṛ* is *vahatú-*. *Vahatú-* has a morphological peculiarity since it is not directly derived from the root *vah* 'to carry, convey, lead', but from its thematic present stem *váha-* (Wackernagel and Debrunner 1954: 666). This noun does not mean 'carrying, transporting, leading' as a general action noun, but has a specialised semantics: 'bridal procession, nuptial ceremony,

---

20 For the indirect reflexive middle voice of *kṛ* see also *dhánvan srótaḥ* **kṛṇute gātúm** *ūrmíṁ* RV 1. 95.10a (= AVP 8.14.10a) 'He makes himself a stream in the wasteland, a way, and a wave' (JB), in which the parallelism of *srótas-*, *gātú-* and *ūrmí-* indicates that the second one (*gātú-*) also has to be taken in a concrete sense. Geldner interprets the passage partly as a double accusative construction with *kṛ* as a factitive copula: 'Ein Strom auf dürrem Lande macht er sich Bahn, (treibt) seine Woge.'
21 According to one of my anonymous reviewers, the fact that the goal here is abstract (immortality rather than heaven) and that *amṛtatvā́ya* is in the dative (and not the accusative), thus indicating not the goal in the strictest sense, but rather the purpose/intention of the action (i.e. 'for the sake of immortality'), might be an indicator of *kṛṇvānā́so … gātúm* being a SVC. I do not see any reason why these two circumstances would be in conflict with my interpretation formulated above. Remember also that the order of the two members of the construction and their being separated by an intervening constituent speaks against the SVC-interpretation as well (on this point see also below).

wedding'. The relevant passages[22] speak about arranging or preparing this ceremony for someone, which implies that *kṛ* again basically retains its lexical meaning and *vahatú-* cannot be regarded as the nominal host of a support verb construction.

(9)   *tváṣṭā*   *duhitré*   **vahatúṁ**   **kṛṇoti**
       Tvaṣṭṛ:NOM   daughter:DAT   wedding_ceremony:ACC   make:PRS.3SG
       'Tvaṣṭar is arranging a wedding for his daughter.' (JB)
       'Tvaṣṭṛ richtet seiner Tochter die Hochzeit aus.' (G)
       (Rigveda 10.17.1a)

The third example of a deverbal noun in *-tu-* being the direct object of *kṛ* is the phrase *sótuṁ kṛ* in (10). The noun *sótu-* is a derivative of *su* 'to press, extract'.

(10)   *tá*   *íd*   *védiṃ*   *subhaga*   *tá*   *ā́hutiṃ /*
       they:NOM.PL PTCL sacrificial_altar:ACC blessed:VOC they:NOM.PL oblation:ACC
       té   **sótuṃ**   **cakrire**   *diví*
       they:NOM.PL pressing:ACC make:PRF.MID.3PL heaven:LOC
       'Just those (have made) the altar, o you of good fortune, they the poured offering; they have made the soma-pressing (to be) in heaven.' (JB)
       'Die haben, o Holder, die Vedi, die die Opfergabe, die die Somapressung bei Tage(sanbruch) hergerichtet.' (G)
       (Rigveda 8.19.18ab)

Since the phrase *sótuṁ kṛ* is part of a triple coordinating construction, in which at least one (i.e. *védi-* 'sacrificial altar'),[23] but probably both of the other two parallel nouns[24] has a concrete sense, I assume that the third noun, *sótu-* is not to be regarded here as a genuine action noun (i.e. 'the act of pressing') either, but rather as a result noun (*nomen rei actae*), which refers to the 'pressed soma-juice' that is to be offered.[25] This means that the verb *kṛ* has the same lexical semantics in each of the coordinate

---

22 Apart from example (9) see also *siyonám pátye* **vahatúṁ kṛṇuṣva** RV 10.85.20d 'Bereite dem Gatten eine behagliche Hochzeitsfahrt' (G). Note that Jamison and Brereton interpret the phrase as containing a double accusative construction: 'Make your wedding procession a comfortable place for your husband.'

23 This is, of course, not to deny that *védi-* itself is perhaps ultimately a deverbal derivative. According to Mayrhofer (1992–2001: II, 581 s.v. *védi-*), it may go back to **(a)va-sd-i-* 'seat' and contain the root *sad* 'to sit' (thus it may be a locational noun: 'where one sits down').

24 The third noun in the coordinating construction is the similarly deverbal *ā́huti-* (from *ā́+hu* 'to sacrifice, to offer an oblation, to sprinkle, lit. to pour onto/into'), which refers to the 'sacrificial offering' as a substance rather than the act of the offering itself ('pouring into').

25 This interpretation is in accordance with Renou's (1964: 66) translation: 'le *soma*-pressé'. It should be added that *sótu-* could in principle also function as an action noun, which is most evident from the existence of the dative *sótave* and ablative *sótoḥ* infinitive forms attested in RV 1.28.1b ('in order to press') and RV 10.86.1a ('from pressing'), respectively.

phrases ('to make, prepare, make ready') and none of the coordinate members can be regarded as a SVC.[26]

There is another *-tu*-stem which occurs in combination with *kṛ* in Early Vedic. Namely, the derivative compound *pitukṛ́ttara-* RV 10.76.5d implies the existence of an otherwise unattested phrase *pitúṁ kṛ* (Scarlata 1999: 76). Although the noun *pitú-* is in all probability a derivative of the root *pay^i* 'to swell, abound, be fat' (Mayrhofer 1992–2001: II, 84, 130; Widmer 2004: 17–19), its deverbal origin is no more perceptible synchronically. In Vedic it is a concrete noun with the meaning 'solid food, nourishment', therefore there is no question of interpreting *pitúṁ kṛ* as a SVC. Its meaning is simply 'to prepare food/nourishment' with the verb having its primary lexical meaning.

4.2 Deverbal *-ti*-stems with *kṛ* in the Rigveda

In the previous section we could see that no deverbal nouns in *-tu-* are attested in the Rigveda as nominal host of a support verb construction with *kṛ*. Let us see now whether there exist any such constructions involving deverbal nouns in *-ti-*.

Our answer to this question is undoubtedly a positive one. The clearest example is *śruṣṭíṁ kṛ*, which occurs four times in the Rigveda (in addition to the following passage see also RV 1.69.7b; 7.18.6c; 7.18.10d).

(11)   *ádhvaryavaḥ*   **kártanā**   **śruṣṭím**   *asmai*
       adhvaryu:VOC.PL   do:AOR.IMP.2PL   obedience:ACC   this:DAT
       'Adhvaryus! Act in obedience to him!' (JB)
       'Adhvaryu's! Erweiset ihm Gehorsam!' (G)
       (Rigveda 2.14.9a)

I offered a thorough analysis of this construction in earlier publications (Ittzés 2013: 107–108, 2016: 61–64) and demonstrated that the SVC *śruṣṭíṁ kṛ* 'to do obedience' (inflected in the aorist and the perfect) and the simple verb *śruṣ* 'to listen to, obey' (inflected exclusively in the present tense) are in complementary distribution in terms of aspect and thus make up a suppletive paradigm.[27] From this fact I drew the

---

26 As can be seen, Jamison's translation takes pāda b with a different syntax. In her commentary she elaborates on this interpretation: 'make X (to be) in Y' is equivalent to 'put X in Y' (http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/?page_id=27 ad loc.; accessed 16 March 2024).

27 In this particular case, the reason of the Vedic suppletion lies in the original defective (i.e. present only) inflection of the secondary root *śruṣ* < PIE *ḱleṣ. In my opinion, the aorist, fientive, and essive stems listed by Rix and Kümmel (2001: 336) have to be regarded as post-PIE creations of the individual daughter languages. In other similar pairs of SVC versus simple verb, the suppletion seems to have other reasons (cf. e.g. Ittzés 2013 on *ví+muc* vs. *vimócanaṁ kṛ*).

conclusion that this SVC, and perhaps the oldest SVCs in general, at least originally, had a specific grammatical function and were not necessarily mere stylistic or pragmatic variants of the underlying simple verbs, as it is usually asserted.[28]

Let us have a look at further attestations of deverbal *-ti*-stems with the verb *kṛ*. It can be observed that one part of these derivatives are not *nomina actionis*, but other types of deverbal derivatives, mostly concrete nouns.[29]

(12) *urvī́ṁ* **gávyūtim** *ábhayaṁ* **kṛdhī́** *naḥ*
broad:ACC pasture:ACC fearlessness:ACC make:AOR.IMP.2SG we:DAT
'Create for us broad pastureland and fearlessness!' (JB)
'Schaff uns weite Trift und Sicherheit!' (G)
(Rigveda 7.77.4b)[30]

(13) **urukṣitíṁ** sujánimā **cakāra**
wide_dwelling:ACC giving_good_birth:NOM make:PRF.3SG
'He, affording good birth, has made (them) wide dwelling.' (JB)
'Er, der gute Geburt gibt, schuf weite Wohnstatt.' (G)
(Rigveda 7.100.4d)

Another group of constructions involve genuine *nomina actionis* which refer to eventualities whose agent participant is different from the subject of the verb *kṛ*. Such constructions therefore express causativity. The agent of the action encoded in the deverbal noun is expressed in the clause in the dative case. As I have mentioned above, the predicative noun and the support verb of prototypical SVCs share the same agent. Nevertheless, I consider the causative constructions under discussion as SVCs as well, since the verb in them undoubtedly has a light or bleached semantics, even though it retains more traces of its lexical meaning ('to make, prepare, arrange') than in the prototypical constructions.

(14) *yuvā́m* **súṣutiṁ** **cakrathuḥ** *púraṁdhaye*
you:NOM.DU easy_birth:ACC make:PRF.2DU Puraṃdhi:DAT
'You two made an easy birth for Puraṃdhi.' (JB)
'Ihr schafftet der Purandhi leichte Geburt.' (G)
(Rigveda 10.39.7d)

---

28 For the latter view concerning potential Proto-Indo-European SVCs see e.g. Balles (2006: 37); cf. Schutzeichel (2014: 79). On PIE SVCs as technical terms cf. n. 36 below.
29 Concerning the attributive (and compositional first member) *úru-* 'broad' in example (12) as an indication of the concrete meaning of the noun cf. examples (5) and (6) above. See also *ā́huti-* 'soma offering' as a concrete noun in example (10). Note furthermore *ūrdhvā́ṁ* **dhītíṁ kṛṇávad** *dhāráyac ca* RV 7.64.4b 'will make and sustain a high vision' (JB). However, the latter example may also be interpreted as a factitive copula construction (see e.g. the translation by Geldner: 'das Gedicht emporrichten und festmachen wird'; also Griffith [1973: ad loc.]: 'makes the song rise upward and sustains it').
30 Cf. also the slightly different verse RV 9.78.5d (*urvī́ṁ* **gávyūtim** *ábhayaṁ ca nas* **kṛdhi**).

(15)   *sá*   *iyānáḥ*   **karati**   **svastím**
      he:NOM   approached:NOM   make:AOR.SBJV.3SG   well-being:ACC
      asmā[31]
      this:DAT
      'He, being implored, will create well-being for him.' (JB)
      'Er möge darum angegangen ihm Glück bescheren.' (G)
      (Rigveda 10.99.12c)

In (14), *súṣuti-* means 'good or easy birth' (*sū* 'to procreate, beget, give birth') and the person whom the Aśvins make have an easy birth is Puraṁdhi, while in (15) the one who will have *svastí-* 'well-being' (i.e. *su-astí-* < **su-ṇs-tí-* probably related to *nas* 'to approach, resort'[32]) through the favour of the god Indra is the poet referred to by the proximal demonstrative pronoun (*asmai*).

     A slightly different case is the combination *práśastiṁ kṛ*, which is attested three times in the Rigveda with a finite verb and once in the form of a determinative compound (*praśastikṛ́t-*). In each case the clause contains a constituent in the dative (*nas*, *vām*, *bráhmaṇe*), but contrary to the previous examples this certainly does not express the agent of praising (*práśasti-* from *prá+śaṁs* 'to praise, laud'), but rather its beneficiary.

(16)   *apraśastā́*   *iva*   *smasi* /   **práśastim**   *amba*
      unpraised:NOM.PL   like   be:PRS.1PL   praise:ACC   mother:VOC
      nas   **kṛdhi**
      we:DAT.PL   make:AOR.IMP.2SG
      'We are like ones unlauded: make a laud for us, mother.' (JB)
      'Wir fühlen uns ungeehrt; schaff uns Ehre, o Mütterchen!' (G)
      (Rigveda 2.41.16cd)

(17)   *ayáṁ*   *vāṁ*   *yajñó*   **akṛta**   **práśastiṁ**
      this:NOM   you:DAT.DU   sacrifice:NOM   make:AOR.MID.3SG   praise:ACC
      'This sacrifice here has made its own encomium for you.' (JB)
      'Dieses Opfer hat euch Ehre gemacht.' (G)
      (Rigveda 1.181.1c)

(18)   **práśastiṁ**   *naḥ*   **kṛṇuta**   *rudriyāso*
      praise:ACC   we:DAT.PL   make:PRS.IMP.2PL   belonging_to_Rudra:VOC.PL
      'Make good our eulogy, Rudras.' (JB)
      'Schaffet uns Anerkennung, ihr Rudrasöhne!' (G)
      (Rigveda 5.57.7c)

---

31 Sandhi-form for dative *asmai*.
32 On the etymology see Gotō (1987: 200: ",Wohlsein'[< *,glückliche Heimkehr']" [good health < *happy homecoming]); Mayrhofer (1992–2001: II, 796–797). The traditional view of connecting *svastí-* with *as* 'to be' probably has to be rejected.

(19) **praśastikŗ́d**   *bráhmaṇe*   *no*   *ví̥y*   *ùcha*
      making_praise:NOM formulation:DAT we:DAT.PL apart shine:PRS.IMP.2SG
      'As creator of lauds, dawn forth for our sacred formulation.' (JB)
      'Unserem Segenswort Ehre machend geh auf!' (G)[33]
      (Rigveda 1.113.19c)

As far as the agent of the praising is concerned, there are in principle two possibilities. Firstly, the agent may be the same as the subject of the verb *kŗ*, in which case *práśastiṁ kŗ* is a prototypical SVC. Secondly, the agent may be somebody not explicitly mentioned in the context, which means that the construction expresses causativity, similarly to the phrases treated above.

In my opinion, examples (16) and (19) can quite straightforwardly be interpreted as instances of the latter pattern, i.e. as causative structures, namely a particular deity (Sarasvatī in 2.41.16 and Uṣas in 1.113.19) is asked to see to it that the poet receives praise from others (i.e. *práśastim … nas kŗdhi* 'make [the] praising for [/of] us; arouse praise for us; make [others/the people] praise us'; *praśastikŗ́d bráhmaṇe* 'making praise for [our] formulation; arousing praise for [our] formulation; making [others/the people] praise our formulation'). On the other hand, example (17) seems to me to contain a prototypical SVC inasmuch as the sacrifice, by way of metonymy, can be interpreted as itself praising the addressees of the hymn, the Aśvins (i.e. … *vā́ṁ … akŗta práśastiṁ* 'has made [the] praising for [/of] you two; has praised you').

The interpretation of (18) is controversial. While Geldner apparently takes the phrase *práśastiṁ naḥ kŗṇuta* along the causative pattern, Jamison in her commentary[34] argues that "as detailed in the first hemistich, the Maruts have given us bountiful riches of all sorts; in return we should be producing a *práśasti-* for them – not they for us" and therefore pushes "the sense of √*kŗ* from 'make' to 'make good' – that is, act such that the praise we are giving you is true." If this is true, then example (18) has to be left out of consideration for our purposes. Be that as it may, it seems to be clear that at least in one of its occurrences, (17), *práśastiṁ kŗ* can be interpreted as a prototypical support-verb construction.

Brief mention must be made here of another determinative compound with a *-ti-* stem first member followed by *-kŗ́t-*: *abhiṣṭikŗ́t* RV 4.11.4b; 4.20.1b; 9.48.5c. Since, however, neither the meaning of the compound (Scarlata 1999: 68: "'der Hilfe bereitet, helfend', 'der überlegen macht', 'überlegen handelnd, überlegen' [?]" [who provides help, helping; who makes superior; acting superior, superior]), nor the precise etymology of its first member (*abhiṣṭí-* 'favourer, helper' or *abhíṣṭi-* 'favour, assistance'? cf. Scarlata 1999: 68–69; see also Mayrhofer 1992–2001: I, 92–93), nor the

---

33 Cf. Scarlata (1999: 76): 'Erstrahle {und} bereite {so} unserem Formelgebet ein Lob!'. Note that the translation of Jamison and Brereton takes *bráhmaṇe* as depending on *ví̥y ùcha*.
34 http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/?page_id=21 ad loc. (accessed 18 March 2024).

internal syntax of the compound are uncontroversial, I leave it out of consideration here. To be sure, one of the possibilities is to take it as "'Hilfe schaffend' mit akkusativischem V[order]G[lied]" ['providing help', with accusative first member] (Scarlata 1999: 69).

If we conceive the various meanings and uses of the verb *kṛ*[35] as making up a continuum, we can say that in the above mentioned type of causative SVCs its semantics ('to bring about, produce, cause') is in the support verb area, but closer to the full lexical meaning ('to create, prepare') than its semantically completely bleached usage as a prototypical support verb ('to do').

There is another instance of a deverbal *-ti*-stem action noun which certainly makes up a SVC in combination with *kṛ*: *níṣkṛtiṁ kṛ* 'to do an expulsion' (in Geldner's translation: "eine Sühnung machen"):

(20) *tásmā*   *arcāma*   **kṛṇávāma**   **níṣkṛtiṁ**
      that:DAT   chant:PRS.SBJV.1PL   do:PRS.SBJV.1PL   expulsion:ACC
      'We will chant to it, and we will perform expulsion.' (JB)
      'Dagegen wollen wir (einen Zauber) singen und eine Sühnung machen.' (G)
      (Rigveda 10.165.1c)

This example also shows another feature of SVCs, namely that their nominal host (and thus the entire SVC) may have a more specialised semantics with respect to the underlying simple verb (cf. *níṣ+kṛ* 'to drive away, expel, remove'), which means that the two variants are often not perfectly synonymous.[36]

Another potential example may be *árātiṁ kṛ* in (21):

(21) *yó*   *no*   **árātiṁ**   *samidhāna*   **cakré**
      who:NOM   we:DAT.PL   hostility:ACC   kindled:VOC   do:PRF.MID.3SG
      'Whoever has directed hostility toward us, o kindled one' (JB)
      'Wer uns, du Entflammter, Mißgunst erwiesen hat' (G)
      (Rigveda 4.4.4c)

The etymology of *árāti-* is disputed. According to Mayrhofer (1992–2001: II, 446–447 s.v. *rātí-*, following Kuiper), it is probably the negation of *rātí-* "Gabe,

---

35 On the usages and functions of the Vedic root *kṛ* from a typological perspective see Ittzés 2022.
36 This feature of the SVCs can be observed in modern languages most clearly in the case of technical terms (cf. e.g. Kamber 2008: 84; Marušić 2018). We might categorise the SVC *níṣkṛtiṁ kṛ* itself as a Vedic ritualistic technical term, if we take into account that the same phrase occurs also later in Middle Vedic prose in a similar context (*kurvītá … níṣkṛtim* ŚB 12.4.1.2). However, since the (Early) Vedic SVCs are nearly always hapax legomena, it is difficult to judge their precise semantic relationship to their corresponding simple verb. It has also been argued (Balles 2006: 37–38) that, in addition to being stylistic or pragmatic variants, SVCs might have been existed as technical terms in PIE as well (cf. n. 28 above).

Opfergabe, Gunst" [gift, oblation, grace, favour], which is a resultative noun from the root *rā* 'to give, donate' (Mayrhofer 1992–2001: II, 442–443). This means that *árāti-* cannot, strictly speaking, be regarded as a deverbal noun. However, it might perhaps still be considered as a broadly defined event noun and thus as making up a SVC with *kṛ*.[37]

Even if it were in principle completely understandable if certain changes had taken place between Proto-Indo-European and (Early) Vedic in this regard, the data we have seen nicely agree with and thus corroborate the functional difference of the two types of derivatives under investigation. We were indeed able to find Early Vedic SVCs with *kṛ* involving deverbal action nouns in *-ti-*, while deverbal *-tu-*stems that are construed with *kṛ* in Early Vedic are concrete nouns (i.e. locatival nouns or result nouns) and do not make up SVCs.[38] The clear distribution which could be observed in the case of these two derivational patterns seems to suggest that the presence or absence of a particular deverbal abstract formation in Early Vedic SVCs may be used as a diagnostic tool for deciding which one of the two functional types it belongs to.[39]

4.3 Action nouns in Early Vedic support-verb constructions

As far as further deverbal derivatives are concerned, it seems that with the exception of *-tu-*stems, virtually all types of deverbal abstracts or action nouns are

---

37 Notice, however, that it is not typical of the components of Vedic SVCs to be separated by intervening words (cf. Ittzés 2020/2021 [2022]: 116). It could, of course, be argued that *samidhāna* in (21) is a syntactically independent vocative form, which has no bearing on the syntactic structure of the clause and which threrefore allows the two parts of the construction to be regarded as "adjacent". Nevertheless, I know of no other uncontroversial Early Vedic SVC with *kṛ* which is split by a vocative form (nor, for that matter, by any other constituent).

38 As a matter of fact, *-ti-*stems too can "topicalise" various arguments of the underlying predicate and be used as *nomina loci* or *rei actae*, a feature which has been argued to have originally been characteristic of *-tu-*stems. For instance, *gáti-* (from *gam* 'to go') in its sole attestation in the Rigveda (RV 5.64.3a) means 'way, road' rather than 'going'. Similarly, *matí-*, the derivative of *man* 'to think', means first of all 'thought' (and very often its verbal manifestation: 'praise song') as well as 'mind' rather than 'thinking' in its abstract sense. This seems to indicate that either the borderline between the two derivational types (*-ti-stems and *-tu-stems) was never completely impenetrable or, which is perhaps a more acceptable hypothesis, certain changes of function must have taken place between PIE and Vedic Old Indo-Aryan, perhaps due to the decreasing productivity of the *-tu-*type.

39 Even if the number of the above examined constructions involving *-tu-* (Section 4.1) and *-ti-*stems (Section 4.2) is not particularly large, it is in my opinion considerable enough that the different behaviour of the two types in SVCs cannot be regarded as the consequence of their uneven overall distribution in Vedic (i.e. the fact that *-ti-*stems in general are much more frequent than *-tu-*stems).

in fact attested as nominal hosts of Vedic SVCs with *kṛ*. More or less clear examples include stems in *-ana-* (22), *-man-* (23), *-as-* (24), *-anu-* (25), *-a-* (26) and root nouns[40] (27).[41]

(22) *sáṁ yád ā́naḷ ádhvana ā́d íd áśvair /*
PREV when reach:AOR.3SG road:ACC.PL then only horse:INS.PL
vimócanaṁ kṛṇute
unyoking:ACC do:PRS.MID.3SG
'When he has fully reached (the end) of the road, only after that does he perform his unyoking of the horses.' (JB)
'Wenn sie ihre Wege vollendet hat, dann macht sie mit den Rossen Ausspann.' (G)
(Rigveda 3.30.12cd)[42]

(23) ***visarmā́ṇaṁ kṛṇuhi*** *vittám eṣāṁ*
dissolution:ACC make:PRS.IMP.2SG possession:ACC this:GEN.PL
'Dissipate the possessions of those' (JB)
'Laß deren Besitz zerrinnen' (G)
(Rigveda 5.42.9a)[43]

(24) *rā́jā cid ebhyo* **náma** *ít* **kṛṇoti**
king:NOM even this:DAT.PL reverence:ACC PTCL do:PRS.3SG
'Even the king makes his bow to them.' (JB)
'Auch der König macht ihnen seine Verbeugung.' (G)
(Rigveda 10.34.8d)[44]

---

40 An anonymous reviewer remarks that the different degrees of productivity may have been possible distributional factors of the individual deverbal abstract formations in SVCs. Even if this might in principle be true for *-tu*-stems (cf. above), it is clearly contradicted by the fact that root nouns too are attested as nominal hosts of SVCs (see example 27 below).

41 One should not forget the deverbal *ā*-stems either, which in spite of curiously not being directly attested in (Early) Vedic as nominal hosts of SVCs with *kṛ* may still be assumed to have had this function, since it is certainly this type that was grammaticalised during the Old and Middle Vedic period as the so-called periphrastic perfect. See the detailed treatment by Ittzés 2020/2021 [2022].

42 See Ittzés 2013 on this construction.

43 Having in mind the fundamental intransitivity of the underlying verb *ví+sṛ* 'to flow in various directions, disperse, dissolve', this construction too has to be considered as belonging to the causative type ('to make the dissolution/dispersal of sth/sb'). However, it is important to note that in contrast to the causative constructions treated above, *visarmā́ṇaṁ kṛ* governs an accusative object (*vittám*), which points to the fact that it is more grammaticalised and functions in fact as a complex predicate.

44 On this phrase (and the fact that *námas-* in the Rigveda is something that is vocalised) cf. the article of Alex Roy in the present volume of the journal.

(25) *yadā́* **krṇóṣi** **nadanúṁ** *sám* *ūhasi*
when make:PRS.2SG roaring:ACC PREV shove:PRS.2SG
'When you make your roar, you just shove (them all) together.' (JB)
'Wenn du das Schlachtgeschrei erhebst, so scharst du (Leute) um dich.' (G)
(Rigveda 8.21.14c)

(26) *prásūto* **bhakṣám akaraṁ** *carā́v* *ápi*
impelled:NOM eating:ACC do:AOR.1SG vat:LOC near_to
'Urged on, I have done my own consuming at the vat.' (JB)
'Aufgefordert habe ich einen Trunk bei (vorgesetzter) Grütze getan.' (G)
(Rigveda 10.167.4a)

(27) **krṇván** **saṁcŕtaṁ vicŕtam** *abhíṣṭaya /* *índuḥ*
do:PRS.PTCP.NOM tying:ACC untying:ACC prevailing:DAT drop:NOM
siṣakti̯y *uṣásaṁ* *ná* *sū́r̯yaḥ*
follow:PRS.3SG Uṣas:ACC like Sūrya:NOM
'Performing the knotting and unknotting in order to prevail, the drop
accompanies (the gods?), like the sun the dawn.' (JB)
'Indem er bindet und löset, um zur Geltung zu kommen, folgt der Saft
(ihnen) wie Sūrya der Uṣas.' (G)
(Rigveda 9.84.2cd)

In the absence of applicable tests, it is often notoriously difficult, occasionally down-
right impossible, to decide whether a given phrase should be interpreted as a proto-
typical SVC (i.e. action noun plus support verb *kr* with "light" meaning sharing the
same subject) or a construction consisting of a concrete noun and the verb *kr* retaining
its full lexical semantics. Consider, for instance, the case of *sádaḥ kr* in example (28):

(28) *yátra* *ku̯và* *ca* *te* *máno /* *dákṣaṁ*
where(relat.) where(interrog.) ever you:GEN.SG mind:ACC skill:ACC
dadhasa *úttaram /* *tátrā* **sádaḥ**
set:PRS.SBJV.MID.2SG afterwards there seat/sitting:ACC
krṇavase
make:PRS.SBJV.MID.2SG
'Wherever your mind is (set), (there) you will set your skill next, there you
will make your seat.' (JB)
'Worauf immer du deinen Sinn und höheren Verstand richten wirst, dort
sollst du dir einen Sitz bereiten.' (G)
(Rigveda 6.16.17)

The translations cited above interpret *sádas-* (from the root *sad* 'to sit') in this passage
as a concrete locatival noun ('seat; on which one sits') and take *kr* as having its lexical

meaning 'to prepare, make ready, arrange'. However, Stüber (2002: 142) claims that the phrase is "Umschreibung von *sad*" [periphrase of *sad*], i.e. it is a SVC involving *sádas-* as an action noun and being virtually synonymous with the simple verb *sad* ('to sit [down]; lit. to do sitting [down]'). Since it seems to me that there are no clear criteria which would help us decide the question, I am leaving this issue open for now.[45]

5 Conclusions

To summarise, the use of *-ti*-stems and the avoidance of *-tu*-stems in Vedic support-verb constructions corroborate the hypothesis of earlier scholars on two different types of deverbal nouns (even if not necessarily along the "objective vs. subjective" distinction originally assumed by Benveniste). This means that these two derivational suffixes were not simply allomorphs in Vedic, and probably still less in PIE, but had different functions. Furthermore, the presence of deverbal abstracts derived by other suffixes (such as *-ana-, -man-, -a-,* etc.) as nominal hosts of support-verb constructions may suggest that these formatives were equivalent or similar to *-ti-*, at least in certain respects (i.e. in their use in "generalising" vs. "individualising" strategies of abstraction). In order to be clear on their exact relationship, it will be necessary to make a thorough survey of these various action nouns in other contexts and syntactic configurations as well, as the evidence of support-verb constructions is insufficient in this regard. It may well turn out that even if these action nouns do not differ in a certain regard, they do have subtle differences in other respects.

References

Balles, Irene. 2006. *Die altindische Cvi-Konstruktion: Form, Funktion, Ursprung*. Bremen: Hempen.
Benveniste, Émile. 1948. *Noms d'agents et noms d'action en indo-européen*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.

---

45 In some cases, there might be indications as to which interpretation is to be preferred. To mention just one example, in AVŚ 18.3.8ab (*út tiṣṭha préhi prá drava | ókaḥ kṛṇuṣva salilé sadhásthe*) the four imperative forms probably have a sequential reading, which implies that each of them, including *ókaḥ kṛ*, has a telic interpretation. In my opinion, this means that *ókaḥ kṛ* means 'to make/prepare (oneself) a dwelling' ('Rise up, advance, run forward, make yourself a dwelling in the water as your resting place') and not 'to do dwelling / to dwell' as a SVC.

Butt, Miriam. 2010. The light verb jungle: Still hacking away. In Mengistu Amberber, Brett Baker & Mark Harvey (eds.), *Complex predicates: Cross-linguistic perspectives on event structure*, 48–78. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chantraine, Pierre. 1964. Les noms d'action répondant aux verbes signifiant « manger » et « boire » chez Homère: ἐδητύς, βρῶσις, βρωτύς, βρώμη, πόσις, ποτής. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 59. 11–23.

Geldner, Karl F. 1951. *Der Rig-Veda: Aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt und mit einem laufenden Kommentar versehen*, Bd. 1–3. (Harvard Oriental Series 33–35). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gotō, Toshifumi. 1987. *Die „I. Präsensklasse" im Vedischen: Untersuchung der vollstufigen thematischen Wurzelpräsentia* (Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse 489). Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Griffith, Ralph T. 1973. In Jagdish Lal Shastri (ed.), *The hymns of the Rigveda: Translated with a popular commentary.* New revised edn. [1st edn. 1889–1890]. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Irslinger, Britta. 2009. Indogermanische Abstraktsuffixe – synchron und diachron. In Rosemarie Lühr & Sabine Ziegler (eds.), *Protolanguage and prehistory: Akten der XII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, vom 11. bis 15. Oktober 2004 in Krakau*, 215–235. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Ittzés, Máté. 2013. Light verb constructions vs. simple verbs in Vedic: *vimócanaṃ kṛṇute* (RV 3,30,12d). In Danuta Stasik & Anna Trynkowska (eds.), *CEENIS current research series*, 1, 107–123. Warszawa: Dom Wydawniczy Elipsa.

Ittzés, Máté. 2016. *Funkcióigés szerkezetek a védikus óind nyelvben* [Light verb constructions in Vedic Old Indo-Aryan]. Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University habilitation thesis.

Ittzés, Máté. 2020/2021 [2022]. Light verb, auxiliary, grammaticalization: The case of the Vedic periphrastic perfect. *Die Sprache* 54. 95–129.

Ittzés, Máté. 2022. The root *kṛ* in the Rigveda from a typological perspective. In Melanie Malzahn, Hannes A. Fellner & Theresa-Susanna Illés (eds.), *Zurück zur Wurzel: Struktur, Funktion und Semantik der Wurzel im Indogermanischen. Akten der 15. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 13. bis 16. September 2016 in Wien*, 99–119. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Jamison, Stephanie W. & Joel P. Brereton (transl.). 2014. *The Rigveda: The earliest religious poetry of India*, vol. 1–3. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kamber, Alain. 2008. *Funktionsverbgefüge empirisch: Eine korpusbasierte Untersuchung zu den nominalen Prädikaten des Deutschen* (Germanistische Linguistik 281). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Keydana, Götz. 2013. *Infinitive im Ṛgveda: Formen, Funktion, Diachronie* (Brill's studies in Indo-European languages & linguistics 9). Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Keydana, Götz. 2023. Language change and the actuation problem: Grammaticalization in Vedic Sanskrit. *Journal of South Asian Languages & Linguistics* 10. 1–17.

Kim, Jeong-Soo. 2005. Die Nomina agentis auf -*tar*- im Vedischen. In Irene Balles & Rosemarie Lühr (eds.), *Indogermanische Nomina agentis*, 71–160. Leipzig: Universität Leipzig, Institut für Linguistik.

Kiparsky, Paul. 2016. The agent suffixes as a window into Vedic grammar. In Dieter Gunkel, Joshua T. Katz, Brent Vine & Michael Weiss (eds.), *Sahasram ati srajas: Indo-Iranian and Indo-European studies in honor of Stephanie W. Jamison*, 170–192. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press.

Kümmel, Martin Joachim. 2000. *Das Perfekt im Indoiranischen: Eine Untersuchung der Form und Funktion einer ererbten Kategorie des Verbums und ihrer Weiterentwicklung in den altindoiranischen Sprachen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Langer, Stefan. 2005. A formal specification of support verb constructions. In Stefan Langer & Daniel Schnorbusch (eds.), *Semantik im Lexikon*, 179–202. Tübingen: Günter Narr.

Lazzeroni, Romano. 1997. La transitività come categoria linguistica: i nomi d'azione indoeuropei. *Incontri Linguistici* 20. 71–82.

Lowe, John J. 2017. *Transitive nouns and adjectives: Evidence from Early Indo-Aryan* (Oxford studies in diachronic and historical linguistics 25). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lubotsky, Alexander M. 1997. *A R̥gvedic word concordance*, vol. 1–2. (American Oriental Series 82–83). New Haven: American Oriental Society.

Lühr, Rosemarie. 2021. Zur Semantik der vedischen *Nomina agentis* auf *-tar* und *-tár*. In Alain Blanc & Isabelle Boehm (eds.), *Dérivation nominale et innovations dans les langues indo-européennes anciennes: Actes du colloque international de l'université de Rouen (ÉRIAC), 11–12 octobre 2018*, 95–110. Lyon: Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée.

Marušić, Borislav. 2018. Besonderheiten der Funktionsverbgefüge in der deutschen Konzernsprache. *Jezikoslovlje* 19. 87–106.

Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1992–2001. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, Bd. 1–3. Heidelberg: Winter.

Mel'čuk, Igor. 2022. Support (= light) verbs. *Neophilologica* 34. 1–30.

Mohanan, Tara. 1997. Multidimensionality of representation: NV complex predicates in Hindi. In Alex Alsina, Joan Bresnan & Peter Sells (eds.), *Complex predicates* (CSLI Lecture Notes 64), 431–471. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.

Panagl, Oswald. 1982. Produktivität in der Wortbildung von Corpussprachen. Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Heuristik. *Folia Linguistica* 16. 225–239.

Porzig, Walter. 1942. *Die Namen für Satzinhalte im Griechischen und im Indogermanischen*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Renou, Louis. 1964. *Études védiques et pāṇinéennes*, Tome 13. Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard.

Risch, Ernst. 1974. *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*, Zweite, völlig überarbeitete Aufl. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Rix, Helmut. 1979. Abstrakte Komplemente im Indogermanischen. In Bela Brogyanyi (ed.), *Studies in diachronic, synchronic, and typological linguistics: Festschrift for Oswald Szemerényi on the occasion of his 65th birthday*. Part 1, 725–747. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Von Helmut Rix & unter Mitarbeit von Martin Kümmel, homas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp und Brigitte Schirmer, (eds.). 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Scarlata, Salvatore. 1999. *Die Wurzelkomposita im R̥gveda*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Schindler, Jochem. 1972. *Das Wurzelnomen im Arischen und Griechischen*. Würzburg: Julius-Maximilians-Universtät zu Würzburg dissertation.

Schmitt, Rüdiger. 2015 [2016]. Die griechischen Verbalabstrakta auf -τύς. *Historische Sprachforschung* 128. 164–192.

Schutzeichel, Marc. 2014. *Indogermanische Funktionsverbgefüge* (Wissenschaftliche Schriften der WWU Münster XII:13). Münster: Verlagshaus Monsenstein und Vannerdat.

Seiler, Hansjakob. 1986. Zum Zusammenhang von Nomina actionis, Nomina agentis und Eigennamen. In Annemarie Etter (ed.), *O-o-pe-ro-si: Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag*, 60–71. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Shipp, George P. 1968. Nouns in -σις and -τύς in Homer. *Antichthon* 2. 15–31.

Stüber, Karin. 2002. *Die primären s-Stämme des Indogermanischen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Tichy, Eva. 1995. *Die Nomina agentis auf -tar- im Vedischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Tichy, Eva. 2004. *Indogermanistisches Grundwissen für Studierende sprachwissenschaftlicher Disziplinen*, 2. Aufl. Bremen: Hempen.

van Nooten, Barend A. & Gary B. Holland (eds.). 1994. *Rig Veda: A metrically restored text with an introduction and notes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vincze, Veronika. 2008. A puszta köznév + ige komplexumok státusáról [On the status of bare noun + verb complexes]. In Balázs Sinkovics (ed.), *LingDok 7. Nyelvész-doktoranduszok dolgozatai*, 279–297. Szeged: Szegedi Tudományegyetem Nyelvtudományi Doktori Iskola.

Wachter, Rudolf. 1997. Das indogermanische Wort für 'Sonne' und die angebliche Gruppe der *l/n*-Heteroklitika. *Historische Sprachforschung* 110. 4–20.

Wackernagel, Jakob & Albert Debrunner. 1954. *Altindische Grammatik*, Bd. II.2. *Die Nominalsuffixe*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Widmer, Paul. 2004. *Das Korn des weiten Feldes: Interne Derivation, Derivationskette und Flexionsklassenhierarchie: Aspekte der nominalen Wortbildung im Urindogermanischen*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.

Winhart, Heike. 2005. *Funktionsverbgefüge im Deutschen: zur Verbindung von Verben und Nominalisierungen*. Tübingen: Universität Tübingen PhD-dissertation. https://d-nb.info/974495387/34 (accessed 14 June 2024).

Witzel, Michael. 1989. Tracing the Vedic dialects. In Colette Caillat (ed.), *Dialects dans les littératures indo-aryennes: actes du colloque international ..., Paris (Fondation Hugot), 16–18 septembre 1986*, 97–264. Paris: Collège de France, Institut de Civilisation Indienne.

Bionote

Máté Ittzés
Department of Indian Studies, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary
ittzes.mate@btk.elte.hu
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0061-6361

Máté Ittzés is an associate professor and the head of the Department of Indian Studies and the Indo-European Linguistics Research Division at Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, where he teaches courses on Indo-European linguistics, Indo-Aryan and Greek historical lingustics and Latin syntax. His research has appeared in edited volumes and scholarly journals such as *Indogermanische Forschungen* and *Indo-Iranian Journal*. Recently, he has published articles on light verb constructions in Old Indo-Aryan.