

INSIDE THE TEXTS BEYOND THE TEXTS

NEW APPROACHES TO THE STUDY
OF THE VEDAS

Proceedings of the
International Vedic Workshop
Harvard University, June 1989

Edited by Michael Witzel

Cambridge 1997

DEPARTMENT OF SANSKRIT AND INDIAN STUDIES
HARVARD UNIVERSITY
DISTRIBUTED BY
SOUTH ASIA BOOKS, COLUMBIA, MO

The photo on the front and back page is that of a Vājasaneyi Saṃhita manuscript in early Nāgarī, c. 1200 AD. The MS is exceptional in that it is very early and, against later practice, accented (red markers) in the style of the Maitrāyaṇī school, see Vishveshvaranand Indological Journal, vol. 12, 1974, 472-508. Occasional word division marks have been added (vertical, in black). The folio contains VS 8.30-35.

The horse-drawn royal chariot on the back cover is from Sanchi; the caption is from VS 8.32

Copyright © 1997 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College
All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America

No part of this book may be used or reproduced
in any manner whatsoever without written permission
except in case of brief quotations embodied in critical
articles and reviews

For information write to: Editor, Harvard Oriental Series,
Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies,
2 Divinity Avenue, Cambridge MA 02138, USA
617-495 3295; email: witzel@fas.harvard.edu
www.fas.harvard.edu/~sanskrit/hos-om.html

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data

Inside the Texts, Beyond the Texts
New Approaches to the Study of the Vedas
edited by Michael Witzel

(Harvard Oriental Series, Opera Minora, v. 2)
ISBN 1 - 888 789 - 03 - 4

I. Witzel, Michael (ed.), 1943- II. Title
III. Series: Harvard Oriental Series, Opera Minora; 2

CIP

Hans Henrich Hock

Chronology or Genre? Problems in Vedic Syntax

1. It* is well known that during the Vedic period the Sanskrit language underwent many changes, some of them of major proportions. This is especially clear in the area of morphology which has been covered in detail in such publications as Arnold 1897, Avery 1880, Debrunner & Wackernagel 1930, Narten 1964. (For phonology see the recent discussion in Hock 1991c.) In fact, it is because of this evidence of pervasive change that Vedic Sanskrit has justly been called a living language-- in contradistinction to Classical Sanskrit which has just as accurately been referred to as a fettered language. (Cf. the discussion and references in Hock & Pandharipande 1976.)

Given that Vedic was a living, changing language, it is to be expected that there was change also in syntax. And many syntactic changes have indeed been proposed. However, as I show in this paper, in many cases it is not at all clear whether syntactic differences between the early language of the Rig-Veda and other mantra, yajus, etc. collections (the 'mantra language') and the later language of Vedic Prose should be attributed to differences in chronology. In fact, in many cases it appears that the differences instead reflect differences in genre. And in yet other cases it is difficult, if not impossible, to decide whether the observable differences reflect distinctions of genre or of chronology.

2. To illustrate the problem let me start with one change that has been postulated frequently enough to deserve fuller attention, by scholars differing as widely in their views on the nature of Indo-European syntax as Friedrich (1975), Lehmann (1974), and Miller (1975). This alleged change concerns word order. The basis for the assumption that there has been a change is that, as is well known, word order is relatively free in the Rig-Veda, whereas in Vedic Prose, verb-final structures vastly predominate. This difference is then generally attributed to influence from the Dravidian languages. However, as I have shown elsewhere (Hock 1984, see also Andersen 1982-83), post-Vedic texts, both Sanskrit and Middle Indo-Aryan, such as the prose portions of Kalidāsa's Śakuntalā or the inscriptions of Emperor Aśoka, have percentages for verb-final structures that are

* Paper read at the June 1989 International Vedic Workshop at Harvard University. I am grateful to participants in the Workshop for helpful and challenging comments, especially to George Cardona, Mark Hale, Stephanie Jamison, and Jared Klein.

approximately the same as in the Rig-Veda, even though the details may vary.¹

If we take seriously the reasoning behind the claim that there was a word order change from the Rig-Veda to Vedic Prose, then the evidence of these later texts would force us to assume that the post-Vedic language was able to free itself from the influence of Dravidian and to return to the freedom of word order of the Rig-Vedic language. However, as is well known, the classical language (and Middle Indo-Aryan) is by no means monolithic, either in terms of genre or in terms of word order. While some genres,

¹ In Hock 1984, I supported these arguments with the following statistics, in keeping with the statistics-oriented approach of scholars like Friedrich 1975.

(a) Rig-Veda	Number	Percentage	
OV#	32	45	} ~ 63% Verb-final
V#	13	18	
OVX#	15	21	
(S)VO	3	4	
#(X)V	8	11	

[Based on RV 1.1, 1.152, 6.54, 7.61]

(b) Vedic Prose:			
OV#	83	63	} = 97% Verb-final
V#	44	34	
OVX#	1	1	
#V	3	2	

[SB 1.1.1.1-22 without mantras and passives]

(c) Kalidāsa:			
OV	21	45	} = 68% Verb-final
V#	11	23	
OVOS	1	2	
#(X)V	14	30	

[Śakuntalā: prastāvanā and act 1 without verses, Prakrit passages, or passives]

(d) Aśoka:			
OV	7	21	} = 60% Verb-final
V#	13	39	
OVX	1	3	
S(O)VO/X	8	24	
#(X)V	4	12	

[Rock Edicts 1-4]

Note, however that statistics of this sort are notoriously problematic. Different scholars tend to come up with rather different statistics for a given portion of text. Moreover, text samples tend to be quite limited in size. This is especially a matter of concern, since even for the same researcher, statistics may differ markedly from one portion of a text to the next. Ultimately, for Sanskrit at least, a much better understanding of word order can be obtained by careful reading of all (or most) of the available relevant literature.

including scientific discourse but also fable literature, prefer fairly rigidly verb-final structures, other textual traditions, including drama and the older epic literature, exhibit a much greater freedom of word order.

Given that the mantra language and Vedic Prose represent different genres, it seems more reasonable to explain their word order differences in the same way as for Classical Sanskrit and Middle Indo-Aryan, namely as reflecting differences in genre, rather than to postulate a chronological 'flip-flop' from free verb-final to rigid verb-final order, and only then to a system where both free and rigid verb-final orders are permitted, with different genres preferring one or the other type of ordering.

Extrapolating from this example, we can draw several lessons. First, since the earliest, mantra literature differs from the later Vedic Prose not only in chronology but also in genre, we must always ask ourselves whether syntactic differences are to be attributed to historical development or should be linked with differences in genre. In addition, in order to meaningfully deal with questions of this type we may have to go beyond the Vedic period, to the classical stage of the language or to Middle Indo-Aryan: Where the mantra language more closely agrees with (certain genres of) the post-Vedic period, the most reasonable assumption is that the different behavior of Vedic Prose is to be attributed to genre distinctions. Finally, rather than assuming 'flip-flops' in the grammatical system of Sanskrit, we should try to assume a system that accommodates both types of texts and attributes their differences to different choices among the syntactic processes available in that system.

3. There are of course certain differences between the mantra language and Vedic Prose, above all in verbal syntax, which clearly reflect linguistic changes. These include the well-known, but in the Vedic period still rather gradual, increase in the use of the *ta*-participle at the expense of the finite past tenses (cf. e.g. Avery 1880, Bloch 1906-08) and the fading out of the subjunctive mood by the time of Paṇini (cf. e.g. Renou 1937 and Stump 1979). That these were genuine historical changes is indicated by the fact that the classical language and Middle Indo-Aryan exhibit the logical conclusion of the change (in the case of the subjunctive loss) or ever-increasing effects of the change (in the case of the *ta*-participle's encroachment on the finite past tenses).

Another change with far-reaching consequences involves the syntax of causatives. Because the development of causatives has been discussed only in fairly recent literature and is therefore perhaps less widely known, I will give a brief outline of its nature, with references to the most important literature.

For this discussion, it is useful to refer to the 'transitivity' hierarchy in (1), where the transitivity of verb classes increases from top to bottom. (See Hock 1985 for a more general justification of this hierarchy.)

(1) Transitivity hierarchy

A	Intransitives
B	Motion verbs
C	Verbs of communication
D	Perception verbs (see, hear, realize ...)
E	Verbs of consumption (eat, drink)
F	Other verbs with 'affected agent' (touch, wear, fight ...)
G	Other transitives

As Cardona (1978) and Hock (1981) have pointed out, in the Rig-Veda, causatives are made only from verbs of classes A - F. The first example of a causative from class G, *dāpayatu*, is attested in the Atharva-Veda.² It is only in Vedic Prose that we find class G verbs productively forming causatives. The classical language, of course, in principle permits causatives from any verb.

Along with the Vedic-Prose expansion of causative formation as a morphological category, we find an important change in the syntax of the causative construction. While in early Vedic, the intermediate agent or 'causee' was invariably in the accusative (excepting lexicalized constructions³), Vedic Prose permits an option between instrumental and accusative marking; cf. (2) vs. (3). In this regard, Vedic Prose again agrees with the practice of the classical texts; cf. (4).⁴ (In (4a), the accusative-marked causee has become subject of the corresponding passive.)

- (2) devān ... pāyaya havīḥ (RV 2.37.6)
'Make the Gods drink the oblation.'
- (3) (a) oṣadhīr eva phalaṃ grāhayati (KS 26.5)
'He causes the plants to take fruit.'
- (b) vāruṇenaivā bhrātrvyam grāhayitvā brāhmaṇa sṛṇute (TS 2.1.8.2, similarly KS 13.4)
'Having caused Varuna to seize the enemy, he lays him low with the sacrificial formula.'
- (4) (a) yena ... tādrśam kapaṭalekham ... lekhitāḥ tapasvī śakaṭadāsaḥ (Mudr. 7.9.5-6)
'... by whom the unfortunate Śakaṭadāsa was made to write such a fictitious letter.'

² The relevant passage is cited in (a) below. Interestingly, the Rig-Vedic passage in (b) seems to use a circumlocution (*āditsantaṃ ... dānaya codaya*) to express the same idea.

(a) (ā)ditsantaṃ dāpayatu (AV 3.20.8)

'Let him cause the one to give who is not about to give.'

(b) āditsantaṃ cid ... dānaya codaya (RV 6.53.3a/b)

'Urge on to give the one who is not about to give.'

³ Such as the dative of the addressee with verbs of the type *vedayati* 'cause to know --> inform'. See Hock 1984 for further details.

⁴ Pāṇini's grammar, of course, offers a very different system, with verbs from classes A - E getting accusative marking (or nominative in the passive), F - G winding up with instrumental marking, and *hṛ-* and *kṛ-* having an option between the two markings. (Cf. Pāṇ. 1.4.52-3.)

- (b) lekham śakaṭadāsenā lekhatvā (Mudr. 1.19.5)
'... having had Śakaṭadāsa write the letter ...'

There are some differences of opinion as to what motivated the change from the early, mantra-language system of causee marking to that of Vedic Prose and the later language. Jamison (1976 and 1977[1983]) has argued that the change was motivated by a need for disambiguating causees from objects. Cardona (1978) has tried to relate instrumental causee marking to the instrumental marking of passive agents. I have advocated instead a derivation through reinterpretation of animate instrumentals of instrument of the type illustrated in (5); cf. Hock 1981 and 1991a.⁵

- (5) prajāpatinaivaiṇam cinute (KS 21.3)
'He piles it with the help of Prajāpati.'

However, this much is clear: The differences between the mantra language and Vedic Prose reflect genuine chronological changes, as confirmed by the fact that the classical language agrees with Vedic Prose, not with the mantra language. Moreover, the changes in question have taken place mainly within the period of Vedic Prose. (Cf. Hock, In Press (a) for speculations as to how and when the change came about.)

4. In some other cases, the evidence is suggestive that there has been a genuine change, but its cogency is limited somewhat by a scarcity of relevant data. This appears to be true for certain aspects of the syntax of passives.

Here, again, we can distinguish two areas of change, disregarding the purely morphological issue of the formation of passive verbs.

One, which should be quite uncontroversial, concerns the classes of verbs permitted to occur in the passive. In this respect, the passive of the mantra language behaves very much like the passive of English by being essentially limited to transitive verbs, i.e. to verb classes C - G. And the 'logical' object of the verb ordinarily becomes the subject of the passive. Cf. for instance (6). There are only two complications: First, verbs of class B (perhaps also of class A) can form a passive if accompanied by a 'cognate' object (whether that object is made from the same root or not); cf. (7). Secondly, in one or two examples a verb that has a direct object not marked in the accusative nevertheless undergoes change to the passive, but the object retains its case and, therefore, does not become a subject. The resulting passive is subjectless or 'impersonal'; cf. (8). Presumably what is important is not the case marking of the object but merely whether the verb is transitive.

- (6) idāṃ pitrē ... ucyate vācaḥ (RV 1.114.6)
'This message is said to the father ...'
- (7) gatō nādhvā ... (RV 7.58.3)
'Like a traveled road ...'

⁵ In Hock 1981, I tried to show how Pāṇini's different system can have arisen from the system of causee marking as it developed in Vedic Prose.

- (8) *ápāy asyāndhaso* (RV 2.19.1)
'(Of) this juice was drunk (by him).' = 'He drank (of) his juice.'

In Vedic Prose, as well as in the classical language, the earlier restrictions on passive formation no longer apply. In principle, passives can be made from any verb, including the verb 'to be'; cf. e.g. the Vedic-Prose passages in (9), where (a) presents a finite passive from a motion verb (in transferred meaning), while (b) offers a passive-like gerundive from the verb 'to be'.

- (9) (a) *tīra iva vai mithunéna caryate* (ŚB 1.9.2.8)
'Secretly, as it were, sexual union takes place.'
(Lit.: '... it is carried on by means of sexual union.')
- (b) *tasmān na moghahāsina bhavyam* (KS 25.6)
'Therefore one should not be one who laughs falsely.'

While in this case the evidence that there has been change is unambiguous, another aspect of passive syntax is less clear. For this aspect, which concerns the 'subject properties' of Agents and Patients in passive constructions, let me start with Vedic Prose and the classical language, in both of which the unmarked constituent order in passives is 'Agent before Patient before Verb', as in the classical example (10). That is, here the Agent, not the superficial subject, the Patient, occurs in initial or subject position in unmarked order. Moreover, in Vedic Prose and in the classical language, it is the Agent, not the superficial subject of the passive which exhibits the subject properties of controlling the absolutive (cf. also Pāṇ. 3.4.21) and of serving as the antecedent for the reflexive; cf. the Vedic-Prose examples in (11) and (12).

- (10) *devadattena kṛtaḥ kriyate*
'A mat is made by Devadatta.'
- (11) *nā vā āhiṅkṛtya sāma gīyate* (ŚB 1.4.1.1)
'For the sāman is not sung without one making the sound *hiṅ*.'
- (12) *ātmānaḥ pūrvā tanūr adéy(a)* (TS 6.3.2.6)
'(One's) own previous body is to be recovered (by one).'

I have argued elsewhere (Hock 1982b) that the situation in the mantra language was very different, namely that here the unmarked order was 'Patient before Agent before Verb', and that the superficial subject, i.e. the Patient -- not the Agent -- controlled reflexivization and absolutive formation. (For reflexivization and absolutive formation see the examples in (13) and (14).) That is, it appears that it is the Patient which exhibits the relevant subject properties in the passive. If correct, the fact that Vedic Prose and Classical Sanskrit jointly differ from the mantra language would constitute prima-facie evidence for chronological change.

- (13) ... *svéna yuktásah krátunā* ... (RV 7.90.5)
'... yoked with their own power ...'
- (14) ... *niśádyā* ... *hávyo babhútha* (RV 10.6.7)
'... having sat down, you are/have come to be invoked.'

Unfortunately, however, the evidence for change is not as strong as one might like it to be: Of some 30 Rig-Vedic passages which contain both the Patient and the Agent to the left of the Verb, 22 have the order Patient Agent Verb, with the Patient in initial, subject position, and only 8 have the order Agent Patient Verb.⁶ In all of the six Rig-Vedic passive sentences with reflexives, the pronoun refers to the Patient.⁷ Finally, in all of the four attested cases of passives and passive-like structures that can be assigned to the mantra language, absolutive formation is controlled by the main-clause Patient, not by the Agent.

The problem with the statistics just cited is that they are based on fairly limited evidence, especially as far as reflexives and absolutives are concerned. Moreover, in the case of the absolutives, three of the four attested examples are amenable to alternative explanations. For instance, in (14) it is possible to argue that the absolutive is bracketed not with the Patient of the passive-like gerundive *hávyaḥ* 'to be invoked', but with the Agent/Subject of the active verb *babhútha*. In that case, the passage in (18) would tell us nothing about the syntax of absolutives in passive constructions.

I still feel that given the available evidence, the most likely claim is that there was a change in passive subject properties from the mantra language to the language of Vedic Prose and the classical period. However, given the limited nature of the evidence, the hypothesis cannot be considered unassailable.

5. In yet other cases, the way of caution would lie in assuming that there has been no overall change in syntax and that differences in behavior should be attributed to shifting preferences for particular constructions.

The case that I will use to illustrate this situation requires an even longer-range view of history and a reversal in perspective, going back in time from the present-day situation to the Vedic period.

5.1. As I have noted elsewhere (Hock 1989), in Modern Indo-Aryan (as well as in Dravidian), interrogative pronouns, if they move at all, tend to do so into the position immediately before the verb (cf. (15a/b)), a position which has been independently characterized by Jayaseelan (1989) and Nagarajan (1989) as a focus position for modern Indian and other SOV languages, as well as for Hungarian, a 'lapsed' SOV language. (For the

⁶ In establishing these statistics, passages containing clitic pronouns or pronouns that are typically fronted have been ignored, since the position of these pronominals is not determined by their status as subject, objects, etc. Cf. section 6 below.

⁷ Note that in active sentences there is a chance of only one in five that reflexivization might refer to non-subjects. It is therefore unlikely that all six passives have 'sloppy' reflexivization.

similar situation in SOV Turkish see Kornfilt 1987. See also the crosslinguistic study by Kim 1988.) On the other hand, common wisdom has it that in Sanskrit, if there is any movement, it is to a position at or near the beginning of the sentence as in (15c).

(15) Unmoved interrogative	Moved interrogative
(a) Hindi	
rām ne kisko pustak dī	rām ne pustak kisko dī
(b) Tamil:	
rāmaṅ yārukku pustakam koṭuttāṅ	rāmaṅ pustakam yārukku koṭuttāṅ
(c) Sanskrit:	
rāmeṇa kasmai pustakaṃ dattam	kasmai rāmeṇa pustakaṃ dattam

'To whom did Rām(aṅ) give a book?'

5.2. In Hock 1989 I considered the difference between Sanskrit and Modern Indo-Aryan a possible innovation. However, as I soon realized, the late Sanskrit text of the *Vetālapañcaviṃśati* offers many examples of interrogatives, and a smaller number of relatives, in preverbal position; cf. (16a).⁸ While the pattern in (16a) may not be as frequent as the clause-initial pattern in (16b) or the pattern with the pronoun in second position (16c), it seems to be attested frequently enough to have to be recognized as one of the options of the grammar underlying the *Vetālapañcaviṃśati*. Note moreover, that there are many examples of the type (16d) in which the pronoun position is simultaneously clause-second and preverbal, making it difficult to decide which of the two positions the pronoun actually occupies.

⁸ Here as elsewhere in the following discussion, I will count as preverbal pronoun position only those instances in which at least two other constituents precede the preverbal pronoun. Other examples of preverbal pronouns in the *Vetālapañcaviṃśati* occur at the following locations: 34.11-12, 42.21, 44.10-11, 84.2-3, 96.11-12, 100/102.28-1, 114.21, 116.19-20, 118.23-4, 126.35-128.-1, 128.22-3, 130.13-14, 134.13-14 (interrogatives); 18.13-14, 98.3-4, 110.16-17, 116.12, 128.11-12 (relatives). Another possible example of a preverbal interrogative is found at 84.2-3, if clause-initial *tad* 'then, now' is counted as an element of the clause. Note however that examples like the following, with interrogative after *tad* plus another constituent, suggest that, as in the earlier language, *tad* may (optionally) not 'count' as the first member of the clause. (For further discussion, see below.) Without that assumption, we would have to assume that in these examples the interrogatives occupy a position which is neither initial, nor second, nor preverbal -- a highly unusual and marked pattern in this text.

- (a) *tad bhavataḥ katham etan mayi bhanyate* (Vet. 90.4-5)
'Then, how are you telling me this?'
- (b) *tad bhavaṅ katham atmaṇaṃ khādayati* (Vet. 140.33)
'Then, how do you let yourself be eaten?'

- (16) (a) *tadāham etasya virahe kathaṃ jīvayiṣyāmi* (Vet. 20.14)
'... then how will I live without him?'
nijaśekharaḍ utpalam ekaṃ karṇe tayākṛṣya yad arpitaṃ (Vet.16.5)
'In that, having plucked a lotus from her garland, she placed it over her ear ...'
- (b) *kim etad āścaryam* (Vet. 6.10)
'What wondrous thing is this?'
- (c) *yadi deśāntariṇy anugraho 'sti ...* (Vet. 8.11)
'If there is a favorable inclination toward a foreigner...'
striṇpuruṣayor madhye kim puruṣaḥ kṛtaghnaḥ ... (Vet. 40.2)
'Of men and women, are men ungrateful ...?'
- (d) *tadyakarṣaṇāya yāvat karaṃ prasārayati ...* (Vet. 12.1-2)
'As he stretches out his hand to grab him ...'
- (d) *tasya sabhāryasya vadhāḥ kutra bhaviṣyati* (Vet. 26.1)
'On whom will be the (fault of the) murder of him and his wife?'
- asyaḥ pāpiṣṭhayaḥ śoṇitāśrupātaṃ yatra bhavati ...* (Vet. 24.18-19)
'Where the shedding of this most evil woman's blood and tears occurs ...'

Now, in a late text like the *Vetālapañcaviṃśati*, the pattern with relative or interrogative pronouns in preverbal position might be argued to reflect influence from Modern Indo-Aryan. Further evidence for this claim might be seen in the fact that in the *Vetālapañcaviṃśati*, as in Modern Indo-Aryan (Hindi), preverbal position is much more common for interrogatives (15x) than for relatives (7x).

5.3. Preverbal placement of relative pronouns, however, is found also in the earlier Sanskrit of the *Bhagavad-Gītā*.⁹ Compare for instance the

⁹ It might be objected that examples from metrical texts like the *Bhagavad-Gītā* are of questionable value, since their word order may be governed by metrical, rather than grammatical considerations. While considerations of meter no doubt play some role in such texts, it is highly doubtful whether poets would produce ungrammatical structures just for the sake of the meter. The role played by metrical (and other poetic) considerations is more likely to be one of favoring some grammatically acceptable (even if marked) structures over others. That this is a better explanation than the assumption of 'poetic license', defined as the use of ungrammatical or grammatically questionable structures, is shown by two facts.

First, in many cases it is not at all difficult to construct metrically equivalent, or at least metrically acceptable, alternatives in which the relative pronouns are not placed preverbally, but into clause-first or second position; cf. the examples below. (In some cases (b), this requires relatively little change; in others (a), a more drastic reorganization is needed.)

examples in (17).¹⁰ Again, the number of examples is not very large (15 or 6% of a total number of 247 counted occurrences of relative pronouns). Still, the pattern is found more frequently than other non-initial or non-second-position patterns (which amount to 5 examples, or 2%), other than a slightly more frequent subtype, with relative pronoun following the (non-initial) verb; cf. (18).

- (17) (a) *karmaṇy akarma yaḥ paśyed akarmaṇi ca karma yaḥ |*
(Bh.G 4.18)
'Who would see non-action in action, and action in non-action ...'
- (b) *tadvat kāmā yaṁ praviśanti sarve (|)* (Bh.G 2.70)
'... in that way whom all desires enter ...'
(Similarly 17.18; cf. also 5.16 with genitive.)
- (c) *sakheti matvā prasabhaṁ yad uktaṁ (|)* (Bh.G 11.41)
'When, thinking (you) a friend, (I have) loudly said'
(Similarly 18.45)
- (18) (a) *evaṁ pravartitaṁ cakraṁ nānuvartayattha yaḥ |*
(Bh.G 3.16)
'Who does not here make the wheel roll (that has) been set in motion ...'
- (b) *kartaṁ necchasi yaṁ mohāt kariṣyasi avaśo 'pi tat ||*
(Bh.G 18.60)
'... what you do not want to do out of folly, that you will certainly do.'
- (c) *āpūryamāṇam acalapratiṣṭhaṁ (|) samudram āpaḥ*
praviśanti yadvat
'Just as the waters enter the ocean (which is) being filled and with immovable support ...' (Bh.G 2.70)

(a) *karma yo 'karmaṇi paśyed akarmaiva ca karmaṇi |* (cf. (17a))
'Who would see action in nonaction, and non-action in action ...'

(b) *tadvat yaṁ kāmāḥ praviśanti sarve (|)* (cf. (17b))
'... in that way whom all desires enter ...'

Secondly, mere poetic license would not explain why in the Bhagavad-Gītā, preverbal relative pronouns are in about two thirds of all cases subject pronouns. We might expect a more even mixture of case forms. Rather, as argued in the body of the paper, it is possible to give a grammatical/functional explanation for this phenomenon: Pre- or post-verbal position serves as a focusing device for these constituents. As I realized after this was written, Pollock (1977) has advanced very similar arguments for Classical Sanskrit lyric poetry.

¹⁰ Additional examples of preverbal relatives occur at the following locations: 3.12, 4.9, 4.14, 5.16, 13.27, 13.34, 14.23, 17.11, 17.18, 18.16, 18.46, 18.67. In addition, there are two examples with relative pronoun in post-predicate position, as in the example below. These have not been included in the statistics, because of the difficulties in deciding whether the predicate of these structures should be treated as equivalent to a verb, or whether they should be interpreted as having a 'deleted' verb 'to be', and whether (in the latter case) the relative pronoun should be considered preverbal or postverbal.

asmākaṁ tu viśiṣṭā ye (Bh.G 1.7)

'But those who are outstanding among us ...' (Sim. 17.28)

(Similarly 7.1, 11.53, 14.11, 18.19.)

Significantly, not only is the postverbal pattern in (18) just about as common as the preverbal pattern in (17), it shares with the latter the fact that in about two thirds of all attestations, the relative pronoun is a subject pronoun (as in the (a) versions). On the other hand, objects of various sorts (as in the (b) versions) are exceedingly rare, while adverbials of the type (c) are somewhat more common, especially in the postverbal type (18). This parallelism in behavior between pre- and postverbal structures suggests that both patterns are functionally similar to each other. The most likely account of this similarity is as follows: In unmarked order, subjects are initial in their clause. Therefore, the common process of 'fronting' (which places elements clause-initially for emphasis, focus, etc.), if applied to subjects, creates structures which on the surface are indistinguishable from the unmarked order. The 'postposing' of subjects into pre- or post-verbal position, then, places subjects into a marked position which can be interpreted as signaling emphasis, focus, etc. (On this matter see also Hock 1986:315-6 and Kachru 1980:129-30, both with Hindi data, as well as the discussion further below.)

5.4. Much more research is needed before we can be certain whether a special preverbal focus position must be recognized for all of Classical Sanskrit or whether it is limited to certain texts such as the Bhagavad-Gītā or the Vetālapañcaviṁśati. Moreover, while Vedic Prose does offer occasional examples of demonstrative, interrogative, and relative pronouns in preverbal position, as in (19), these are exceedingly rare and do not seem to be any more frequent than examples of the type (20), with pronouns neither in the normal initial (or near-initial) position nor in preverbal position.

- (19) (a) *śucim evainaṁ medhyaṁ yajñiyaṁ tena karoti* (KS 8.8)
'Thereby he makes him pure, sacrificially pure, (and) fit for sacrifice.'
- (b) *vācāpatnīko 'gnihotraṁ katham eva juhōti* (AB 7.10.1)
'How does someone without a wife offer the agnihotra on command?'
(Sim. ibid. 2. Both of these come from a very late passage.)
- (c) *anirjñāya purastād amāvāsyaṁ candramasaṁ yad upaiti yad yajate* (AB 7.11.5)
'In that he begins and sacrifices at the time of the new moon, without having observed the new moon in the east ...'
(Again, this is from a very late passage.)
- (20) (a) *prajāyā ha vai nāmaitād yāt prayajā itī* (ŚB 1.5.3.3)

'Indeed, that has the name *prajaya* which (we call) *prayāja*.'

- (b) *tēna haitena maruto yad indrāgni tksam cakrate* (JB 2.299)
'When Indra and Agni saw the Maruts with that very (thing) ...'

5.5. In the language of the Rig-Veda,¹¹ however, preverbal placement as in (21a) seems to occur with considerably greater frequency. At least for relatives, it seems to be attested more frequently than any other non-initial or non-second-position patterns.¹² Demonstratives can be found in the same position, as in (21b), although apparently more rarely. In some passages, both the relative and the correlative demonstrative pronoun appear to be placed in preverbal position; cf. (22). Clear examples of interrogatives in preverbal position are difficult to locate; but interrogatives generally are rare in the Rig-Veda, compared to relatives and demonstratives. (21c) is the best example I have found. On the other hand, in examples of the type (21d), it is not certain whether the interrogative should be considered preverbal (before *apaśya*) or in second position (after *āher yātāram*). (Similar ambiguous examples are found for relatives and demonstratives. They are ignored in the present discussion.)

- (21) (a) *ūd usriya jānita yó jajāna* (RV 3.1.12c)
'... who as creator created forth the cows.'
(b) *vavrām anantām āva sá padīṣṭa* (RV 7.104.17c)
'May she fall down into limitless depths.'
(c) *ā_etān rāthesu tasthūṣaḥ kāḥ śuśrava* ... (RV 5.53.2a/b)
'Who has heard them standing on the chariots?'
(d) *āher yātāram kām apaśya indra* ... (RV 1.32.14a)
'Whom did you see as the avenger of the snake, O Indra ...?'
- (22) *apām bilam āpihitam yād āśid vṛtrām jaghanvām āpa tād vavāra* (RV 1.32.11a/b)
'What opening of the waters (had been) covered, that he opened up (after) killing Vṛtra.'

¹¹ See note 9 concerning the question of whether metrical texts are suitable for word order studies.

¹² Other Rig-Vedic examples of the relative pronoun in preverbal position are found at the following locations: 1.190.3c, 1.190.6c, 2.10.1b, 2.24.8a/b, 4.45.7b, 5.15.2c/d, 5.30.10b, 5.30.15c, 5.32.1c, 5.33.3a/b, 6.15.14c, 6.25.4b, 6.25.6c/d, 7.27.3b, 7.28.5b, 7.82.1c, 7.90.2a, 7.98.5, 7.103.2a, 8.6.2a/b, 8.6.3a/b, 8.13.32c, 8.45.14c. (The count is fairly complete for books 5 - 7; for books 1 - 4 and 8, the count is less complete; I have not checked books 9 and 10.)

5.6. The evidence presented so far can be taken to suggest that Sanskrit throughout its history permitted pronouns of various types (relatives, interrogatives, and to some extent, demonstratives) to occur in a preverbal focus position and that the relative dearth of attestations of this pattern in Vedic Prose, as well as perhaps in many classical texts, is in some way to be attributed to genre (Hock, *forthc.* (c)). In that case, the only meaningful change would have occurred in the transition to Modern Indo-Aryan, which has lost the initial or second-position alternative for interrogatives and which tends to limit preverbal placement to the same interrogative pronouns.

Note that the alternative interpretation of the available data, that the grammar of Vedic Prose did not have a preverbal focus position, would require the methodologically dubious assumption of a 'flip-flop' between the Rig-Veda, Vedic Prose, and (certain genres of) the classical language. It is, therefore, considerably less attractive.

5.7. The view that such a flip-flop is unlikely finds further support if we consider that placement into a preverbal ('focus') position is not limited to pronominals, but is possible also for other, non-pronominal constituents (or parts of constituents). Compare the Vedic Prose examples in the 'double-focus' constructions of (23), where one of the contrasting elements, the subject, is placed immediately in front of the verb.¹³

- (23) (a) *yātrāsyā pūruṣasya mṛtāsyāgnim vāg āpyeti vātam prāṇā(h)* ... (ŚB 14.6.3.13 = BĀU 3.2.13)
'When of this dead person the voice enters the fire, the breath (enters) the air ...'
(b) *prthivyāi cainam agnē ca daivī vāg āviśati ... divās cainam ādityāc ca daivam māna āviśati ... adbhyaś cainam candrāmasaś ca daivāḥ prāṇā āviśati* ... (ŚB 14.1.3.27-9 = BĀU 1.5.18-20)
'From the earth and from the fire, divine speech enters him ... From the sky and from the sun, divine mind enters him ... From the waters and from the moon, divine breath enters him ...'

Evidence of this type permits us to conclude that the syntax of preverbal placement in Sanskrit (and Indo-Aryan in general) remained remarkably stable throughout its history, with some fluctuation only in the extent to which particular categories were permitted and/or required to move into the preverbal focus position.

6. Let me conclude by examining a case in which the evidence suggests change in some areas and genre-conditioned variation in others. This is the case of the behavior of particles, enclitics, and various types of pronouns. To keep the discussion manageable, I will focus on the behavior of non-locational deictic pronouns of the type *tād*, *etād* and of the relative and

¹³ For preverbal focus constructions in Rig-Vedic, see for the time being Schäufele 1989.

interrogative pronouns. I will refer to pronouns of the type *tád*, *etád* simply as 'deictics' and to the whole set of deictic, relative, and interrogative pronouns as 'stressed pronominals'.¹⁴

6.1. In Hock 1982a I postulated for Vedic Prose a system of what I called 'initial strings' which, with modifications required by further evidence,¹⁵ can be described as follows:

¹⁴ Note that this set does not include personal pronouns or the locational deictics *idám* and *adáh*.

¹⁵ Such modifications include the following:

(i) In Hock 1982a, I concentrated on the deictics *tád*, *etád*, since these most prominently are fronted in Vedic Prose. It is only in the relatively brief discussion of the Rig-Vedic evidence that I raise the issue of relative pronouns. I now include relative pronouns, interrogatives, and deictics in one class of 'stressed pronominals'. (For evidence and discussion, see the body of this paper.)

(ii) My discussion further suggested that in Vedic Prose, 'deictics' (or 'stressed pronominals') obligatorily were placed into initial strings. While such placement does indeed take place in more than 90% of all cases, the examples in (19) and (20) show that, like the mantra language and the classical language, other orders were possible. Differences between Vedic Prose and the earlier language in regard to pronoun placement thus constitute different preferences, not differences in grammar.

(iii) The discussion in my earlier paper may further suggest that in Vedic Prose, clitic pronouns and sentential particles (whether accented or not) obligatorily move into initial strings. In fact, although initial-string placement of these elements is found in more than 90% of all cases, passages of the type (a) and (b) below demonstrate that, as in the Rig-Veda and in the later language, the movement is optional. (Example (a) exhibits a clitic pronoun outside the string, within the noun phrase to which it belongs, while (b) offers a sentential particle not placed into the string [which is set off in square brackets].) Here again we have a difference in preference, not in grammar.

(a) *ayam aham asmi vo vtra(h)* (AB 7.27.3)

'I here am your hero.'

(b) [*yá no 'smin*] *na vai kam avidad* (AB 3.22.6)

'For she has not obtained anything in this (share) of ours.'

(iv) In light of the overwhelming evidence of Vedic Prose, I suggested in my earlier paper that only single-word parts of complex noun phrases can move into string-initial position. Here again, there is evidence to suggest that, as in the earlier mantra language and the later classical language, it was possible to front entire complex constituents. Compare example (c), in which the 'conflict' between complex-constituent fronting and the fronting of stressed pronominals is resolved by placing the first word of the fronted complex constituent into string-initial position and putting the remainder of the fronted constituent after the final element (*tad*) of the string. (The fact that the genitive modifier of this fronted constituent appears in preverbal position might suggest that also here, we are dealing with the fronting of only part of a constituent. However, in the present case, that part is itself a complex constituent. Moreover, rather than being 'stranded' in preverbal object position after the fronting of its 'head' noun phrase, the genitive modifier may well have been placed in preverbal focus position, so as to create a double focus structure; cf. the translation.) Example (d) might illustrate an alternative approach, with the stressed pronominal placed after the entire fronted constituent.

The initial position ('position 1') of the string attracts 'topicalized' noun phrases or parts of noun phrases (i.e., elements which are emphasized, under focus, etc.), or if nothing else has been fronted, stressed pronominals. Note that the initial position can accommodate at most one constituent or part of a constituent. It may be followed by unaccented clitic particles in position 2, themselves optionally followed by accented particles in position 3. The next position, 4, accommodates clitic pronouns. A final '5th' position (or 'default position') houses stressed pronominals that ordinarily would have been fronted into first position but could not be accommodated because of the constraint against more than one constituent or part of a constituent in that position. The whole string may be preceded by an optional member of the set *átho*, *tád*, *sá*, words which can be roughly glossed as 'so, then, now' and thus function as a kind of sentence linker. (Following Klein 1991, I will refer to these words as indicators of NEXUS.)

(c) *indriyám evá tád vtryám yájamáno bhrátrvyasya vṛñkt(e)* (TS 6.5.1.1-2)

'It is of his opponent that he thereby takes away the strength and vigor.'

(d) *prajāpatiṃ vírastaṃ yátra deváh samáskurvams* (SB 7.2.1.5)

'When the Gods put together Prajapati (who had been) relaxed ...'

(v) Finally, as the discussion in the body of this paper shows, beside *átho*, mentioned in note 10 of my 1982 paper, *tád* and *sá* (Minard's '*sá*-figé') may occur in initial position without counting as the first accented word of the initial string. Independent evidence for the fact that '*sá*-figé' is different from ordinary *sá* 'that (one), he' is provided by passages of the type (e) below, in which *sá*, morphologically nominative (i.e. subject-case) and masculine, fails to agree in gender with the neuter subject (*-yaśah*) of both the relative and the correlative clause. (For recent discussions of *sá*-figé see Jamison 1992 and Hock In Press (a).)

(e) *sa yad evásmin dikṣitayaśo bhavati tad asminn utthite yaśo bhavati*

'Now, what glory of the dikṣita is in it (the black antelope skin) that glory is in him (when he has) arisen.' (JB 2.68)

Further evidence suggesting that '*sá*-figé' has the same nexus functions as *átho* or its variant *átha* comes from the pattern observable in the following passage and in many others like it: An argument is introduced by '*sá*-figé'; further steps in the argument each begin with *átha*. (In the present example, the argument is followed by a subsidiary argument of parallel structure.)

(f) *sa yat prathamam upamarṣti tena ...*

atha yad dvitīyam upamarṣti tena ...

atha yad dvir aṅgulyā prāśnāti

sa yat prathamam prāśnāti tena ...

atha yad dvitīyam prāśnāti ten(a) ...

atha yat sruṇā prāśnāti tena ... (JB 1.41)

'Now, in that he wipes the first one, thereby ...

Further, in that he wipes the second one, thereby ...

Further, as to why he eats twice with his finger:

Now, in that he eats the first, thereby ...

Further, in that he eats the second, thereby ...

Further, in that he eats with a ladle, thereby ...'

Like German coordinating conjunctions of the type *und* 'and', *aber* 'but', these words may not 'count' as the first element of the clause (or of the initial string). See (24) for a summary and (25) for selected illustrations.

(24)

NEXUS	1	2	3	4	5
átho		P	P	E	D
sá	X	u	tú	naḥ	
tád	D	sma ha	vai hí	enam ...	
			

(P = unaccented particle;
P = accented particle;
E = enclitic pronominal;
D = stressed pronominals (*tád, etád, yád, kím*);
X = accented word other than particles or D.)

- (25) (a) átho mánasā vai prajāpatir yajñām atanuta (TS 1.6.8.4)
(NEXUS X P ...)
'Then/moreover, with his mind Prajapati stretched out the sacrifice.'
- (b) sa yo ha sa mṛtyur (JB 1.12)
(NEXUS D P D ...)
'Now, (the one) who is that death ...'
- (c) atha ya enam anutsargaṃ lipsate (JB 2.393-7)
(NEXUS D E ...)
'Now, who tries to take hold of it without letting go ...'
- (d) sa yo hāsyaitaṃ pratiṣṭhāṃ veda (JB 2.431)
(NEXUS D P E D ...)
'Now, who knows this support of it ...'
- (e) tad yatra vai brāhmaṇaḥ kṣatraṃ vaśam eti (AB 8.9.6)
(NEXUS D P ...)
'Now, when the brahmin does the bidding of the princely power ...'
- (f) tād yajñamukhād evaitān naṣṭrā rākṣāṃsy átó 'pahanti (ŚB 1.1.2.3)
(NEXUS X (P) D ...)
'So he now wards off the evil spirits and demons from this beginning of the sacrifice.'
- (g) tād yātrāsýetara atmāgaṃs (ŚB 1.8.3.17)
(NEXUS D E ...)
'Now, where his (= the sacrificer's) one self went ...'
- (h) prá ha vá enaṃ páśavo viśanti (MS 1.8.2)
(X P P E ...)

- (i) 'The cattle indeed turn toward him.'
náha nv évaitásya táthā prajāḥ váruṇo grhṇāti (ŚB 2.5.2.4)
(X P P P D D ...)
'Now Varuṇa does not seize that one's offspring in this manner.'
- (j) dviśántaṃ hāsyā tād bhrátrvyam abhyátiricyate (ŚB 3.1.1.3)
(X P E D ...)
'That remains over for his hateful enemy.'
- (k) tair enāṃ ye vyardhayanti (JB 2.384)
(D E D ...)
'Who make it deprived of them ...'
- (l) indro vai yatra mahānāmniṣu mithunatvam aichat ... (JB 2.384)
(X P D ...)
'When Indra desired copulation with the mahānāmniṣ ...'

Building on my earlier findings, Schäufele 1991 has argued that position 1 be identified in generative terms as TOPIC, with the rest of the string attached to that TOPIC and that the optional 'extra-clausal' position for nexus elements be identified as COMP. As a consequence, we can rewrite (24) roughly as (24').

(24') COMP TOPIC 2 3 4 5

6.2. For the Rig-Veda, I proposed a similar system, but noted that relative pronouns appear to have been permitted in position 3. I left open the question whether the Rig-Veda knew a default position 5. Since then, Klein 1991 has proposed for the Rig-Veda a system very much along the same lines, with stressed pronominals in position 3; cf. (26), where the symbols have been adjusted to conform to their use in (24). Note that Klein likewise does not suggest the existence of a fifth position.

(26)

NEXUS	1	2	3	4
átha	D	P	D	E
	Nég		P	P
	X			

6.3. A very different hypothesis on the Rig-Veda has been proposed by Hale (1987a, b). In his view, a structurally defined 'COMP' position is the 'landing site' only for relative and interrogative pronouns. Topicalized constituents are fronted across COMP to a 'TOPIC' position that precedes COMP. Sentential clitic particles, then, attach to the right of the leftmost node, which may be TOPIC or COMP, depending on which position has been filled. Finally, clitic pronominal elements are attached to the right of

COMP. Compare the (rough) summary in (27), where (a) and (b) illustrate what happens with sentential clitic particles. Evidence which in Hale's view supports this analysis can be seen in (28a) vs. (28b), with and without TOPIC respectively. For sentential clitic particles, see for instance (29).¹⁶

(27)	TOPIC	COMP	pronominal clitics	
(a)	TOPIC	clit. particle	COMP	pronominal clitics
(b)	COMP	clit. particle	pronominal clitics	

(28)(a)	idhmám	yás	te	jabhárac ... (RV 4.12.2a)
	TOPIC	COMP	Clit.	
	'... who ... bore the kindling to you.'			
(b)	yás	te	idhmám	jabhárat... (RV 4.2.6a)
	COMP	Clit.		
	'... who ... bore you the kindling ...'			

(29)	uraú	vá	yé	antárikṣe mádanti ... (RV 3.6.8a)
	TOPIC	clit.ptcle.	COMP	
	'... or who rejoice in the wide atmosphere ...'			

6.4. If my analysis for Vedic Prose, especially as reformulated by Schäufele, is contrasted with Hale's interpretation of the Rig-Vedic evidence, it might be concluded that there has been a formidable syntactic change from one stage of the language to the other.

And in fact, there does seem to be a significant difference between these two stages in terms of the placement preferences for relative pronouns: In the Rig-Veda, structures of the type (28a), with relative pronoun following the initial constituent, or 'topic', are extremely common. Comparable patterns are relatively rare later on, both in Vedic-Prose and in the classical language. Note moreover that the shift in behavior of relative pronouns from the Rig-Veda to the later language is not mirrored by a similar shift in the behavior of deictics. If anything, in Vedic Prose, deictics show a slightly greater preference for second position, as compared to the Rig-Veda. Compare the statistics in (30), where 'second position' refers to the position after the first accented element (plus any number of intervening particles or clitic pronouns).¹⁷

¹⁶ Hale extends his analysis to Taittirya-Saṁhita prose; cf. Hale 1987a, as well as his unpublished contribution to the present Vedic Workshop. However, he only deals with the relative sequencing of 'TOPIC' and 'COMP', ignoring the crucial evidence of clitic pronouns. Hale's position has changed since then, as has mine. For up-dates on our positions see Hale, In Press and Hock, In Press (b).

¹⁷ For the Rig-Veda, the figures are based on 9.68-97 and 10.1-35 [a and c lines only] and for the Jaiminīya-Brahmaṇa on 2.235-39 and 3.166-72. For the Bhagavad-Gīta, the whole text has been used.

(30)	(a) Relative-pronoun position: Initial vs. second					
	Rig-Veda		Jaiminīya-Brahmaṇa		Bhagavad-Gīta	
	initial	second	initial	second	initial	second
yá-	79	60	53	6	139	57
	1.3	1	9	1	3.3	1

(b)	Position of <i>tá-</i> in the Rig-Veda and Vedic Prose			
	Rig-Veda		Jaiminīya-Brahmaṇa	
tá-	80	14	126	29
	6.5	1	4	1

While some of these differences, especially those concerning the placement of *tád*, may reflect minor genre differences, the agreement of Vedic Prose and the later language as regards relative-pronoun placement suggests a real chronological readjustment. But this adjustment is not a matter of grammar: Initial and second position-placement is grammatical both in the Rig-Veda and in the later language. Rather, it is a question of preference.

The real relevant change consists in the fact that the elaborate Vedic system of initial strings has been lost in the classical language, such that 'second position' no longer means a non-initial position within the initial string, but simply 'position after the first word or constituent'.

6.5. What is more important, then, is that Hale's account predicts for relative and interrogative pronouns a behavior very different from that of deictics, at least for the Rig-Veda. For only relatives and interrogatives are accommodated in his COMP position.¹⁸ On the other hand, my (reformulated) account, as well as Schäufele's, would in principle allow all stressed pronominals, whether deictic or relative/interrogative, to exhibit the same behavior.

There is good reason to believe that -- with the exception of position 5 which appears to have been only a weak alternative in Rig-Vedic -- the initial-string syntax of the Rig-Veda was virtually identical to that of Vedic Prose and that the system that accommodates both stages of Vedic Sanskrit is more likely to have been the one in (24/24') and (26) than the one in (27). To justify this claim, I will in the following concentrate on the observable facts and the patterns they require us to recognize, ignoring the theoretical differences between my analysis (as reformulated by Schäufele) and that of Hale.

6.6. First, although it is true that in the Rig-Veda, deictics and relatives prefer different positions in the clause -- or in initial strings --, it is also true that if we disregard such statistical differences, the potential range of

¹⁸ In addition, Hale's interpretation, in assigning post-first-element position to accented and non-accented particles by Wackernagel's Law, must treat accented particles as 'clitics', ignoring the fact that they are accented and never alternate with non-accented variants. (See Hock 1982a, note 23, as well as Schäufele 1991 for counterarguments and further discussion.)

distribution is the same for both classes of pronouns. Note first of all the examples cited earlier in (21) and (22), where both sets of pronouns occur in preverbal position. Secondly, compare the examples in (31) - (34). (Because interrogatives occur much less frequently, only examples with relatives and demonstratives are cited.) Here (31) exemplifies sentence-initial position; (32) gives the pronoun in second position, followed by clitic pronouns;¹⁹ and (33) illustrates a third near-initial option, namely after the first, presumably topicalized constituent plus clitic pronoun.²⁰ The pattern in (33), which I consider to show the pronoun in position 5 (after the clitic-pronoun position 4), is the least frequently attested initial-string variant. However, the fact that it occurs at all, combined with its continued (and vigorous) appearance in Vedic Prose, suggests that it must be recognized as an available alternative.

- (31) D-initial + clitic pronoun
 (a) ... yás te sákhibhya á váram (RV 1.4.4c)
 '... who is dearer to you than (all) friends.'
 (b) tám tvá vájeṣu vājinaṃ vājyāmaḥ ... (RV 1.4.9a/b)
 'We make victorious you, the victorious, in the victories.'
- (32) X + D + clitic pronoun
 (a) tákṣad yát ta uśána sāhasā sāho ... (RV 1.51.10a/b)
 'When Uśanas made force for you by force ...'
 (b) ánu tán no jāspátir maṃsiṣṭa (|) rátnaṃ devásya savitúr iyānāḥ

¹⁹ This pattern is much more common for relative pronouns than for deictics. Thus in book 5, I found fifteen examples of relative pronouns in this pre-clitic-pronoun position, but only three for deictics. Nevertheless, in books 1 through (the middle of) 8, I found at least twenty examples with deictics: 1.186.11a/b; 3.9.2; 4.46.5a, 6; 5.33.8a/c, 9, 10; 7.36.7a/b, 38.6a/b, 40.2a/b ~ 52.4a/b ~ 52.3c/d, 64.3a/b, 68.6a/b, 95.4a/b; 8.6.5a, 19.5c/d, 20.14d, 20.26b, 27.12a/b, 27.22a/b, 8.66.5c. Note that this count excludes configurations of the type illustrated below, in which the clitic following the deictic belongs to the same constituent as the deictic. For, as Mark Hale has observed, the placement of the clitic may here reflect the fact that Rig-Vedic clitic pronouns do not have to move into initial strings but may be (or remain) attached to (part of) the constituent to which they belong. (If examples of this sort are included, then the ratio between examples with relative pronouns and deictics in book 5 comes out to be 15 : 13, i.e. about even.)

vísvét tá te sadhamádeṣu cākana (RV 1.51.8d)

'I enjoy all these (actions) of yours at the soma drinkings.'

²⁰ Reliable examples of this pattern are rare both for relative pronouns and for deictics. Other examples that I have found in books 1 through (the middle of) 8 occur at the following locations: 8.21.8b, 8.21.10c/d (deictics), and 1.89.5c, 8.72.6/7, 8.72.18, perhaps also 5.64.6 and 7.82.6b (relatives). What is interesting is that if my count is correct, the best examples are limited to two books (1 and 8) and are concentrated in just a few hymns: Deictics are found in 1.41 and 8.21 (2x), and relatives in 1.89 (2x) and 8.72 (2x). The situation is not much different if we include examples in which the clitic pronoun and the deictic or relative belong to the same constituent, except that we have to add books 5 and 7, with 5.44.4a/b and 7.57.4c, 58.4d, 7.61.2a/b, 89.5d (deictics) and 5.64.6, 7.82.6b (relatives), plus one example of a deictic in 3.34.7c/d. Again, one is struck by the fact that examples of this pattern are both rare and concentrated in particular books of the Rig-Veda.

'May the Lord of the Family assign this jewel of God Savitṛ to us, going (for it).'

(33) X + clitic pronoun + D

- (a) ... devá no yátha sádama íd vṛdhé ásanna (RV 1.89.1c)
 '... so that the Gods may always be for our growth.'
 (b) prá vaḥ sá dhítáye naśat (RV 1.41.5c)
 '... that reaches your (favorable) thinking.'

6.7. Finally, as the earlier cited examples (25k) beside (25j) illustrate, both sets of pronouns continue to be parallel in Vedic Prose, in that both relatives and deictics can occur in the default position 5 of initial strings.²¹

Examples of the type (25c, d, g) might suggest that for relatives Vedic Prose offered an alternative, pre-clitic-pronoun position. However, note that all such examples contain an initial nexus element which on independent grounds (cf. e.g. (25a), note 15(v) of this paper, and the discussion in Hock 1982a, note 10) must be recognized as (optionally) being extra-clausal (or not in the initial string). Note further that in examples (25b, d, e), the sequence NEXUS plus relative pronouns is followed by sentential particles which, both in my account and in Hale's, should be expected to be placed after the first accented element of the clause or string. Finally, in (25b, d), a deictic pronoun follows the particle (plus or minus clitic pronoun). That is, if we accept the relative pronouns as occupying position 1 of an initial string, then the sequence of elements is precisely as expected: D P [P] E D. If, on the other hand, we accepted the nexus elements as occupying first position, then we would wind up with entirely anomalous structures of the type X D P [P] E D

6.8. The syntactic parallelism between deictics and relatives suggests that in their broad outlines, the accounts in Hock 1982a (and its above modification), Schäufele 1991, and Klein 1991, are preferable to Hale's. For in the former 'initial-string' approach, deictics and relatives (as well as interrogatives) are treated as members of the same category, having the privilege of occurrence in the same syntactic positions, while the latter hypothesis, by reserving COMP as the 'landing site' for relatives and interrogatives, makes the incorrect prediction that relatives and interrogatives differ from deictics in their privilege of occurrence.

Moreover, and more importantly for the concerns of the present paper, within the initial-string approach we can point to a clear difference between Rig-Vedic and Vedic Prose (in addition to the change in preference for relative-pronoun placement, for which see section 6.4 above): Whereas in Vedic Prose, the 'default position' for stressed pronominals which could not be accommodated in the first position of initial strings was position 5, this

²¹ The pattern with relative pronoun in 5th, post-clitic-pronoun position is fairly rare in Vedic Prose, just as are other examples with relative pronoun not in the first position of the initial string, but it is attested frequently enough to have to be recognized as an available alternative. (Without attempting to make a complete search, I have found examples at the following other locations in the Jaimintya-Brahmana: 1.65, 157 (2x), 245; 2.56, 187, 270, 291.)

position was only very weakly established in the Rig-Veda. The normal default placement appears to have been into position 3, after (unaccented) sentential particles and before clitic pronouns.

Unfortunately, in the present case we cannot support our argument with the evidence of the classical language. For while we do find evidence for the placement of relative pronouns, interrogatives, and deictics of the type *tád*, *etád* into first (or 'TOPIC') position, second (or post-'TOPIC') position, and preverbal focus position (cf. again the examples in (16a) and (17)), the classical language lacks the elaborate initial strings of Vedic. We are thus unable to tell whether the second (or post-'TOPIC') position of the classical language corresponds to the 3rd position of the Rig-Veda or the 5th position of the Rig-Veda and Vedic Prose.

7. As I hope to have demonstrated in this paper, work on historical Vedic syntax must proceed with considerable caution. In many cases, syntactic differences between the early mantra language and the later language of Vedic Prose have to be attributed to differences in genre, rather than chronology. To decide which of these two alternatives is the more appropriate we have to look very carefully at the intra-Vedic evidence, as well as at the evidence of the later language. Even so, the evidence may in some cases be insufficient to unambiguously argue for genuine chronological change.

References

- Andersen, Paul Kent. 1982-83. *Amplified sentences in Aśoka*. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 96.17-29.
- Arnold, Edward V. 1897. Outline of the historical grammar of the Vedas. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 18.203-52.
- Avery, John. 1880. Contributions to the history of verb inflection in Sanskrit. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 10.219-324.
- Bloch, Jules. 1906-08. La phrase nominale en sanskrit. *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 14.27-96.
- Cardona, George. 1978. Relations between causatives and passives in Indo-Iranian. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 8:2.1-42.
- Debrunner, Albert, and Jacob Wackernagel. 1930. *Altindische Grammatik*, 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Friedrich, Paul. 1975. *Proto-Indo-European syntax: The order of meaningful elements*. *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, Monograph No. 1.
- Hale, Mark Robert. 1987 (a). *Studies in the comparative syntax of the oldest Indo-Iranian languages*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Ph.D. dissertation.
- 1987 (b). Wackernagel's law and the language of the Rigveda. *Studies in memory of Warren Cowgill*, ed. by C. Watkins, 38-50. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- , In Press. Deriving Wackernagel's Law: Prosodic and syntactic factors determining clitic placement in the language of the Rigveda. *Approaching second: Second Position clitics and related phenomena*, ed. by A. Halpern and A. Zwicky. Stanford: CCSL.
- Hock, Hans Henrich. 1981. Sanskrit causative syntax: A diachronic study. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 11:2.9-33.
- 1982 (a). Clitic verbs in PIE or discourse-based verb fronting? Sanskrit *sá hovāca gárgyah* and congeners in Avestan and Homeric Greek. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 12:2.1-38.
- 1982 (b). The Sanskrit passive: synchronic behavior and diachronic change. *Studies in South Asian languages and linguistics*, edited by P.J. Mistry, 127-37. (South Asian Review, 6.)
- 1984. (Pre-)Rig-Vedic convergence of Indo-Aryan with Dravidian? Another look at the evidence. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 14:1.89-108.
- 1985. Transitivity as a gradient feature? Evidence from Indo-Aryan, especially Sanskrit and Hindi. *Proceedings of the Conference on Participant Roles: South Asia and Adjacent Areas*, ed. by A. R. K. Zide et al., 247-63. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- 1986. *Principles of historical linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. (Second revised edition, 1991)
- 1989. On early Indo-Aryan and Dravidian syntax. Paper read at the International Seminar on Theoretical Approaches to Language Variation, 23-25 March 1989, Delhi University.
- 1991a. Causees, passive agents, or instruments? Instrumental NPs with causatives in early and later Vedic Prose. Hock 1991b:71-93.
- (ed.) 1991b. *Studies in Sanskrit syntax*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- 1991c. Dialects, diglossia, and diachronic phonology in early Indo-Aryan. *Studies in the historical phonology of Asian languages*, ed. by M. C. Shapiro and W. G. Boltz, 119-159. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- In Press (a). Nexus and 'extraclausality' in Vedic, or 'sá-figé' all over again: A historical (re)examination. *Historical, Indo-European, and lexicographical studies: Festschrift for Ladislav Zgusta in honor of his 70th birthday*, ed. by H. H. Hock. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- In Press (b) Who's On First: Towards a prosodic account of P2 clitics. *Approaching second: Second Position clitics and related phenomena*, ed. by A. Halpern and A. Zwicky. Stanford: CCSL.
- In Press (c). Rhetorical motivations of Vedic-Prose word and clause order. *Indo-Iranian Journal*.
- and Rajeshwari Pandharipande. 1976. The sociolinguistic position of Sanskrit in pre-Muslim South Asia. *Studies in Language Learning* 1:2.107-38. (Urbana: University of Illinois.)
- Jamison, Stephanie. 1976. Functional ambiguity and syntactic change: The Sanskrit accusative. *Papers from the Parasession on Diachronic Syntax*, 126-35. Chicago: Linguistic Society.

- 1977 (1983). *Function and form in the -aya-formations of the Rigveda and Atharvaveda*. Yale University Ph.D. dissertation. Revised version (1983): *Ergänzungshefte zur Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, 13.
- 1992. Vedic *sá-figé*: An inherited sentence connective? *Historische Sprachforschung* 105:213-239.
- Jayaseelan, K. A. 1989. Wh-movement in Malayalam. Paper read at the International Seminar on Theoretical Approaches to Language Variation, 23-25 March 1989, Delhi University.
- Kachru, Yamuna. 1980. *Aspects of Hindi grammar*. New Delhi: Manohar.
- Kim, Alan Hyun-Olak. 1988. Preverbal focusing and type XXIII languages. *Studies in syntactic typology*, ed. by M. Hammond et al., 147-169. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Klein, Jared S. 1991. Syntactic and discourse correlates of verb-initial sentences in the Rigveda. Hock 1991b:123-43.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin. 1987. *Turkish and the Turkic languages*. The world's major languages, ed. by B. Comrie, 619-44. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lehmann, Winfred P. 1974. *Proto-Indo-European syntax*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Miller, D. Gary. 1975. Indo-European: VSO, SOV, SVO, or all three? *Lingua* 37.31-52.
- Nagarajan, Hemlatha. 1989. A note on focus placement and focus movement rules in English, Hungarian, Aghem, and Tamil. Paper read at the International Seminar on Theoretical Approaches to Language Variation, 23-25 March 1989, Delhi University.
- Narten, Johanna. 1964. *Die sigmatischen Aoriste im Veda*. Wiesbaden.
- Pollock, Sheldon Ivan. 1977. *Aspects of versification in Sanskrit lyric poetry*. (American Oriental Series, 61) New Haven, CT: American Oriental Society.
- Renou, Louis. 1937. *La décadence et la disparition du subjonctif*. (Monographies sanskrites, 1.) Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- Schäufele, Steven. 1989. The syntax of verb phrases in Vedic. Paper read at the 11th South Asian Languages Analysis Roundtable, 4 June 1989, Madison, WI.
- 1991. Single-word topicalization in Vedic Prose: A challenge to Government & Binding? Hock 1991: 151-73.
- Stump, Gregory T. 1979. The loss of the subjunctive mood in *yadi*-conditionals from Vedic to Epic Sanskrit. *Papers from the 1978 Mid-America Linguistics Conference*, ed. by R. E. Cooley et al., 242-51. University of Oklahoma.