

*All Indo-European compounds are derived from a common origin*—new evidence for a Darwinistic view on I.-E. nominal compounding

According to the teaching of the late Jochem Schindler, who spent a great part of his final years on the study of I.-E. nominal compounding, but regrettably was deprived of the opportunity to publish the most important insights gained from this study himself, the I.-E. possessive compounds (aka bahuvrihi compounds) started out as a subclass of the I.-E. derivational compounds. As is generally agreed, the latter originated as hypostasized predicatively or adverbially used phrases (that is, neither clauses nor sentences) consisting of at least two nouns or one noun and one adverb. To be more precise, Schindler came to the conclusion that the possessive compounds had begun as hypostasized predicatively used phrases with an instrumental form of a noun acting as nucleus. There seems to be, however, one major problem with Schindler's diachronic analysis of the bahuvrihi compounds, viz. the fact that in the branches of I.-E. that preserved both derivational and bahuvrihi compounds as productive categories, these categories behave differently with respect to word formation. The crucial difference is that whenever athematically inflected nouns act as a second member of a compound, we regularly find an additional final suffix attached to them in case we have to do with a derivational compound, whereas as a rule rather no suffix is added to them in case the compound is a bahuvrihi. Schindler's interpretation can, of course, only be accepted in case that morphological discrepancy can be taken or preferably even be shown to be due to a secondary process of differentiation. In this paper, I will argue that some numerals of PIE that are obviously to be traced back to compounds having an athematic second member and lacking any final suffix, and which for this very reason have so far been viewed upon as either determinative or bahuvrihi compounds, are actually best taken for old derivational compounds, thereby backing Schindler's claim of a common origin for both I.-E. derivational and bahuvrihi compounds.