

STUDIA ORIENTALIA  
EDIDIT SOCIETAS ORIENTALIS FENNICA  
XI. 7

---

SOME NOTES ON THE FORMATION AND  
USE OF NOMINAL COMPOUNDS IN  
THE RIG-VEDA

BY  
Y. M. BIESE

HELSINGFORSIAE 1945  
SOCIETAS ORIENTALIS FENNICA

Helsinki 1945  
Printed by the Finnish Literary Society

## Some Notes on the Formation and Use of Nominal Compounds in the Rig-Veda.

BY

Y. M. BIESE

In examining the oldest stages of many Indo-European languages such as Sanskrit, Homeric Greek, Latin, or the most ancient literary works of the Germanic peoples (the Beowulf, the Edda or the Gothic translation of the Bible), we find a great number of nominal compounds. In most cases the various types of these formations go back into the Ie. parent language.

Certain types of Ie. nominal compounds are commonly assumed to represent very early stages in the development of the Ie. parent language. An analysis of their origin takes us back into a period which lies long before that stage of development which the parent language had reached immediately before it was split up into the separate Ie. languages. Thus the origin of the compounds called *Tatpuruṣas*<sup>1</sup> goes back into a pre-inflectional period, when certain case-relations were expressed by uninflected nominal stems.<sup>2</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> This is a term used by the Indian grammarians to denote what we might call nominal compounds in which the first element stands in the relation of some nominal case to the second element, the genitive relation being the most common type.

<sup>2</sup> Here the term 'pre-inflectional' need not be taken in an absolute sense. Even if we derive the origin of the Ie. nominal inflection from an older non-inflectional period, it must be assumed that the development of the inflection took place gradually. We may therefore use the term 'pre-inflectional' with reference to a stage in the development of the Ie. language, when the nominal inflection which is characteristic of the structure of the Ie. parent language in its later stages, had either not yet been developed or had only partly attained the extent it was later to receive.

origin of the Karmadhāraya compounds (see p. 3) lies in a period in which the motion of the adjective had not yet been developed.

Regarding the various stages in the development of the Ie. parent language I shall here distinguish between Common Indo-European and Primitive Indo-European, the former term referring to the Ie. parent language of the period immediately before its disintegration into the separate Ie. languages, the latter term being reserved to denote those periods — by necessity very vaguely distinguished chronologically — into which the evolution of the parent language goes back. These terms are used here as equivalents of the German *Grundsprache* and *Ursprache* as used by JACOBI, *Compositum und Nebensatz* (Bonn 1897).

The investigation and explanation of the origin of certain types of nominal compounds offers many difficult and complicated problems. As the language of the Rig-Veda represents the oldest form of any Ie. language known to us, and as nominal compounds play a very important part in Vedic word-formation, the Vedic language must be considered of great importance whenever the history of Ie. nominal compounds is investigated.

The number of nominal compounds instanced in the hymns of the Rig-Veda is very great, the total figure amounting to more than three thousand. If the very numerous formations with the privative particle *a*, *an* as well as the great number of other prefix-formations are added, the total will amount to about four thousand.

Regarding their syntactic value all nominal compounds may be divided into two main groups, substantives and adjectives. In the Rig-Veda the number of adjectival formations is far in excess of those functioning as substantives, the latter amounting to only about one-eighth of the total.

Numerically the most important type of all Vedic compounds consists of the so called Bahuvrīhis, i. e. compounds such as *viśvarūpa* 'having all shapes', *śata-dura* 'having a hundred doors' (corresponding to the Greek *ἑκατόμυλος*), which have numerous counterparts among such Homeric formations as *ζόδο-δάκτυλος* as well as among corresponding Germanic examples such as Old Norse

*hvit-beinn*, Engl. *barefoot* (= Old English *bærfót*), German *barfuss*, and Gothic *hrainja-hairts* (= *καθαρός τῆ καρδία*, corresponding to an Old English *clænheort*). The rest of the Vedic nominal compounds consists of a considerable number of Tatpuruṣas and Karma-dhārayas, to use the terms introduced by the Indian grammarians, i.e. compounds which could be termed case-governed or determinative compounds and appositive compounds respectively. The number of Dvandvas occurring in the Rig-Veda is not very large, owing to the rather limited scope of this type. A fairly common type is represented by the so called synthetic compounds, i.e. compounds such as *viśva-vid* 'who knows all, knowing all', which are determinative compounds with a verbal noun as their second element.

It is a well-known fact that nowhere else in the Ie. languages do nominal compounds play such an important part as in Classical Sanskrit, where their use has developed into one of the most important syntactic and stylistic features of the language. This tendency is sometimes carried almost to absurdum, numerous compounds being of an enormous length and requiring a careful analysis in order to be fully understood.<sup>1</sup> The picture offered by the Vedic use of the compounds is entirely different, compound formations consisting of more than two components being very rare.<sup>2</sup> In this respect the language of the Rig-Veda is as yet far from the stage that was to be reached by the later language. Vedic usage is almost on the same level as that of the other old Ie. idioms, Greek, Latin and Germanic, except that the number of Vedic nominal compounds is comparatively greater. By careful analysis it will no doubt be possible to show that the later development is to some extent anticipated in the use of Vedic compounds.

The Bahuvrīhis are commonly regarded as constituting one

<sup>1</sup> On the use of compounds in Sanskrit literature see JACOBI, *Compositum und Nebensatz* p. 91 etc.

<sup>2</sup> A few Vedic examples of such formations may be quoted here: *viśvāyucepas* 'exciting or terrifying all men', *raghupati-majihvas* 'light-winged, having a light-falling foot', *duroka-śocis* 'shining very brightly'.

of the oldest types of Ie. nominal compounds.<sup>1</sup> This is well in accord with their frequent use in the Rig-Veda. The history of the Bahuvrīhis shows that, except in Sanskrit, they are everywhere on the decline. They are more numerous in the older strata of the Ie. languages than in the later periods. This applies to Greek and Latin as well as to the Germanic languages.<sup>2</sup>

A considerable number of old Bahuvrīhi compounds having a substantive as their second element were augmented with a final suffix, by which they became more clearly characterized as adjectival formations. This process was due to the fact that there existed a certain discrepancy between their meaning and form, which led to the result that some more clearly expressed characterization of their adjectival nature was felt to be needed, as soon as the development of case-inflection and gender-distinction had taken place. The type of the suffix-formed Bahuvrīhis also goes back into the Ie. parent language, and in the later stages of the Ie. languages these formations are steadily gaining ground at the cost of the old Bahuvrīhis.<sup>3</sup> In the later stages of Sanskrit the most commonly used suffix is the unstressed syllable *-ka*.<sup>4</sup> In the Rig-Veda this suffix is instanced in two uncertain cases only: *tri-kadru-ka* 'three Kadru-vessels (?)' and *try-amba-ka* 'having three mothers'. The number of compounds formed with the suffixes *-i*, *-ya*, *-a* as well as *-in* and *-vant* is, however, considerably greater, but compared with the total these formations are very infrequent indeed, amounting to not more than a few per

<sup>1</sup> Cf. HIRT, *Idg. Gr. IV*, p. 37 etc.

<sup>2</sup> In spite of this the Bahuvrīhis are still a living category in the Germanic languages. They have a certain picturesqueness and vigour, which no doubt is the reason why they are used in Modern English for slogan-like new-formations in the field of public and political life, e. g. *roundhead*, *blue-stocking*. Cf. also W. LAST, *Das Bahuvrihi-Compositum im Ae., Me. und Ne.* Diss. Greifswald 1925.

<sup>3</sup> The suffixes occurring in Sanscrit Bahuvrīhis are dealt with at some length by WACKERNAGEL, *Altindische Grammatik II*, 1 § 44—53.

<sup>4</sup> This suffix corresponds to the *-ig* / *-ag* suffixes which become very common in the Germanic languages.

cent.<sup>1</sup> Although the suffix-formed Bahuvrīhis go back into the Ie. parent language, I think that they must be regarded as belonging to a comparatively late stage in the development of Common Indo-European. This is clearly illustrated by their relatively insignificant role in the Rig-Veda. Thus we may assume that the introduction of suffix-formed Bahuvrīhis did not take place very long before the Aryan tribes left the common Ie. speech-community. This would be in accord with the fact that the Aryans were obviously the first of the tribes speaking the Ie. parent language to branch off towards a separate linguistic development.

Among the Vedic compounds there is a fairly numerous type consisting of so called synthetic compounds such as *sabar-dhu* 'scattering nectar', *vr̥dha-snu* 'trickling blessing', *viśva-bhrāj* 'all-illuminating', *viśva-vid* 'knowing all', *vr̥tra-han* 'who has killed Vritra'. They are characterized by having a verbal noun as their second element, while the substantive forming their first component often figures as the object of the second part. These formations, which have been called synthetic compounds<sup>2</sup>, are in many respects of a somewhat aenigmatic character.<sup>3</sup> It is a curious characteristic of

<sup>1</sup> In the other Ie. languages suffixes play a much more important part in the Bahuvrīhis. This applies even to Greek where formations such as *ὄμο-γαστρως* 'coming from the same womb' are quite frequent. In the Germanic languages formations with suffixes corresponding to the Ie. *-to* become very frequent in Scandinavian and English (e.g. *blue-eyed*, *blåögd*), whereas German seems to have resorted almost exclusively to the suffix *-ig*: *blau-äugig*, *krumm-beinig* etc.

<sup>2</sup> See JACOBI, p. 5 on the use of this term.

<sup>3</sup> These compounds occur in the Aryan languages as well as in Greek, Latin, Slavic, and to a certain extent in the Germanic languages. Only a few examples may be given here: gr. *χέρ-νυψ*, *βου-πλήξ* (in both cases a substantiation has taken place), lat. *signifer*, *armiger*, *tibicen*, Russian *kono-krád* 'horse-thief'. According to HIRT, I. F. VII, 411 etc. Germanic formations such as *arbinumja* 'heir' belong to the same type, although they represent a somewhat later development. Latin examples such as *signifer* contain a suffix, the original form having been *\*signi-ferus*. Most Latin and Greek as well as all Germanic formations contain suffixes of some kind. Numerous Latin and Greek examples are quoted by JACOBI, p. 6—12.

these compounds that the words functioning as their second element do not exist, at least in a great number of cases, as separate words of the language outside the compounds. In all other cases compounds have usually been formed, in various ways, by putting together words which are, even apart from their use in compounds, found as independent words in the language. The difficulties which the synthetic compounds offer to the explanation of their origin are summarized by Jacobi as follows (p. 5): »Sieht man sie wie gewöhnliche Composita an, so steht man vor dem Widerspruch, dass zwei Wörter zusammengesetzt wurden, von denen das eine vorher nicht bestand. Geht man diesem Widerspruch aus dem Wege durch die Annahme, dass die im zweiten Gliede aufzutreffenden Wörter in einer fernen Urzeit auch selbständig gebraucht worden seien, so erhebt sich die Frage, weshalb diese Wörter oder vielmehr ganze Wortkategorien — denn um solche, nicht um einzelne Wörter handelt es sich — so vollständig im freien Gebrauch aufgegeben worden sind und sich um so reichlicher in der Composition erhalten haben.« Jacobi has endeavoured to explain the origin of the synthetic compounds by assuming that the second element, which has the meaning of an agent-noun or a present participle, represents a kind of participle occurring in Primitive Indo-European. He calls it the relative participle, and assumes that these formations were once very frequent, but later, for various reasons, became ousted out of use except as final members of compounds.<sup>1</sup>

I cannot here enter upon a detailed criticism of Jacobi's theory. His assumption that the origin of certain compounds is to be found in various kinds of clauses of the Primitive Ie. language

<sup>1</sup> JACOBI p. 21: »Wenn wir also jene primitiven nomina agentis nicht direkt mit dem Participium praes. (oder aor.) identifizieren können, so dürfen wir sie doch als Participia der Ursprache bezeichnen, die sich nur in gewissen, zu Composita erstarrten Wendungen erhalten haben. Wir wollen sie im Unterschied zu den eigentlichen Participien Relativparticipia nennen, weil die mit ihnen gebildeten Composita inhaltlich Relativsätzen entsprechen und zwar solchen, die eine wichtige Eigenschaft derjenigen Person oder Sache beilegen, auf welche sie sich beziehen.«



is, I should think, in itself convincing and is the only correct explanation of the origin of the Bahuvrīhi compounds.<sup>1</sup> In discussing the problem of the origin of the synthetic compounds I shall here pay attention to some aspects of the question which have been overlooked by Jacobi and others. A more detailed investigation of certain problems connected with the matter must, however, be left to further studies on the use of Vedic compounds.

As synthetic compounds occur in the Rig-Veda in considerable number and as this text represents the oldest attainable source for the investigation of the problem, we must pay due regard to some facts which can be ascertained through a survey of the Vedic material.

All synthetic compounds are not formations of exactly the same structure. In some cases the second element is, at least from a Sanskrit point of view, the verbal root pure and simple, in other cases some slight modifications of the root have taken place. In other cases the second element of these compounds, though closely related to the verbal root, has been augmented with a suffix, by which it is more clearly characterized as an agent-noun. Among the very numerous verbal roots which occur unchanged at the end of synthetic compounds the following may be mentioned: *sad*, *sū*, *dviṣ*, *druh*, *yuj*, *vid*, *bhid*, *chid*, *ji*, *nī*, *rāj*, *jur*, *jū*, *duh*, *vr̥dh*, *han*, *dhā*. An examination of the material contained in WHITNEY'S *Die Wurzeln, Verbalformen und Primären Stämme der Sanskrit-Sprache* (Leipzig 1885) shows that about 230 verbal roots have corresponding root-nouns which have been formed without any alterations. Of these about two thirds occur only at the end of compounds, one third being found either as separate nouns only or as separate nouns and final elements of compounds as well. Out of the 230 verbal roots occurring also as nouns there are only about thirty which have not been found in the Vedic language. In many of these cases, however, the root is as such of comparatively late appearance or root-nouns which have not been found in the Vedic language occur in other old texts. Thus we

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Y. M. BIESE, *Der spätlateinische Accusativus absolutus und Verwandtes* (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae 1928), p. 151—169.

are, I think, justified in maintaining that those synthetic compounds which have unchanged verbal roots as their second element represent the oldest stratum of these compounds.<sup>1</sup> As is to be expected, these formations occur in great number in the Rig-Veda. Only a few Vedic examples may be mentioned here to illustrate the formation and meaning of these compounds: *agnīdh* 'who lights (or has lighted) the fire', *agre-pā* 'who drinks first', *añjas-pā* 'who drinks the unction', *adhri-bhid* 'who shatters the rocks', *dravino-vid* 'who gives goods', *pṛtanā-sah* 'who defeats the enemy's army', *vṛtra-han* 'who has killed Vritra'.

Because these formations must be regarded as the oldest stratum of the synthetic compounds, the whole problem of the origin of this type of compounds centres round the question of the nature of the second element.

In translating the synthetic compounds of the Sanskrit or other languages we usually render the second element by using an agent-noun or a present participle. As was mentioned above, Jacobi has derived the synthetic compounds from a kind of relative clauses assumed to have existed in the Primitive Ie. language. However probable his explanation may be, I think it must be supplemented, as far as the very first origin of the synthetic compounds is concerned, by another theory which I am here going to suggest.

It is of great importance to remember that, although the root-nouns which occur as second elements of the synthetic compounds are interpreted as being agent-nouns with a meaning closely resembling that of present participles, this is by no means their only function. Besides functioning as nomina agentis, the root-nouns in a great number of cases occur also as nomina actionis.<sup>2</sup> A very great number of root-nouns in Sanskrit occur both as nomina actionis and as nomina agentis. Thus *druh* means 'injuring, hostile' as well as 'injury', *dviṣ* both 'enemy' and 'hate', *vṛdh* both 'strengthening' (adj., and at the end of comp.) and 'strengthening, increase' (subst.),

<sup>1</sup> Cf. JACOBI, p. 17—25 and HIRT, Idg. Gr. IV, p. 26.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. HIRT, Idg. Gr. III, p. 83 WACKERNAGEL Ai. Gr. II, 1. § 77, and DELBRÜCK, Syntax, III, 165.

etc. The root *sad* is of great interest. It does not occur as a separate word either as an agent-noun or as an action-noun, but at the end of compounds it is found in the Rîg-Veda in both meanings. As an agent-noun we have it in the word *upastha-sad* 'sitting in the shrine' and *apsu-sad* 'living in the water', whereas its function in formations such as *upa-sad* 'attendance' and *ni-ṣad* 'sitting' is clearly that of an action-noun.

It can be taken for granted that in Primitive Ie. the root-nouns were very frequent and that they were freely used both as action-nouns and as agent-nouns. Their markedly early appearance and wide use in Sanskrit and other old Ie. languages decidedly points in that direction. In the earlier stages of the development of the Ie. language the distinction between agent-noun and action-noun had probably not yet been developed. The root-nouns, functioning very frequently in word-combinations which were later to develop into synthetic compounds, had naturally a rather vague meaning as they were words having both verbal and nominal qualities. These root-nouns were originally some kind of action-nouns rather than agent-nouns, because it is easier to conceive of agent-nouns developing from a common basic verbal noun having the meaning of an action-noun than *vice versa*. In this respect the development of English conversion-nouns is of considerable interest.<sup>1</sup> In the English language there are numerous nouns derived from verbs, e.g. *sink*, *rise*, *go*, etc. They have mostly the meaning of action-nouns but in some cases they have also meanings which place them on the same footing as agent-nouns. It is commonly believed, and I think correctly too, that in Ie. as well as in other languages the category of verbs was gradually evolved from that of the nouns. Thus the root-nouns here discussed may date back to the period when there was not yet any clear distinction between the noun and the verb.

In my opinion, then, the word-group functioning as the source of a synthetic compound such as the Vedic *viśva-vid* originally meant something like 'all + knowledge', *vṛtra-han* something like 'Vṛtra +

<sup>1</sup> For their history see Y. M. BIESE, *Origin and Development of Conversions in English*, Helsinki 1941 (*Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae*, B XLV, 2).

+ killing, death'. The exact relation between the two elements cannot be expressed satisfactorily by using the linguistic relations we now resort to in describing the syntactic structure of sentences and word-groups. The word-groups with which we are here concerned were mostly used, as appears from the fact that the synthetic compounds are of an adjectival nature, with reference to some nominal idea, the name of a person or thing, figuring in the same utterance. There may thus have been such word-groups as (to use Sanskrit stems to represent the words) *Indra Vrtra han*. It consisted of a noun, *Indra*, to which another word-group added a reference, the latter word-group having some sort of sentence-character of its own. The sentence as a whole had the following meaning: A subject, *Indra*, is mentioned and it is said of him that to him pertains the quality expressed by the word-group which mentions the killing of *Vrtra* by naming a person and the action by which he has been affected.

As Jacobi (p. 8) has pointed out, there are some cases of the synthetic compounds in which the second element has a preterital instead of the prevailing presential meaning. Such examples are e. g. *vrtra-han* (which was discussed at some length above) as well as *agni-cit* 'who has arranged the sacrificial fire' and *sapatna-han* 'who kills (or has killed) his rivals'. As these formations also occur in the Rig-Veda, it may be assumed that the type belonged to the oldest synthetic compounds. The preterital meaning is well in accord with their original use as action-nouns which I have suggested for the second element of these compounds.

In this connection I must draw attention to a fact which seems to point out that the root-nouns functioning as action-nouns were once of great importance in Primitive Ie. In Vedic Sanskrit there are numerous root-nouns entering the category of infinitives by having a case-ending appended to them (see WHITNEY, Sanskrit Grammar § 969 etc.). As these formations do not occur in the later language though they have counterparts in other Ie. languages (Latin formations such as *agi* belong here, see HIRT, Idg. Gr. IV, p. 92), they are certainly old and may even belong to the oldest infinitives.

The root-noun functioning as the second element of the word-groups which were in the course of time united into synthetic compounds had, as I see it, originally no clearly developed participial meaning at all. There is, however, no doubt that such a meaning became gradually developed. I think that this must have taken place parallel with the development of the verb itself. As the idea of the verbal force of certain words became more and more clearly developed, — and part of this process may be seen at work in the evolution of old infinitives of the kind mentioned above — this process was also extended to those word-groups in which the root-noun of the second element had as yet only a rather vague relation to a verbal shade of meaning. The final element was then felt to contain a reference to the performer of the action which was inherent in its meaning. As regards speech-feeling the meaning of the old action-nouns became gradually transformed into that of agent-nouns. This process may have been a very slow and gradual one, and it probably took place parallel with the general development of more clearly defined case-relations between the nominal and verbal parts of the sentence. The syntactic relation known as that between a verbal idea and its object was probably one of the first to become established. A very large number of synthetic compounds occurring in the Rig-Veda have second elements with transitive meaning, and this may be assumed with a high degree of probability to have been a very common type in Primitive Ie.

The prevailing transitive meaning need by no means be regarded as speaking against the origin of the synthetic compounds here suggested. This is seen from the fact that, as has been pointed out by WUNDT, *Die Sprache* II, p. 143, transitive relations have been expressed by nominal means much longer than the intransitive ones.

In a great number of those synthetic compounds that were introduced in the later stages the root-noun of the second element has been augmented by adding suffixes used in forming agent-nouns. In this respect the development of the synthetic compounds bears close resemblance to that of the Bahuvrīhi compounds into which the suffix-formations were introduced in ever increasing number.

In the synthetic compounds this was carried a step further than in the Buhuvrīhis, as is shown by the Germanic languages, in which all synthetic compounds have been replaced by suffix-formations. A survey of the nominal compounds occurring in the Rig-Veda leads to the conclusion that already in the Vedic language the suffix-formations played a far more important part among the synthetic compounds than among those belonging to the Bahuvrīhis (see p. 4 above).

In trying to explain the origin of the synthetic compounds with the aid of the so called relative participles of Primitive Ie. Jacobi has referred to certain constructions in Telugu and other non-IE languages. I cannot enter upon a discussion of the conclusions he has drawn from that material, but I wish to draw attention to some Finnish constructions which in my opinion speak in favour of the suggestions I have put forward in explanation of the synthetic compounds.

In *Helkkavirsii* by the Finnish poet Eino Leino I have found the following instances:<sup>1</sup> p. 113 *Saat sa mahdin maan ikuisen / tulet Kouta kaikkitieto* (— — — 'you will become Kouta who knows all'), p. 114: *Tahdot tulla kaikkitieto* ('you wish to become one who knows all'), p. 158: *päällä paaden vaahtiparskun* ('on the rock which is foaming with spray'), p. 133: *Tuop' oli Äijö yksin-synty, yksin-alku, yksin-kuolo* ('this was Äijö, who was born alone, who alone has a beginning, who dies alone'). In the word *kaikkitieto* we have a compound which is an exact equivalent of the Vedic *viśva-vid*. The interesting point is that *tieto* outside this compound is found only as a very common action-noun (corresponding to the verb *tietää* 'to know') but never as an agent-noun. The same observation applies to the words *synty*, *alku*, and *kuolo*. These Finnish examples are of considerable interest, because they show that in compounds action-nouns can be used with a meaning which must be circumscribed by using a verb or an

<sup>1</sup> Eino Leino, *Kootut teokset* (Collected Works) IV, Helsinki 1927.

agent-noun. Hence it is not improbable that a similar development may have taken place in Primitive Ie.

Although the second element of the synthetic compounds was originally an action-noun, it was later felt, as previously suggested, to be the equivalent of a participle or an agent-noun. As such it was no doubt interpreted already in the Common Ie. language. This must have been the starting point of the introduction of suffix-formations into these compounds. A survey of the use of the Vedic synthetic compounds leads to the conclusion that in the great majority of instances they are used in the nominative or vocative case. I have not had time to make complete statistics, but selective calculation based on my lists shows that to one hundred instances in which synthetic compounds are used in the nominative (and vocative) case there are only seven or eight instances of the dative, ablative, genitive, locative and instrumental case put together, the number of accusative examples being between one fourth and one fifth of the nominative uses. This clearly reveals the verbal and participial nature which had developed in the function of the second element. In this connection I must refer to the rather important fact that in Latin the present participle shows a clearly marked tendency to be used in the nominative case. This must be taken as an indication of its verbal force.<sup>1</sup>

A few words must be said here about the relation existing between the synthetic compounds and the Bahuvrīhis. In most cases it is possible to make a clear distinction between these two types. In describing the meaning of a Bahuvrīhi we must resort to an idea which is beyond the exact meaning of its two components, usually that of having or possessing — hence the name exocentric or possessive compounds<sup>2</sup> — while the synthetic compounds, being Tatpuruṣas,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. HORN, Beiträge zur Geschichte der absoluten Partizipialkonstruktionen im Lateinischen (Lund—Leipzig 1918) p. 3—11 and HAVERS, Glotta 16, 127.

<sup>2</sup> These compounds are used *anyapadārthe* 'to denote something else', cf. WACKERNAGEL, Ai. Gr. II, 1, p. 273.

need no semantic element outside the scope of their two components for their interpretation. Thus a typical Bahuvrīhi like *hiraṇya-nābha* does not mean 'a golden navel' but 'one who has a golden navel', whereas a synthetic Tatpuruṣa such as *viśva-vid* simply means 'knowing all, a knower of all'.

There are instances, however, where it is not easy to draw a clear border-line between the two types. Thus *yajña-vāhas* 'offering or receiving worship' must be regarded as a Bahuvrīhi, although we translate it in the same way as the usual type of synthetic Tatpuruṣas. Its exact meaning was originally 'one who has (or to whom belongs) the worship as an offering (or receiving)'. On the other hand *yajña-vāha* 'conducting the sacrifice' must be regarded as a synthetic Tatpuruṣa. To take another example, *madhu-psaras* fond of 'sweetness' or 'enjoying sweetness' is a Bahuvrīhi, and its exact meaning is 'one whose enjoyment is the sweetness', the second element consisting of the noun *psaras* 'feast, enjoyment'.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand *madhu-pā* 'drinking sweetness' is a synthetic compound, having as its second element the root *pā*. Although the investigation of the history and etymology of the compounds in question reveals their exact meaning, they must have appeared, at least to the ordinary speech-feeling, as formations of almost the same meaning and type. An important criterion seems to be that as soon as we have a verbal root as the second element after a noun, the compound must be regarded as a synthetic compound of the type *viśva-vid*. The mutual relation of Bahuvrīhis and synthetic Tatpuruṣas needs further investigation especially with a view to their early history and subsequent coincidences of meaning. It was my purpose with the present section to draw attention to this problem. In this connection the Finnish examples quoted above (p. 12) are of importance as they may also be interpreted as Bahuvrīhis (a category not infrequent in the Finnish language).

<sup>1</sup> A similar compound *deva-psaras* is expressly mentioned as belonging to the Bahuvrīhis by WACKERNAGEL, *Ai. Gr. II*, 1 p. 273.