

TIZIANA PONTILLO

DID THE SANSKRIT MODEL BRING
«TRUE ENLIGHTENMENT TO EUROPEAN SCHOLARS»
WHEN THEY ANALYSED AND CLASSIFIED
THE *BAHUVRĪHI* COMPOUNDS?*

1. *A glance at the history of bahuvrīhi terminology*

The title of the present contribution stems from the following passage by Whitney¹:

«A single further matter of prime importance may be here referred to, in illustration of the character of the Hindu grammarians as classifiers and presenters of the facts of their language. By reason of the extreme freedom and wonderful regularity of word-composition in Sanskrit, the grammarians were led to make a classification of compounds in a manner that brought true enlightenment to European Scholars; and the classification has been largely adopted as a part of modern philological science, along even with its bizarre terminology».

Whitney's low opinion of the Sanskrit grammarians as well as his frequent misinterpretations of their work are well-known: in particular, the quoted passage occurs in the paper selected by Staal for his *Reader on the Sanskrit Grammarians* as being the most representative and influential contribution by a Western Linguist in which a skeptical trend in the approach to indigenous grammarians of the Sanskrit language can be observed². Therefore, in this work by Whitney it is rather surprising to find such a positive assessment of the indigenous grammatical compounding classification.

The purpose of the present research is thus to check the assumed 'enlightenment', which should have descended from pre-modern indigenous Sanskrit grammars for the benefit of the modern grammars of Sanskrit language. So, let us start by taking a glance at the history of *bahuvrīhi* terminology, focusing on one of the main contemporary insights into this category of compounds considered in comparison with Pāṇini's model, namely the opposition between the so-called endocentric and exocentric compounds.

* This research was supported by a R.A.S. Grant (REG RASSR15811) within a two-year project whose title is *Justifying changes and making the new acceptable*.

¹ WHITNEY, *Hindu Grammar*, 290.

² STAAL, *Reader*, 141.

A diagram in the *Appendix* offers an overall look at the extension of the mentioned phenomenon of the adoption of the Sanskrit term, by showing the terminological choices made by some of the best-known earliest Indo-European or Sanskrit, Greek and Latin Grammars and the relevant interpretations of the original model which are associated with the specific terms selected. In fact, it became apparent that some scholars acknowledged Pāṇini's model, but did not provide an in-depth analysis, while others apparently seem to know it well, but did not acknowledge it or worse.

Bopp is the first Scholar to deal with Old-Indian compounds³ in 1827 by using the Indian terms in his *Ausführliches Lehrgebäude der Sanskrita-Sprache*⁴. Later on (1833-1852) he did the same in a comparative context in the fifth volume of his *Vergleichende Grammatik*⁵. He called these compounds 'bahuvrīhi' or 'possessive Komposita', by explaining that they express the owner ('den Besitzer') of what the individual parts of the compound designate, so that there is always something to be added, namely the concept of possessing («der Begriff des Besitzenden ist immer zu supplieren»)⁶.

Unlike Bopp, but always in the middle of the nineteenth century (1852), Benfey did not assume something which has to be added beyond the constituents, but underlined the adjectival role of the *bahuvrīhi* and the usual presence of a third noun after the combination of nominal stems which would otherwise constitute a mere endocentric. In modern terms, we might say that he targeted his definition on the head of *bahuvrīhi* compounds, which is not included in the compound itself but has to be combined with it. Even more noteworthy is the fact that he associated the label 'relative Zusammensetzung' (relative compounding) with *bahuvrīhi* in his Sanskrit grammar⁷, making a terminological choice that was explicitly inspired by the usual *vigraha* supplied by Indian Grammarians for such compounds, which – as is well known – very often includes a relative pronoun (or a demonstrative one) inflected in whatever case, except the nominative one:

«Die Indischen Grammatiker lösen die Zusammensetzung durch einen Relativsatz auf, in welchem das Relativ in jedem Casus ausser Nominativ erscheinen kann» (Indian grammarians are used to analyse compounding by means of a relative clause whose relative pronoun can appear in any case except for the nominative case).

³ See LINDNER, *Word-formation*, 44; 48.

⁴ See BOPP, *Lehrgebäude*, 268 ff., 310 ff.

⁵ See BOPP, *Grammatik*, 1072 ff.; 1410 ff.

⁶ See BOPP, *Grammatik*, 455.

⁷ BENFEY, *Grammatik*, 272-273.

A few years later, in his grammar (1857), Monier Williams made an analogous choice. He justified this by explaining that *bahuvrīhis* are translated into English through the use of a relative pronoun, and that they «are relatively and not absolutely employed», i.e. «they are used as epithets of other words, as adjectives [...]»⁸. This is why he consistently listed and analysed four kinds of examples of ‘relative forms’ of

- a. copulative or coordinative compounds (*dvandva*);
- b. dependent or determinative compounds (*tatpuruṣa*);
- c. descriptive or appositional compounds (*karmadhāraya*);
- d. indeclinable compounds (*avyayībhāva*);

respectively, i.e. compounds obtained by transforming *dvandva*, *tatpuruṣa*, *karmadhāraya* and *avyayībhāva* compounds into *bahuvrīhis*, in four different chapters⁹.

In 1870 Kielhorn used the term ‘attributive’ in order to underline the adjectival nature of this compound and faithfully following Pāṇini’s rules explained that «[A *bahuvrīhi*] denotes something other than what is expressed by its members»¹⁰. In 1888 Delbrück did not devote a separate chapter to the *bahuvrīhi* type, but mentioned them in the section titled «Appositionelle Nebeinanderstellung von Substantiven» (Appositional juxtaposition of nouns), where he emphasises two features of *bahuvrīhis*, namely their borderline status between noun and adjective¹¹, and their syntactic position and dependence on another noun, alongside which they occur¹². Nonetheless, in his work, there is no hint at Pāṇini’s description.

The ‘relative’ feature of these compounds was finally interpreted in a diachronic way in 1897 by Jacobi, whose renowned thesis on compounds had some crucial scientific consequences: he maintained that in the earliest stages of the Indo-European languages, compounds might have played the same role as subordinate clauses¹³. He was of course inspired by the com-

⁸ MONIER WILLIAMS, *Grammar*, 329-330.

⁹ The ‘relative’ feature of these compounds was also interpreted in a diachronic way by Jacobi who maintained that in the earliest stages of the Indo-European languages, compounds might have played the same role as subordinate clauses did later. See below, fn. 14.

¹⁰ KIELHORN, *Grammar*, 250.

¹¹ «An der Grenze zwischen Substantivum und Adjectivum und deshalb auch in ihrer Stellung wechselnd sind die Bahuvrīhis» (DELBRÜCK, *Syntax*, 61).

¹² «Diese Entstehung spiegelt sich noch in der Stellung, insofern sie meist hinter dem Substantivum stehen, zu dem sie gehören» (This development is even reflected in their position, inasmuch as they are usually subordinated to the substantive to which they belong; DELBRÜCK, *Syntax*, 62).

¹³ DELBRÜCK (*Syntax*, 62) had already compared *bahuvrīhis* including a past participle with locative absolute constructions, e.g. *tvāṣṭā hatāputro vīndraṃ somaṃ āharat* (TS 2.4.12.1) «Tvaṣṭṛ whose son had been killed, took Soma away from Indra

mon practice of Indian grammarians who regularly involve a relative clause in the Sanskrit paraphrase-analysis (*vigraha*) of each *bahuvrīhi*¹⁴, but only Wackernagel explicitly quoted Pāṇini's rule *anekam anyapadārthe*: «Das Kompositum steht also, wie sich P. 2,2,24 ausdrückt, *anyapadārthe*, als Bezeichnung eines andern Dings»¹⁵. He explained that Indian grammarians give the name *bahuvrīhi* to those compounds which (a) define the concept of a noun more precisely (e.g. *viśvānara-savitṛ-* 'the sun dear to all men'), or (b) designate the concept of constituents as the characteristic feature, if they are used as nouns, (e.g. *viśvānara-*, used to designate the sun).

As far as the Indo-Europeanist trend is concerned, particularly with regard to Bopp's emphasis on the possessive meaning of *bahuvrīhis*, Wackernagel acknowledges that it is a crucial and frequent meaning, but underlines that it is not exclusive. He demonstrates this by quoting some Vedic examples such as *parjanya-retas-* 'aus dem Samen des Parjanya entsprungen' ('sprung from the seed of the God Parjanya')¹⁶ and *ásva-prṣṭha-* 'Auf Rosses Rücken getragen' ('carried on horseback'), where the notion of possession seems to be absent. Moreover, he dissociated himself from Delbrück's opinion regarding the supposed secondary origin of the *bahuvrīhi* as derived from the original *tatpuruṣa* type, by explaining that *bahuvrīhis* are far more frequent than *tatpuruṣas* in the earliest stages of the Old Indian language, exactly like in Old Greek and even concluded that in the original language compounds with a (non-verbal, i.e.) noun second constituent were substantially formed only when a third concept was to be designated by such a combination¹⁷.

His analysis offers a diachronically oriented evaluation of these compounds, which was shared by Brugmann's contemporary *Grundriß*, where the term 'Mutata' is adopted for *bahuvrīhi* compounds because it accounts for the hypostatization process on which they seem to rely¹⁸.

(after his son was killed)» – tr. DELBRÜCK: «Tvashtar, dessen Sohn getötet worden war (nachdem sein Sohn getötet worden war), raubte den Indralosen Soma»).

¹⁴ «[...] gewisse Composita den wert von Nebensätzen hatten, wie denn ja auch die Grammatiker immer die Bahuvrīhi durch Relativsätze aufgelöst haben» (Certain compounds had the value of subordinate clauses, just as grammarians have always analysed the *bahuvrīhi* by means of relative sentences) – JACOBI, *Compositum*, 93.

¹⁵ WACKERNAGEL, *Grammatik*, 273.

¹⁶ WACKERNAGEL, *Grammatik*, 273. *parjanya-retas-* qualifies the feminine noun *iṣu-* 'an arrow/a reed' in RV 6.75.15 and *ásva-prṣṭha-*, the masculine noun *grāvāṇ-* 'pressing stone' in RV 8.26.24.

¹⁷ «Man kann wohl sagen, daß Komposita mit substantivischem nicht-verbalem Hinterglied fast nur gebildet wurden, wenn es galt einen dritten Begriff durch eine solche Verbindung zu bezeichnen» (WACKERNAGEL, *Grammatik*, 288).

¹⁸ «Sie erscheinen als Ergebnis eines Hypostasierungsvorgangs» (They appear as a result of a hypostatization process) – BRUGMANN, *Grundriß*, 72.

Nevertheless, Brugmann underlines that this is not correct, because exocentric compounds do not derive from the matching endocentric ones¹⁹. Only a later synchronic mechanism might have actually consisted in the addition of the concept of quality/property to pre-existent matching endocentric compounds²⁰. Thus, Wackernagel and Brugmann relegated *tatpuruṣas* to a secondary and especially diachronically later role, as has been more recently confirmed by both Hoenigswald on the basis of Indo-European studies (1937)²¹ and on Rgvedic documentation (1978)²² and by Benveniste in a broader general linguistic reflection in 1966²³.

In the background of the mentioned theories, two different architectures of compounding seem to have been at work: on the one hand, the renowned theory of a pre-inflectional stage of Indo-European morphology with the assumption of Hirt's so-called 'Kasus Indefinitus' (1902)²⁴, on the other, an analysis of compounds as a phrase emerges, and the absence of case endings is connected with the notion of the stem status of the compound, and directly or indirectly explained by resorting to a zero-replacement of endings as postulated by Pāṇini's grammar. This rule is actually targeted on the obtainment of whatever linguistic form, which can properly be termed as a 'nominal stem'²⁵, and a compound (*samāsa*) is precisely a 'nominal stem' (*prātipādika*) in accordance with the typology of nominal stems taught in A 1.2.45-46²⁶, which encompasses

- a. primary nominal stems;
- b. deverbal and denominal derived nominal stems;
- c. compound nominal stems.

¹⁹ «Die exozentrischen Komposita sind nicht aus den esozentrischen entstanden, sondern ebenso alt, weshalb die Benennung Mutata unrichtig ist» (BRUGMANN, *Grundriß*, 75).

²⁰ «Allerdings liess das Plus des Eigenschaftsbegriffs später die *Bahuvrīhi* teilweise als auf esozentrischen Komposita beruhend erscheinen, daher z.B. ai *rātri-divam*, substantiviertes Neutrum, 'Zeitraum von Tag und Nacht' auf Grund von *rātri-divā* 'bei Tag und bei Nacht'» (BRUGMANN, *Grundriß*, 76-77).

²¹ HOENIGSWALD, *Composizione*, 270.

²² HOENIGSWALD, *Note*.

²³ BENVENISTE, *Problèmes*, 145-176.

²⁴ HIRT, *Grammatik*, 326. See also DARMESTETER, *Traité*, 9: «Dans la composition ancienne, en effet, le thème représente l'idée sous la forme la plus générale et la plus abstraite; c'est la notion vague et indéterminée du phénomène, action, qualité, substance».

²⁵ See LINDNER, *Komposition*, 107: «die fehlende Vordergliedmorphologie in den Stammkomposita auf formneutralisierende Ellipse zurückzuführen sei, mutatis mutandis mit Pāṇini's luk in Verbindung zu bringen und ein Vorläufer precursore der Erklärungsschiene durch morphologische Unterspezifizierung». See also DUNKEL, *Origins*, 53: «The oldest alternative to the theory of a pre-inflectional stage goes back at least to Pāṇini 2.4.71».

²⁶ A 1.2.45 *arthavad adhātur apratyayaḥ prātipadikam*; 1.2.46 *kṛttaddhitasamāsāś ca* «A unit other than a verbal base or an affix, and which is endowed with a meaning, has to be called *prātipadika*, and a unit ending with a *kṛt*- or a *taddhita*-affix or a compound unit [has to be also called *prātipadika*]».

A 2.4.71: [luk 58] *supo dhātuprātipadikayoḥ*

[LUK zero-replacement] of a nominal case-ending which occurs as a part of a verbal base (*dhātu*) or of a nominal stem (*prātipadika*).

Nonetheless, it was Bopp's analysis and terminology that would finally prevail, while the pattern of explanation essentially targeted on constituent-analysis, i.e. on that which indigenous grammar termed *vigrahavākya*, promoted by Benfey, Monier Williams and above all by Jacobi, was almost completely forgotten. Indeed, both *bahuvrīhi*, 'possessive compounds' in English and 'possessivkomposita' and 'Besitzkomposita' in German were preferred, e.g. by Leumann in his *Latin Grammar* (1926-1928)²⁷, 'exocentrici o possessivi' in Italian, e.g. by Pisani in his *Sanskrit Grammar* edited in 1943²⁸, while in French, 'la valeur possessive' of *bahuvrīhis* was emphasised by Françoise Bader, dating back to 1962²⁹. This continued to happen right up to modern-day works on Indo-European languages such as the recent *Indogermanische Grammatik* by Thomas Lindner published in 2011, where *bahuvrīhis* are also called *Possessivkomposita*, even though the scientific contribution given by Indian Grammarians is – perhaps unwillingly – acknowledged:

«Da sich die kompositionelle Terminologie der altindischen Grammatik (zumeist Beispielwörter für den Typus) ebenfalls eingebürgert hat, jedenfalls im indogermanischen Diskurs, sei sie vorweg kurz erwähnt»³⁰ (Since the compositional terminology of the Old-Indian grammar (there are examples for almost each type) has been naturalised, it is briefly mentioned at least in the Indo-European explanation).

And analogous acknowledgements can be read in Schwyzer's *Griechische Grammatik* dating back to 1939, where the Indian classi-

²⁷ LEUMANN, *Formen-Lehre*, 385. He also recalls (385-386) the use of the terms *mutata* and *exocentric*: «Formal sind sie, von der idg. Betonung vielleicht abgesehen, gleich gebaut wie nominale Determinativkomposita; ihr Begriffsinhalt aber ist nicht wie dort durch das Schlußglied festgelegt, sondern er ist adjektivisch-attributiv einem außerhalb stehenden Sachsubstantiv als Eigenschaft oder Merkmal beigelegt, weshalb man sie auch wohl als *Mutata* oder *Exozentrika* bezeichnet» (From the morphological point of view, they are the same as nominal determinative compounds – excluding the IE accentuation; but their conceptual content is not determined by the final member, since the compound plays an adjectival/attributive role with respect to an external substance as a property or as a feature of this – hence they are also called *mutata* or *exocentrics*). See also LEUMANN, *Formen-Lehre*, 397: «Besitzkomposita, funktionell Adjective, selten substantiviert».

²⁸ PISANI, *Grammatica*, 188.

²⁹ BADER, *Formation*, 123.

³⁰ LINDNER, *Komposition*, 20.

fication of compounds is positively defined as exemplary for the other Indo-European languages:

«Die indische Klassifikation nach der Bedeutung ist für die übrigen indogermanischen Sprachen und für nicht-Indogermanische vorbildlich geworden»³¹ (The Indian classification according to meaning has become a model for the other Indo-European and even for non-Indo-European languages).

And it is not difficult to find this extension in a number of historical grammars of the modern languages of Europe, which «adopted the description of the compound types found in the grammar of Sanskrit» as «the descriptive basis for compounds», as Susan Olsen recently pointed out in her contribution to the five multi-authored volumes on *Word-Formation of the Languages of Europe* published in 2015³².

Thus, this is a certified case of the extension of grammatical terminology from indigenous Sanskrit grammar to Western grammars, some of which are even devoted to several European languages. Nonetheless, it is puzzling to find such a great distance for example between Schwyzer's and Lindner's attitude to the adoption of the Early Indian terminology, the former one persuaded that it can be profitably exported to other languages, the latter merely quoting it as a piece of linguistic archaeology³³. Moreover, Schwyzer's usage of *Nominal Satzkomposita*³⁴ (p. 454) is actually the sole exception of the use of an alternative term, since all the other Scholars use 'possessive' compounds. One therefore wonders what their scope in adopting the *bahuvrīhi* term actually is. I suspect in fact that, in the majority of grammars, *bahuvrīhi* is merely a fashionable name, which is repeated *ad-lib*, without any relationship to its original grammatical background.

2. Did Whitney disguise the real extent to which Indian grammarians actually affected his analysis?

Despite his praise of the Indian classification of compounds from which we started, Whitney then goes on in the same paper to make a negative statement on the relevant 'bizarre terminology' it entails.

³¹ SCHWYZER, *Grammatik*, 428.

³² «In the early Indic language of Sanskrit, compounds were extremely prevalent, so much so that the description of the compound types found in the grammar of Sanskrit was adopted as the descriptive basis for compounds in the historical grammars of Europe» (OLSEN, *Composition*, 366).

³³ See above.

³⁴ SCHWYZER, *Grammatik*, 454.

For this reason, he considers that this classification «can hardly claim to be worth preserving». In his renowned and very rich grammar³⁵ he also still preferred the term ‘possessive compounds’ and classified them together with the relatively rare compounds with a first deverbal constituent ending in *-at* which governs a final nominal constituent (such as Vedic *vidád-vasu* ‘winning good things’, *jamád-agni* ‘consuming fire’, *codayánmati* ‘inciting devotion’³⁶) as ‘secondary adjective compounds’. The definition proposed in his *Sanskrit Grammar* is often quoted in several contributions on compounding, for instance in Olsen’s chapter found in the above-mentioned *Handbook*³⁷:

«The possessives are noun-compounds [...], 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 determinative³⁸».

Moreover, Whitney is definitely against the term ‘relative’ which he considers «an utter misnomer [...] though the meaning of such a compound (as of any attributive word) is easily cast into a relative form [...]»³⁹. Nonetheless, he recognises that «There are, however, in the older language a few derivative adjective compounds which imply the relation of appertenance rather than that of possession», even though he considers them mere «survivals of a state of things antecedent the specialization of the general class as possessive»⁴⁰.

But something doesn’t make sense! In his famous and revolutionary work *The life and growth of language* which preceded the grammar by just a few years (1875), he considered what is modernly called ‘word-compounding’ as «putting two independent elements together to form a single designation», so that «such a word is logically an abbreviated descriptive phrase, with the signs of relation [...] omitted [...]». Moreover, the large variety of English case-relations he illustrates – *bahuvrīhi* included – seem to depend on the style of commentaries on Pāṇini’s rules devoted to explain compounds. He accordingly singles out the specific case relation which links the two constituents of each compound⁴¹. For example, he writes that

³⁵ WHITNEY, *Grammar*, 501.

³⁶ WHITNEY, *Grammar*, 511.

³⁷ OLSEN, *Composition*, 367.

³⁸ WHITNEY, *Grammar*, 501.

³⁹ WHITNEY, *Grammar*, 502.

⁴⁰ WHITNEY, *Grammar*, 502-503.

⁴¹ WHITNEY, *Life*, 120-121.

- «a *headhache* is a pain *in* the head» where the locative relation is emphasized,
- «a *head-dress*, a dress *for* the head»;
- «a *headland*, a point of land *comparable to* a head»;
- «a *buttercup*⁴² or *butterfly* is a cup or a fly *having the colour of* butter⁴³».

It is self-evident that he must have changed his mind, and *de facto*, in the following European Studies on compounding, the analysis of compounds as a sentence where the case endings disappear came to be lost.

In my opinion, the choice Whitney made played an influential role both in the following tradition of the Western Sanskrit Grammars and within the linguistic theories of compounding in general. Thus, even though the term *bahuvrīhi* is quite regularly bandied about, there is little record of the variety of relations that can be conveyed by the constituents of a *bahuvrīhi* with respect to another inflected word, in accordance with the grammatical system which coined this term. Everything is instead flattened to the single possessive relation.

3. *Relativising the endocentric vs. exocentric opposition*

A pivotal feature in the majority of current explanations of compounds is the opposition between determinative and possessive compounds⁴⁴, also mentioned as the opposition between ‘endocentric and exocentric compounds’ (before 1908 ‘esocentric and exocentric compounds’)⁴⁵. From the period of American Structuralism onwards and especially in the contributions of generative morphologists, the main target of the analysis devoted to compounds in both a semantic and syntactic perspective was precisely this distinction between endocentric and exocentric compounds, i.e. between compounds in which one or none of the respective constituents may be regarded as ‘the head’, i.e. ‘the most important constituent’ in the syntactic unit⁴⁶. The expression ‘exocentric compound’ was attested for the first time in a monograph on Lithuanian compounds by Aleksandrow⁴⁷, perhaps going back to

⁴² I.e. a cup-shaped flower.

⁴³ WHITNEY, *Life*, 121.

⁴⁴ LINDNER, *Komposition*, 25: *Determinativkomposita vs. Possessivkomposita*.

⁴⁵ LINDNER, *Komposition*, 28.

⁴⁶ See. e.g. BAUER, *Typology*, 348; SCALISE, FÁBREGAS, *Head*, 110.

⁴⁷ ALEKSANDROW, *Studien*, 110.

his teacher Baudouin de Courtenay⁴⁸. It was then adopted and made broadly known by Brugmann⁴⁹ and later combined with the famous immediate constituent analysis by Bloomfield (*Language*, 194-197; 235-236)⁵⁰. However, as maintained, for instance, by Sadovski⁵¹, the term ‘exocentric’ seems to be based on Pāṇini’s rule A 2.2.24 *anekam anyapadārthe*, and we have already seen how Wackernagel emphasised this rule by quoting it at the beginning of his explanation of *bahuvrīhi* compounds⁵². Nonetheless, we have to understand whether the endo-/exo-centric dichotomy was actually a crucial feature in Pāṇini’s pattern of compounding or not.

In fact, in a recent joint contribution shared with Maria Piera Candotti, we tried to demonstrate that Pāṇini’s description of compounds «does not focus on the head, but rather it relies on the non-head of each compound»⁵³, namely on the so-called *upasarjana* constituent, whose term literally denotes «the action of pouring [something] upon [something else]»⁵⁴. A metalinguistic rule teaches how to recognise this constituent in the grammar because it is inflected in the nominative case in the wording of rules (A 1.2.43 *prathamānirdiṣṭam samāsa upasarjanam* «What is stated in the nominative in a compound-[string] is called *upasarjana*»). Moreover, A 1.2.44 (*ekavibhakti cāpurvanipāte* «And what has one single ending, even when it is not in the first place [is the upasarjana]») states that the *upasarjana* is recognisable because it is characterised by a frozen syntactic relation with the other constituent.

In other words, «independently of the case ending which applies to the resultant compound when it is used in a sentence – case ending

⁴⁸ LINDNER, *Note*, 190.

⁴⁹ BRUGMANN, *Grundriß*, 60 f.; *Vergleichende*, 71 ff.

⁵⁰ See also LINDNER, *Komposition*, 28: «Inwieweit hierbei – wie dann ja auch (jedenfalls mittelbar) bei Bloomfield – die altindische Terminologie eine Rolle spielte, läßt sich nicht mehr ermitteln» (The extent to which the old Indian terminology played a role in this, as it did (at least indirectly) in Bloomfield, cannot be determined).

⁵¹ SADOVSKI, *Dvandva*, 352.

⁵² WACKERNAGEL, *Grammatik*, 273.

⁵³ This is Pāṇini’s marked choice. In fact, he seems to have deliberately dismissed the analysis of compounds based on the identification of the head (*pradhāna*), which had possibly even been in use at least before Kātyāyana’s age, as RADICCHI, *Samāsa*, 33 deduces from M 2.205 l. 21 ad Vt 3 ad A 4.1.14 (*pūrvasūtre ’pradhānasyopasarjanam iti saṃjñā kriyate* «The technical term *upasarjana* is adopted in place of [the technical term] *a-pradhāna* that occurred in previous grammatical *sūtra*-works»). See also KV ad A 1.2.57: *tathopasarjanaparibhāṣāṃ kurvanti apradhānam upasarjanam iti* and Kayāṭa’s paraphrasis for *pūrvasūtra*: *pūrvācāryakṛtam vyākaraṇam*.

⁵⁴ CANDOTTI, PONTILLO, *Subordination*, 22.

which matches that of its head in the constituent analysis⁵⁵ – the non-head constituent is fixed once and for all»⁵⁶. Again, following the traditional analysis, we can see how in the following diagram *puruṣaḥ* is inflected in different cases while *rājñāḥ* remains unchanged:

<i>puruṣaḥ</i> 'man' NOM.	<i>rājñāḥ</i> 'King's' GEN. m. sg.	→ <i>rājapuruṣaḥ</i> lit. 'King's man', 'royal officer' NOM. m. sg.
<i>puruṣam</i> 'man' ACC.		→ <i>rājapuruṣam</i> 'Royal officer' ACC. m. sg.
<i>puruṣeṇa</i> 'With/by the man' INSTR.		→ <i>rājapuruṣeṇa</i> 'With/by the royal officer' INSTR. m. sg. ⁵⁷

On the basis of the first above-mentioned rule on the *upasarjana* (A 1.2.43), we realise that A 2.2.24 *anekam anyapadārthe* is a rule constructed upon the concept of *upasarjana*, because *anekam* is inflected in the nominative, as Kātyāyana already noticed in Vt 2 ad A 2.2.24 *anekavacanam upasarjanārtham*, «The mention of (the word) *aneka* is meant for (the designation) *upasarjana*»⁵⁸. Thus, A 2.2.24 indeed teaches that «Two or more inflected words optionally combine to denote the object of another inflected word (i.e. the object of an inflected word different from the constituents)». Moreover, due to the nominative adopted for *anekam*, this rule teaches that the endings of the inflected words which constitute the non-head constituents and *de facto* all the surface-constituents of the *bahuvrīhi* compound are fixed once and for all. As a consequence, these surface-constituents do not change, in spite of the specific case ending which applies to the resultant compound when it is used in a sentence and also independently of the syntactic relation which links them to the denotatum of the whole resultant compound. For instance, *kṛtābrahman-* occurs three times in the RV, always as NOM. m.sg. (*kṛtābrahmā*) and, on each occasion, a different syntactic role is played by the denotatum of the whole compound with respect

⁵⁵ The so-called *vigraha*, according to current indigenous grammatical analysis.

⁵⁶ CANDOTTI, PONTILLO, *Subordination*, 23. The last condition enunciated in the rule («when it is not in the first place») self-evidently refers to a quite common feature of endocentric Indo-European compounds, which is also clearly explained in A 2.2.30 (*upasarjanaṃ pūrvam* «The first constituent [in a compound] is the *upasarjana*» with its exceptions (A 2.2.31-38).

⁵⁷ Examples from KV on A 1.2.44.

⁵⁸ Tr. ROODBERGEN, *Bahuvrīhi*, 27.

to the *upasarjana*-constituent *kṛtá-*. In the following diagram we can easily appreciate what does change and what does not in these three different nominative occurrences, imagined as if they should be inflected in different case endings.

<i>kṛtám bráhmaṇ</i> ‘created’ NOM.n.sg. ‘sacred formula- tion’ NOM.n.sg.	<i>anena</i> ‘that’ INSTR.m.sg.	→ <i>kṛtábrahmā</i> RV 2.25.1 ‘One <u>by whom</u> the sacred formulation was created’ NOM. m.sg.
		→ <i>kṛtábrahmānam</i> ‘One <u>by whom</u> the sacred formulation was created’ ACC.m.sg.
		→ <i>kṛtábrahmānā</i> ‘ <u>By one by whom</u> the sacred formulation was created’ INSTR.m.sg.
	<i>asmai</i> ‘that’ DAT.m.sg.	→ <i>kṛtábrahmā</i> RV 6.20.3 (= god Indra) ‘One <u>for whom</u> the sacred formulation was created’ NOM. m.sg.
		→ <i>kṛtábrahmānam</i> ‘One <u>for whom</u> the sacred formulation was created’ ACC.m.sg.
		→ <i>kṛtábrahmānā</i> ‘By one <u>for whom</u> the sacred formulation was created’ INSTR.m.sg.
	<i>asmin</i> ‘that’ LOC.m.sg.	→ <i>kṛtábrahmā</i> RV 7.70.6 (= <i>yajna-</i> m. sg. ‘sacrifice’) ‘That <u>in which</u> the sacred formulation was created’ NOM. m.sg.
		→ <i>kṛtábrahmānam</i> ‘That <u>in which</u> the sacred formulation was created’ ACC.m.sg.
		→ <i>kṛtábrahmānā</i> ‘ <u>By that in which</u> the sacred formulation was created’ INSTR.m.sg.

Therefore, Pāṇini’s rule (A.2.2.24), intentionally evoked by some Western linguists, in order to account for the *bahuvrīhi* formation, might have actually been misunderstood. Pāṇini’s *anyapadārthe* principle and the term exocentric are perhaps often adopted with excessive nonchalance in several linguistic works on compounding, as if the term *artha* could perfectly match the modern syntactic and semantic notion of ‘head’, which

is not the case. In other words, *anyapadārthe* is a mere syntactic-semantic constraint concerning the denotation of the whole compound, unequivocally envisioned as a specific syntactic relation between the surface-constituents and the denotatum of the resultant compound. This is indeed a privileged relation directly linking one of the surface-constituents with the final denotatum, as we can understand on the basis of the three above-listed examples, where the left-hand constituent *kṛtām* is directly connected with the final denotatum of the compound, by means of three different *kāraka*-relations, since the denotatum respectively plays the role of *kartṛ* ‘agent’, *sampradāna* ‘recipient’ and *adhikaraṇa* ‘substratum’ with respect to the action of ‘creating’ conveyed by the past passive participle *kṛtā-*. However, such a relation is independent of the internal analysis of the compound and this is indeed well tuned to the most recent research on compounding which often considers «exocentricity more as a function of the whole word than as a result of the internal analysis of the compound and of the identification of the head»⁵⁹.

Of course, this pattern of explanation of compounding reduces the importance of the opposition between endocentric and exocentric formations within the context of the general classification, which is thus independent of the relation between the constituents actually involved in the compound. Scalise and Bisetto in 2012 were the first scholars to adopt a comparable perspective, but independently of Pāṇini. In fact, as they have shown⁶⁰, both a subordinate and an appositive/attributive compound can be both endocentric and exocentric. This is what led these two scholars to relativise the definition of head within a compound and divide it into three components: semantic head, categorial head and morphological head. As a consequence, their new classificatory model comprehends three classes of compounds, all of which include both the endocentric and exocentric form⁶¹.

Pāṇini himself might have actually been able to enlighten European scholars about this analysis, since more than twenty-four centuries later, they seem to be proposing a classification that is quite similar to the ancient grammarian’s. In any case, perhaps modern scholars should have made (and some contemporary scholars still need to make) an effort in order to read Pāṇini’s work by referring to Pāṇini’s work itself, i.e. the relevant linguistic analyses should not overlap with those accumulated by the later commentators.

⁵⁹ CANDOTTI, PONTILLO, *Subordination*, 21-22.

⁶⁰ SCALISE, BISETTO, *Classification*, 45.

⁶¹ This model is also adopted by LIEBER, *Lexical*, 140; LIEBER, *Approach*, 87.

Appendix

Who? When?	ALTERNATIVE TERM (if there is one)	explanation
Bopp 1827	Possessive Komposita	Sie drücken [...] den Besitzer dessen aus, was die einzelnen Theile der Zusammensetzung bedeuten, so daß der Begriff des Besitzenden immer zu supplieren.
Benfey 1852	Relative Komposita	Die Indischen Grammatiker lösen die Zusammensetzung durch einen Relativsatz auf, in welchem das Relativ in jedem Casus außer Nominativ erscheinen kann.
Monier Williams 1857	Relative Compounds	[...] for the obvious reason of their being <i>relatively</i> and not absolutely employed [...] translated into English by the aid of a relative pronoun.
Kielhorn 1870	Attributive Compounds	[A <i>Bahuvrīhi</i>] denotes something else than what is expressed by its members [...] has the nature of an adjective.
Delbrück 1888		[...] ursprünglich substantivische Determinativ-komposita. Diese Entstehung spiegelt sich noch in der Stellung, [...] hinter dem Substantivum [...], zu dem sie gehören.
Jacobi 1897		[...] den Wert von Nebensätzen hatten, wie denn ja auch die Grammatiker immer die Bahuvrīhi durch Relativsätze aufgelöst haben.
Wackernagel 1905		Das Kompositum steht also, wie sich P. 2,2,24 ausdrückt, <i>anyapadārthe</i> 'als Bezeichnung eines andern Dings'. Man kann wohl sagen, daß in der Grundsprache Komposita mit substantivischem nicht-verbalem Hinterglied fast nur gebildet wurden, wenn es galt einen dritten Begriff durch eine solche Verbindung zu bezeichnen.
Brugmann 1906	Mutata Komposita	Sie erscheinen als Ergebnis eines Hypostasierungsvorgangs. [...] Die exozentrischen Komposita sind nicht aus den esozentrischen entstanden, sondern ebenso alt, weshalb die Benennung Mutata unrichtig ist. [...] Allerdings liess das Plus des Eigenschaftsbegriffs später die Bahuvrīhi teilweise als auf esozentrischen Komposita beruhend erscheinen.

Leumann 1926-28	Besitzkomposita / Possessivkomposita	[...] gleich gebaut wie nominale Determinativkomposita; ihr Begriffsinhalt aber ist nicht wie dort durch das Schlußglied festgelegt.
Schwyzler 1939	Nominal-satzkomposita	Satzkomposita d.h. solche, die nach wahrscheinlicher Erklärung durch einen (parenthetischen Nominal- oder Verbal-) Satz auflösbar sind. Als Nominalsatzkomposita lassen sich fassen <i>bahuvrīhi</i> (ῥοδοδάκτυλος ‘[wie] Rosen [sind] Finger’) [...] <i>dvandvas</i> wie <i>ιατρόμαντις</i> ‘Arzt und Wahrsager [ist er]’ [...], <i>bahuvrīhi</i> mit adjektivischem Vorderglied <i>πολύοινος</i> ‘viel Wein [ist da]’ [...]; ursprünglich auch die Komposita mit (anscheinend) verbalem Hinterglied <i>ὄρεσττροφος</i> ‘im Gebirge [ist seine] Nahrung’. Die indische Klassifikation nach der Bedeutung ist für die übrigen Indogermanischen Sprachen und für nicht-Indogermanische vorbildlich geworden.
Pisani 1943	Exocentrici o possessivi	Ogni composto esocentrico [= endocentrico] può in via di principio essere usato come exocentrico [= esocentrico].
Bader 1962		[...] valeur possessive de ces adjectifs
Lindner 2011	Possessivkomposita	Wenn freilich der semantische Kern nicht in den semantischen Merkmalen des Kopfes begründet ist (d.h. Kern ≠ Kopf), mithin außerhalb der Kopfsemantik und somit der Gesamtbedeutung des Kompositum liegt, wird die Bildung exozentrisch genannt. Da sich die kompositionelle Terminologie der altindischen Grammatik (zumeist Beispielwörter für den Typus) ebenfalls eingebürgert hat, jedenfalls im indogermanischen Diskurs, sei sie vorweg kurz erwähnt.

Primary Sources

A [*Aṣṭādhyāyī*] *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*, ed. and tr. by R.N. SHARMA, 5 vols., Delhi 1990-2003

KV [*Kāśikā-Vṛtti*] *Kāśikā*. A Commentary on Panini's *Grammar* by Vāmana and Jayāditya, ed. by Ā. SARMA, K.H. DESHPANDE, and D.G. PADHYE, Hyderabad 1969-1970

- M [*Mahābhāṣya*] *The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali*, ed. by F. KIELHORN, Bombay 1880-1885. Third edition, revised and furnished with additional readings, references, and select critical notes by K.V. ABHYANKAR, Poona 1962
- ṚV [*Ṛgveda*] *Ṛgveda-Samhitā* with a Commentary of Sāyaṇācārya, ed. by N.S. SONTAKKE & C.G. KASHIKAR, 4 vols., Poona 1983² 1933-1951]
- Vt Kātyāyana's *Vārttikas* quoted from M

Cited works

- ALEKSANDROW, *Studien* = A. ALEKSANDROW, *Litauische Studien. I: Nominalzusammensetzung*, Dorpat 1888
- BADER, *Formation* = F. BADER, *La formation des composés nominaux du latin*, Paris 1962
- BAUER, *Typology* = L. BAUER, *Typology of Compounds*, in R. LIEBER, P. ŠTEKAUER (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Compounding*, Oxford 2012
- BENFEY, *Grammatik* = TH. BENFEY, *Vollständige Grammatik der Sanskrit Sprache*, Leipzig 1852
- BENVENISTE, *Problèmes* = E. BENVENISTE, *Problèmes de Linguistique Générale*, Paris 1966
- BLOOMFIELD, *Language* = L. BLOOMFIELD, *Language*, New York 1933
- BOPP, *Lehrgebäude* = F. BOPP, *Ausführliches Lehrgebäude der Sanskrita-Sprache*, Berlin 1827
- BOPP, *Grammatik* = F. BOPP, *Vergleichende Grammatik des Sanskrit, Zend, Griechischen, Lateinischen, Litauischen, Gotischen und Deutschen*, 6 vols., Berlin 1833-1852
- BRUGMANN, *Grundriß* = K. BRUGMANN, *Grundriß der Indogermanischen Sprachen. II. Lehre von der Wortformen und ihrem Gebrauch*, Straßburg 1905-1906
- BRUGMANN, *Vergleichende* = K. BRUGMANN, *Vergleichende Laut-, Stammbildungs- und Flexionslehre nebst Lehre vom Gebrauch der Wortformen der Indogermanischen Sprachen: Zweiter Band, Erster Teil: Allgemeines, Zusammensetzung, Nominalstämme*, Straßburg 1906
- CANDOTTI, PONTILLO, *Subordination* = M.P. CANDOTTI, T. PONTILLO, *Lexical Subordination and Compounding: Pāṇini's Focusing on the Non-head*, «Studi e Saggi Linguistici» 57.2 (2019), 11-43
- DARMESTER, *Traité* = A. DARMESTER, *Traité de la formation des mots composés dans la langue française*, Paris 1875
- DELBRÜCK, *Syntax* = B. DELBRÜCK, *Altindische Syntax*, Halle 1888 (reprint: Darmstadt 1968)
- DUNKEL, *Origins* = G.E. DUNKEL, *On the Origins of Nominal Composition in Indo-European*, in H. EICHNER, H.C. LUSCHÜTZKY, V. SADOVSKI, *Compositiones indogermanicae: In memoriam Jochem Schindler*, Prague 1999, 47-68

- HIRT, *Grammatik* = H. HIRT, *Indogermanische Grammatik. Doppelung Zusammensetzung Verbum*, Heidelberg, Winter 1928
- HOENIGSWALD, *Composizione* = H.M. HOENIGSWALD, *Su alcuni caratteri della derivazione e della composizione nominale indoeuropea*, «Rend. Ist. Lombardo» (Lett.) 15 (1937), 267-274
- HOENIGSWALD, *Note* = H.M. HOENIGSWALD, *A Note on Rgvedic Bahuvrīhis*, «Indian Linguistics» 39 (1978), 29-30
- JACOBI, *Compositum* = H. JACOBI, *Compositum und Nebensatz, Studien über die indogermanische Sprachentwicklung*, Bonn 1897
- KIELHORN, *Grammar* = F. KIELHORN, *A Grammar of the Sanskrit Language*, Bombay 1870
- LEUMANN, *Formenlehre* = M. LEUMANN, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*, «Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft», II.2, München 1926-1928
- LIEBER, *Lexical* = R. LIEBER, *On the Lexical Semantics of Compounds*, in S. SCALISE, I. VOGEL (ed.), *Cross-Disciplinary Issues in Compounding*, «Current Issues in Linguistic Theory» 311, Amsterdam-Philadelphia 2010, 127-144
- LIEBER, *Approach* = R. LIEBER, *A Lexical Semantic Approach to Compounding*, in R. LIEBER, P. ŠTEKAUER (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Compounding*, Oxford 2012, 78-104
- LINDNER, *Note* = TH. LINDNER, *A Note on 'endocentric'*, «Historiographia Linguistica» 36.1 (2009), 190-192
- LINDNER, *Komposition* = TH. LINDNER, *Komposition*, «Indogermanische Grammatik» 4.1, Heidelberg 2011
- LINDNER, *Word-formation* = TH. LINDNER, *Word-formation in Historical-comparative Grammar*, in P.O. MÜLLER, I. OHNHEISER, S. OLSEN, F. RAINER (ed.), *Word-Formation. An International Handbook of the Languages of Europe*, I («Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft» 40.1), Berlin-Boston 2015, 38-51
- MONIER WILLIAMS, *Grammar* = M. MONIER WILLIAMS, *A Practical Grammar of the Sanskrit Language*, Oxford 1857
- OLSEN, *Composition* = S. OLSEN, *Composition*, in P.O. MÜLLER, I. OHNHEISER, S. OLSEN, F. RAINER (ed.), *Word-Formation. An International Handbook of the Languages of Europe*, I («Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft» 40.1), Berlin-Boston 2015, 364-386
- PISANI, *Grammatica* = V. PISANI, *Grammatica Sanscrita Storica e Comparativa*, Milano 1943
- RADICCHI, *Samāsa* = A. RADICCHI, *La teoria pāṇiniana dei samāsa secondo l'interpretazione delle scuole grammaticali indiane dal quinto all'ottavo secolo d.C. (parte prima)*, Firenze 1985
- ROODBERGEN, *Bahuvrīhi* = J.A.F. ROODBERGEN, *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya. Bahuvrīhi/ Dvandvāhnika (P 2.2.23-2.2.38): Text, Translation and Notes*, «Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study of Sanskrit C» 9, Pune 1974

- SADOVSKI, *Dvandva* = V. SADOVSKI, *Dvandva Tatpuruṣa and Bahuvrīhi on the Vedic Sources for the Names of the Compound Types in Pāṇini's Grammar*, «Trans. Philol. Soc.» 100.3 (2002), 351-402
- SCALISE, BISETTO, *Classification* = S. SCALISE, A. BISETTO, *The Classification of Compounds*, in R. LIEBER, P. ŠTEKAUER (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Compounding*, Oxford 2012, 34-53
- SCALISE, FÁBREGAS, *Head* = S. SCALISE, A. FÁBREGAS, *The Head in Compounding*, in S. SCALISE, I. VOGEL (ed.), *Cross-Disciplinary Issues in Compounding*, "Current Issues in Linguistic Theory" 311, Amsterdam-Philadelphia 2010
- SCHWYZER, *Grammatik* = E. SCHWYZER, *Griechische Grammatik. Auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik, I. Band Allgemeiner Teil, Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*, München 1939
- STAAL, *Reader* = J.F. STAAL, *A Reader on the Sanskrit Grammarians*, Cambridge, MA 1972
- WACKERNAGEL, *Grammatik* = J. WACKERNAGEL, *Einleitung zur Wortlehre. Nominalkomposition*, "Altindische Grammatik" II.1, Göttingen 1905 [reprint: Göttingen 1957]
- WHITNEY, *Life* = W.D. WHITNEY, *The life and growth of language*, London 1875
- WHITNEY, *Grammar* = W.D. WHITNEY, *A Sanskrit Grammar, including both the Classical Language, and the Older Dialects of Veda and Brahmana*, Cambridge, MA 1889²
- WHITNEY, *Hindu Grammar* = W.D. WHITNEY, *The Study of Hindu Grammar and the Study of Sanskrit*, «Amer. Journ. Philol.» 5.3 (1884), 279-297

ABSTRACTS

MARIA ISABELLA BERTAGNA, *La metatesi nel De Thucydide di Dionigi di Alicarnasso: esempi di riscrittura*

The metathesis in Dionysius' of Halicarnassus De Thucydide. Instances of rewriting (pp. 459-472).

This paper examines the method of metathesis in Dionysius' *De Thucydide*. Metathesis is an instrument of ancient literary criticism of rewriting texts. After a brief information on the author and his cultural project and a description of the work the paper analyzes concrete examples of rewriting, with attention to the introduction formulas. The role of metathesis in the critical analysis of *De Thucydide* is highlighted, with notes on metathesis as an exegetical-educational instrument known to literary criticism long before Dionysius. The rewriting of passages from Thucydides aims to illustrate how to avoid obscure language, which for Dionysius is often close to *soloikismos*.

Keywords: Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Ancient literary criticism, Metathesis.
maria.bertagna@unipi.it

MARTINA BONO, *Alcune testimonianze documentarie e letterarie sull'opposizione politico-militare a Elagabalo*

Some Documentary and Literary Records Concerning the Political and Military Opposition to Heliogabalus (pp. 347-385).

This contribution aims at scrutinising the opposition to Heliogabalus' principate by focusing on its initial phase, the succession to Macrinus, using both literary as well as documentary sources, whose value has so far not been fully appreciated. During 218-219 AD many military revolts broke out mostly in the Syrian areas of the Empire, compromising Heliogabalus' affirmation. Heliogabalus' rule was later threatened also while he resided in Nicomedia, before his arrival in Rome: among the rebellions burst out during this period, worth noticing is the revolt of the στρατιῶται Κελτικοί – mentioned only by the contemporary senator and historian Cassius Dio (LXXIX, 4, 5) – whom we try here to identify with more accuracy. The military turmoil has been flanked by an albeit weak

movement of senatorial opposition in Rome. The instability of Heliogabalus' principate since its beginning betrays the faintness of imperial *auctoritas*, a condition Heliogabalus never managed to overcome.

Keywords: Civil war, Macrinus' supporters, Heliogabalus' legitimation strategy, Political opposition, Military turmoil, Senatorial weakness.
martina.bono01@universitadipavia.it

DOMITILLA CAMPANILE, *Contese per la proedria anche nell'Ade: Alessandro figlio di Filippo, Annibale cartaginese e Luciano di Samosata Contentions for the 'proedria' even in Hades: Alexander Philip's son, Hannibal the Carthaginian, and Lucian of Samosata* (pp. 311-324).

This article deals with the 12th Lucian's Dialogue of the Dead. In the text, three of the greatest generals – Alexander, Hannibal, and Scipio – debate about who of them deserves the pride of place before Minos the judge. The author of the present paper aims at placing this dialogue within the broader cultural, political and historical context of the Second Century AD.

Keywords: Lucian, Dialogues of the Dead, Competition, Primacy.
domitilla.campanile@unipi.it

MARIA PIERA CANDOTTI, *Metalinguistic thought and substitution in late-Vedic linguistic thought* (pp. 515-534).

Undoubtedly, the use of a substitution-paradigm to interpret the mechanism of signification has been characteristic of many cultural traditions over the centuries. Rarely, however, has it taken on the dimensions that we recognize in the late-Vedic period, in which it stands as a global heuristic paradigm that permeates the whole creation and transmission of culture in the Indian sub-continent. The article questions the role of this cultural specific background in the development of metalinguistic thought. Three crucial steps are taken into account, namely the grammarians and philosophers Pāṇini (ca V/IV BC), Patañjali (II BC) and Bhartṛhari (V AD). The crucial role of the substitution-frame emerges quite clearly in the paradigmatic shift between the two authors, the first still thinking within a substitution frame while the latter reasons in a compositional one. Bhartṛhari, on the other hand, proves, also on this subject, that he is a brilliant restorer of the late-Vedic linguistic thought; an element that should be taken more into account in the global interpretation of this great philosopher.

Keywords: Metalinguistic, Autonymy, Pāṇini, Bhartṛhari, Substitution.
maria.candotti@unipi.it

GIUSEPPE CORDIANO, *I Caecilii Victores in età severiana nella zona del Lago di Bracciano e le 'Mura di Santo Stefano'*

The Severan Caecilii Victores in the Area of Bracciano Lake and the 'Mura di Santo Stefano' (pp. 325-346).

Not far from Bracciano Lake, in ancient southern Etruria (*Regio VII*), a villa-*praetorium* was built during Septimius Severus' reign. Some inscriptions show that Roman *equites* of North Africa (*Caecilii Victores*) realized this rare example of 'tower-villa' near ancient *lacus Sabatinus* at the beginning of III century A.D.

Keywords: Latin epigraphy, *Villae-praetoria*, *Regio VII*, Severan age, *Latifundia*.

giuseppe.cordiano@unisi.it

MARCO DONATO, *Discorsi e pedine: teoria e prassi del dialogo negli spuria del Corpus Platonicum*

Speeches and pawns: theory and praxis of dialogue in the spuria of Corpus Platonicum (pp. 51-77).

Scholars engaging in the analysis of pseudo-platonic dialogues have often noticed a distinctive 'eristical' turn of Socrates' interrogations and argumentation in most of these texts. This peculiarity, traditionally seen as a sign of the authors' lack of dialectical subtlety, can instead be interpreted as a deliberate strategy, connected to a re-interpretation of the ways and means of Socratic dialogue. Hints to this new evaluation of the literary genre can be found in the dialogues themselves, most notably in the passages comparing dialogue to *petteia*, an image inherited from Plato.

Keywords: *Pseudoplatonica*, *petteia*, Plato, Academy, Poetics.

marcodona@gmail.com

GIULIA ECCA, *L'équipe del medico nell'antichità: allievi e assistenti Physician's Team in Antiquity: Students and Assistants* (pp. 79-99).

Through an overview of the most important literary, papyrological and epigraphic sources, this paper aims at reconstructing the role that students and assistants played in ancient medical practice, beside the physician. The testimony of the *De decenti habitu* emerges as particularly relevant, since it shows the development of a sort of hierarchy among students and assistants in Antiquity.

Keywords: Ancient medicine, Hippocratic texts, Medical education, Galen.

giulia.ecca@uniroma1.it

JESPER EIDEM, *'Reserved for the Gods and the Dead...': High Temples on the Rania Plain (Kurdish Region of Iraq)* (pp. 3-21).

Building on evidence from recent investigations, this article offers a new, tentative interpretation of the Middle Bronze Age levels on the high northern part of Tell Shemshara (Iraqi Kurdistan), excavated in 1957, and since washed away by Lake Dokan. As argued here, the principal feature crowning Tell Shemshara was probably a small temple with burials embedded in its foundation platform.

Keywords: Tell Shemshara, Iraq, Kurdistan, Temples, Burial.

jesper.eidem@unipi.it

CORRADO GAGLIARDI, *Prima della congiura: C. Cassio Longino tra politica e filosofia negli anni della guerra civile*

Before the conspiracy: C. Cassius Longinus between Politics and Philosophy in the Years of the Civil War (pp. 225-248).

This paper aims at providing a reconstruction of the political-military events concerning C. Cassius Longinus occurred during the civil war, with a focus on the period after the battle of Pharsalus. The analysis of the different versions of the historiographical sources and the news from Cicero's correspondence seem to reveal that Cassius decided to abandon Cato and the rest of Republicans only after learning of Pompey's death, and that he gained Caesar's forgiveness in Cilicia during the summer of 47. Caesar appointed him *legatus*, but never entrusted him with any task in the African and Spanish campaigns, during which Cassius always stayed in Italy. However, by examining some passages from the correspondence between Cicero and Cassius, in which the conversion of the latter to Epicureanism is discussed, Cassius' relationships with Caesar still seem to be good until at least the beginning of 45.

Keywords: C. Cassius Longinus, M. Tullius Cicero, C. Iulius Caesar, Epicureanism, Civil war.

corradogagliardi@hotmail.it

MICHELE GAMMELLA, *La lex portorii Lyciae nel quadro delle riforme fiscali di Nerone*

The lex portorii Lyciae in the Context of Nero's Fiscal Reforms (pp. 249-260).

In 2007 a new inscription concerning Lycian customs has been partially published. Its date, as proposed by the editor and accepted until now (between 60 and 62/63 AD) can be discussed in the light of some

prosopographical elements, as well as by comparing it to the already known *lex portorii Asiae* and to other pieces of evidence about Nero's fiscal policy. Since prosopography can offer no discriminating features, this last comparison suggests an earlier dating, to the end of 50s, among other measures to counter abuse from *publicani*.

Keywords: Nero, *Portorium*, Publicans, Reforms, Lycia.

michele.gammella@sns.it

GABRIELE GATTIGLIA, SARA ROBERTO, *Necrogeografia di un'area urbana. Un'analisi diacronica dei paesaggi funerari di Pisa*

Necrogeography of an urban area. A diachronic analysis of funerary landscapes of Pisa (pp. 199-224).

This contribution seeks to understand the funerary landscapes in the urban area of Pisa as a function of environmental, cultural, social, and personal interactions both in a diachronic and synchronic way. Starting from spatial and statistical analysis, we propose to read the funerary landscape from a perspective of almost osmotic and continuous interrelation between the cities of the dead and the surrounding environment characterised by a constant and fluid presence of water, avoiding fruitless dualistic conflicts. Such an approach is not new in archaeology since sites, bioarchaeological data, and material culture related to burials can be read as reflecting the dead's spatial agency above and below ground. In this perspective, we consider the funerary landscape as a taskscape, that is, as a landscape of correlated activities, never static or immutable, in which different agents interact and in which the sensorial multiplicity intervenes decisively. The burial of the dead, the design of cemeteries, tombs, and funerary monuments, is an essential human institution, instrumental both to creating places and the imagination of the future and offers an insight into the socio-cultural and political contexts in which they were generated. Such places have been invested with meaning by those who produced them and, in turn, have been co-opted for the construction of identity, territorial and ideological signalling. Therefore, in our case, the taskscape becomes a deathscape where places are modified by the rituals associated with death and which in turn can influence human experiences of death.

Keywords: Archaeology, Agency, Deathscape, Water, Spatial analysis.

gabriele.gattiglia@unipi.it, saruscia206@gmail.com

MALHAR KULKARNI, *Introducing fresh terminology to cognitively explain sentence meaning in the PĀÑINIAN grammatical tradition* (pp. 487-495).

Pāṇini's grammar composed in around 500 BC explains a sentence in Sanskrit in a compositional way. Simultaneously, it presupposes the analysis of the sentence meaning also in a proportionate compositional way. Interestingly, it also explains the sentential accent in a similar, compositional way (KULKARNI *et al.*, *Compositionality*). Building on this theoretical position, this paper argues that among these three levels there is an interrelation and that the Pāṇinian tradition shows its awareness of this interrelation. The components of a sentence are called *padas* in Pāṇinian terminology. The components of these *padas* are of two types: root (*prakṛti*) and suffix (*pratyaya*). In the same fashion, the components of the sentence meaning are the meaning of *padas* (*padārthas*) and the components of the meaning of *padas* are the meaning of the root (*prakṛtyārtha*) and the meaning of the suffix (*pratyayārtha*). In this context, this paper introduces a fresh terminology to deal with the sentence as well as sentence meaning as compositional on the one hand and as one undivided unit on the other.

Keywords: Sanskrit grammar, Sentence meaning, *Śabdāsūtra*, *Samgraha*.
malhar@iitb.ac.in

FRANCESCO MARCATTILI, *Spose per sempre: nuptiae e lanificium nella scultura funeraria romana della Regio IV*

Brides forever: nuptiae and lanificium in Roman funerary sculpture from the Regio IV (pp. 261-287).

This article examines Roman funerary sculpture in the *Regio IV*, with special regard to a number of monuments dedicated to deceased women between the end of the first century B.C. and the mid Imperial period. On the grounds of antiquarian sources and some comparanda, the author proposes a new interpretation of the objects carved in the bas-reliefs (parasols, sandals, *tálaros*, carding combs, ecc.). According to iconographic and semantic models attested from the Archaic period in Italy, these objects referred to the themes of wedding and *lanificium*, and indicated the virtues of the honoured women (*domiseda*, *lanifica*, ecc.).

Keywords: Roman funerary sculpture, *Regio IV*, Honoured women, Wedding, Wool processing.

francesco.marcattili@unipg.it

GIOVANNI MAZZINI, *'The servant of the king': Qatabanic 'gr in light of Ancient South Arabian and Semitic* (pp. 421-426).

The subject of this article is the term 'gr in Qatabanic, and a new interpretation is proposed considering Ancient South Arabian and other

Semitic sources. It is suggested that this term be used with the king's name as an official title with socio-political implications.

Keywords: Qatabanic, Ancient South Arabian, Semitic languages.

giovanni.mazzini@unipi.it

SIMONETTA MENCHELLI, FRANCESCA BULZOMÌ, SILVIA MARINI, *Topografia e topologia: la documentazione funeraria nei paesaggi liguri ed etruschi fra romanizzazione e tardo-antico*

Topography and Topology: the Funerary Evidence in Ligurian and Etruscan Landscapes between Romanization and Late Antiquity (pp. 159-197).

The paper deals with the epistemological value of funerary evidence for reconstructing the ancient landscapes in North coastal Etruria. 105 funerary sites dated from the 4th-3rd cent. BC up to the 7th cent. AD were studied with a topological approach and they provided significant information about the settlement patterns, the land-use, the road-systems and, in general, the economic and social peculiarities of this district. Moreover, graves and necropolises resulted very useful in identifying specific aspects and elements in the Romanization process both in the Ligurian and Etruscan areas.

Keywords: Funerary evidence, North coastal Etruria, Landscapes, Romanization.

simonetta.menchelli@unipi.it, francescabulzomi@libero.it, silviamarini83@alice.it

ALESSANDRO ORENGO, «*Ma in armeno questo non l'abbiamo*»: *il confronto tra teoria linguistica generale e realtà dell'armeno nell'opera grammaticale di Oskan Erewanc'i*

«*But in Armenian we do not have this*»: *the Comparison between General Linguistic Theory and Reality of Armenian in the Grammatical Work of Oskan Erewanc'i* (pp. 473-485).

The article deals with Oskan Erewanc'i's (1614–1674) grammar book, which is actually a translation – and partly an adaptation – of the first two books of the *Grammaticalium libri tres* by Italian philosopher Tommaso Campanella. In its longer version, Oskan's work is attested only in a handful of manuscripts. While adapting his source, Oskan occasionally declares that a given grammatical category (e.g. grammatical gender for nouns and adjectives) exists, but not in Armenian. In so doing he is influenced by the tendency towards 'grammatisation' predominant in contemporary Western

culture. The latter was a process brought about within the framework of the so called ‘extended Latin grammar’, which provided the reference point to which any language must adhere in order to be adequately described, as well as the necessary metalanguage to be used in such descriptions.

Keywords: Oskan Erewanc'i, Tommaso Campanella, Paolo Piromalli, Armenian grammatical tradition (17th century), Extended Latin grammar. alessandro.orengo@unipi.it

TIZIANO OTTOBRINI, [...] *Θεν και οὐθέν* (Gn I, 2 Teodoziona): sopra un monstrum linguistico greco-giudaico e il contributo di Giovanni Filopono

[...] *Θεν και οὐθέν* (Gn I, 2 Theodotion): a Greek-Jewish Linguistic monstrum and the Contribution by John Philoponus (pp. 387-400).

The essay focuses on the singular translation of Gn I, 2 by Theodotion (one of the three Greek translators reported in Origen's *Hexapla*), with particular regard to the *monstrum* *θέν και οὐθέν*. Through the synopsis of the Hebrew original and of the Greek translations (the LXX and the other two hexaplarly authors, Aquila and Symmachus), the origin and reasons of the *unicum* *θέν* – unexplained till now – will be discussed. The contribution made by John Philoponus' *De opificio mundi* (VI century AD) is a privileged point of view: the Alexandrian exegete is noteworthy because not only does he report each translation, but also he explicitly comments on them, showing how in Late Antiquity this strange lesson was intended.

Keywords: Philoponus, *Hexapla*, Theodotion, *Genesis*, Translation. tiziano.ottobrini@univaq.it

FRANCESCO PADOVANI, *Valore e simbologia del termine 'traccia' (ἵχνος) nel lessico teologico di Plutarco*

Meaning and Symbolology of the Word ἵχνος ('Trace, Footprint') in Plutarch's Theological Lexicon (pp. 289-309).

The essay provides an in-depth analysis of the semantic field of the word *ἵχνος*, i.e. «trace, footprint», within Plutarch's theology. The interpretive approach adopted here combines literature, philosophy and history of Greek religion. The term *ἵχνος* actually recalls some famous scenes of gods leaving their footprints on the ground in Homer. In Plutarch it also relates to the Pythagorean-Platonic (mainly metaphoric) terminology connected to the imperative 'follow the God' as it is described in Plato's *Phaedrus*. The comparison between Plutarch's theological method of inquiry and techniques such as divination and hunting suggests that his own approach to the problem is not entirely metaphoric. He is concerned with

allowing some kind of concrete presence of God in the earthly realm in order to preserve Greek traditional religious beliefs that had been shaped by the epic poetry of the archaic period. Plutarch's adoption of the semantic field of ἵγνος and the recurrence of the same semantic area in Plato, Epicurus and in the pseudo-Platonic dialogue *Epinomis* confirm Plutarch's commitment to the complex academic debate about the forms of knowledge, in which the observation of sensible phenomena played a key-role. Under this respect, the analysis of the word ἵγνος helps to define Plutarch's theological position within the Platonic tradition.

Keywords: Plutarch's theology, Divine footprints, *Iliad* 13.71-72, Plato's *Phaedrus*, *Epinomis*, Epicurus.

padovanifrancesco89@gmail.com

TIZIANA PONTILLO, *Did the Sanskrit model bring «true enlightenment to European Scholars» when they analysed and classified the Bahuvrīhi compounds?* (pp. 497-514).

Whitney (1884: 290) used the words quoted in the present title to refer to the choice made by most linguists to largely adopt the Sanskrit classification of compounds. Nonetheless, such praise is followed by a negative statement on the relevant 'bizarre terminology' this entails and above all by the statement that it «can hardly claim to be worth preserving». As is well known, in spite of Whitney's opinion, such Sanskrit terminology – introduced by Bopp – is still largely current and the concept of 'exocentric' compound is officially based on Pāṇini's rule 2.2.24: *anekam anyapadārthe*, which in fact teaches how to form *bahuvrīhi* compounds. However, such a rule and the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* analysis of compounding in general sometimes seem to have been misunderstood. As a consequence, Pāṇini's assumed impact on the Western models of compounding has perhaps to be scaled back, even though recent theories seem to have independently attained lines of interpretation of the so-called exocentric compounds that could easily have been found in his grammar.

Keywords: Sanskrit Indigenous grammar, History of Linguistics, Compounding rules and classifications, Pāṇini, W.D. Whitney.

pontillo@unica.it

SIMONE RENDINA, *Troilus of Side. Sophist and Power behind the Throne* (pp. 401-418).

Troilus, a native of Side, was the adviser of Anthemius (Emperor Theodosius II's regent) in the early 5th century AD, although he had no formal of-

fic. He was also a sophist (i.e. a skilled and influential rhetorician), and the teacher of rhetoric of several prominent figures in the cultural life of Constantinople. Synesius of Cyrene was also an acquaintance of Troilus: in his letters, Synesius of Cyrene generally defines Troilus as a ‘philosopher’, and only once as a ‘sophist’. The fact that Troilus was interested in philosophy is demonstrated by his *Prolegomena to the Rhetoric of Hermogenes*. This work is very probably the only extant writing of Troilus. It is a preparatory reading to rhetorical studies in general (not only to Hermogenes’ rhetoric), and discusses Aristotle’s and Plato’s definitions of rhetoric. The cultural references it contains highlight the meeting points between rhetoric and philosophy in the 5th century, an aspect that was especially evident in the Neoplatonic philosophical school. This paper reconstructs Troilus’ intellectual profile and his relations to the Christian beliefs and institutions, thus contributing to the reflections on the interaction between rhetorical theory and political life in the late antique Roman East.

Keywords: Hermogenes, Late Antiquity, Rhetoric, Synesius, Troilus.
Simone.rendina@alumni.sns.it

FRANCESCO ROVAI, *On the standardisation of the Latin language and writing in the Late Republic* (pp. 435-458).

This paper aims to illustrate the parallels between the standardisation of the Latin (written) language and the canonisation of the Latin script. During the centuries-long process of selection and regularisation that led to the emergence of what is currently labelled ‘Classical Latin’, a comparable process of progressive canonisation of the writing system took place. In particular, a palaeographic and linguistic inspection of two 3rd-century BC documents shows that the standard language excluded most of their orthographic spellings and linguistic forms, just as the classical canonised writings excluded many of their graphic tendencies and variants. Two orthographic proposals are also discussed that are directly related to the graphical design of the letterforms.

Keywords: Latinitas, Standardisation, Latin orthography, Palaeography, Iconicity.

francesco.rovai@unipi.it

MARIAELENA TALIN, *Nuova luce sul Peplo (pseudo)aristotelico*
New Light on (pseudo)Aristotelic Peplos (pp. 101-117).

The attribution to Aristotle of a work entitled *Peplos* has (almost) never been doubted in antiquity. It appears, indeed, in the list of Aristotle’s works

of the *Vita Aristotelis* by pseudo Hesychios. Nowadays, however, it is generally regarded as spurious. Although some studies have been carried out on this work, there are at least three points that need some clarification and/or correction. Firstly, the *Peplos* is not, as scholars formally believed, mentioned in the Arabic lists of Aristotle's works. Secondly, a new fragment mentioned only by Felix Jacoby in his preparatory studies for the edition of Aristotle in the *Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker* and ignored by all subsequent editors of the *Peplos* may shed new light on the content of the work. Thirdly, the categorical rejection of Aristotelian authorship must be reviewed on the basis of Gutzwiller's (*Epitaphs*) stylistic and lexicographic analysis of some epigrams that probably belong to the *Peplos*.

Keywords: Aristotle, *Peplos*, Epigrams, Casiri, Joannes Lydus.

mariaelena.talin@kuleuven.be

ALESSIA TERRINONI, *L'incendio come strumento politico di lotta e delegittimazione nel I secolo a.C.*

Fire as an Instrument of Political Struggle and Delegitimation in post-Sullan Age (pp. 119-158).

The fire of the temple of the Nymphs occurred between 57 and 56 BCE is an example of some practices and tendencies typical of the late republican Roman history, related to the use of fires with a political background. Starting from them, it is possible to consider the entire period beginning with the 80's of 1st cent. BCE, by pursuing two research axes: 1) the study of the ways, times and contexts in which fire began to be used as an instrument of political struggle, thus breaking with the past; 2) the analysis of the communication strategies of the late republican oratory which made the 'arsonist' a recurring figure in public debate. The survey on the sources points out at the cultural changes related to fire brought by the events of the years between 88 and 80 BCE. Definitely breaking with the past, the use of fire started to play an increasingly central role in political struggles, so that fires became a well-established and common practice in the contrasts between Roman citizens. At the same time, fire and the intentional use of it became, right from Sulla, an important rhetorical *topos* for political delegitimation, as clearly shown by Cicero's orations.

Keywords: Fire, Arson, Political struggle.

terrionialessia@gmail.com

VERONICA ARIEL VALENTI, *Inaccusatività e natura agglutinante. Un'ipotesi sul proto-indoeuropeo, una realtà del sumerico*

Inaccusativity and Agglutinative Nature. A Hypothesis on Proto-Indoeuropean and a Reality of Sumeric Language (pp. 23-49).

With arguments in favour of the inaccusativity of the Indoeuropean language, we hypothesize a prehistoric inclination common to that ergativity which is physiologically extinguished in the choice of a nominative-accusative asset, as is shown by the Mesopotamic languages and Egyptian. Thus we look at the *forma mentis* and the *Weltanschauung* which lead to an ergative choice (as, for example, in the case of the non-reifying attitude of the gnoseological approach) and which concludes the net distance that separates the inaccusative choice from the nominative-accusative asset. If to the inaccusative asset, which may be hypothesized for the Indoeuropean, we associate the agglutinative nature and the word-phrase which may both be hypothesized for the Indoeuropean, then in such a 'reconstruction' of the Indoeuropean not only are traces discerned such as the phenomenology of ergativity but also the transparency and evocativeness of the language. These last traces find, for instance, confirmation in the phonic features which are intrinsic to the Vedic texts and which are traces of a precedent situation, witnessing and celebrating a live and vital transparency and evocativeness of the language shying away from the opacity of the word that will become a prerogative in subsequent languages.

Keywords: Inaccusativity, Phenomenology of ergativity, Agglutinative nature, Transparency and evocativeness of the language.

fu_ver@hotmail.com