IVAN ANDRIJANIĆ

External Vocatives in the *Nalopākhyāna*

Abstract

This paper explores the use and function of the vocatives used by Bṛhadaśva to address Yudhiṣṭhira and their possible role in fitting the story into the *Mahābhārata*. These vocatives, outside of the main Nala story, are a direct formal link to the main plot. Verses in which vocatives appear can be distributed broadly into two groups. The first, somewhat larger group consists of external vocatives that appear in formulaic verses used either to introduce or conclude various narrative units, such as chapters, direct speech, or flow of thought. The second group consists of vocatives that appear in the narrative parts themselves. As they are an integral part of the story, these are examined closely. Special attention is paid to stanzas with vocatives that R.M. Smith identifies as interpolations, which contain repetitions of words and phrases from the surrounding text (a phenomenon Ježić refers to as duplication repetitions). In later manuscripts, many words are replaced with external vocatives, indicating that a number of vocatives that appear as part of narration may be of such origin. The distribution and function of external vocatives and some late features of the story indicate the hypothesis that the story was incorporated into the *Mahābhārata* in its developed form, but that it was subsequently reworked and further adapted.

Introduction

The *Nalopākhyāna* (*Mahābhārata* [=MBh] 3,50[1]–78) has attracted the attention of researchers and translators since the earliest days of Indological scholarship.[2] However, many contributions focus on interpreting the literary features of the story, as well as various comparative aspects. Even with a cursory reading, the text of the BORI edition may give the impression of complex structure; the story itself seems to have been appropriately inserted as a kind of commentary on or digression to the broader storyline of the *Mahābhārata*. At first glance, the impression is that the text has been reworked and expanded, indicating a complex text history.

Sukthankar (1939), supplemented by Jhala (1968), argues that some of Sudeva's speech (MBh 3,65.7–25) is a direct borrowing from the *Rāmāyaṇa* (*Sundarakāṇḍa*, *sarga*s 13, 14, 17, and 28). Mary Brockington (2012) notes similarities in narrative motives with the *Rāmāyaṇa*, indicating that some themes and motifs in the *Nalopākhyāna* were copied and reused from the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Van Buitenen (1975: 182–185) compares the story of Nala as narrated in the *Mahābhārata* with oral folk versions in new Indo-Aryan languages, concluding that the *Nalopākhyāna* might be based on some old, pre-existing oral literature to the same extent as the oral folk tales of Nala in the new

---

1   Introduction in 3,49.29–43.
2   The *Nalopākhyāna* was first published and translated into Latin by Franz Bopp in 1818. Johann Gottfried Ludwig Kosegarten translated it into German in 1820. In 1838 and 1847, two German translations by Friedrich Rückert and Ernst Heinrich Meier were also published. The first English version, translated by Henry Hart Milman, was published in 1835. The *Nalopākhyāna* has become a favourite text for beginner Sanskrit learning among foreign students. In 1860, Monier Williams published a text with a detailed vocabulary intended as an introduction to the study of translation from Sanskrit. In 1872, Adolf Friedrich Stenzler included the first three *adhyāya*s along with a vocabulary in the second edition of his *Elementarbuch der Sanskrit Sprache*. Charles Rockwell Lanman included the first five *adhyāya*s in his *Sanskrit Reader*, published in 1888.

Indo-Aryan languages.[3] The Sanskrit version, according to van Buite-
nen, likely contains both additions and deletions. Other authors like
Gresseth (1979) and Jamison (1999) note some important parallels
between the *Nalopākhyāna* and the Odyssey, while J.D. Smith (1992)
compares the story to the French medieval cantefable *Aucassin et
Nicolette*. According to von Simson (2005), who drew attention to the
etymologies of personal names, a seasonal myth lies under the surface
of the *Nalopākhyāna*. R.M. Smith (1960) distinguishes the hands of
two authors on the basis of a statistical analysis of meter, morpholog-
ical features, and the distribution of compounds. However, there are
several issues with R.M. Smith's conclusion of two authors. Does this
mean that the story consists of two stories by two different authors,
or that two co-authors worked together on the story? Contemporary
statistical stylometric analysis has shown that it is possible to distin-
guish between different "handwriting" in works by multiple authors;[4]
however, the *Nalopākhyāna* differs significantly from contemporary
works with multiple authorship. Another, even larger issue with R.M.
Smith's analysis are his outdated, pre-computer statistical methods.[5]
Along with the hands of the two authors, R.M. Smith (1960: 371–381)
also singles out 42 interpolations that do not belong to the "hands"
of the two main authors. This claim is somewhat more challenging
and is worth considering, especially if these interpolations may have
anything to do with the fundamental idea that the text was inserted

---

3   For different versions and retellings of the Nala and Damayantī story, see the
     comprehensive and informative volume edited by Susan S. Wadley, 2011.
4   The literature on the topic of differentiating authorial contributions in multi-
     author documents is very extensive. Contemporary computers and machine
     learning have enabled the development of a number of effective techniques.
     Only as an example we can cite Dauber et. al. (2017). For the history of
     authorship attribution studies up to 2008, see Juola 2008.
5   This is not intended as a comprehensive critique of R.M. Smith's methods
     and conclusions. The method conducted in his research deserves a systematic
     evaluation from the point of view of modern computational statistical methods,
     especially in the stylometric sub-fields of authorship attribution and authorship
     verification.

into the *Āraṇyakaparvan* (or that the *Āraṇyakaparvan* was created by combining and adapting various older stories).

The question that is pertinent to the current research is whether the story of Nala is an independent story that was incorporated into MBh. According to Monier Williams (1879: vi, xi), it belongs to a much earlier period of Indian history than the main plot of the poem. Winternitz (1909: 324) considers the *Nalopākhyāna* an epic within an epic, as well as one of the poems included in MBh. R.M. Smith (1960: 358) claims that the *Nalopākhyāna* was not composed for MBh, but rather represents a part of the old *kṣatriya* tradition. Sukthankar (1939: 294) sees it as palpable interpolation. Brockington (1998: 140) sees it as an independent piece that was subsequently incorporated into MBh.[6] Van Buitenen (1975: 183) raises the question of the extent to which the Nala story is independent of MBh by indicating a number of similarities with the main plot of MBh, such as the envious grudge of Kali, the half-dressed Damayantī, losing the kingdom in the dice game, and the exile in the forest. Van Buitenen is, however, cautious not to over-emphasize these similarities.[7] Gönc-Moačanin (2016: 405) sees the *Nalopākhyāna* as a "consciously interpolated narrative which might have been thought by redactors of the epic to play a role as a kind of corrective to Yudhiṣṭhira's behaviour in the *Sabhāparvan*".

---

6   Cf. also Brockington's (2006: 39) comment "...the story is legendary and probably regarded as such by the redactors who included them within the Mahābhārata..."

7   Biardeau (1984, 1985) bases her extensive structuralist analysis on parallels with the main story. In this sense, she sees the Nalopākhyāna as a "mirror story". This type of analysis, which approaches the Nalopākhyāna as a functional part of a unique, coherent epic, resounded strongly with experts focused on literary (especially synchronic) analysis of the text. Personally, I am not sure if Biardeau intended to observe her analysis from a diachronical point of view. For a strong critique of Biardeau's symbolism and similarities in the literary motifs and themes, see J.D. Smith (1992: 14–16) and Gönc-Moačanin (2021: 95–96), who warn of exaggerations in Biardeau's analysis and etymological "absurdities". Cf. also von Simson 2005: 132. For a general analysis of the *upākhyāna*s from a literal and synchronic point of view, see Adluri & Bagchee 2016 (eds.).

This paper will take a closer look at the idea that the *Nalopākhāna* is an insertion. Unlike Gönc-Moačanin, who approaches this problem from the broader position of literary motifs, I shall approach it more technically, looking for 'patches' used to connect the story to the frame story. If the *Nalopākhyāna* was in fact inserted into a broader textual framework, do any visible features in the text suggest so?

If the text was inserted, the question arises as to its form before the insertion, as well as to the shape of the broader textual unit into which it was inserted. In shaping the broader texts of the entire *Āraṇyakaparvan*, did it truly come to pass that an (oral?) version of the old warrior story was inserted, which was then adapted to the broader context? Did some features of the story seem appropriate to this exact context? Or is the *Nalopākhyāna* an editorial insertion of an already formed (written?) textual unit?[8]

One may suppose that the visibility of the patches also depends on the degree of "completion" of the story at the time of supposed insertion. If the inserted story is merely a floating oral compendium of motifs, the story is certainly more open to adaptations and modifications aimed at adapting the floating story to a broader textual framework; in this case, the patches would be less apparent. However, if a "more defined" story was inserted, the patches might be more visible at the insertion points.

Assuming the story were inserted, possible text patches should be visible in passages that directly connect the *Nalopākhyāna* with a broader context. The only such formal, textual link are the vocatives used by the sage Bṛhadaśva to address Yudhiṣṭhira. These vocatives are, besides a complex net of narrative motifs,[9] the only direct tex-

---

8   As an example, Van Buitenen (1975: 185) suggests that the dice game episode might be an innovation of the Sanskrit version, as the folk versions do not contain it.

9   For the analysis of the literary motifs connecting the *Nalopākhyāna* with MBh's main plot, see Mary Brockington (2012) and van Buitenen (1975: 182–185). Also see the structuralist analysis of Madleine Biardeau, who views the *Nalopākhyāna* as a story that mirrors the *Mahābhārata*'s main plot. Cf. also Hiltebeitel 2001: 215–239.

tual features connecting the *Nalopākhyāna* with the main plot of the *Mahābhārata*. If the story in this or another form predated the present form of the *Āraṇyakaparvan*, lines and verses with such external vocatives might be additions attached to the text during the process of insertion, or verses adapted by adding external vocatives. Therefore, this paper will focus primarily on the distribution and function of such vocatives external to the *Nalopākhyāna*'s plot, as well as the verses in which they appear, in order to identify potential indications that such verses do not belong to the story's plot, thus indicating a text patch that serves to incorporate the story into the text.

External vocatives

Bṛhadaśva uses 24 different vocatives to address Yudhiṣṭhira; they are used by Bṛhadaśva a total of 103 times in the *Nalopākhyāna* proper, as well as seven times in the introduction (MBh 3,49.29–43), which formally belongs to the previous *upākhyāna*. The BORI edition of the *Mahābhārata* also has 17 external vocatives in the * passages in the critical apparatus. Sorted by frequency of occurrence, these external vocatives are: *rājan* (24 + *5)[10]; *bhārata* (22, *4)[11]; *viśām pate* (18 + *1)[12];

---

10 MBh 3,49.38a; 3,49.41a; 3,57.2a; 3,58.2a; 3,60.1a; 3,61.11a; 3,62.22c; 3,63.24c; 3,65.30a; 3,65.37a; 3,66.26c; 3,67.2c; 3,67.20c; 3,67.21c; 3,69.10b; 3,70.6c; 3,70.35c; 3,70.39c; 3,71.7c; 3,71.28a; 3,77.25c; 3,77.28a; 3,78.9c; 3,78.22a; 3,62.43d*298_1; 3,77.29f*353_3; 3,78.10d*360_2; 3,78.10b*359_2; 3,78.23d*367_2.

11 MBh 3,50.6d; 3,51.1b; 3,52.1b; 3,54.10b; 3,54.13d; 3,54.22b; 3,54.25b; 3,54.25d; 3,54.27d; 3,56.11b; 3,59.16b; 3,60.28d; 3,60.30d; 3,61.112d; 3,62.42d; 3,65.31d; 3,66.11b; 3,71.16b; 3,71.21b; 3,72.29d; 3,73.23d; 3,75.16b; 3.54.032d*0226_01; 3.54.32d*226_6; 3.58.22d*245_2; 3.78.10d*360_4.

12 MBh 3,49.36; 3,50.30b; 3,50.31b; 3,51.8b; 3,53.12b; 3,59.8b; 3,60.30b; 3,62.42b; 3,63.1b; 3,65.34b; 3,66.9b; 3,66.15b; 3,66.24d; 3,67.22b; 3,68.13b; 3,69.19b; 3,71.34b; 3,76.19b; 3,78.10d; 3,54.32d*226_4.

mahārāja (8 + *2)[13]; *kaunteya* (5)[14]; *pṛthivīpate* (5)[15]; *nṛpa* (4)[16]; *yudhiṣṭhira* (4)[17]; *rājendra* (2 + *2)[18]; *kurunandana* (3)[19]; *bharataṛṣabha* (2 +*1)[20]; *mahīpate* (1 + *1)[21]; *bharataśreṣṭha* (1)[22]; *rājaśārdula* (1)[23]; *kaurava* (1)[24]; *naraśreṣṭha* (1)[25]; *puruṣarṣabha* (1)[26]; *ariṃdama* (1)[27]; *pārthiva* (1)[28]; *nareśvara* (1)[29]; *prabho* (1)[30]; *janādhipa* (1)[31]; **kauravya* (*1);[32] **pāṇḍunandana* (*1)[33]; *pāṇḍava* (1)[34]; *anagha* (1)[35].

Even a cursory look of their position in the verse makes it apparent (as described in detail by Donnet 1980) that vocatives occupy a fixed position in the hemistich, e.g. all *bhārata* and *viśām pate* vocatives appear in the same position, at the end of the hemistich either as *pādas* b or d. *Bhārata* appears at syllable positions 14, 15, and 16, while *viśām pate* appears at 13, 14, 15, and 16. In this position, they meet the requirement of the *śloka* meter in the fourth *pāda* ($\smile - \smile \underline{\smile}$). Of

---

13   MBh 3,51.24a; 3,58.8a; 3,67.4a; 3,68.24c; 3,69.32c; 3,71.19c; 3,74.8c; 3,54.32d*226_2; 3,78.11d*362_1.
14   MBh 3,50.16c; 3,51.25a; 3,69.3a; 3,77.1a; 3,78.15c.
15   MBh 3,49.36d; 3,49.38d; 3,70.39; 3,75.5; 3,78.7.
16   MBh 3,66.20b; 3,71.34d; 3,75.22d; 3,75.24d.
17   MBh 3,56.18c; 3,58.9d; 3,65.29b; 3,68.20b.
18   MBh 3,69.33a; 3,78.5c; 3,62.43d*297_1; 3,70.36f*334_1.
19   MBh 3,70.16b; 3,72.23b; 3,73.21e.
20   MBh 3.74.6a; 3.78.6c; 3.78.1d*356_2.
21   MBh 3,57.20b; 3,64.4d*302_2.
22   MBh 3.66.21c.
23   MBh 3,62.17e.
24   MBh 3,63.24b.
25   MBh 3,78.6c.
26   MBh 3,77.28d.
27   MBh 3,74.14b.
28   MBh 3,78.14d.
29   MBh 3,51.5d.
30   MBh 3,51.8d.
31   MBh 3,62.11f.
32   MBh 3,54.27f*224_1.
33   *Kauravya* and *pāṇḍunandana* appear only in two * passages in the critical apparatus (3,54.27f*224_1 and 3,70.36f*334_1).
34   MBh 3,49.35d.
35   MBh 3,49.36b.

22 *rājan* (external) vocatives,[36] 18 appear at the end of a and c *pāda* (7th and 8th syllable) where the penultimate syllable must be long (7th). All *mahārāja* vocatives also appear at the end of a and c because long syllables in this position are required at the antepenultimate (6th) and penultimate (7th) in the *pāthyā* hemistich. Also, all *viśām pate* vocatives appear at the end of b and d, just like *bhārata*, because it fits the prescribed scheme with a long syllable at the antepenultimate, position 14 ($\cup$ – $\cup$ $\asymp$).[37] The fixed position of the vocatives indicates the formulaic nature of such verses, and it is no coincidence that they appear regularly in positions where the syllable quantity is prescribed. Donnet (1980: 78) sees such expressions as coming from a reserve of expressions meant to remedy any difficulty with meter in narration. However, besides their fixed place in the hemistich, external vocatives are distributed in a peculiar way, indicating that they are not only a helping hand in narration: if they only served to help with the metric scheme, their distribution would be random.

There are seven external vocatives in the introduction (3,49.29–43), while the other 103 are distributed throughout 29 chapters of the *Nalopākhyāna*. This distribution is not homogeneous; two chapters (3,55 and 64) contain no vocatives; in three chapters, we find only one (3,52; 53 and 76); in six chapters, we find three vocatives each (3,56; 57; 59; 61; 72; 73). Eight chapters have a more even distribution of four vocatives (3,58; 60 ; 63; 68; 70; 74; 75; 77). There are 10 chapters with five or more. The longest chapter, 3,61, has only two vocatives in 125 verses, while the last chapter has 11 vocatives in only 23 verses.

The largest clusters of vocatives thus appear at the introduction and at the conclusion of the *Nalopākhyāna*. The introduction and conclusion are the first places where possible connecting patches can be sought. The introduction to the Nala story from 3,49.29 to 43 describes Bṛhadaśva's visit to the Pāṇḍavas. We find there a dense cluster

---

36   Vocative *rājan* is internally used frequently for Nala, once even for Puṣkara (3,56.5d).

37   For a detailed analysis of the position of external vocatives see Donnet 1980: 62–67.

of seven external vocatives in only 15 verses. The concluding passage that may have served as a patch at the end of the *Nalopākhyāna* might begin with Bṛhadaśva's speech to Yudhiṣṭhira (MBh 3,78.5) and end with 3,78.23. R.M. Smith (1960: 381) considers this an interpolation that serves to fit the Nalopākhyāna into MBh. If this is true, we may suppose that MBh 3,49.29–43 (introductory passage) also serves the same purpose. In the concluding passage (MBh 3,78.3–23), which R.M. Smith (1960: 381) identifies as an interpolation, we find a cluster of 10 vocatives in the chapter of only 23 verses.

The dense distribution of vocatives in the introductory and concluding paragraphs indicates that these passages were used to fit the story into the whole, and the vocatives remind the reader of the frame story.

Generally speaking, verses in which external vocatives appear can be divided into two groups.

The first, larger group consists of external vocatives that appear in formulaic verses that introduce or conclude some part of the story. They usually appear at the beginning and end of a chapter, and before or immediately after the beginning and end of direct speech, serving as introductory or concluding verses.

Altogether, 32% of all external vocatives (33/103) appear in the first or last three verses of an *adhyāya*.[38] When such verses appear at the beginning, they mostly serve as an announcement, and when they are at the end, they serve as a conclusion rounding off individual chapters. A further five external vocatives appear immediately after *extra metrum* "*bṛhadaśva uvāca*" announcements within *adhyāya*s, not counting the appearance of external vocatives after *bṛhadaśva uvāca* at the beginnings of chapters.[39] Also, external vocatives appear immediately before *extra metrum* lines preannouncing direct speech

---

38   MBh 3,50.30; 3,50.31; 3,51.1; 3,52.1; 3,56.18; 3,57.2; 3,57.23; 3,58.2; 3,60.1; 3,62.42b, 3,62.42d; 3,63.1; 3,63.24b; 3,63.24d; 3,65.37; 3,66.24; 3,66.26; 3,67.2; 3,67.20; 3,67.21; 3,67.22; 3,68.24; 3,69.3; 3,69.32; 3,69.33; 3,70.39; 3,71.34b; 3,71.34d; 3,72.29; 3,76.19; 3,77.1; 3,77.28b; 3,77.28d.

39   MBh 3,66.9; 3,67.2; 3,67.4; 3,71.16; 3,72.23.

or narrative announced by the *extra metrum* line in a few cases.[40] In a
way, the verses in which external vocatives appear seem to round out
different narrative units like chapters, narrative episodes, or speeches.

On the other hand, a number of vocatives appear in *śloka*s that
serve as the introductory or concluding verses of some smaller nar-
rative units, such as direct speech, which is not necessarily marked
with an *extra metrum* line. This group includes verses that serve as
announcements of the speaker. This group is quite fluid, and no for-
mal marker (such as an *extra metrum* line) distinguishes them; context
should be used to recognise such cases. As an example, after the hunt-
er saves Damayantī from the serpent in 3,60.27, the external vocative
bhārata occurs in 3,60.28 as part of the verse that announces the hunt-
er's question (direct speech) to Damayantī.[41] The storyteller summa-
rizes her answer with verse 3,60.30, which contains two vocatives.[42]
MBh 3,61.112, where the vocative *bhārata* appears, is also a verse
that announces the question of the caravan people to Damayantī. MBh
3,66.11 announces the speech of Sunandā to Damayantī, and 3,66.15
announces Damayantī's speech to Sunandā. MBh 3,66.25 and 3,68.13
announce Damayantī's speech to her mother. MBh 3,68.20 introduces
Damayantī's announcement of her second *svayaṃvara*. MBh 3,70.6
marks the end of Nala's address to Ṛtuparṇa; MBh 3,70.16 marks
the beginning of Ṛtuparṇa's address to Nala. MBh 3,71.21 marks the
end of Ṛtuparṇa's speech. Stanza 3,62.42 with the vocative *bhārata*

---

40 In MBh 3,53.12 before *devā ūcuḥ*; 3,61.11 and 3,71.7 before *damayanty uvāca*;
    3,78.15 before *vaiśaṃpāyana uvāca*.
41 MBh 3,60.28c
    samāśvāsya kṛtāhārām atha papraccha bhārata || 28 ||
    "He comforted her and gave her food to eat, then questioned her, o Bhārata."
    (Tr. van Buitenen 1975: 335)
42   MBh 3,60.30
    damayantī tathā tena pṛcchyamānā viśāṃ pate |
    sarvam etad yathāvṛttam ācacakṣe 'sya bhārata || 30 ||
    "At his urging Damayantī told him all, O lord of your people, in the way it had
    befallen, Bhārata." (Tr. van Buitenen 1975: 335)

marks the end of Damayantī's address to King Cedi's mother, and the beginning of the Queen Mother's address to her daughter Sunandā.[43]

Vocatives sometimes appear at the concluding passage of an episode, such as MBh 3,62.17, which concludes the caravan episode.[44] The episode of Damayantī's hideout in Cedi also concludes with two verses (3,66.20–21), each containing a vocative.[45]

It should be noted that most of these announcing, concluding, and connecting verses with vocatives are remarkably formulaic. In these formulas, vocatives occupy a fixed position supplemented with a standard variety of gerunds, past participles, or phrases (*tac chrutvā*; *evam uktaḥ*; *vacanam/vākyam abravīt* etc).[46] The majority of external vocatives belong to this first group, which announces/concludes rather formulaic, stereotypical verses.

The second group of verses with external vocatives consists of those that appear to be part of the regular flow of narration. Unlike the first group, these verses do not mark any turn in narration; they appear as an integral part of the Nala story, and as such connect the *Nalopākhyāna* even more strongly to the *Mahābhārata* than the verses from the first group. These shall thus be examined carefully, especially in the light of R.M. Smith's analysis, according to which many such

---

43   Other examples where vocatives appear in *śloka*s that serve as an introduction to direct speech are: 3,62.42; 3,67.4; 3,67.20; 3,71.7; 3,74.8.

44   MBh 3,62.17
     evamādīni duḥkhāni sā vilapya varāṅganā |
     hataśiṣṭaiḥ saha tadā brāhmaṇair vedapāragaiḥ |
     agacchad rājaśārdūla *duḥkhaśokaparāyaṇā || 17 ||*

45   Cf. also 3,57.20, when Vārṣṇeya takes care of Nala and Damayantī's children and departs to Vidarbha. In 3,57.23 Nala's entry into the service of Ṛtuparṇa is announced.

46   MBh 3,51.1 *tac chrutvā* + *bhārata*; 3,53.12 *evam uktaḥ* + *viśāṃ pate*; 3,60.28 *atha papraccha* + *bhārata*; 3,61.112 *papracchuḥ* + *bhārata*; 3,62.42 *evam uktvā* + *viśāṃ pate*; 3,65.34 *viśāṃ pate* + *papraccha*; 3,65.37 *evam uktaḥ* + *rājan*; 3,66.9 *tac chrutvā* + *viśāṃ pate*; 3,66.15 *viśāṃ pate* + *abhivādya*; 3,66.26 *rājan* + *idaṃ vacanam abravīt*; 3,67.4 *mahārāja* + *vacanam abravīt*; 3,70.6 *evam ukte* + *rājan*; 3,70.16 *abravīd* + *kurunandana*; 3,71.7 *te śrutvā* + *rājan*; 3,72.23 *evam uktasya* + *kurunandana*; 3,74.8 *mahārāja* + *vākyam abravīt*; 3,78.22 *taṃ śrutvā* + *rājan*.

non-formulaic verses with external vocatives are identified as interpolations.

This second group challenges the assumption that verses with external vocatives are connecting patches serving to connect the story to the broader narrative context because they appear to be an integral part of the narrative and, unlike the vocatives of the previous group, form a natural whole with the story.

Interpolated verses with external vocatives

R.M. Smith (1960: 370–381) compiled a list of verses he considered interpolations in the *Nalopākhyāna*. The hash sign indicates those stanzas that can be, according to R.M. Smith (1960: 381), most plausibly regarded as interpolations, while underlined stanzas indicate that they contain vocatives; the vocatives found there are in parentheses: 50.3a & d; 51.21cd; 52.23; 53.16; #53.20cd; #54.5; #54.13cd (*bhārata*); #54.15ab; #54.18–19; 54.25cd (*bhārata*); #54.27c–f (*bhārata*); #54.35–38; #55.9–10b; #58.8–10 (*mahārāja, yudhiṣṭhira*); 58.31; 59.6; #59.18–24; #60.3; #60.5; #60.10; 60.15; #60.18–61.9 (*viśām pate, bhārata*)[47]; #61.12–13; #61.16–17; #61.19–20; #61.30–62.17 (*bhārata, janādhipa, rājaśārdūla*);[48] #64.17–18; 65.7–26b; 66.6ab?; 67.14–15; 68.9; 70.17ab; 70.34ef; #71.6–7 (*rājan*); 71.21cd (*bhārata*); 72.21; 72.26cd; 73.14–17; #74.19; #75.13; 77.25–27; #78.3–23.[49]

Of these 42 alleged interpolations, 22 external vocatives appear in 10 of them, more than a fifth of all the external vocatives in the *Nalopākhyāna*.

Passages containing verses with external vocatives that are not announcements or conclusions, but rather appear as part of the narrative,

---

47   Both in MBh 3,60.30.
48   In 61.112 *bhārata*; 62.11 *janādhipa*; 62.17 *rājaśārdūla*.
49   Eleven vocatives in these stanzas: 78.5c *rājendra*; 78.6c & d *naraśreṣṭha*; *bharatarṣabha*; 78.7b *pṛthivīpate*; 78.8b *pāṇḍava*; 78.9c *rājan*; 78.10d *viśāṃ pate*; 78.14d *pārthiva*; 78.15b & c *satyaparākrama, kaunteya*; 78.22a *rājan*.

will thus be presented. This paper classifies such verses into the second group. R.M. Smith identifies four of these examples as interpolations; one additional example is not identified as an interpolation by Smith. To identify interpolations, R.M. Smith uses traditional philological methods, such as identifying contradictions and disturbances in narration. R.M. Smith's analysis will be verified with the repetition analysis methodology developed by Mislav Ježić (1979, 1986, 2009) and used to identify text-layers in the *Bhagavadgītā*.[50] Szczurek (2005) uses the same methodology to identify *bhakti* interpolations in the *Bhagavadgītā*. In his analysis of the text history of the *Bhagavadgītā*, Ježić distinguishes between two types of repetitions that appear in texts that have been created over a long period of time and have been subjected to expansion and insertion. The first type of repetitions are duplication repetitions, wherein the subject is given a new connotation indicating a different layer of text; such repetitions serve as a patch that incorporates a new layer. Repetitions in inserted passages serve the function of fitting the inserted text into the new environment.[51] The second are continuity repetitions, wherein the subject develops in a logical way, indicating the same textual layer.

The first example of a passage that R.M. Smith refers to as an interpolation is MBh 3,54.13. This verse belongs to the second group in which the verse with the vocative is not an introduction or conclusion, but rather appears as part of the plot. Carefully reading the verse in its context, we see a break in the narrative. Damayantī's line of thought begun in verse 12 is interrupted by the narrator's speech. In verse 12, she asks herself how to distinguish Nala from the gods; in verse 13, the narration shifts to the point of view of the narrator, who reports how Damayantī bethought herself of the marks of gods she had heard of. In the following verse (14), her line of thought then continues, and she thinks of the marks of the gods she has heard of from the elders,

---

50 Cf. Szczurek's contribution to this volume "The Death of Bhīṣma in the Mahābhārata"; employed also in Andrijanić 2021.
51 Andrijanić 2023 shows that the same repetitions occur in interpolations that are excluded from the critical BORI edition on the basis of manuscript evidence.

but does not notice them now. If 3,54.13, which contains the external vocative *bhārata*, were omitted, Damayantī's line of thought would remain uninterrupted. The fact that this is most likely an interpolation is also apparent from repetitions remarkably similar to those noted by Ježić (1979, 1986, 2009), Szczurek (2005), and Andrijanić (2021 and 2022). The boldfaced text below are duplication repetitions from preceding verse 3,54.12 (*sā cintayantī* is duplicated as *samcintayantī sā*) and from following verse 3,54.14 (*devānām lingāni śrutāni* is duplicated and shortened as *śrutāni devalingāni*).

MBh 3,54.12
sā cintayantī buddhyātha
tarkayāmāsa bhāminī |
kathaṃ nu devāñ jānīyāṃ
kathaṃ vidyāṃ nalaṃ nṛpam || 12 ||

Worryingly the shining girl wondered in her heart, "How am I to know who are the Gods, how am I to find out who is King Nala?"[52]

MBh 3,54.13
evaṃ **saṃcintayantī sā**
vaidarbhī bhṛśaduḥkhitā |
śrutāni devaliṅgāni
cintayāmāsa bhārata || 13 ||

As she was worrying most unhappily in this fashion, the princess of Vidarbha bethought herself of the marks of Gods she had heard of, Bhārata.[53]

MBh 3,54.14
devānāṃ yāni **liṅgāni**
sthavirebhyaḥ **śrutāni** me |
tānīha tiṣṭhatāṃ bhūmāv
ekasyāpi na lakṣaye || 14 ||

---

52   Tr. van Buitenen 1975: 328.
53   Tr. van Buitenen 1975: 328.

"I have heard from the old people
about the marks that betoken Gods,
but I do not perceive even one in
them while they are standing on the
ground!"[54]

The next example is MBh 3,54.25, wherein two external vocatives *bhārata* occur. This verse contains only one duplication, the periphrastic perfect *varayāmāsa* from the next verse (3,54.26). However, when one considers the content of the stanza and its surroundings more closely, it seems clear that the verse could be interpolated. In the preceding verse (3,54.24), we learn that the gods took off their disguise and that Nala stood with a faded garland, full of sweat and dust. The interpolation then informs us that Damayantī chose Nala. However, in the next verse (3,54.26), she puts her garland around his neck, and it is again said that she chose him for marriage. The supposed interpolation actually anticipates too early the information that Damayantī has chosen Nala.

MBh 3,54.24
chāyādvitīyo mlānasrag
rajaḥsvedasamanvitaḥ |
bhūmiṣṭho naiṣadhaś
caiva nimeṣeṇa ca sūcitaḥ || 24 ||

And the Niṣadhan stood revealed by
his shadow, his faded garland, his
dustiness and sweatiness, and the
blinking of his eyes, while he touched
the ground.[55]

---

54   Tr. van Buitenen 1975: 328.
55   Tr. van Buitenen 1975: 328.

MBh 3,54.25
sā samīkṣya tato devān
puṇyaślokaṃ ca bhārata |
naiṣadhaṃ **varayāmāsa**
bhaimī dharmeṇa bhārata || 25 ||

Now that she could see the Gods and
Puṇyaśloka of Niṣadha, o Bhārata,
the daughter of Bhīma chose him
according to the Law.[56]

MBh 3,54.26
vilajjamānā vastrānte
jagrāhāyatalocanā |
skandhadeśe 'sṛjac[57] cāsya
srajaṃ paramaśobhanām |
varayāmāsa caivainaṃ
patitve varavarṇinī || 26 ||

Bashfully she[58] touched the hem of his
garment and threw over his shoulders
a most beautiful garland; and thus
the fair woman chose him for her
husband.[59]

It would also be appropriate in this case to omit *pāda* 25d and replace
it with 26f, thereby eliminating the *pāda* e-f from verse 26. This would
result in two correct *śloka*s, each consisting of four *pāda*s, instead of
one verse with six *pāda*s. If such an emendation were made, there
would be no duplication repetition or external vocative.[60]

The next interpolation with an external vocative might be
3,54.27cdef. These two hemistiches are highly suspicious as they

---

56   Tr. van Buitenen 1975: 328.
57   Insler (1989: 578) provides convincing arguments that *asṛjat* should be
     emended to *asajat*.
58   In the Sanskrit original, the pronoun "she" is not used, but rather *āyatalocanā*
     'the long-eyed one' is mentioned.
59   Tr. van Buitenen 1975: 328.
60   I would like to thank Mislav Ježić for this suggestion.

state that the great *ṛṣi*s and gods voiced their approval of Damayantī's choice; however, the surrounding text does not mention that any great *ṛṣi*s or other gods attended the *svayaṃvara* except the four *lokapāla*s. As the verse contains three hemistiches, the hemistich with *pāda*s c and d in which the external vocative is located could easily be an interpolation, as the *ṛṣi*s and gods are not mentioned before. This example does not contain literal repetitions, although *sādhu sādhv iti* might be a duplication of the original *hā hā-iti*.[61]

MBh 3,54.27ab
tato **hā heti** sahasā
śabdo mukto narādhipaiḥ |

The assembled kings at once gave vent
to their woe,

MBh 3,54.27c–f
devair maharṣibhiś caiva
sādhu sādhv iti bhārata |
vismitair īritaḥ śabdaḥ
praśaṃsadbhir nalaṃ nṛpam || 27 ||

and the Gods and great seers voiced
their applause in wonderment, praising
King Nala.

---

61   R.M. Smith (1960: 373) considers the last two hemistiches (cdef) interpolations, but finds ab also spurious because *hā hā* is rather an exclamation of anger or surprise than praise. Following Smith's suggestion, it can also be argued that it makes contextual sense for the kings to be disappointed (*hā hā*), while the celestial beings and great sages were amazed (*sādhu sādhu*), especially since the *lokapāla*s (no matter how narratively strange) joyfully bestowed gifts upon Nala! (The narrative strangeness is not a significant issue, as the inclusion of the *lokapāla*s serves to magnify Damayantī's love for Nala). In this case, *pāda* 27ef can be omitted, and instead of the vocative *bhārata* in 27d, the metrically and semantically fitting *vismitaiḥ* from 27e could be used. In doing so, the questionable assertion about the presence of celestial beings and sages would be retained, although they may be invisibly present. Through this (likely bold) emendation, a verse consisting of 4 *pada*s with the ending *sādhu sādhv iti vismitaiḥ* could be obtained. I would like to thank Mislav Ježić for this suggestion as well.

Verses 58.8–10 (the vocatives *mahārāja* and *yudhiṣṭhira* appear in
58.8 and 9), wherein Puṣkara forbids the townspeople to help Nala,
are highly suspicious; R.M. Smith considers them interpolations that
produce excessive sympathy for Nala. Indeed, verse 11 would fit very
nicely if it directly followed *śloka* 7. An inconsistency with the sur-
rounding text is seen later in verse 18, in which Nala says that the dice
are the reason why citizens deny him hospitality, while the assumed
interpolation claims that Puṣkara forbade them from doing so.

   An interesting example of a possible interpolation with an exter-
nal vocative is 3,71.6–7, which R.M. Smith (1960: 379) considers an
elaborate version of verses 3–4. A comparison of the verses reveals
duplications of the words *rathaghoṣa* (4, 6), *rathanirghoṣa* (3, 5, 7),
and *megha* (4, 7), as well as the image of the coming cloud (4), which
is not directly duplicated in 7, but paraphrased (*meghodaya*). Also,
aśvās "horses" in 3b, *vājiṣu* and *hayās* in 5 is repeated as *hayās* "hors-
es" in 6c.

MBh 3,71.3
tatas taṃ **rathanirghoṣaṃ**
nal*āśvās* tatra śuśruvuḥ |
śrutvā ca samahṛṣyanta
pureva nalasaṃnidhau || 3 ||

Nala's horses heard the roar of the
chariot there; and when they heard it
they got excited as before, whenever
Nala had been with them.

MBh 3,71.4
damayantī ca śuśrāva
rathaghoṣaṃ nalasya tam |
yathā **meghasya** nadato
gambhīraṃ *jaladāgame* || 4 ||

So did Damayanti hear the roar of
Nala's chariot, rumbling like the
monsoon cloud at the onset of the rainy
season.

MBh 3,71.6
prāsādasthāś ca śikhinaḥ |
śālāsthāś caiva vāraṇāḥ
hayāś ca śuśruvus tatra
rathaghoṣaṃ mahīpateḥ || 6 ||

The peacocks on the terrace, the
elephants in the stable, and the horses
heard the roar of the king's chariot;

MBh 3,71.7
te śrutvā **rathanirghoṣaṃ**
vāraṇāḥ śikhinas tathā |
praṇedur unmukhā rājan
meghodayam ivekṣya ha || 7 ||

and, hearing the chariot thunder, the
peacocks and elephants made sounds
of yearning, as though they expected
the monsoon to break.

The next example of a *śloka* with an external vocative which R.M.
Smith did not mark as interpolation is MBh 3,56.11. As part of the
narrative, this verse also belongs to the second group. I argue that the
templates for this verse are verses 12 and 15. The duplication repeti-
tions are boldfaced.

MBh 3,56.11
tataḥ paurajanaḥ sarvo
mantribhiḥ saha bhārata |
rājānaṃ **draṣṭum** āgacchan
nivārayitum āturam || 11 ||

All the townspeople came with the
councillors to see the king, O Bhārata,
in order to stop the sick man.

MBh 3,56.12
tataḥ sūta upāgamya
damayantyai nyavedayat |
eṣa **paurajanaḥ sarvo**
dvāri tiṣṭhati kāryavān || 12 ||

The bard came and said to Damayantī,
"All the townspeople are waiting at the
gate with business…"

MBh 3,56.15
rājan paurajano dvāri
tvāṃ didṛkṣur avasthitaḥ |
mantribhiḥ sahitaḥ sarvai
rājabhaktipuraskṛtaḥ |
taṃ **draṣṭum** arhasīty
evaṃ punaḥ punar abhāṣata || 15 ||

"King, the townspeople are waiting at
the gate to see you, accompanied by all
the councillors, and they pledge their
loyalty to their king. Pray see them!"
she said over and over again.

In the verse 11 *paurajanaḥ sarvo* and *mantribhiḥ* are duplicated from verses 12 and 15, while *saha* is paraphrased as *sahitam*. Regarding the direction of borrowing, 11 cannot be the model for 12 and 15 because of the following indications in the text: first, the line of narration is broken, as verse 11 comes too early, conveying information about the reason why the townspeople came to Nala's gate, which is provided later.

On the other hand, following a valuable suggestion proposed by Mislav Ježić, one can also consider replacing the vocative *bhārata* 11 with *sarvaiḥ* from the verse 15, and omitting the *pāda*s c and d from the same verse where duplication repetitions appear. This would restore a regular four-*pāda* verse structure in the *pāda* 14 instead of irregular 6-*pāda* as we have it now; moreover, the composition would have a symmetrical arrangement (*draṣṭuṃ rājānam* / *draṣṭum paurajanam*).

Certain clusters of vocatives also appear in verses that lack clear signs of being interpolations. Verses 3,69.32–33 (where the vocatives *rājendra* and *mahārāja* appear) offer the narrator's commentary on Bāhuka's skill in handling horses, together with Vārṣṇeya's suspicion that Bāhuka is Nala in disguise. The narration is in a way disrupted, as the verses convey the narrator's commentary, while verses 23–31 directly convey Vārṣṇeya's thoughts about Bāhuka's identity. However, these two verses are in no way contradictory. However, verse 23 is duplicated in 33 and 34.[62] Although the direction of borrowing is not entirely clear, without verses 32–34 (where two external vocatives appear), nothing would be lost, as they only reiterate 23–31 from the point of view of the narrator Bṛhadaśva. If they are interpolated, they are well embedded into the context, although Ṛtuparṇa is introduced rather unnecessarily in the last verse.

Another group of three verses with vocatives (3,65.29–31) appear immediately after the large interpolation that Sukthankar recognizes as having been assembled from various parts of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The first verse with a vocative (3,65.29) may be an interpolation, as Sudeva tells Damayantī about her parents, children, and relatives in the previous verse (3,65.28), while Damayantī asks him about her relatives in the next verse 29 (the one with the vocative *yudhiṣṭhira*), which appears to be an unnecessary addition. The next verse also describes Damayantī's grief. Pāda d from 3,65.30 (*bhrātur iṣṭaṃ dvijottamam*) is duplicated and paraphrased on the model of 3,65.27b (*bhrātus te dayitaḥ sakhā*). MBh 3,65.31, which also contains a vocative *bhārata*, provides the information that Sunandā overheard Sudeva's and Damayantī's conversation. This verse cannot be considered an interpolation because it provides information crucial to the narration.

Another such verse with an external vocative (*bhārata*) containing information crucial to the narration is MBh 3,59.16, which provides the information that Nala has found a sword he will use to cut off half

---

62 MBh 3,69.23cd **vārṣṇeyaś cintayāmāsa bāhukasya hayajñatam** || ≈ 3,69.32ab evaṃ vicārya bahuśo **vārṣṇeyaḥ paryacintayat** |; 3,69.33ab ṛtuparṇas tu rājendra **bāhukasya hayajñatām** |

of Damayantī's dress. These last two examples do not seem to be interpolations.

Other examples of verses with external vocatives that appear as an inseparable part of the narrative are 3,50.6–7, where *ṛṣi* Damana comes to Bhīma; 3,51.5, where Damayantī's friends inform Bhīma she is unwell; 3,54.10, which describes how Damayantī saw four gods and Nala in the same form. The next *śloka* 3,54.11 is naturally and grammatically derived from 10 (*śloka* 10: *dadarśa puruṣān*> *śloka* 11: *tāṃ samīkṣya*); 3,54.22, where the gods reveal their forms. Other examples of *śloka*s with vocatives that seem to be a part of regular narration are 3,51.8; 3,62.22; 3,65.29–31; 3,66.11 (where Damayantī's mole is revealed); 3,67.21; 3,69.19; 3,71.19; 3,71.28; 3,73.21; 3,74.14; 3,75.16; 3,75.22.

One interesting and potentially indicative phenomenon should be noted here. The critical apparatus displays a tendency of certain manuscripts to substitute certain words with external vocatives. In 3,49.40, instead of the CE word *rājā*, which refers to Nala, the vocative *rājan* referring to Yudhiṣṭhira occurs in B_3, B_4, T_1, and G_1. In 3,50.13c, *rajendra* appears in K_3 instead of *cānyeṣu*; in place of *pārthivaḥ* in 3,54.34, M_2 has *bhārata*; in place of *rājā*, K_2, B, D have *rājan*; 3,58.6c T_1 has *rājan* instead of CE *rājā*; 3,59.5c $Ś_1$; $K_{1,\,4}$; B_3; D_1, M_1 have *rājan* instead of CA *rājā*, to name a few.

Numerous such examples of the change of ordinary words into external vocatives attested in the critical apparatus suggest the possibility that some vocatives that are part of the narrative whole in the critical edition may have originated in the same way. Of course, no direct proof is possible for such a claim, but if this overall tendency existed in later manuscripts, it is quite possible that it existed in variants that preceded the reconstructed archetype. This phenomenon may be indicative of the tendency to connect the *Nalopākhyāna* to its surroundings more tightly.

The opposite phenomenon is also visible according to the critical apparatus; numerous external vocatives from the CE are replaced in later manuscripts with other words that do not refer to Yudhiṣṭhira,

but to some character from the Nalopākhyāna. Thus, for example, the external vocative *bhārata* from 3,50.6 is replaced with the word *pārthivaḥ* in D$_{2, 3}$; with *bhārgavaḥ* in M$_2$. The vocative *rājendra* from the next verse is replaced with the nominative *rājendraḥ* in D$_3$ and G$_2$. In 3,50.13, *viśām pate* is replaced with *suvismitā* in K$_3$; the same vocative from 3,51.8 is replaced with the nominative *viśām patiḥ* in B, D$_n$, D$_{4, 6}$. Also, the vocative *prabhu* from the same verse is replaced with the nominative *prabhuḥ* in K$_4$, D$_1$. Numerous similar examples from the critical apparatus may testify to the fact that, in the later period of manuscript transmission, it was no longer so important to produce the impression of a story tightly integrated into the *Mahābhārata*.

Concluding remarks

In slightly more than half of cases, external vocatives are in special positions at the beginnings and ends of certain narrative units. Thus, two large groups of *śloka*s with vocatives in 3,49 and 3,78 round out the whole of the *Nalopākhyāna*. However, clusters of vocatives are also found at the beginnings of smaller narrative units such as *adhyāya*s, but these also serve as announcements and conclusions of direct speech or someone's line of thought. Such stanzas are usually highly formulaic, and the vocatives in them constitute the majority of the vocatives in the entire story. The appearance of external vocatives in such introductory and concluding passages can be explained by the narrator's use of interruptions and turns in the narration as an opportunity to remind the reader / listener of the *Mahābhārata* frame story. This is also an ideal opportunity to connect the story with the main plot.

On the other hand, a large number of vocatives can be found in the narrative itself. A few of these *śloka*s with vocatives that form part of the narrative might be interpolations. R.M. Smith's list of interpolations covers five of them as interpolations; a few more could also be added to the list of interpolations. It is important to note that duplication repetitions are found in most of these possible interpolations, the

same as those that occur in interpolations recognized by Ježić (1979, 1986, 2009) and Szczurek (2005), as well as repetitions in interpolations that are excluded from the constituted text of the MBh critical edition (and cited in the critical apparatus), as analyzed in Andrijanić 2023.

From the presented material, it can be concluded that external vocatives are partly limited to non-narrative parts of the text, and that these verses can easily be recognized as a 'patch' used to adapt the text to the textual unit into which it was inserted. However, a number of vocatives also appear in the part of the text inseparable from the main story that conveys information crucial to the narrative. Such *śloka*s cannot be patches, and show that the matter is more complicated and complex than it seems at first glance.

In fact, the idea that the editors of the *Mahābhārata* inserted some pre-formed text and merged it into the *Mahābhārata* using stanzas with external vocatives seems somewhat simplified. It is a widely accepted claim that the *Nalopākhyāna* in the form in which it was transmitted in the *Mahābhārata* is not simply an ancient short warrior epic. Gönc-Moačanin analyses *kāvya* conventions in the *Nalopākhyāna* that indicate the story is more recent than some have claimed, at least in its surviving form. The story does retain some archaic features; it might be said that the *Nalopākhyāna* is an old oral story that was reshaped in the course of history and adapted to the *Mahābhārata*. The broader theme of the *Nalopākhyāna* itself certainly fits perfectly with the theme and purpose of the *Mahābhārata*, but numerous differences in the *Nalopākhyāna* from the main story of the *Mahābhārata*[63] indicate that the work was not composed specifically for Yudhiṣṭhira's consolation. However, the arrangement of the external vocatives, as well as the number of vocatives in the interpolations, indicate that the *Nalopākhyāna* (which pre-existed in this or another form) has been inserted, adapted, and formally connected to the main *Mahābhārata* narrative with external vocatives. However, the form of the work before

---

63 For differences see van Buitenen 1975: 183; von Simson 2005: 130–131; Gönc-Moačanin 2016: 405–408.

the time of insertion must have been in several respects different from the present form.

This is indicated by the vocatives found in the *śloka*s blended into the narrative. There are few such *śloka*s, and these may be the result of further adjustments and reworking after the episode was inserted into the whole. This process can be traced in the critical apparatus when later manuscripts replace individual words with external vocatives. This phenomenon indicates the work was additionally adapted to its broader textual context.

Bibliography

ADLURI, Vishwa; BAGCHEE, Joydeep (eds.) 2016. *Argument and Design: The Unity of the Mahābhārata*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

ANDRIJANIĆ, Ivan 2021. Notes on the text history of Mokṣadharmaparvan's Vasiṣṭha-Karālajanaka-Saṃvāda (MBh 12,291–12,296). In: DICSEP 6: 129–158.

——— 2023. Repetitions in Interpolations Excluded from the Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata. In: ANDRIJANIĆ, Ivan; Petteri KOSKIKAL-LIO; Krešimir KRNIC; Sven SELLMER & Przemysław SZCZUREK (eds.) *Medhótá śrávaḥ I. Felicitation Volume in Honour of Mislav Ježić on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*: 311–332. Zagreb: Croatian Academy od Sciences and Arts.

BIARDEAU, Madeleine 1984. Nala et Damayantī, héros épiques, IIJ 27: 247–274.

——— 1985: Nala et Damayantī, héros épiques, IIJ 28: 1–34.

BROCKINGTON, John Leonard 1998. *The Sanskrit Epics*. Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill.

——— 2006. Epic Svayaṃvaras. In: PANDA, Raghunath & Madhusudan MISRA (eds.) *Voice of the Orient* (*A Tribute to Prof. Upendranath Dhal*): 35-42. Delhi: Eastern Book Linkers.

BROCKINGTON, Mary 2012. Nala, Yudhiṣṭhira, and Rāma Fitting the Narrative Pattern. In: *Devadattīyam, Johannes Bronkhorst Felicitation Volume*. Bern: Peter Lang AG, International Academic Publishing.

VAN BUITENEN, Johannes A. B. 1975. *The Mahābhārata, Volume 3. Book 4: The Book of the Virāṭa; Book 5: The Book of the Effort*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

DAUBER, Edwin; Rebekah OVERDORF & Rachel GREENSTADT 2017. Stylometric Authorship Attribution of Collaborative Documents. *CSCML*: 115–135.

DONNET, Daniel 1980. Aspects des mécanismes formulaires dans le Nalopākhyānam. In: *Indianisme et Bouddhisme: Mélanges offerts à Mgr Étienne Lamotte*: 53–78. Louvain-la-Neuve: Publications de l'Institut orientaliste de Louvain.

GRESSETH, Gerald K. 1979. The Odyssey and the Nalopākhyāna. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 109: 63 – 85.

GÖNC-MOAČANIN, Klara 2016. The Nalopākhyāna Seen Through the Lens of Kāvya. In: DICSEP 5: 405–415.

——— 2021. Nalopākhyāna revisited. In: DICSEP 6: 93–123.

HILTEBEITEL, Alf 2001. *Rethinking the Mahābhārata. A Reader's Guide to the Education of a Dharma King*. Chicago: The University of Chicago press.

INSLER, Stanley 1989. Damayantī's Svayaṃvara. JAOS 109 (4): 577–580.

JAMISON, Stephanie W. 1999. Penelope and the Pigs: Indic Perspectives on the "Odyssey", *Classical Antiquity* 18 (2): 227–272.

JEŽIĆ, Mislav 1979. The first yoga layer in Bhagavadgītā. In: SINHA, J.P. (ed.) *Ludwik Sternbach Felicitation Volume*, I: 545–557. Lucknow: Akhila Bharatiya Sanskrit Parishad.

——— 1986. Textual layers of the Bhagavadgītā as traces of Indian cultural history. In: *Sanskrit and World Culture. Proceedings of the fourth World Sanskrit Conference*: 628–683. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

——— 2009. The Triṣṭubh Hymn in the Bhagavadgītā. In: DICSEP 4: 31–66.

JHALA, G. C. 1968. The Nala Episode and the Rāmāyaṇa. A Footnote, *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 48 – 49: 295 – 298.

JUOLA, Patrick 2008. *Authorship Attribution*. Boston–Delft: now Publishers Inc.

MONIER WILLIAMS, Monier 1879. *Nalopakhyanam. Story of Nala, an Episode of the Mahabharata* (Second Edition, Revised and Improved). Oxford: at the Claredon Press. (First edition, Oxford, 1860)

VON SIMSON, Georg 2005. Nalopākhyāna as a Calendar myth. In: DICSEP 3: 113–135.

SMITH, John Dargavel 1992. The Hero as Gifted Man: Nalain the Mahābhārata. In: SHACKLE, C. & R. SNELL (eds.) *The Indian Narrative: Perspectives and Patterns*: 13 – 31. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

SMITH, Robert Morton 1960. The Story of Nala in the Mahābhārata. *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, M.S. University of Baroda 9 (4): 357–386.

SUKTHANKAR, Vishnu Sitaram 1939. The Nala Episode and the Rāmāyaṇa, *NIA extra series 1, A Volume of Eastern and Indian Studies Presented to Professor F. W. Thomas*, pp. 294–303. Reprinted in: *V. S. Sukthankar Memorial Edition 1: Critical Studies in the Mahābhārata*, Bombay: Karnatak Publishing House, 1944, pp. 406–415.

SZCZUREK, Przemysław 2005. Bhakti interpolations and additions in the Bhagavadgītā. In: DICSEP 3: 183–220.

WADLEY, Susan S. (ed.) 2011. *Damayanti and Nala: the many lives of a story*. New Delhi: Chronicle Books.

WINTERNITZ, Moriz 1909. *Geschichte der indischen Literatur*, *erster Band*, Leipzig: C. F. Amelangs Verlag.

Sažetak na hrvatskome

Izvanjski vokativi u Nālopākhyāni

U ovome se radu istražuje uporaba i funkcija vokativa kojima se Br̥hadaśva koristi za obraćanje Yudhiṣṭhiri, kao i njihova moguća uloga u uklapanju priče o Nali u širi kontekst *Mahābhārate*. Ovi vokativi, izvanjski u odnosu na glavnu priču o Nali, izravna su formalna poveznica s *Mahābhāratom*. Stihovi u kojima se pojavljuju vokativi mogu se općenito podijeliti u dvije skupine. Prvu, nešto veću skupinu

čine formulativne strofe kojima se uvode ili završuju različite narativne cjeline, poput poglavlja, izravnoga govora ili tijeka misli. Drugu skupinu čine strofe s vokativima, koje se javljaju u pripovijedanju samome. Budući da su sastavni dio priče, pomno se ispituju. Posebna pozornost posvećena je strofama s vokativima koje R.M. Smith identificira kao interpolacije, a koje sadrže ponavljanja riječi i izraza iz okolnog teksta u koji su strofe umetnute (tu pojavu Mislav Ježić naziva udvostručujućim ponavljanjima). U kasnijim rukopisima mnoge su riječi zamijenjene vanjskim vokativima, što ukazuje na to da bi određeni broj vokativa koji se pojavljuju kao dio pripovijedanja mogao biti i takva podrijetla. Raspodjela i funkcija vanjskih vokativa i neke kasne značajke priče ukazuju na hipotezu da je priča uklopljena u *Mahābhāratu* u svom razvijenom obliku, ali da je još naknadno prerađivana i dodatno prilagođena.

Vedic Roots, Epic Trunks, Purāṇic Foliage

Dubrovnik International Conference
on the Sanskrit Epics and Purāṇas,
DICSEP publications, vol. 7

Edited by
Ivan Andrijanić
Sven Sellmer

General Editor
Mislav Ježić
Fellow of the Croatian Academy
of Sciences and Arts (Zagreb)