

On the distinction between 'primary' and 'secondary' Sanskrit compounds

This paper critically evaluates the relevance of the linguistic distinction between so-called 'primary' (*dvandva*, *tatpuruṣa* and *karmadhāraya*) and 'secondary' (*bahuvrīhi*) compounds, as well as the validity of the generative conception of the former as 'bases' for the latter. These notions were used, to varying degrees, in the Sanskrit grammars of Whitney, Macdonell and Renou. As we shall show, their systematisation in Scharpé's grammar, on the basis of examples of homonymous compounds, alone demonstrates their intrinsic inadequacy, which may explain their subsequent disappearance. This is not the case with the (slightly later) distinction between 'exocentric' and 'endocentric' inherited from the neogrammarians (especially Brugmann), taken up by Bloomfield, Carnoy, Renou, Coulson etc. and still in use (Gillon, Lowe) for distinguishing *bahuvrīhis* from the other types of compounds (Wackernagel and other scholars preferred to stick to the indigenous classification in their grammatical description and avoid introducing such 'modern' linguistic notions). Homonymous Vedic compounds distinguished by accent, such as the famous mythological example of *indraśatru* discussed by Patañjali, Bhartṛhari and Kumārila, and the case of the compound proper names of the Mitanni Āryas, will help us to confirm at least the linguistic irrelevance (and thus the grammatical uselessness) of the idea that the *bahuvrīhi* is something 'secondarily' generated from a 'primary' *tatpuruṣa* or *karmadhāraya*.

William Dwight **Whitney**, *Sanskrit Grammar, including both the classical language and the older dialects of Veda and Brahmana*, 2nd ed., Boston, Gin & Co, **1889**.

- I. Copulative
- II. Determinative
 - a. Dependent
 - b. Descriptive
- III. Secondary Adjective
 - a. Possessive
 - b. with Governed Final Member
 - i. [Vedic] Participial Compounds
 - ii. Prepositional

§ 1247, III.g. : Secondary adjective compounds, the value of which is not given by a simple resolution into their component parts, but which, though having as final member a noun, are themselves adjectives. These, again, are of two sub-classes: A. Possessive compounds, which are noun-compounds of the preceding [= determinative] class, with the idea of *possessing* added, turning them from nouns into adjectives. [B. ...]

(...) III. Secondary Adjective Compounds

§ 1292.a : A compound having a noun as its final member very often wins secondarily the value of an adjective, being inflected in the three genders to agree with the noun which it qualifies, and used in all the constructions of an adjective.

b. This class of compounds, as was pointed out above (1247.III.), falls into the two divisions of A. Possessives, having their adjective character given them by addition of the idea of *possessing*. [B. ...]

A. Possessive Compounds

§ 1293 : The possessives are noun-compounds of the preceding class, determinatives, of all its various subdivisions, to which is given an adjective inflection, and which take on an adjective meaning of a kind which is most conveniently and accurately defined by adding *having* or *possessing* to the meaning of the determinative.

a. Thus : the dependent **sūryatejās** *sun's brightness* becomes the possessive **sūryatejas** *possessing the brightness of the sun* ; **yajñakāmá** *desire of sacrifice* becomes **yajñākāma** *having desire of sacrifice* ; the descriptive **bṛhadratha** *great chariot* becomes the possessive **bṛhadratha** *having great chariots* ; **áhasta** *not hand* becomes **ahastá** *handless* ; **durgandhi** *ill savor* becomes **durgándhi** *of ill savor* ; and so on. (...)

§ 1295 : The possessive compound is distinguished from its substrate, the determinative, generally by a difference of accent. This difference is not of the same nature in all the divisions of the class ; but oftenest, the possessive has as a compound the natural accent of its prior member (as in most of the examples given above).

Arthur A. **Macdonell**, *A Sanskrit Grammar for Students*, 3rd ed., Oxford UP, 1927 (2nd ed. 1911).

- I. Co-ordinative (Dvandva)
- II. [Determinative]
 - A. Dependent (Tatpuruṣa) Determinative
 - B. Descriptive (Karmadhāraya) Determinative
- III. Possessive (Bahuvrīhi)

§ 185. (...) Possessives are secondary compounds, consisting chiefly of Determinatives turned into adjectives (...)

§ 189 : These compounds are essentially adjectives agreeing with a substantive expressed or understood. They are determinatives (generally of the adjectival descriptive class) ending in substantives, which are made to agree in gender, number, and case with another substantive. Thus

bahuvrīhi bahu-vrīhi, m. 'much rice,' becomes an adjective in the sense of 'having much rice' (an example used by the Hindu grammarians to designate the class).

Every kind of determinative can be turned into a possessive; — e.g. *indraśatru* indra-śatru, m. 'foe of Indra' : adj. 'having Indra as a foe'. (...)

a. In the Vedic language possessives were distinguished from determinatives by accent; — e.g. *rāja-putrá*, 'king's son'; *rājá-putra*, adj. 'having kings as sons.'

b. Possessive often come to be used as substantives or proper names ; — e.g. *su-hrd*, 'good-hearted,' becomes masc. 'friend' ; *satyá-śravās*, adj. nom. m. 'of true fame,' becomes the name of a man (cp. Ἑτεο-κλήης).

Compare Id. *A Vedic Grammar for Students*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, **1916** :

3. Possessive (Bahuvrīhi) Compounds

§189 : These compounds are secondary adjectives. They are determinatives (generally Karmadhārayas), ending in substantives, which have been transformed into adjectives agreeing in gender, number, and case with another substantive expressed or understood. The transformation is accompanied by a shift of accent from the final member to the first. (...)

1. Karmadhāraya Possessives (...)

2. Tatpuruṣa Possessives (...)

3. Bahuvrīhis come to be used substantively; when the noun with which they agree is dropped (...)

Louis **Renou**, *Grammaire sanscrite*, Paris, Adrien Maisonneuve, **1930**.

§ 74A : Selon la structure et en même temps la fonction du composé, on distingue :

a) Les composés dits primaires, dans lesquels la valeur propre du dernier membre se maintient : le rapport des membres entre eux est soit une jonction — types copulatifs, soit un rapport de dépendance casuelle, d'apposition ou d'attribution — types déterminatifs.

b) Les composés dits secondaires, dans lesquels, bien que le dernier membre soit par nature substantif, l'ensemble prend en quelque sorte valeur d'un adjectif et s'applique comme tel à un objet extérieur pour le qualifier — types possessifs (ou attributifs). Le rapport des membres entre eux est en principe le même que dans la classe a), il y a seulement transfert de la valeur globale.

§ 92 (on the bv.) : Le rapport des membres entre eux et la structure du composé sont conformes à ceux des tatpur. (nominaux) et des dvandva substantifs, dont les possessifs représentent, avec le transfert indiqué (...), une formule parallèle : encore qu'il y ait assez rarement coïncidence d'un tatpur. et d'un bahuvr. pris isolément (...).

Louis Renou left out the distinction 'primaire'/'secondaire' in his *Grammaire sanscrite élémentaire*, Paris, Adrien Maisonneuve, **1946**, where (§ 23) he only says that 'par opposition' to the other classes of compounds, viz. 'copulatifs', 'déterminatifs' and 'appositionnels', the 'possessifs' 'sont appelés aussi exocentriques.'

The distinction between 'exocentric' and 'endocentric' for distinguishing *bahuvrīhis* from the other types of compounds comes from the neogrammarians (especially K. Brugmann). It was thereafter used by the linguists Leonard Bloomfield and Albert Carnoy (*Grammaire élémentaire de la langue sanscrite, comparée avec celle des langues indo-européennes*, Louvain, Éditions Universitas, Paris, P. Geuthner, 1925 ; 2nd ed., Louvain, Éditions Universitas, 1937), and then in Oxford by Michael Coulson etc. (*Oxford Handbook of compounding*, 2009, Lowe, etc.) See Dominik WUJASTYK, "Bloomfield and the Sanskrit Origin of the Terms 'Exocentric' and 'Endocentric'", *Historiographica Linguistica* 9, 1982, p. 179-184; J. NOORDGRAAF, "Honderd jaar 'exocentrisch'? Uit de geschiedenis van een term", *Voortgang* 1987, p. 153-161.

§ 616 : composés *bahuvrīhi* : composés *possessifs* : composés d'une des classes précédentes (tatpuruṣa ou karmadhāraya), dans lesquels l'ensemble des termes prend la valeur d'un adjectif qualifiant un substantif hors du composé.

§ 617 : (...) On peut appeler composés *secondaires*, ceux dans lesquels l'ensemble des termes se rapporte à un objet extérieur : les composés bahuvrīhi (4) — par opposition aux composés *primaires* : les composés dvandva (1), tatpuruṣa (2) et karmadhāraya (3).

§ 700 : Les composés bahuvrīhi n'étant que la transposition en fonction dépendante de composés primaires dont le dernier terme est un substantif, les différents types de composés bahuvrīhi se ramènent aux types correspondants de composés primaires. Leur analyse se fait en changeant l'ensemble du composé en une phrase relative.

composés primaires et leur analyse	composés bahuvrīhi correspondants et leur analyse	type de composé : bahuvrīhi à relation
[dvandva	?	copulative]
tatpuruṣa		
<i>kisalaya-rāgaḥ</i> [subst.] m. « rougeur (<i>rāga-</i>) d'une jeune pousse (<i>kisalaya-</i>) » [=] <i>kisalayasya rāgaḥ</i>	<i>kisalaya-rāgaḥ</i> [adj.] m. (<i>adharah</i>) « (lèvre) ayant la rougeur d'une jeune pousse » [=] <i>kisalayasya (iva) rāgo yasya</i> [so 'dharah]	casuelle
karmadhāraya		
<i>vidyā-dhanam</i> [subst.] n. « richesse (<i>dhana-</i>) qui est le savoir (<i>vidyā-</i>) » [=] <i>vidyaiva (= eva) dhanam</i>	<i>vidyā-dhanah</i> [adj.] m. (<i>narah</i>) « (homme) dont la richesse consiste en son savoir » [=] <i>vidyaiva dhanam yasya [sa</i> <i>narah]</i>	appositionnelle
<i>candrānanam</i> [subst.] n. « visage (<i>ānana-</i>) comme la lune (<i>candra-</i>) » [=] <i>candra ivānanam</i>	<i>candrānanā</i> [adj.] f. (<i>strī</i>) « (femme) au visage pareil à la lune » [=] <i>candra ivānanam yasyāḥ [sā strī]</i>	comparative
<i>pāpa-matiḥ</i> [subst.] f. « mauvais (<i>pāpa-</i>) esprit (<i>mati-</i>) » [=] <i>pāpā matiḥ</i>	<i>pāpa-matiḥ</i> [adj.] m. (<i>narah</i>) « (homme) ayant un mauvais esprit » [=] <i>pāpā matir yasya [sa narah]</i>	attributive
<i>su-putraḥ</i> [subst.] m. « un excellent (<i>su-</i>) fils (<i>putra-</i>) »	<i>su-putrā</i> [adj.] f. (<i>strī</i>) « (femme) qui a d'excellents (un excellent) fils »	

Problems :

1°) *kisalaya-rāga* : in the case of the supposed 'tp. > bv.' transformation (making '*tatpuruṣa-bahuvrīhi*'), the 'casual' value is valid for the tp. not for the bv., the value of which is clearly (and distinctively) 'comparative' (no need to put the *iva* in brackets). In other examples such as *rājaputrau*, as a bv. meaning 'both (ones) whose (respective or numerous; or even single if one talks of the parents) son(s) was/were king(s)', in comparison to the tp. 'the two sons of the king(s)', the kdh. 'the two sons (who were) kings' and the dv. 'the king and the son', how to decide if it is a 'tp. > bv.' transformation (cf. implicitly Macdonell 1927 § 189a infra) or a 'kdh. > bv.' one?

2°) *candrānana* : in the case of the supposed 'kdh. > bv.' transformation, if the 'comparative' value is ok here for the bv. (cf. *candra-mukhaḥ* = *candra iva mukhaṁ yasya*, 'moon-faced'), the (formally) corresponding (homonymous) kdh. does not mean at all 'a moon-like face' (*candrānanam* or *candra-mukham* has no meaning as a kdh.). One needs here the reversely constructed compound for providing the comparative meaning 'moon-like face' : *mukha-candraḥ* = *mukhaṁ candra iva* (and, according to 1°, this bv. *candra-mukha-* cannot be considered as 'corresponding' to the tp. *candra-mukha-*, which is devoid of comparative element in its meaning = 'the face of [the god] Candra'; like for instance, as noted Renou, the bv. *vidyut-prabhaḥ* = *vidyutaḥ* [gen.] *iva prabhā yasya saḥ*, cannot be said to correspond to the tp. *vidyut-prabhā* = *vidyutaḥ prabhā*).

Note: this sub-type of kdh. (substantive) involving a comparison, defined by indigenous grammar as an *upamānottara-pada-karmadhāraya* (one 'whose second member is the object of comparison') is analysed by a comparison (*upamā*) stricto sensu, with a *vigraha* of structure *mukhaṁ candra iva*, but can also be analysed, according to the poetics, by a metaphor (*rūpaka*), with in this case a *vigraha* of structure *mukhaṁ eva candraḥ* (a 'moon-face'), depending on whether the predominance of meaning is placed on, respectively, the subject being compared (*upameya*) or the object/standard to which the comparison is made (*upamāna*) (an identity is established between both in the *rūpaka*).

3°) *pāpa-mati* : the apparently 'obvious' example of the compound made of 1 adj. + 1 subst. like *mahā-rathaḥ* which would be 'at first' understood as a kdh. = *mahān rathaḥ*, and then viewed as the 'corresponding' ('*karmadhāraya*'-)bv. *mahā-rathaḥ* = *mahān rathaḥ yasya saḥ*. But the *vigraha* could also be (with the plur.) *mahānto rathāḥ - yasya saḥ*. Semantically, they are very different, they do not function/cannot be analysed in the same manner, and according to the bv. *vigraha*, not only the number of the adj.+ substantive (singular or plural) can be different, but even the function of the 'qualifying' adj. is slightly different (an attr. is not exactly the same as an epithet).

4°) *vidyā-dhana* : the same syntactical remark could be done for this 'obvious' example of transformation,

5°) *su-putra* : the 'possessive' bv. *su-putraḥ* 'looks like' the kdh. *su-putraḥ* semantically, but the bv. *a-putra* 'sonless' has not very much to do with the meaning of the kdh. *a-putra* 'not a son'.

6°) ? : ‘Dvandva [made of substantives]-adjectives’ or ‘Dvandva-Bahuvrīhis’ ?

(a few Vedic and epic/śloka occurrences only)

- Nala 13.2 [ed. Caland = MBh 3,62.2bc] : *taḍāgaṃ padmasaugandhikam* [« un étang (*taḍāga*-) doté/couvert de lotus (*padma*-) et de nénuphars (*saugandhika*-) »], adj. corresponding to the dv. substantive *padma* + *saugandhika*- (noted by Scharpé)
- MBh 1,210*113.11 : *akṣamālāṅgulīyakaḥ* ‘wearing an *akṣamālā* and a finger ring’ (*aṅgulīyaka*)’ (Haas).
- *Mokṣopāya* IV.43.16ab: *śarīram asthi-māṃsam* ‘the body that possesses/consists of bone and flesh’ (noted by Slaje).
- *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* 3.12 : *bhikṣavaḥ* [...] *sa-strī-putra-paśu-striyaḥ* ‘Bhikṣus [...] with married sons (lit. sons with wives), cattle, and wives’ (Slaje, who hints that here *sa*- is not the bahuvrīhi marker of the whole compound).

Such very rare examples of dvandva adjectives made of two (or more) substantives and meaning "having/concerned by/related to/with/for etc. such and such", could be termed “pre-/non-classical” (if not irregular or ‘non-grammatical’).

Cf. Whitney 1889 § 1293 (these examples are also discussed by Wackernagel, *AIG* II/1, p. 280):

- b. A copulative [should add: substantive] compound is not convertible into an adjective directly, any more than is a simple noun, but requires, like the latter, a possessive suffix or other means (...). A very small number of exceptions, however, are found : thus, **somendrá** [‘for Soma and Indra’] (TS.), **stómaprṣṭha** [‘having songs and (melodies said) prominents’] (VS. TS.), **hastyṛṣabha** [« qui porte (la marque) de l’éléphant et du taureau », Renou] (ÇB.) (...)

In § 1294b Whitney adds examples of old ‘derivative adjective compounds which imply the relation of appurtenance rather than of possession, and which are with probability to be viewed as survivals of a state of things antecedent to the specialization of the general class as possessive’, among which are a few of (primary) dvandva structure too, such as *somendrá* (already cited), and, ‘in the later language’, **devāsura** [*saṃgrāma*] [‘battle’ of the gods and demons], **narahaya** ‘of man and horse’, **cakramusala** ‘with discus and club’ [cf. *śārṅgaśaṅkhagadācakramusalaṃ śūlam* HV 47.29*586.2].

Such compounds (not confirmed as bahuvrīhi by the accent in the case of the Vedic ones, see supra) should be placed in the class of dvandva, in this case formed from substantives but used as an adjective and which consequently takes on the value of a determinative complement (with different possible values for the latter) — despite the (misleading) English translation, there is indeed no possible bahuvrīhi vighraha here, unless to imagine an implied initial *sa*-, by a sort of ellipsis: it would be indeed necessary to add a *sa*- as a front member to formally obtain authentic bahuvrīhis (a one, in this case, made of *sa*- as first member, and of a dvandva as the second member).

As noted by Whitney, the adjective characteristic should be better (grammatically speaking) marked with suffixes like in the examples of

Kumārabhārgaviya[m kāvyam], Arjunarāvaṇīya[m kāvyam], Vākyapadīya[m śāstram]

(in the examples, the use of *akṣamālāṅgulīyakaḥ*, with the secondary adj. suffix *-ka*, instead of *akṣamālāṅgulīyaḥ* is relevant in this respect; cf. also the derived form used as second member in *padmasaugandhikam*; as for the last two examples, *asthi-māṃsam* can also be considered as an appositional dvandva substantive, and the ellipsis of *sa*- before *sa*- remains understandable).

indraśatru

Mantra : “Svāhā! As Indraśatru, grow/prosper/succeed (*vardhasva*)!”

with either *indra-śatru-* = tp. (accent on the final syllable, *antodātta*) = the foe/conqueror of Indra (*indrasya śatruḥ*)

or *indra-śatru-* = bv. (*pūrvapada-prakṛti-svara*) = the one whose conqueror/foe is Indra (*indraḥ śatruḥ yasya saḥ*)

Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā 2,4.3 : “*svāhēndraśatruḥ vardhasva*” *itīndrasyāhainam śatrum ācikīṛṣad indram asya śatrum akarot* ‘by saying “*svāhēndraśatruḥ vardhasva*,” he [= Tvaṣṭṛ] desired to make him [= Vṛtra] the enemy/conqueror of Indra [but] he made Indra his conqueror.’

Taittirīya-Saṃhitā 2,5,2.1-2 : *yád ábravīt “svāhēndraśatruḥ vardhasva” iti tásmd āsyēndraḥ śatruḥ abhavat* : ‘since he said “*svāhēndraśatruḥ vardhasva*,” then Indra became his conqueror.’

Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa (Mādhyam̐dina) 1,6,3.10 : *átha yád ábravīd indraśatruḥ vardhasvétī, tásmd u hainam indra evá jaghāna; átha yád dha śásvad ávakṣyad indrasya śatruḥ vardhasvétī śásvad u ha sá evēndram ahanīṣyat* ‘and since he said “*indraśatruḥ vardhasva*,” then Indra killed him; but if he had said “as conqueror of Indra's foe, grow!,” then certainly he would have killed Indra.’

Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa 2,155.12 : *taṃ [= vṛtram] hāgnau pravartayāṃ cakārendraśatruḥ vardhasva svāheti* ; (...) 23 : *tasmād u hainam indra eva jaghāna yad indraśatruḥ vardhasva svāheti pravartayāṃ cakāra; atha yad dha prāvartayiṣyad indrasya śatruḥ vardhasva svāheti*.

Patañjali, *Mahābhāṣya* Intr. :

yājñikāḥ paṭhanti : “sthūlapṛṣatīm āgnivāruṇīm anaḍvāhīm ālabheta” iti. tasyāṃ samdehaḥ – sthūlā cāsau pṛṣatī ca sthūlapṛṣatī, sthūlāni pṛṣanti yasyāḥ sā sthūlapṛṣatī. tāṃ nāvaiyākaraṇaḥ svarato ’dhyavasyati. yadi pūrvapadaprakṛtisvaratvaṃ tato bahuvrīhiḥ, athāntodāttatvaṃ tatas tatpuruṣa iti.
The specialists of the sacrifice teach that “a cow provided with large spots should be immolated to Agni and Varuṇa.” In this (expression) there is doubt whether *sthūlapṛṣatī* means ‘large and spotted’ or ‘having large spots’. No one other than a grammarian has the solution, (which takes place) thanks to the accent: when the accent is on the radical of the front member, then it is a *bahuvrīhi*, and if the final element carries the acute tone, then it is a *tatpuruṣa*. (...)

Challenged by Kumāṛila, *Tantravārttika* 1,3, (*adhik.*) 9 : *sthūlapṛṣatyādi-śabdārtheṣv api vyākhyātṛ-paramparaiva nirṇaya-kṣamā_iti na vyākaraṇam apekṣitavyam* ‘even in the case of such words as *sthūlapṛṣatī* and the like, we can safely have recourse to the [Vedic] commentators themselves (for the ascertaining of the actual meaning of the said words). And as such there can be no use of Grammar at this point’ (...)

*yathāivāvasthito vedas tathā vyākhyāpi sarvadā /
athaḥ sthūlapṛṣatyādivyākhyā vyākaraṇād ṛte //*

‘And the explanatory commentaries to the Veda being as eternally continuous as the Veda itself, such words as *sthūlapṛṣatī* and the rest are found to be explained without the help of Grammar’ (tr. Jha pp. 285-286)

***duṣṭaḥ śabdaḥ svarato varṇato vā mithyā prayukto na tam artham āha /
sa vāgvajro yajamānaḥ hinasti yathendraśatruḥ svarato 'parādhāt //* [itī]
*duṣṭāñ chabdān mā prayukṣmahīty adhyeyaḥ vyākaraṇam.***

“a faulty word, used erroneously, either as to accent or phoneme, is out of condition to express the meaning (expected of it): it is a word-lightning which strikes the priest, as (it happened in the case of the word) *indraśatru* (which was pronounced) with a mistake as to accent.”[as it is said]

It is so that we do not use faulty words that we need to learn grammar.

Criticized by Kumāṛila, *Tantravārttika* 1,3,9 : ‘The second use spoken of by the *Mahābhāṣya* is that it protects us from the misfortunes that befall those uttering incorrect words, as evinced by the text — ‘a word pronounced incorrectly, either as to its accents or letters, becomes a thunderbolt killing the sacrificer, as for instance the word *indraśatru* (which was addressed to Vṛtra, as the killer of Indra, a Genitive Tatpuruṣa, but as the accent that was used was that of the Bahuvrīhi compound, Vṛtra became one whose killer was Indra).’ But here the *Mahābhāṣya* has substituted in this text the word ‘word’ [*śabda*] for ‘Mantra,’ which is the reading known to many men [see *Pāṇinīya-Śikṣā* st. 52a in the Ṛgveda rec. : *mantra hīnaḥ svarato varṇato vā*]; and this substitution of a different reading only shows an undue degree of partiality to his own theories. And as for the misfortunes of sinfulness befalling the sacrificer who employs incorrect *Mantras*, it is a fact that no one denies; specially as we have many texts, — f.i. ‘the sentence that is killed (spoilt) by the priest, kills the sacrificer himself’ — that clearly point to the fact of the discrepancies in the use of *Mantras* by the Priests bringing about evil results to the sacrificer. And it is because the text refers to the mistakes of *Mantra* that it has cited the use of a *Mantra* — ‘*indraśatro vardhasva*’ — as an example’ (tr. Jha p. 287)

Bhartṛhari, *Vākyapadīya* 3,10.5 :

***sambodhanaḥ na loke 'sti vidhātavyena vastunā /
svāhendraśatrur vardhasva yathā rājā bhaveti ca //***

There is normally no vocative with a subject that is to be determined, as [in the examples] “Svāhā! As *Indraśatru* prosper!” and “Become king!”.

Commented by K. A. Subramania Iyer 1974: Wherever, however, the word ending in the nominative case is part of the predicative portion of a sentence, it cannot express the idea of the vocative as in *svāhā indraśatrur vardhasva* and *rājā bhava*. Here *indraśatruḥ* and *rājā*, though ending in the nominative case, belong to the predicative portion of the sentence. Therefore, they cannot express the vocative idea. Drawing the attention of something which is already there is the vocative idea. The predicative portion of a sentence, on the other hand, is something which is not known to the hearer and, therefore, not taken for granted by him. Therefore, in these two sentences, though there is command, there is no *sambodhana*, the vocative idea.

Bhartṛhari’s remark is noteworthy, because it shows that, according to both examples, even if we could have here some vocative, for instance *he vṛtra* (or *he agni-pravartita*, cf. JB) with *svāhendraśatrur vardhasva*, or *he rāma* with *rājā bhava*, the nominative is required in the second case because *rājā* is attribute, and in the first case because the compound is a kind of ‘circonstancial’ appositional substantive (both “belonging to the predicative portion of the sentence”, whereas the vocative itself is outside it).

Compound proper names of the Mitanni Āryas

The earliest historically attested Indo-Aryan compounds are represented by the proper names of ārya princes and other individuals in and around the Syrian kingdom of Mitanni in the 16th-14th centuries BC. These names (which are per se ‘substantives’) are mostly bahuvrīhis (see their analysis by Dumont 1947, etc.), indicating, by the relation of their components, a form of possession or quality of the person they designate or ‘qualify’, just like proper names attested in the form of tatpuruṣa ‘adjectives’ (such as Indrota ‘Indra-promoted’).

However, they are not syntactically dependent or ‘secondarily’ epithets of something else, principal, as adjectives would be. Nor can they be explained as ‘built/based’ on some prior karmadhāraya (or tatpuruṣa). Thus the name of the king Bṛhad-aśva (= Μεγάλλιππος) has always meant ‘He whose horses are big/who has big horses’, and never ‘Big Horse’ (a name/totem that could have been borne by some West Indians only).

Old-Indo-Aryan language was able to make clear distinction between *bahuvrīhi* and *tatpuruṣa/karmadhāraya* compounds by means of the accent. Indigenous Sanskrit grammar built a very valuable linguistic theory on the different types (and sub-types) of compounds.

Then Western linguistic tradition then came, itself dependent of the primeval Greco-Latin grammatical distinction between ‘substantives’ (nouns) and ‘adjectives’. Applied to the Sanskrit compounds, it has led to the view that the *tatpuruṣa/karmadhāraya(/dvandva)* (mainly substantives) were ‘primary’ and that the *bahuvrīhi* (‘fundamentally adjectival’ Gillon) were, secondarily, ‘based on’ the former (with odd categories as ‘karmadhāraya-bahuvrīhi’, ‘tatpuruṣa-bahuvrīhi’ or even ‘dvandva-bahuvrīhi’ — there are of course some common characteristics, for instance, as noted by Davella, *samānādhikaraṇa* common to kdh. and to ‘samānādhikaraṇa-bahuvrīhi’, cf. P. 1.2.42 *tatpuruṣaḥ samānādhikaraṇaḥ karmadhārayaḥ*).

The fact is that *tatpuruṣa*, *karmadhāraya* and *dvandva* can also be adjectives if, simply, their last member is itself an adjective, whereas the *bahuvrīhi*, which has always a substantive as last member, presents a ‘syntactic’ (Lowe) or ‘exocentric’ (or relative) peculiar aspect/turn, forming a complex qualificative meaning which itself can work as an adjective.. or a substantive.