Word order stylistics of Daṇḍin's *Daśakumāracarita*[1]

Stefan Baums

15th September 1999

Abstract

A position on what the various factors influencing word order (and other linguistic features) are and how they interact will be taken. Then a brief historical overview will be given of the theoretical and methodological attitudes underlying the body of research that has been done on Sanskrit word order. In the central chapter, for one particular Sanskrit text (Daṇḍin's *Daśakumāracarita*) one particular aspect of word order (the position of predicates) will be discussed in detail, applying the theoretical outlook presented in chapter 2, referring back to the history of research outlined in chapter 3

Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction

These pages are my modest attempt to say something interesting about Sanskrit word order, as far as constraints of time and space and the circumstances of writing would permit. The main theoretic concern will be with the respective roles that grammar and style play for word order in Sanskrit, a language that is often said to have 'free word order' (what that means in detail will hopefully become clearer), and that is preserved to us not least importantly in literary documents, for the proper interpretation and appreciation of which stylistic considerations would seem to be quite relevant.

The problem of the relationship of grammar and style has been intriguing Indologists for a long time; the following passage about the literary Prakrit Māhārāṣṭrī (Jacobi 1886, p. LXVI) may serve as illustration:

> Die prâkṛitische Wortstellung ... ist frei, ohne willkürlich zu sein. Sie dient nicht mehr ausschließlich der Kennzeichnung oder Hervorhebung der Satzteile als solcher, obschon die grammatische Funktion stets ein wirksamer Faktor für die Stellung der Worte blieb; sondern sie hängt ebenso von der Natur der darzustellenden Sache, dem Zusammenhange und dem Wohllaute ab. In der richtigen Abmessung des Einflusses, der jedem der genannten Faktoren zukommen soll, beruht offenbar zum großen Teile die Kunst des Prosastiles.

I could not agree more with Jacobi's opinion, which is why this quotation makes a good starting point for my exposition; at the same time, I consider this dissertation to be something of an experimental approach to the study

of Sanskrit word order, so it could happen that the form of my discussion will turn out to be rather different from his.

I am pursuing two parallel aims in my approach: On the one hand, I am trying to stay quite clear throughout about the theory and methodology that I am following; for this reason, I have prefaced the investigation with a chapter that tries to give as full an account as possible of the assumptions with which I am entering my discussion. On the other hand, I have been aiming for a sort of exhaustiveness that would allow me to see not only those cases which can be fairly satisfactorily explained, but also those that cannot, and which group is the larger one.

To achieve this aim inside the bounds of this dissertation, I had to restrict my subject matter quite radically to one particular aspect of Sanskrit word order, and to a text of manageable size. As for the subject matter, the dissertation concentrates on the word order behaviour of predicates. Predicates are arguably the most central parts of clauses (only they are not optional, and they partly determine the number and nature of the other parts of the clause). They have also received some interesting treatments in the past which will provide a convenient starting point and backdrop for discussion.

Faced with the decision of whether to look at some new text with old eyes, and most likely not being able to go beyond basic description, or trying to look at a text that has been comparatively well studied already, evaluating what has been done and finding out how to improve on it, the latter seemed more profitable. I have chosen Daṇḍin's *Daśakumāracarita*, not only because of previous acquaintance with it, but also because it has been discussed from several angles in the literature on Sanskrit word order, one reason being that it affords plenty of illustration for one particularly interesting stylistic figure connected with the predicate, which we will discuss in section 4.1.

The fourth *ucchvāsa* of the *Daśakumāracarita* has been singled out for discussion. The position of the predicate of every sentence in it has been considered and categorized; the results are presented in chapter 4. References are by *ucchvāsa*, page and line number to Bühler and Peterson's edition in the Bombay Sanskrit Series (Bühler 1887, Peterson 1891); this edition has the advantages of giving variant readings, a feature on which I will draw in my discussion, and of being among the more easily accessible

editions, which will make it easier to track down my references and check my claims in context. All translations are my own.

Chapter 2

Approach

I will outline here in the bare essentials my conception of what grammar and style are, and what their relationship may be. More will probably be implicit in the way that I deal with the material in chapter 4. My thinking about the connection between grammar and style has been influenced by Spencer (1964) and Landfester (1997).

2.1 Grammar

A grammar can be thought of as a body of knowledge, available to the speaker of a language for use, though mostly unconscious, providing some mechanisms for verbal expression and understanding, and failing to provide others, in this way laying down the rule on what is possible and what is impossible in the language that the speaker knows. It may further be argued that in addition this body of knowledge makes the production and understanding of some grammatical structures more difficult than that of others, and that the speaker will be aware of this relative difficulty or ease, and will be able, in the production of language, to aim for any point on the scale. A grammar in this conception does not fully determine the use that will be made of it, leaving the speaker ample latitude to choose, using it, the expression he desires, all the while being swayed by various external influences, many of them originating from the society in which he operates and towards which he adopts an attitude, not least of all communicated verbally. This is an outlook which I believe to be basically compatible with the views of mainstream modern linguistics. I will avoid all formalism as much as possible (and have been quite successful, I think). The relative

difficulty or ease with which a grammar lets one produce different structures will be referred to with the basic Prague School structuralist dichotomy of 'marked' and 'unmarked' constructions.

2.2   Style

I have outlined how the grammar of his language provides the author with the means to express himself (though he will not be aware of the exact workings of these means), but leaves the choice of how exactly he does it – which particular operation from among those provided by his grammar he employs – firmly with him. The first characteristic of style now is that it involves him making this s e l e c t i o n. Various considerations will influence him, but he has the opportunity to imprint his individuality on the series of choices he makes. It is not enough, however, that he prefers one expression over another in one particular situation only; for this preference to be stylistic, to cease to be random, it has to be repeated whenever the author is faced with a similar choice. This r e p e t i t i o n, the second characteristic of style, is what makes the reader notice that a choice has indeed been made, and what it was; only after this step can the reader start making inferences about the author's intention behind the choice. The third characteristic of style is that the same effect can be achieved by different stylistic devices; if the author wants to increase the likelihood that his intention is recognized, he will use the c o m b i n a t i o n of several related devices for combined effect. If one tries to see this process of stylistic interaction from the reader's (or stylistics student's) point of view, it may be said that a reader approaches a text with certain expectations, based on his previous exposure to its author, to its literary genre, etc. Most of these expectations will be fulfilled, but occasionally he will encounter something unexpected. If he repeatedly encounters the same unexpected thing, this will gradually change his set of expectations and what used to be seen as unusual will (maybe only for the time being, for this author, for this text) be experienced as normal.

2.3   General demands of communication

For completeness' sake, mention should be made of the existence of communicational principles that cannot be called grammatical, but in their raw form are not stylistic either. I am thinking here of such basic needs as to engage and hold the listener's (or reader's) attention, because otherwise there will be no communication at all, to maintain a certain level of intelligibility, etc. I will, however, not need to invoke these principles in the further course of discussion.

Chapter 3

History

It may come as a surprise quite how many treatments of Sanskrit word order have accrued over the years. Some information can naturally be plucked from the surveys of Sanskrit syntax – Speijer (1886), Delbrück (1888), and Speyer (1896) – or even from general grammars of the language, especially that of Renou (1968). Next there are those works which treat comprehensively of just the order of words: Delbrück (1878), Thommen (1905), Lahiri (1933), and Canedo (1937). Finally, a large number of articles and parts of books have of course been dedicated to individual aspects of Sanskrit word order; a few of these will be mentioned below when the need arises. A comprehensive bibliography of writings on any aspect of Sanskrit syntax is provided in Hock (1991).

It should be noted that the larger works aiming at more or less complete coverage at a certain level of detail are all beginning to look somewhat dated now. This shows not so much in the facts usefully collected and categorized there, as in the (often unspoken) theoretical assumptions underlying the presentation. It will be useful to discuss the nature and development of the most important ones in outline.

The fundamental assumption that is at the heart of not just the older but basically all the literature, but an assumption nonetheless, is that the most useful, or natural, or only viable way to treat word order variation is to take one variant as basic and the others as derivative. While everyone is more or less in agreement that the derivative variants belong to the domain of stylistic choice, and are so to speak derived anew every time such a choice against the basic variant is made, conceptions of the nature of the basic variant have undergone some changes. To begin with, Delbrück (1878

and 1888) called the basic variant 'traditionell' and the derivative variant 'occasionell'. The main motivation for the speaker to choose an 'occasional' word order in Delbrück's conception is to emphasize a word:

> Neben der traditionellen Wortstellung giebt es occasionelle, deren hauptsächlichstes Grundgesetz das folgende ist: Je wichtiger ein Wort dem Redenden erscheint, um so entschiedener strebt es dem Anfang des Satzes zu. Oder da man die Wichtigkeit des Wortes durch die Betonung zu erkennen giebt: je mehr ein Wort durch den Ton ausgezeichnet wird, um so mehr rückt es nach vorn. (Delbrück 1888, p. 16)

The 'traditional' word order, on the other hand, is that which the speaker has inherited from his forefathers, which was already present in the Indo-European proto-language, and which is also found in related languages, such as Latin (Delbrück 1878, p. 13, 1888, p. 16). This conception suffered from the supposition that there was no word order variation in Indo-European itself (since only the traditional word order is inherited), and was never fully adopted by other scholars. As Bloomfield (1912/13, p. 174 f.) puts it, treating of the different positions of the verb in Vedic:

> The preceding discussions with their illustrations have been carried on from the point of view of the end position of the verb; the variations from that position have been treated as tho they were descendant forms. I would, however, once more disavow the opinion that the final verb type was at any time the exclusive type of expression.

Delbrück himself subsequently dropped the term 'traditional' for his comparative Indo-European syntax (in Brugmann & Delbrück 1897–1916). He is using 'habituell' there instead, and has given up the position that the basic word order has a greater claim to antiquity than the derivative one. Speijer (1886, p. 9), while talking about a 'traditional or regular arrangement' as opposed to 'various exceptions caused by the exigencies of style, euphony, metre etc.', is not making any (pre-)historic claims on behalf of his terms, and in the writings of his successors, the dichotomy is consistently continued in the guise of 'habitual' vs. 'occasional' (Thommen 1905, Canedo 1937, Renou 1968).

Later, with the rise of linguistics as an independent and increasingly self-conscious discipline, new terminology has been introduced. The structuralist dichotomy of 'marked' vs. 'unmarked' has achieved a certain longevity and is still current; and also because it is akin in spirit to the old 'habitual' vs. 'occasional', it has been adopted here. As linguistics came to see its central task not in the description of the 'what' and 'why' of linguistic activity (which are directly relevant for stylistics), but rather in the quest for the 'how' (the mechanisms that make linguistic activity possible in the first place, more remotely relevant for stylistics), formalism and a plethora of new terminology blossomed. No useful purpose would be served, however, in rehearsing it here; the interested reader is directed to Staal (1967), the first treatment of Sanskrit word order that was linguistic in this new sense, to Gillon (1996), who elaborates on Staal's ideas, and to some of the articles and, once again, the bibliography in Hock (1991).

Chapter 4

Application

I will now proceed to the examination of grammatical syntax and syntactic style, as manifested in the word order phenomena associated with predicates in our text. I will consider it the unmarked case that the verb is at the very end of its clause; in practical terms this means that no special comment is called for if an instance of a verb in that position occurs. This does not, however, mean that no stylistic effect can be achieved by the employment of an unmarked word order: a text can certainly be conspicuous for being plain, for consistently avoiding the unusual, as indeed is true of Brāhmaṇa prose. But in this case the stylistic effect results from the unusually high frequency with which the unmarked structure is encountered; the i n d i v i d u a l occurrence of, e. g., a verb in clause-final position does still not call for an explanation. The *Daśakumāracarita*, it should be said at this point, is certainly not conspicuous for syntactic plainness.

4.1   Bridges between sentences

The first unusual word order that will be considered is that in which the predicate occurs at the very beginning of its clause, and is followed by the sentence-connecting particle *ca*, as in:

> a n a i ṣ ī c *ca tāto me māṃ devasyālakeśvarasyāsthānīm.*
> (4.3.18; 'And my father took me to the audience hall of the god, the lord of Alakā.')

In his *Sanskrit syntax* of 1886, Speijer, talking about the connection of sentences, remarks that the type 'राजा सर्वान्निशष्टानाहूय मन्त्रयितुमुपविष्टः ।

आह च तान् [instead of तांस्याह]' (p. 12, from the *Hitopadeśa*) 'often occurs, especially in polished style'. He then further illustrates it with the following passage from our text:

> *ahaṃ tu ... viṣaṃ kṣaṇād astambhayam; apatac ca bhūmau mṛtakalpaḥ.* (4.7.19; 'I stopped the poison in an instant; and he fell on the ground as if dead.')

In the same year Jacobi, in his Māhārāṣṭrī reader, described the same construction for that language (extending his observation to Sanskrit in his article of 1895, illustrating extensively from the second *ucchvāsa* of our work). He is innovative in his attempt to explain the relationship between the initial position of the verb and the particle *ca*:

> Da nämlich *ca*, *ya* eigentlich nur Worte verbindet, so muß es,
> um Sätze zu verbinden, hinter das wichtigste Wort, welches nun
> in den Anfang zu stehen kommt, treten. Welches das wichtigste
> Wort ist, ergiebt der Zusammenhang; wenn derselbe aber nicht
> für ein anderes Wort einen besonderen Nachdruck verlangt, so
> tritt das Verbum als das wichtigste Element der Erzählung in
> den Vordergrund und nimmt *ca*, *ya* nach sich.

One may be forgiven the feeling that Jacobi's reasoning falls a bit short of convincing here, is in fact hiding a circularity: it is difficult to argue, in a case in which the predicate (or indeed any part of the clause) i s opening the sentence, that it is n o t itself the most important word; and since his contention is that the predicate is the most important element of the narrative sequence if nothing else is specially emphasized (which in itself is not obvious and would require more, or indeed some, discussion), why then, following his reasoning, is the last and not the first position the unmarked position of the (verbal) predicate?

The means to unravel this tangle of cause and effect is to realize that the whole matter departs from the fact that the author w a n t s to join together two sentences (as evidenced by the mere presence of *ca*, anywhere in the second sentence); one strategy at his disposal is to front the predicate of the second sentence while keeping that of the first in its usual end position (and to make the two predicates similar semantically, morphologically, or phonetically, see below). If he then wants to underline the connectedness of the sentences by using the conjunction *ca*, does he have any choice but to

put it in the second position of the sentence? While Jacobi does not seem to think so, it is not really too difficult to point out some instances where the sentence- (or clause-) connecting *ca* is not in the second position; a little detour will provide an opportunity to make some further points about the role of style in the making of Sanskrit word order.

The first three examples occur together, one following upon the other, each in its own sentence; this is probably no coincidence: the author seems to pursue a purpose in making his character (Kāmapāla) speak in this way; to hazard a guess, this looseness of speech (the usual, maybe normative, position of *ca* of course being the second) may be meant to betoken Kāmapāla's youthful dissoluteness, but this is really an instance of a usage which seems to be stylized by the criteria of unexpectedness and repetition, but where the associated intended effect cannot be clearly recovered:

> *katham api samagacche c a; atha channaṃ c a viharatā ku-*
> *mārīpure sā mayāsīd āpannasattvā; kaṃcit sutaṃ c a pra-*
> *sūtavatī.* (4.3.1; 'And somehow I achieved a liaison; and then
> she became pregnant from me, staying secretly in the girls'
> chambers; and she gave birth to a child.')

The next example seems to have its *ca* in a completely arbitrary position:

> *asminn evāvakāśe pūrṇabhadramukhāc c a rājaḥ śayyāsa-*
> *nasthānam avagamya tadaiva ... suraṅgām akaravam.* (4.9.19;
> 'On just that occasion, learning from Pūrṇabhadra's mouth of
> the places where the king lay and sat, I at once made a tunnel.')

In the last example, *ca* seems to link up the main clause with a preceding gerundial clause, but the fact remains that the *ca* is not in the second position of its own clause.

> *tataḥ ... kāṇḍapaṭaparikṣipte viviktoddeśe darbhasaṃsta-*
> *ram adhiśāyya, svayaṃ kṛtānumaraṇamaṇḍanayā c a tatra*
> *saṃnidheyam.* (4.7.3; 'Then, after laying him down on a pile
> of grass in a secluded place surrounded by a canvas, you have to
> put on the ornaments for following in death and lie down there
> together (with him).')

21

To sum up: I object to the 'muß' in Jacobi's first sentence; it has been demonstrated to be off the mark. In this way, not only is the presence or absence of *ca* within the realm of choice of the author (thus potentially stylistic), but also if it is present, then its position is not automatic (determined by a rule of grammar), but quite as much up to the author's preference (thus also potentially stylistic). It is true that the unmarked position of sentence-connecting *ca* is the second position: so in the construction described by Jacobi we have an instance of a stylistic effect being achieved not by the employment of a marked structure, but by the employment of an unmarked structure even beyond the frequency that is expected: while in our text, sentence-connecting *ca* does occasionally occur in a non-second position, it i s, without any exception at all, in the second position if a fronted predicate is used to connect sentences.

To connect two sentences, Daṇḍin puts the predicate of the second sentence in the first position, often choosing it so it is similar to the predicate of the first sentence, and consistently reinforces the effect by using the conjunction *ca*, and by placing it immediately after the fronted predicate, thus setting it off from the rest of the sentence. Before proceeding to a detailed analysis of this method of sentence linking, some remarks on how it presents itself in the further history of research will be of interest.

Following the title of Jacobi's article, the term 'Inversion' (of subject and predicate) came to be regularly used of the construction; this is only half appropriate inasmuch as the figure is never really treated as a swapping of places of the subject and predicate, but always as the predicate moving into a position in front of its subject: the very beginning of the clause; and rightly so, as this manoeuvre is all about bringing parallel words into contact across the sentence boundary, and does not directly concern the position of the subject at all. The usefulness of 'Inversion' is further decreased by the fact that it is used to cover the case of the predicate in 'second' position (see below) as well.

Thommen (1905, based on his Göttingen dissertation of 1903) points out that while predicate fronting with *ca* does occur in the main body of the *Daśakumāracarita* it is absent from the first *ucchvāsa* of the Pūrvapīṭhikā (the one that he has looked at); considering that this *ucchvāsa* fills 11 pages in Bühler's edition, and that predicate fronting is very frequent indeed in the passage that I am examining, this is quite a remarkable fact. Thommen

also offers an illustration of the phenomenon drawn from Aśoka's Rock Edict 4:

> *esa ae ca bahuvidhe dhaṃmacaraṇe v a ḍ h i t e; v a ḍ h a -*
> *y i s a t i ceva devānaṃ priyo priyadasi rājā dhaṃmacara-*
> *ṇaṃ idaṃ.* (Girnār, ll. 7 f.; 'That other various religious prac-
> tice has also been promoted; and king Priyadasi, beloved of the
> gods, will promote this religious practice.')

Gawroński, in his comparison of the language of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* with that of the *Daśakumāracarita* (1907), is drawing on Thommen's work; but it is interesting to note that by now he is referring to the 'bekannte, dem Daśak. eigentümliche Konstruktion' (p. 29). By calling this construction the '*ca*-Verbindung' (p. 29) he is giving centre stage to an aspect that has no claim to it. Canedo (1937, pp. 25–31), on the other hand, recommends himself by treating predicate fronting with *ca* as just one specialized case of predicate fronting in general, and by mentioning under this heading the tendency, in the case of a subordinate clause ('Vordersatz') being followed by a main clause ('Nachsatz'), for the predicates of the two clauses to be adjacent; 'im ganzen kann man wohl sagen, daß diese Stellung in weitem Umfang als Anschlußstellung zu gelten hat' (p. 29).

One should realize that it has never been established how widespread or otherwise this construction is: some say that it is a 'type' that 'often occurs' (Speijer 1886, p. 12); others, that it is peculiar to the *Daśakumāracarita* (Gawroński 1907, p. 29). The only examples that have ever been actually adduced in support of the one attitude or the other are just a handful from the *Daśakumāracarita*, and one each from the *Hitopadeśa* (Speijer), the *Pacatantra* (Jacobi), and Aśoka (Thommen, Canedo). There certainly are distributional limits to be established: it seems, e. g., that this construction is quite alien to Brāhmaṇa prose, which very much prefers to leave its verbs in their original end position, and uses other means to establish connections between sentences (such as anaphoric demonstrative pronouns moved into the first position).

The discussion of the various guises in which our construction appears can be started off with a particularly nice illustration of how we really have to do with a fronting of the predicate and not an interchange between it and the subject, and of how a *ca* is introduced in connection with it. At 4.2.12, Peterson is following his manuscripts A and B for the reading

mitravan mayy avartiṣṭa. mayaikadā rahasi jātaviśrambhe-
ṇa pṛṣṭaḥ sobhāṣata svacaritam. ('He treated me like a friend.
When I once asked him in private, having gained his trust, he
told me his story.')

His manuscript C, however, has the variant

mitravan mayy a v a r t i ṣ ṭ a; p ṛ ṣ ṭ a ś ca mayaikadā ra-
hasi jātaviśrambheṇa sobhāṣata svacaritam.

If the subject and the predicate had indeed traded places, we would have
pṛṣṭaś caikadā rahasi jātaviśrambheṇa mayā instead of the actual result.

The point made is independent of which reading is to be preferred here;
the correspondence between the normal construction and that with its pred-
icate fronted, a *ca* in second position, and the rest of the clause unaffected
is clearly there, be it in the head of Daṇḍin himself or of a later scribe er-
roneously carrying over Daṇḍin's general habit to this particular instance.
That said, apart from possible reservations about the quality of manuscript
C, it is not clear why Peterson has adopted the reading he did: the bridg-
ing construction here seems quite in accordance with Daṇḍin's usage, serv-
ing as it would to connect two sentences between which there is an inti-
mate connection of meaning to start with (the quality of Pūrṇabhadra and
Kāmapāla's relationship, forming the basis for what follows: 'He treated
me like a friend; and when, having gained his trust, I once asked him in
private, he told me his story'). That it is the predicate not of a main but
of a subordinate (participial) clause (a *participium coniunctum*) that is
fronted does not present a problem, as a procession of various examples
will show now; they are arranged according to which sort of clause the two
adjacent predicates belong to.

First is the usual case, in which it is the predicates of two main clauses
that are brought together; this is the most frequent type:

puruṣam ekam āyāmavantam ... aviraruditocchūnatām-
radṛṣṭim a d r ā k ṣ a m; a t a r k a y a ṃ ca ... (4.1.4; 'I
saw a man, tall, ..., with eyes that were swollen and copper-
red from ceaseless crying; and I reflected ...')

ādāya cainaṃ tīvrasnehān mama pitroḥ saṃnidhim a n a i -
ṣ a m; a n a i ṣ ī c ca tāto me māṃ devasyālakeśvarasyā-
sthānīm. (4.3.17; 'And out of deep affection picking him up

I took him to my father; and my father took me to the audience hall of the god, the lord of Alakā.')

Note the lexical similarity *anaiṣam anaiṣīc.*

bālaś ca kila śūdrakāvasthe tvayy āryadāsyavasthāyāṃ mayy u d a b h ū t; a v a r d h y a t a ca vinayavatyā. (4.4.5; 'And the child was born (so he told me) when you were in your Śūdraka existence and I was in my Āryadāsī existence; and it was brought up by Vinayavatī.')

There is a semantic connection of 'natural progression' between *udabhūt* and *avardhyata.*

athāparedyuḥ ... vidhivad ātmajāyāḥ pāṇim a g r ā h a y a t; a ś r ā v a y a c ca tanayavārt⟨t⟩āṃ tārāvalī kāntimatyai somadevīsulocanendrasenābhyaś ca pūrvajātivṛttāntam. (4.5.2; 'Then, on the next day, ... he ceremoniously gave me the hand of his daughter; and Tārāvalī told to Kāntimatī the story of her son, and (gave) to Somadevī, Sulocanā, and Indrasenā an account of their previous births.')

The sequence of two causatives, with the attendant phonetic similarity *-ā-haya- -āvaya-*, may be intentional.

pacavarṣadeśīyaṃ siṃhaghoṣanāmānaṃ kumāram a b h y - a ṣ e c a y a t; a v a r d h a y a c ca vidhinainam sa sādhuḥ. (4.5.9; 'He anointed the about five-years-old prince called Siṃhaghoṣa; and he brought him up properly, the good man.')

sakhī me tārāvalī sapatnī ca ... praṇamyamānāpy asmābhir upoḍhamatsarā p r ā v a s a t; a v a s ī d a t i ca naḥ patiḥ. (4.5.22; 'My friend and co-wife Tārāvalī, in spite of being entreated by me, ran off, her jealousy kindled; and our master is dispirited.')

Here there is a twofold phonetic pattern *-v-s-t -v-s-d* and *-ā-a-a- a-a-ī-.*

Interestingly, there is one case which is the inverse of the preceding: here not the predicates but the subjects of two sentences have been brought together to establish connection; even the usual *ca* is present:

*kārpaṇyam iva varṣati m l ā n a t ā r a ṃ c a k ṣ u ḥ; ā r a -
m b h a ś ca sāhasānuvādī.* (4.1.6; 'Piteously rains the lack-
lustre eye; and the undertaking bespeaks rashness.')

This only serves to show that identical effects can be achieved by different
mechanisms (predicate fronting vs. subject postposition), and that style
has not really to do with how a sentence has been derived, but much more
with the superficial form that the sentence actually takes (a point also made
by Landfester (1997, p. 3), with reference to Chomsky's competence-per-
formance dichotomy).

Second are those cases in which the predicate being fronted is not ac-
tually the main predicate of the second sentence, but the predicate of its
first clause, which is subordinate to the main clause and, in all the cases
considered here, non-finite. This occurs with locatives absolute:

*athāsyāṃ kāśīpuryāṃ aryavaryasya kasyacid gṛhe coray-
itvā rūpābhigrāhito ' b a d h y e; b a d d h e ca mayi mat-
tahastī mṛtyuvijayo nāma . . . uttamāmātyasya śāsanāj . . .
maṇḍalitahastakāṇḍaṃ abhyadhāvat.* (4.1.14; 'Then, caught
red-handed when stealing in the house of some eminent vaiśya in
this Kāśī town, I was bound; and me being bound, on the com-
mand of the chief minister a ruttish elephant called Mṛtyuvijaya,
coiling the segments of his trunk, attacked.')

(the lexical connection of *'badhye* and *baddhe* is obvious), and with gerun-
dial clauses:

*paretāvāse vārāṇasyāṃ kam api dārakaṃ rudantam a d r ā -
k ṣ a m; ā d ā y a cainaṃ tīvrasnehān mama pitroḥ saṃni-
dhim anaiṣam.* (4.3.17; 'In a cemetery ground in Vārāṇasī, I
saw a boy weeping; and picking him up out of deep affection, I
took him to my father.')

Next we have something of a borderline case:

*baddhe ca mayi mattahastī mṛtyuvijayo nāma . . . uttamā-
mātyasya śāsanāj . . . maṇḍalitahastakāṇḍaṃ a b h y a d h -
ā v a t; a b h i p a t y a ca mayā nirbhayena nirbhartsitaḥ . . .
bhīta iva nyavartiṣṭa.* (4.1.16; 'And me being bound, on the

26

command of the chief minister a ruttish elephant called Mṛtyuvi-
jaya, coiling the segments of his trunk, attacked; and, attacking,
being fearlessly threatened by me ... he retreated as if in fear.')

It cannot actually be seen that fronting has taken place (*abhipatya* would
be in the same position if the second sentence stood on its own), but still
there is the *ca* and the semantic and phonetic similarity of *abhyadhāvat*
and *abhipatya*. It is interesting to note how the author, by establishing
the well-defined pattern that I am describing, makes his readers see this
sentence with other eyes than they might otherwise have done.

The following example presents two interesting difficulties.

> *veśeṣu vilasantaṃ māṃ vinayarucir asāv a v ā r a y a t; pu-
> nar a v ā r y a d u r n a y a ś cāham apasṛtya ... saha sa-
> khībhiḥ kandukena parikrīḍamānāṃ kāśībhartuś caṇḍasiṃ-
> hasya kanyāṃ kāntimatīṃ nāmācakame.* (4.2.16; 'Holding
> discipline in high esteem, he restrained me from amusing myself
> in brothels; but again, my bad discipline being unrestrainable,
> I ran away ... and fell in love with the daughter of Caṇḍasiṃha
> the lord of Kāśī, named Kāntimatī, who was playing about with
> a ball together with her friends.')

First of all, *punar* is not only inconvenient in that it prevents *avāryadu-
rnayaś* from occupying the initial position that one has come to expect
(and in that it makes sentence-connecting *ca* the third word, which, as has
already been seen, is unusual generally and non-occurring with the bridging
construction): it is also not clear how to accommodate both *punar* and *ca*
semantically in this sentence (I admit that I do not consider my 'but again' a
happy rendering of *punar ... ca*). It is true that *punar* is supported by all
(three) of Peterson's manuscripts, but still, considering all these problems,
I think that Wilson was right when he deleted *punar* ex coniectura, and
that Peterson should not have reinstated it. This leaves us with the revised
reading

> *veśeṣu vilasantaṃ māṃ vinayarucir asāv a v ā r a y a t; a -
> v ā r y a d u r n a y a ś cāham apasṛtya ... saha sakhībhiḥ
> kandukena parikrīḍamānāṃ kāśībhartuś caṇḍasiṃhasya ka-
> nyāṃ kāntimatīṃ nāmācakame.*

I have taken as a premise that we are indeed dealing with a case of predicate fronting here; this is supported not only by the result that it leads to a reading that is semantically less awkward (avoiding having to square off *punar* and *ca*), but also by the independent fact that there clearly is s o m e sort of fronting here (there is material in front of the subject *aham*), combined with the fact that there is the sort of lexical (semantic and phonetic) relationship between *avārayat* and *avārya-* that is so often associated with the bridging construction.

The second difficulty concerns a subtle ambiguity of interpretation that the sentence presents, which can be illustrated as follows. If fronting had not taken place and every word were in its unmarked position, the sentence would presumably look like this:

> *aham avāryadurnayo 'pasṛtya ... cakame.*

The ambiguity is in the role of *avāryadurnayo* in this sentence. In either case, *avāryadurnayo* is a predicative attribute (this is Speijer's term; I have provided some discussion in an appendix): in the form of an attributive adjective, it furnishes a secondary predication of the subject of its clause. But which clause does it belong to? Is it the the gerundial clause (with the predicate *apasṛtya*):

> *aham, avāryadurnayo 'pasṛtya, ... cakame.*

or is it the main clause (with the predicate *cakame*):

> *aham, avāryadurnayo, 'pasṛtya ... cakame.*

As it is, our text being only available in written form and lacking punctuation, both interpretations are available, and seem to be of about equal likelihood. In speaking, one would favour one or the other by making slight incisions in the intonation curve, probably slight pauses, at the points indicated by commas above. As readers, we are unfortunately deprived of these hints or, according to viewpoint, lucky not to be prejudiced in our interpretation by that of a reciter.

But this ambiguity is resolved in that form of the sentence (which we actually have in our text) in which fronting has taken place, if we use our hypothesis of how fronting works. (Alternatively, if it be preferred to consider the situation not of the modern exegete of an ancient text, but that of a living speaker of the language reading it: due to his internalized and

largely unconscious knowledge of how fronting works – which has grown from his constant exposure to the construction in the use of the language – only one interpretation presents itself to him.) I should elaborate.

In all the examples of fronting that have been considered, and in those that are still to come, the predicate under consideration is fronted to the very beginning of its o w n clause. Never does it leave its own clause and get fronted to, say, the front of a superordinate clause. (And indeed, Gillon (1996) claims from a comparative study of different movement processes in a representative sample of sentences, that words in Sanskrit are quite generally never moved beyond the bounds of their own clause; if he is right, this would support my argument, but I do not crucially depend on it.) If this is accepted as a characteristic feature of the fronting construction, then *avāryadurnayaś* cannot belong syntactically to the gerundial clause, because that would mean that it has been moved out of its own proper clause, crossing the subject of the superordinate clause, *aham*. Therefore the second interpretation, in which *avāryadurnayaś* is part of the main clause, is the one I adopt. It should also be noted that a predicative attribute (though only a secondary predicate) is predicative enough to be available for predicate fronting, especially if the main predicate of the clause (*cakame*) is far away (the example has been considerably abridged).

In this way, a clear hypothesis of how a particular syntactic phenomenon works can guide one towards an interpretation that will at least be principled and consistent; its potential to be, in addition, correct is certainly not adversely affected. My final proposal for a (somewhat literal) translation would, then, be: 'and I, of incorrigibly bad discipline, ran away and ... became desirous of the daughter of Caṇḍasiṃha ... '

Third is the case in which predicate fronting is not, as in the preceding examples, used to link more closely together a pair of sentences, but is employed to make for tighter cohesion of two clauses inside one and the same sentence: in this latter case, the predicate of a subordinate clause (which in the usual Sanskrit manner precedes its superordinate clause) remains in its end position while that of the following main clause is moved so as to be in contact with it (cf. Canedo's remarks on 'Vordersatz' and 'Nachsatz', above; he is referring to parallels in Greek and the Germanic languages). Here, then, predicate fronting does not serve to bridge a gap between potentially independent syntactic entities (whole sentence), but to reinforce the

grammatical connection already existing between the constituent clauses of a single sentence. This occurs with gerundial clauses:

> *anyaḥ kaścin mātaṅgapatir ānīyatām, yenāhaṃ muhūrtaṃ v i h r̥ t y a g a c c h ā m i gantavyāṃ gatim.* (4.2.6; 'Pray bring me some other elephant lord, with whom I may busy myself a while before going the way I have to go.')

> *athāham ā h ū y ā j ā p t ā harasakhena . . .* (4.3.19; 'Then I was called and addressed by the friend of Hara . . .')

and with participial clauses:

> *so 'ham apy . . . ūrmimālinemibhūmivalayaṃ p a r i b h r a - m a n n, u p ā s a r a ṃ kadācit kāśīpurīṃ vāraṇasīm.* (4.1.1; 'I, too, wandering about the circle of the earth garlanded and fellied by waves, at one time approached the Kāśī town Vārāṇasī.')

The following, though not really containing a participle, seems to be essentially of the same construction (cf. Speijer (1886, p. 283): 'The participial employment is not limited to the participles. Any adjective may be employed as if it were a participle.'):

> *ato . . . tasya sādhoḥ puraḥ prāṇān m o k t u k ā m o b a - d h n ā m i parikaram.* (4.6; 'Therefore, wishing to let go of life before this good man, I make preparations.')

Since the second 'conjunct' in these cases is not a complete sentence, but just the main clause of one, no sentence-connecting *ca* is employed. This third case, which shows that the possibility to express close connection between two clauses by making their predicates adjacent exists independently of the conjunction *ca*, supports my decision to consider, in the phenomena treated in the first two parts of this section, the movement of the verb primary and the use of *ca*, though regularly accompanying it there, secondary.

4.2   Predicates in the 'second' position

We now turn to another construction involving the movement of the predicate out of its unmarked clause-final position. Just as Jacobi's article may

be considered the *locus classicus* for what we have called bridging, the discussion of those cases in which the verb is in so-called 'second position' starts from an article that that has since acquired a certain fame for independent reasons: Wackernagel's 'Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung'. After discussing the position in the sentence of the enclitic pronouns and particles of Greek and other Indo-European languages on a full hundred pages (this position, after the first full word of the clause, is determined by what is now often called Wackernagel's Law), he devoted the last two paragraphs of the last page to the position of the finite verb in such sentences of Brāhmaṇa prose (he is drawing on Delbrück (1878) here) as *sá hováca gā́rgyaḥ* or *sá aikṣata prajā́patiḥ*. Here, the first word of the sentence (which must not itself be enclitic; due to the predominant sentence-joining strategy of this part of Sanskrit literature, it often is a demonstrative pronoun) is followed be any enclitic particles that the sentence may have, then by the verb, then the rest. This has been seen with *sá* (*ha*), other possibilities that Wackernagel mentions are *íti ha*, *ápi ha*, *tád u ha*, and *tád u sma*.

This, of course, is Vedic, and as such not automatically relevant for the discussion of our text, were it not the case that Jacobi, in his In-versions-article, published three years after Wackernagel's, followed up his lead as far as the last two examples are concerned. He presents about 20 sentences from the *Pacatantra* which start off with the word *tad* in its meaning 'therefore', followed by the verb, followed by the rest of the sentence, possibly including the subject. His take on the relative importance of grammatical rules and stylistic intent in conditioning this pattern is as follows:

> Jedoch ist die Inversion [of subject and predicate] nach *tad* nicht Gesetz, sie bildet nur die Majorität der Fälle. In einer starken Minorität steht irgend ein anderes Wort nach *tad*, namentlich wenn der Satz lang oder der Prädikatsausdruck kompliziert ist. Die Inversion wird also nicht durch einen sprachlichen Zwang, sondern durch ein feineres Stilgefühl vorgeschrieben. (p. 336)

So this case of 'Inversion' is just as optional as the other one. More difficult, as always, is to determine the author's motives for doing what he does. Jacobi goes on to explain what he means by the 'more refined stylistic sensibility' that is supposed to be the driving force here: it was this

sensibility that made Classical Sanskrit authors adopt a form of expression that had (hypothetically) always been current in everyday language, and was now used to enrich the stylistic armoury of the lettered. The immediate cause that triggered the employment of this figure in the examples that he quotes was according to him that many of them contain imperatives. And since imperatives are inherently stressed, he can invoke the ubiquitous 'emphasis' explanation for any deviation from the usual word order.

I am not going to deny that emphasis indeed plays a role in these cases, but even if that is accepted the question remains to be answered: what is so special about the second position that the verb is moved there instead of to the very beginning of the clause? Now it is profitable to return to Wackernagel's discussion of enclitics. He concludes the passage about Sanskrit verbs with the observation that the word-order behaviour that they show is 'ganz die Weise deutscher Sätze mit Inversion'. This has to be taken together with his views on how word order changed on the way from the Indo-European proto-language into the individual branches of the family (pp. 425 ff.): he is projecting the accentual situation of Vedic, where the verbal predicate of a main clause is normally unaccented while the predicates of subordinate clauses do bear an accent, back to the proto-language; then he takes this reconstructed difference of accent to demand a difference in position as well: the verbs of main clauses, at least if they did not exceed a length of maybe two or three syllables, in common with other enclitic words followed the first word of the sentence; while longer or accented verbs in main clauses, and all verbs in subordinate clauses, were in clause-final position; Germanic later generalized the 'second' position to all main clause verbs, while Vedic at least preserved it, and maybe dropped the length restriction on enclitic verbs as well.

What Wackernagel does not do is establish the hypothesized correlation between accentual status and position for Vedic itself in the first place. He should have done this as the necessary first step before postulating it for the proto-language and speculating on the origin of the Germanic word order. As it turns out, the main clause word order of German verbs is not at all like that of enclitic words in the early Indo-European languages. The latter blindly follow the first word of the sentence, regardless of whether this word in itself makes up a complete constituent of its clause or not, as in his example *sá h o vāca gárgyaḥ*. Their position is thus a purely phonological phenomenon in that they are a word class defined by the

phonological criterion of bearing no accent, and in that their position is determined by the phonological structure of the sentence ('after the first word', a word being an accent-bearing unit), not its syntactic structure. As for the German case: main clause verbs are in no sense lacking an accent; and their position is n o t determined by phonological, but by syntactic criteria: they follow not the first word, but the first c o n s t i t u e n t of the sentence, regardless of the length it may have: 'Der Mann, den ich gestern in der Bibliothek getroffen habe, w o h n t im Haus gegenüber.'

So far it is undecided really which pattern the 'second-position' verbs of Sanskrit follow: that of enclitic words, or that of the German main clause verb, or maybe some other? Going through our text, it becomes clear that this marked position of the verb is much rarer than that described in the previous section; a full list can be given here of 'second-position' verbs after *tad*:

> *tat p ṛ c c h e y a m enam, asti cen mamāpi ko 'pi sāhāyyā-vakāśas.* (4.1.8; 'Therefore let me ask him whether there is some opportunity for me to give help.')

> *tad v i r a m y a karmaṇo 'smān malīmasāt kim alam asi prapadyāsmān āryavṛttyā vartitum iti?* (4.2.10; 'Therefore why don't you desist from this dirty work and approach me to be in an honourable profession?')

> *tad ā s t ā ṃ kāntimatī.* (4.5.1; 'Therefore let Kāntimatī alone.' = 'no need to talk about K.')

There are only two more cases of *tad* meaning 'therefore' in our text; they are added here to show that movement of the verb is optional:

> *tad aham amunaiva saha citāgnim ā r o k ṣ y ā m i.* (4.7.1; 'Therefore I will mount the funeral pile together with him.')

> *tad atra prāptarūpaṃ c i n t a y a t u kumāra eva.* (4.11.7; 'Therefore may the prince decide what is suitable here.')

Finally, there are some very few cases where the verbal predicate without *tad* occurs in what is the second position in the trivial sense of just counting words:

satyam ā h a varākī. (4.3.21; 'The poor girl speaks the truth.')

kāntimatīdarśanāya n a y ā m i tvām. (4.4.16; 'I will take you to see Kāntimatī.')

Unfortunately, both sentences contain only three words altogether, so that it cannot be decided which sort of permutation has led to their word order. As for motives, it is probably safe to suggest that in the second case the syllable sequence *-nāya nayā-* was intended.

A pity it may be, but all that can be said is that the construction with the verb in the 'second' position occurs too rarely in our text sample to draw any firm conclusions. To reach those, clearly much larger amounts of text will have to be sifted, but in the absence of time and space, and true to my purpose of treating a text of manageable size exhaustively, I have to leave that for a later occasion.

4.3   The remainder

Maybe the most surprising result of this investigation was that if those cases are subtracted where the predicate is in its unmarked position, those where it is part of the bridging construction, and those where it is in second position after *tad* (however little that position may be understood yet), then those predicates still unaccounted for are very few indeed and, taking a closer look, even most of them fall into reasonably clear categories.

Emphasis may be much misused as an explanation for word order phenomena, but at the end of the day there are indeed some cases which seem to be best so explained:

k ṣ i ṇ o t i purā sa kṛtaghno bhavantam. (4.5.15; 'This ingrate will kill you before long.')

Connected with the preceding is the front position of an imperative verb; the verb seems to tend more to the first position the more directly the request is expressed:

k a t h a y a tathyaṃ! (4.5.20; 'Tell the truth!')

anyaḥ kaścin mātaṅgapatir ā n ī y a t ā m. (4.2.6; 'Pray bring me some other lordly elephant.')

34

The politeness, as also the rest of the last sentence, is ironic.

While not exceptionless by far, there is at least a noticeable tendency for nominal predicates to precede their subjects:

k a r k a ś o 'yaṃ puruṣaḥ. (4.1.6; 'This man is hard.')

tath o d d h a r a n ī y e cakṣuṣī yathā tanmūlam evāsya maraṇaṃ bhavet. (4.6.7; 'The eyes are to be drawn out in such a way that it causes his death.')

Finally, the word *as-* receives special treatment. If it is used as an existential verb, then it usually heads its clause:

tat pṛccheyam enam, a s t i cen mamāpi ko 'pi sāhāyyāvakāśas. (4.1.8; 'Therefore let me ask him whether there is some opportunity for me to give help.')

ā s ī t kusumapure rājo ripuṃjayasya mantrī dharmapālo nāma viśrutadhīḥ śrutarṣiḥ. (4.2.14; 'There was in Kusumapura a minister of king Ripuṃjaya, Dharmapāla by name, of famous wisdom, a learned ṛṣi.')

Not only does the existential *as-* of the last sentence favour the first position; this is also the beginning of a story, a context in which first-position verbs are the rule and not the exception. If *as-* is used as a copula, then it is enclitic:

ayam a s m i bhavajjāmātā, bhavadanumatyā vinā tava kanyābhimarśī. (4.4.18; 'This is your son-in-law, the lover of your daughter without your permission.')

This becomes especially clear when, as in the following case, *as-*, with complete disregard for the syntactic structure of the clause, separates words that have a strong case to stay together (here, as a noun phrase):

tasy ā s m i dvaimāturaḥ kanīyān bhrātāham. (4.2.15; 'I am his younger brother from a different mother.')

Further, it may be noted that, despite the presence of the copula, this sentence follows the order associated with nominal predicates.

The preceding cases are all well-known categories which are described in any one of the general treatments of syntax or word order mentioned in chapter 3, so I felt individual references to the literature to be unnecessary. But now, after everything has been said and done, there do remain yet another few cases which are more complex or very unclear, and require individual discussion. After that, I can assure the reader, practically every predicate in our text sample has been accounted for.

> *nāthasya yakṣāṇāṃ maṇibhadrasy ā s m i duhitā tārāvalī nā-ma.* (4.3.15; 'I am the daughter of Maṇibhadra, the lord of the yakṣas, Tārāvalī by name.')

Here *asmi* is n o t following the pattern of enclitic words; instead it is in a position that is almost, but not quite like that of the German main clause verb; it is not quite like it in separating the leading genitive noun phrase from its head *duhitā*, which may have been the result ('Sperrung', 'hyperbaton') intended.

> *aham eva mūḍho 'parāddho, yas tava duhitṛsaṃsargānu-grāhiṇo grahagrasta ivotkrāntasīmā svayam eva s a m ā - d i ṣ ṭ a v ā n vadham.* (4.4.20; 'I am the stupid offender in that I, as if possessed by a demon, transgressing the bounds, have myself ordered the killing of you, who were gracious in associating with my daughter.')

Here, too, the Sperrung of *tava duhitṛsaṃsargānugrāhiṇo ... vadham* can hardly fail to be noticed; what remains unclear is by which grammatical mechanism the author effected it: *vadham* seems to have been moved from its original position to the end, but that is more usually done with 'heavy' words or phrases.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

In this study, I have formulated a particular outlook on the study of style that is perhaps most clearly characterized by approaching the subject not from the side of the impressions or presumed impressions that the style of a text leaves on its readers (as when one talks of a 'flowery' or 'vigorous' style), but from the side of the means used. To distinguish those elements of the text that are expressive of style from those that are not, the criteria of selection (from among alternative available linguistic elements), of (conspicuous) repetition (of the selected elements), and of combination (of different devices serving the same end) have been used.

It has been possible to identify several stylistic characteristics of our text: First, what I have called 'bridging'. One particular from among those potential positions of the predicate that are made available by the grammar (the clause-initial position) is selected in such contexts where it will result in the predicate of the clause immediately following the predicate of the preceding clause in its unmarked end-position. This pattern occurs repeatedly, and it occurs repeatedly in such a way that it is combined with the employment of the conjunction *ca* when occurring at the sentence boundary, but not when occurring between two clauses of the same sentence, and is also combined frequently with the existence of phonetic, morphological, and semantic similarities between the two adjacent predicates. It has been suggested how the recognition of such a stylistic pattern can be used in textual criticism. In the approach followed, it would be the logically last step to reconstruct which effect the author intended to achieve with this stylistic device in his readers. It may be suggested that the effect is one of highlighting the connection that obtains between the two sentences or

clauses concerned in terms of temporal progression, logical presupposition, or the like; it does not appear to be the case that the initial verb itself is emphasized.

The second pattern that has been identified was that where the predicate of a sentence occurs in a position following a class of particular sentence-initial words, mainly *tad*. While the pattern did occur frequently enough in our text to be identified as such, the precise characterization of this syntactic position (as made available by the grammar) was hampered by lack of material. It has been possible to state, though, that the selection of this position was not consistently combined with some other linguistic feature reinforcing a hypothetical stylistic effect. Rather, in terms of mechanicalness, the correspondence *devadatta uvāca : tad uvāca devadattaḥ*, though still optional, reminds one of the German *Devadatta sagte : darum sagte Devadatta*; in terms of the position the predicate is actually in, however, there are clear differences between the languages. The connection that had been drawn between this construction and the bridging construction by Jacobi seems unjustified. Further investigation of this construction with its attendant variations throughout a longer stretch of text is still a necessity.

Finally, collecting and categorizing the remaining cases of predicates occurring outside the unmarked position, it became clear that they are surprisingly few in number, and that for most of them reasonable motivation can be provided.

Appendix A

Predicative attributes

'Predicative attribute' may well appear to be a contradiction in terms, which is why I have prepared this little appendix on the topic. As has been seen in the main text, predicative attributes provide a predication that is secondary to that of the main predicate of the clause. It has also been seen how their predicativeness is strong enough to display word order behaviour that is typical of predicates. Their characteristic position in the clause is such that they follow the noun with which they agree (whereas ordinary attributes usually precede) and are often separated from it by some intervening words.

The designation 'predicative attribute' is borrowed from Speijer: at 4.8.19 ('*m a y ā 'si jātamātraḥ p ā p a y ā parityaktaḥ*'), Speijer (1886, 11) calls *pāpayā* a 'predicative attribute' and recommends: 'when translating this sentence one should render पापया by the adverb *basely* or *in a base manner*'. (That Peterson's text has *putra yo 'si jātamātraḥ p ā p a y ā m a y ā parityaktaḥ sa* ..., and that his manuscripts A and C omit *mayā* altogether, does not affect Speijer's point that predicative adjectives can be used sufficiently like English adverbs to occasionally require translation as such.) Lest the term 'adverb' itself be misleading: there are adverbs that do not modify the verb, as their name would seem to imply, but rather the subject, as in 'The child played contentedly in the garden.'

For a very neat illustration of the potential equivalence of predicative attributes and adverbs I am indebted to Bloomfield (1912/13, 175). He juxtaposes the following two Ṛgveda verses ('he who with sound wisdom established the heavenly spaces' in Bloomfield's translation):

vi yo rajāṁsy amimīta s u k r a t u ḥ (6.7.7)

vi yo mame rajasī s u k r a t ū y a y ā (1.160.4)

The variation seems to be due to metrical expediency: the first verse is a *triṣṭubh*, the second a *jagatī*.

Other names that have been used for 'predicative attribute' are 'un-reines adjectiv' ('Wenn das adj. zum prädicat in irgend einer beziehung steht („u n r e i n e s" adj. ist), steht es habituell h i n t e r seinem bezugs-wort.' Thommen 1905, p. 527) and 'semi-predicative postpositive adjective' (Gonda 1960, p. 310).

Bibliography

Bühler, Georg, ed. (1887). *The Daśakumâracharita of Daṇḍin: part I.* No. 10 in Bombay Sanskrit Series, 2nd edn. (Bombay: Government Central Book Depôt).

Bloomfield, Maurice (1912/13). 'On the variable position of the finite verb in oldest Sanskrit'. *Indogermanische Forschungen: Zeitschrift für indogermanische Sprach- und Altertumskunde,* vol. 31, p. 156–177.

Brugmann, Karl & Berthold Delbrück (1897–1916). *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen: kurzgefasste Darstellung der Geschichte des Altindischen, Altiranischen (Avestischen u[nd] Altpersischen), Altarmenischen, Altgriechischen, Albanesischen, Lateinischen, Oskisch-Umbrischen, Altirischen, Gotischen, Althochdeutschen, Litauischen und Altkirchenslavischen.* 2nd edn. (Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner).

Canedo, José (1937). *Zur Wort- und Satzstellung in der alt- und mittelindischen Prosa.* No. 13 in Ergänzungshefte zur Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Delbrück, B. (1878). *Die altindische Wortfolge aus dem Çatapathabrāhmaṇa dargestellt.* No. 3 in Syntaktische Forschungen (Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses).

Delbrück, B. (1888). *Altindische Syntax.* No. 5 in Syntaktische Forschungen (Halle a. S.: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses).

Gawroński, Andrzej (1907). *Sprachliche Untersuchungen über das Mṛcchakaṭika und das Daśakumāracarita.* Ph.D. thesis, Universität Leipzig.

Gillon, Brendan S. (1996). 'Word order in classical Sanskrit'. *Indian Linguistics: Journal of the Linguistic Society of India*, vol. 57, p. 1–35.

Gonda, J. (1960). 'Some notes on the position of the attributive adjective in early Indian prose'. *Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute*, vol. 20, p. 303–318.

Hock, Hans Henrich, ed. (1991). *Studies in Sanskrit syntax: a volume in honor of the centennial of Speijer's Sanskrit syntax (1886–1986)* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers).

Jacobi, Hermann (1886). *Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Mâhârâshṭrî: zur Einführung in das Studium des Prâkṛit: Grammatik · Text · Wörterbuch* (Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel).

Jacobi, Hermann (1895). 'Die Inversion von Subjekt und Prädikat im Indischen'. *Indogermanische Forschungen: Zeitschrift für indogermanische Sprach- und Altertumskunde*, vol. 5, p. 335–338.

Lahiri, P. C. (1933). *Studies in the word-order of Sanskrit prose.* Ph.D. thesis, London University.

Landfester, Manfred (1997). *Einführung in die Stilistik der griechischen und lateinischen Literatursprachen.* Die Altertumswissenschaft: Einführungen in Gegenstand, Methoden und Ergebnisse ihrer Teildisziplinen und Hilfswissenschaften (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft).

Peterson, Peter, ed. (1891). *The Daśakumâracharita of Daṇḍin: part II.* No. 42 in Bombay Sanskrit Series (Bombay: Government Central Book Depôt).

Renou, Louis (1968). *Grammaire sanscrite.* Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient, 2nd edn. (Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve).

Speijer, J. S. (1886). *Sanskrit syntax* (Leyden: E. J. Brill).

Spencer, John, ed. (1964). *Linguistics and style*. Language and language learning (London: Oxford University Press).

Speyer, J. S. (1896). *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*. No. 1.6 in Grund-riss der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde (Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner).

Staal, J. F. (1967). *Word order in Sanskrit and universal grammar*. No. 5 in Foundations of language: supplementary series (Dordrecht-Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Company).

Thommen, Eduard (1905). 'Die wortstellung im nachvedischen Altin-dischen und im Mittelindischen'. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende sprachforschung auf dem gebiete der indogermanischen spra-chen*, vol. 38, p. 504–563.

Wackernagel, Jacob (1892). 'Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wort-stellung'. *Indogermanische Forschungen: Zeitschrift für indo-germanische Sprach- und Altertumskunde*, vol. 1, p. 333–436.

Legalese

I undertake that all material presented for examination is my own work and has not been written for me, in whole or in part, by any other person(s). I also undertake that any quotation or paraphrase from the published or unpublished work of another person has been duly acknowledged in the work which I present for examination.