

# The Prakrit *Mirror of Ornaments* and Bhāmaha’s *Ornament of Literature* Andrew Ollett

## 1. Prakrit and the Language Disciplines

Prakrit is known primarily as a language of literature, or *kāvya*. Daṇḍin, for example, identified Prakrit as the language in which Pravarasēna composed *The Building of the Bridge*.<sup>1</sup> It has also been one of the languages that Jains have used for their religious literature from a relatively early date.<sup>2</sup> By contrast, Prakrit was not in widespread use as a language of systematic knowledge, or *śāstram*.<sup>3</sup> There are three exceptions to this overall tendency. First, Jain authors such as Kundakunda and Siddhasēna wrote philosophical texts in Prakrit in the first half of the first millennium CE. Even Jain philosophers, however, largely abandoned Prakrit in favor of Sanskrit by the second half of the first millennium.<sup>4</sup> Second, there are a number of Prakrit texts devoted to what we might call “practical” knowledge, such as assessing gems, treating snakebites, or crafting love-potions.<sup>5</sup> These are the same domains of systematic knowledge which would later be represented by texts in regional vernaculars, including Kannada and Brajbhasha. Finally, there are grammar, lexicography, metrics and poetics, which we can identify as “language disciplines”, following the ninth-century poet Jinasēna.<sup>6</sup> There are works composed in Prakrit in all of these disciplines.

Since Prakrit was the language of a significant literary tradition, it should not come as a complete surprise that it would also be used in those branches of systematic knowledge that were concerned with literature. As a whole, however, these contributions in Prakrit to the language disciplines remain unstudied, and in many cases, almost nothing is known about their history, their intertexts, and how, if at all, they fit into a larger story about the history of knowledge. In this paper, I will focus on one such text, the *Mirror of Ornaments* (*Alaṅkāradappanāṁ*). I argue that its relationship with Sanskrit works of poetics — and in particular, Bhāmaha’s *Ornament of Literature* — deserves serious

---

<sup>1</sup> Daṇḍin, *Mirror of Literature*, 1.34 (p. 24): *mahārāṣṭrāśrayām bhāṣām prakṛṣṭam prakṛtam viduḥ ~ sāgaraḥ sūktaratnānām sētubandhādī yanmayam* ~ (“The finest Prakrit is known to be the language of Mahārāṣṭra, in which are works like *The Building of the Bridge*, an ocean filled with the jewels of beautiful expressions”). The introduction to this paper builds on material that is presented in Ollett 2017: 143–153. I presented versions of this paper at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem (October 2015) and at the Prakrit International Conference at Śravaṇabelagoḷa (November 2017). Note, finally, that I follow a version of the ISO-15919 standard for transliterating South Asian languages, writing *ē* and *ō* (with macrons) when these letters are long and *e* and *o* (without macrons) when they are short.

<sup>2</sup> I distinguish “Prakrit” from “Middle Indic” and thus maintain that Jains came to use Prakrit — after having used Ardhamāgadhī — around the first century CE, with Bhadrabāhu’s *niryuktis*. See Ollett 2017: 69–73.

<sup>3</sup> For the languages of systematic knowledge (“science”) in South Asia, see Pollock 2011, which surveys the dominance of Sanskrit and its interaction with regional vernaculars in various fields of systematic knowledge.

<sup>4</sup> For the language practices of Jain intellectuals, see Dundas 1996.

<sup>5</sup> See Chintamani 1971 for more details about these texts, and Upadhye 1977 for *Hara’s Belt* (*Haramēkhalā*).

<sup>6</sup> Jinasēna, *Long History* 16.111 (p. 356): *padavidyām adhicchandōvicitim vāgalaṅkṛtiḥ ~ trayīm samuditām etām tadvidō vāri-mayam viduḥ* ~ (“The science of words, the repertoire of meters, and the adornment of speech: these three, taken together, are what experts call ‘the language disciplines’ [lit. ‘made of language’].”)

scrutiny, since the story that we tell about poetics in South Asia depends crucially on what we make of this relationship. I will, in this paper and elsewhere, make an argument for the historical priority of the *Mirror* to its Sanskrit intertexts. I am very well aware that my arguments may not convince everyone, and that a more detailed study may support the opposite conclusion. My purpose here, however, is not necessarily to prove the priority of the *Mirror* to the *Ornament*, but rather to highlight three larger issues which can only be addressed in a preliminary fashion in this paper: first, the nature and directionality of intertextual relations between Sanskrit and Prakrit works; second, the historical phenomenon of works of systematic knowledge composed in Prakrit; third, the different shape that the history of the language disciplines takes on when we take into serious consideration the influence of works composed in Prakrit.

We may begin a brief survey of contributions in Prakrit to the language disciplines with poetics, the analysis of literary forms and techniques. The only surviving work in this field is the *Mirror of Ornaments*, which is organized around a set of just over forty “ornaments” or figures of speech. One work which does not survive, but which certainly dealt with literary techniques to some degree, was composed by the poet Harivṛddha. Although most of the fragments of Harivṛddha’s work, the title of which is not known, relate to the fourfold classification of Prakrit words into Sanskrit-identical, Sanskrit-derived, Regional, and Colloquial, one fragment enumerates eight styles of alliteration. Thus it is likely that this work, in dealing with Prakrit as a literary language, also addressed certain aspects of literary technique. Harivṛddha’s *terminus ad quem* is the metrical handbook by Virahāṅka, *A Compendium of Syllable- and Mora-Counting Meters (Vṛttajātisamuccayaḥ)*.<sup>7</sup>

More Prakrit works were written on metrics than any other domain of systematic knowledge. The earliest surviving text is the aforementioned handbook by Virahāṅka, dated to no later than the eighth century by its editor, H.D. Velankar. I conjectured that it was composed by the great poet Haribhadra, who was also known as Virahāṅka, before his conversion to Jainism.<sup>8</sup> Another important text is *Svayambhū’s Meters (Svayambhūchandaḥ)*, composed by the well-known Apabhramsha poet around the beginning of the ninth century. One *Mirror for Poets (Kavidappaṇam)* was composed in the thirteenth century.<sup>9</sup> A short work called the *Definition of the Gāhā (Gāhālakṣhaṇam)* is attributed to Nanditādḥya and dated to about 1000 CE by H. D. Velankar, but H. C. Bhayani claimed, with good reason, that the text as it survives is “a mutilated and interpolated version or recast of the metrical manual composed by a poet Nandiyādḥya.”<sup>10</sup> In Ratnaśekhara’s *Storehouse of Meters (Chandaḥkōśaḥ)*, composed in the later fourteenth century and written partly in Prakrit and partly in Apabhramsha, we have quite a few references to an earlier work on Apabhramsha meter composed by Alhu and Gulhu. The *Prakrit Piṅgala (Prākṛtapaiṅgalam)*, also from the later fourteenth century, but much more influential than Ratnaśekhara’s work, evidently used some of the same sources.<sup>11</sup> Another metrical handbook, referred to as the *Sprout of Meters (Chandaḥkandali)*, was evidently composed in Prakrit, but it is now lost.<sup>12</sup> The handbooks of Virahāṅka and Svayambhū make reference to a number of

<sup>7</sup> See Namisādhu’s commentary on *Ornament of Literature* 2.19 (p. 17) and Ollett 2017: 207. For more on Harivṛddha, see Bhayani 1973 and 1975.

<sup>8</sup> For the date, see p. xxv of Velankar’s edition. For his identification with Haribhadra, see Ollett 2017: 146.

<sup>9</sup> See p. iv of Velankar’s edition.

<sup>10</sup> See p. xxxii of Velankar’s edition, and Bhayani 1993 [1975]: 165. Bhayani notes that Nanditādḥya might be identical with a Prakrit poet named elsewhere as Nandivṛddha.

<sup>11</sup> See pp. xxxiii–xxxv of Velankar’s edition of the *Mirror for Poets*.

<sup>12</sup> See p. iv of Velankar’s edition of the *Mirror for Poets*.

authors whose works are now lost, including Sātavāhana and Vṛddhakavi.<sup>13</sup> Special mention might be made of one more lost work on Prakrit meter. *Pāḷittiyam*, identified as a work of Prakrit metrics, is mentioned in a Tamil work on meter of the late tenth century.<sup>14</sup> The name leaves little doubt that the work was either composed by, or inspired by, the poet Pāḷitta, who was one of the pioneers of Prakrit literature.<sup>15</sup>

In the field of lexicography, the surviving works are Dhanapāla's *Prakrit Lakṣmī* (*Pāiyalacchi*), composed in 972 CE, and Hēmacandra's *Garland of Regional Nouns* (*Dēśināmamālā*), composed around the middle of the twelfth century. Hēmacandra's work mentions and quotes a number of predecessors, some of whom, such as Abhimānacihna, evidently wrote in Prakrit.<sup>16</sup> No work dedicated to the grammatical analysis of the Prakrit language survives, but a number of Prakrit verses that discuss various aspects of its grammar can be found quoted in a diverse group of texts, including the *White* (*Dhavalā*) and *Victory-White* (*Jayadhavalā*) commentaries of Vīrasēna and Jinasēna, Haribhadra's commentary on the *Daśavaikālikasūtram* of the Śvētāmbara Jain canon, the *Treatise on Theater* (*Nāṭyaśāstram*) ascribed to Bharata, and the *Prakrit Grammar* (*Prākṛtalakṣaṇam*) of Caṇḍa. Hiralal Jain surmised that these quotations came from an independent work on Prakrit grammar.<sup>17</sup>

In all of these fields, we either have fragments of, or references to, Prakrit works that were composed prior to the eighth century. If we were to take seriously the attribution of some of these works to authors of the "first phase" of Prakrit literature, when it was patronized by kings of the Sātavāhana dynasty, then several of these works — those of Pāḷitta and Sātavāhana, and perhaps Harivṛddha and Nandivṛddha as well — must have been composed prior to the third century CE. Whatever their time of composition may have been, there was a historical tendency for Sanskrit to replace Prakrit as the language of systematic knowledge, even when Prakrit literature was the object of that knowledge. This tendency is most visible in Prakrit grammar, where Sanskrit is the metalanguage of all of the texts that survive. The degree to which they reflect or recapitulate earlier texts in Prakrit cannot be determined. In lexicography, the point is made clearly enough by the contrast between Dhanapāla, who wrote entirely in Prakrit verse, and Hēmacandra two centuries later, who provided his versified Prakrit lexicon with a Sanskrit commentary. In metrics, the fact that that certain verse forms were only ever used in certain languages generally required that such forms be exemplified, and sometimes defined, in those languages, and hence the meters characteristic of Prakrit literature would continue to be defined and exemplified in Prakrit. Even so, there is an almost-inexorable shift from Prakrit to Sanskrit. *Svayambū's Meters*, in Prakrit and Apabhramsha, was virtually translated into Sanskrit by a Jain monk named Rājaśekhara at the court of Bhōja in the eleventh century. And his Sanskrit text, the *Crown of Meters* (*Chandaḥśekharaḥ*), was in turn an important source for Hēmacandra's *Teaching on Meter* (*Chandōnuśāsanam*), likewise written in Sanskrit, in the following century.<sup>18</sup> A similar story could be told of the adaptation of the *Prakrit Piṅgala* into a Sanskrit text, the *Ornament of Speech* (*Vāṇībhuṣaṇam*), composed around the year 1400 by

<sup>13</sup> Bhayani 1993 [1975]: 163–164. I think that Vṛddhakavi probably refers to Nandivṛddha, otherwise known as Nanditādhya, who is known to have written a handbook of Prakrit meter. It is also possible, however, that it refers to Harivṛddha, as Bhayani suggests.

<sup>14</sup> Namely in the introduction to Kuṇḍacākarar's *Virutti* on Amitacākarar's *Yāpparuṅkalakkārikai*. See Niklas 1993.

<sup>15</sup> On Pāḷitta, see Ollett 2018.

<sup>16</sup> On Hēmacandra's predecessors see Bhayani 1997.

<sup>17</sup> See Jain 1945. A list of the fragments is found in Ollett 2017: 205–211.

<sup>18</sup> See p. xxii of Velankar's edition of *Svayambū's Meters*.

Dāmōdara at the court of Kīrtisīmha in Mithilā.<sup>19</sup> By contrast, it is very rare to see Sanskrit texts on grammar, metrics, lexicography or poetics adapted into Prakrit at any time.<sup>20</sup> The author of the Prakrit metrical handbooks did draw on Sanskrit metrical handbooks when discussing Sanskrit meters, and the author of the *Mirror for Poets* turned to Hēmacandra's Sanskrit handbook as a source for Prakrit meters as well. But generally the direction of adaptation is from Prakrit to Sanskrit.

## 2. The Mirror of Ornaments

The *Mirror of Ornaments* (*Alaṅkāradappāṇam*) survives in a single palm-leaf manuscript at the Jina-bhadra Sūri Tāḍapatriya Granth Bhaṅḍār at Jaisalmer. The manuscript, consisting of 13 leaves, is written in the so-called Jaina Nāgarī script with *pr̥ṣṭhamātrās*. It was first described in the catalogue prepared in 1923 by C.D. Dalal. It is bundled with copies of two other texts, one of which is a copy of Daṇḍin's *Mirror of Literature* (*Kāvyaḍarśaḥ*) dated to V.S. 1161 (1104 CE).<sup>21</sup> Dalal thus surmised that the copy of the Prakrit *Mirror* was completed before this date, but Muni Jambūvijaya, in his more recent catalogue, listed V.S. 1300 as the date the Prakrit *Mirror*'s copying.<sup>22</sup> Muni Puṇyavijaya had provided a copy of the Jaisalmer manuscript to Agaracandra Nāhaṭā, and in 1968, the latter published his edition of the Prakrit *Mirror*, together with a Sanskrit and Hindi translation provided by his nephew Bhaṁvaralāla Nāhaṭā.<sup>23</sup> In 1999, H. C. Bhayani published an edition and English translation of the *Mirror of Ornaments* that he had prepared on the basis of a photocopy of the Jaisalmer manuscript. I am currently preparing a new edition and translation — the necessity of which will be made clear below — on the basis of digital photographs that were kindly supplied by Muni Puṇḍarīkavijaya.

The *Mirror* defines and exemplifies 42 different ornaments.<sup>24</sup> It consists largely of verses, with short prose sentences introducing each of the examples. It has 134 verses, each of which are numbered. Although some of the verses are corrupt, most of them are clearly meant to have been in the *gāhā* (*gāthā*) meter, which is the verse form *par excellence* of Prakrit literature. The first verse praises the goddess of learning, and on this basis Dalal guessed that the author was a Jain:<sup>25</sup>

*sundarapaaviṇṇāsam vimalālaṅkārarēhīasarīram*  
*suidēviām ca kavvaṁ ca paṇamimō pavaravaṇṇaḍḍham*

With a beauty to her step,  
[Arranged in beautiful words,]  
faultless ornaments adorning her body,  
[faultless ornaments adorning its body,]  
and rich in the choicest color,

<sup>19</sup> Vyas 2007: 367.

<sup>20</sup> One exception appears to be the popular *Jewel-Garland of Questions and Answers* (*Praśnōttaramālā*), which was translated into Prakrit (*Paṇhuttarayaṇamālā*). See Gandhi 1949: 421–422.

<sup>21</sup> See Dalal 1923: 24. The manuscript bundle was numbered 211 in Dalal's catalogue. It has the number 326 in Jambūvijaya Muni's newer catalogue. Dalal identifies the third text as a copy of Indurāja's *Brief Commentary* on Udbhaṭa's work of literary ornaments (*Kāvyaḍarśaḥ*); Muni Jambūvijaya's catalogue, however, identifies it as a commentary on the third chapter of Daṇḍin's *Mirror*.

<sup>22</sup> Dalal 1923: 62; Jambūvijaya 2000: 36. The date of 1300 V.S. is also reported in Bhayani's edition.

<sup>23</sup> Nāhaṭā and Nāhaṭā 1968.

<sup>24</sup> Both Nāhaṭā and Bhayani give the number as 40, based on a misreading of verse 10. For the repertoire of the *Mirror* as compared to that of Bhāmaha's *Ornament*, see below.

<sup>25</sup> Dalal 1923: 62. The reading of the text (orthographically normalized) and the translation is my own; I have corrected the manuscript's *paṇaviām* to *paṇamimō*.

[and rich in the choicest syllables,]  
I do reverence to the Goddess of Learning  
and to poetry.

The examples of the individual ornaments contain references to other deities, but since these examples may have been taken from other texts, they do not necessarily tell us anything about the author's religious persuasion.<sup>26</sup> The author's name is not mentioned. Some of the examples refer to a king with the title *ṅarasēhara-* ("Crown of Men"). If it were known that a king ever took this title, we might be better able to locate the author of the *Mirror* in history.<sup>27</sup> Bhayani guessed that the ninth-century poet Svayambhū might have been the *Mirror*'s author, based simply on the fact that he was said to have written on the topic of poetics.<sup>28</sup>

### 3. Bhāmaha's *Ornament of Literature* and the Prakrit *Mirror*

H.C. Bhayani first noted the close relationship between the *Mirror* and a Sanskrit work of poetics, the *Ornament of Literature* (*Kāvyaālaṅkāraḥ*). There are two works with this name, one composed by Bhāmaha, likely in the sixth or early seventh century, and another composed by Rudraṭa in the ninth century.<sup>29</sup> In what I can only explain as a confusion, Bhayani says, several times, that the *Mirror* bears a close resemblance to Rudraṭa's *Ornament of Literature*, but the text that he goes on to cite in support of this claim is actually Bhāmaha's *Ornament*, not Rudraṭa's.<sup>30</sup> In fact there is nothing about the *Mirror* that would lead us to believe that Rudraṭa's *Ornament* was one of its sources. The *Mirror* is a short text that defines and exemplifies a set of 42 ornaments. Unlike Rudraṭa's *Ornament*, which defines many more, it does not attempt to classify them in terms of their underlying principles. In these respects, the *Mirror* closely resembles other works from the "early period" of South Asian poetics. Bhāmaha discusses around 40 ornaments in his *Ornament*'s second and third chapter. *Bhaṭṭi's Poem* (*Bhaṭṭikāvyaṃ*), composed within more or less the same time-frame as Bhāmaha's *Ornament* — that is, between the late sixth and early seventh century — exemplifies roughly the same number of ornaments in its tenth chapter.<sup>31</sup> And Daṇḍin's *Mirror of Literature* (*Kāvyaādarśaḥ*), composed around 700 CE, defines and exemplifies a similar number of ornaments between its second and third chapters. In terms of its repertoire, then, the *Mirror* clearly belongs with these early texts. And among these texts, the *Mirror* most closely resembles Bhāmaha's *Ornament*, as Bhayani surely meant to observe.

Before examining the connections between the two texts, we should note that the author of the *Mirror* made no claims whatsoever to originality, nor is any indication given of the text's sources. Bhāmaha, by contrast, often reflected on his own position within the tradition of poetics, at times acknowledging the work of previous scholars, at times offering criticism of their classifications, and at times foregrounding his own original contributions. At the end of his second chapter, he reports

<sup>26</sup> See the references to Viṣṇu in vv. 17 and 20 and Śiva in vv. 69 and 73.

<sup>27</sup> See vv. 93 and 105.

<sup>28</sup> See Bhayani's edition, p. 2.

<sup>29</sup> Bhāmaha's *terminus ad quem* is sometimes taken to be 638 CE, the date of Harisvāmin's commentary on the *Śatapatha-brāhmaṇaḥ*, as Mahēśvara, who quotes Bhāmaha in his own commentary on Yāska's *Niruktam*, was evidently a fellow-student of Harisvāmin. The argument is not totally convincing, but as Bronner (2012: 95) notes, a sixth- or seventh-century date for Bhāmaha would accord with other evidence. For the date of Rudraṭa see Kane 1961: 155.

<sup>30</sup> Bhayani's edition, p. 2. This is one particularly egregious example of the many mistakes in an otherwise extremely valuable publication.

<sup>31</sup> For the date of Bhaṭṭi, who says that he wrote the poem while Dharasēna was ruling in Valabhi, see Kane 1961: 74.

that he has provided his own examples.<sup>32</sup> The implication of this statement, in my reading, is that Bhāmaha did not formulate his own definitions.

Bhayani gave several examples of similarities between the *Mirror*'s definitions and those in Bhāmaha's *Ornament*. These similarities are systematic: for nearly every ornament that Bhāmaha defines, the *Mirror* defines it in almost exactly the same words. The examples are different. Some of the examples of a given ornament share a theme, and a smaller number are so similar that they could not possibly have been composed independently, but these are exceptions to the general pattern.<sup>33</sup> Regarding the definitions, by contrast, we only need to look at a few to see that it is impossible for them to have been composed independently. Below I give a series of definitions for particular ornaments from both the *Mirror* and the *Ornament*. The definitions are so close that a single translation is more or less sufficient for both texts. I have selected these ornaments simply because in these cases the text of the *Ornament* can be used to emend the text of the *Mirror*. The emendations admittedly bring the texts closer together, but their similarity is obvious even if the emendations are not accepted.

#### A. *Utpṛēkṣā* or "Seeing-as"

<i>Mirror of Ornaments</i> 113	<i>Ornament of Literature</i> 2.91
<i>thēvōvamāi sahiā asantakiriyāguṇāñujōēṇa</i> <i>avivakkhiasāmaṇṇā uppekkhā hōi sāisaā</i>	<i>avivakṣitasāmānyā kiṁcic cōpamayā saha</i> <i>atadguṇakriyāyōgād utpṛēkṣātīśayanvitā</i>

In *utpṛēkṣā*, "seeing-as," which has exaggeration, and accompanies a trace of comparison, the similarity between two things is not meant to be expressed. It comes about through the application of qualities and actions which do not really exist [Bhā.: which do not actually belong to the thing in question].<sup>34</sup>

#### B. *Atiśayaḥ* or "Exaggeration"

<i>Mirror of Ornaments</i> 54	<i>Ornament of Literature</i> 2.81
<i>jattha ṇimittāhintō lōāikkantagōaram vaṇam</i> <i>virājjai sō tassa a āisaanāmō alaṅkāro</i>	<i>nimittatō vacō yat tu lōkātikrāntagōcaram</i> <i>manyantē 'tiśayōktiṁ tām alaṅkāratayā yathā</i>

When a statement is composed that, in view of particular occasions, goes beyond the limits of the everyday world, that ornament is called *atiśayaḥ*, "exaggeration."<sup>35</sup>

<sup>32</sup> *Ornament* 2.96: "I have provided this ornament of language with examples that I have produced myself" (*svayamkṛtair ēva nidarśanair ayaṁ mayā prakṛptā khalu vāgalaṅkṛtiḥ*). At the end of the third chapter, Bhāmaha similarly claims (3.57) to have "himself critically reviewed the formulation of how speech is ornamented, extensive as it is, and enunciated it thoughtfully" (*girām alaṅkāravidhiḥ savistarāḥ svayaṁ viniścitya dhiyā mayōditaḥ*).

<sup>33</sup> Bhayani pointed out that their examples of *prēyaḥ* are the same (*Mirror* 91, *Ornament* 3.5), although this is perhaps a special case, since Daṇḍin uncharacteristically gives the exact same verse as an example (*Mirror* 2.274). Compare also the examples of *apahnutiḥ* or "denial" (*Mirror* 90, *Ornament* 3.22) and *yathāsamkhyāḥ* or "ordered enumeration" (*Mirror* 68, *Ornament* 2.90).

<sup>34</sup> In this verse, the manuscript has *kiraṇā* in the first line, read correctly by Nāhaṭā and emended to *kāraṇa* by Bhayani. I believe the correct emendation is *kiriyā*. In the second line, the manuscript has *avivikkhiasāmassē*, once again read correctly by Nāhaṭā, which he emended to *avivakkhiasāmatthē*. Bhayani followed his emendation (except reading *-sāmatthā* instead of *-sāmatthē*). The *Mirror* also suggests the reading *asad-* instead of *atad-* in the second line of the *Ornament*'s definition.

<sup>35</sup> The manuscript reads *lōāekkamāta-*, which Nāhaṭā and Bhayani both accepted. It should be emended to *lōāikkanta-*.

C. *Prativastūpamā* or “Counterpart comparison”

<i>Mirror of Ornaments</i> 14	<i>Ornament of Literature</i> 2.34
<i>paḍivatthū sā uvamā jā hōi samāṇavatthurūā a ivamivapivāirahiā vi sarisagunapaccaāhintō</i>	<i>samānavastunyāsēna prativastūpamōcyatē yathēvānabhidhānē 'pi guṇasāmyapratītiḥ</i>
<i>Prativastu</i> , “counterpart,” is that comparison which takes place in the form of something similar [Bhā.: by introducing something similar], despite the absence of words like <i>iva</i> , <i>miva</i> , and <i>piva</i> [Bhā.: even without expressing <i>yathā</i> or <i>iva</i> ] through the apprehension of similar qualities. <sup>36</sup>	

D. *Ākṣēpaḥ* or “Dismissal”

<i>Mirror of Ornaments</i> 58	<i>Ornament of Literature</i> 2.68
<i>jattha ṇisēho vva samīhiassa kiraī visēsatanhāē sō akkhēvō duvihō hontāvakkantabhēṇa</i>	<i>pratiṣēdha ivēṣṭasya yō visēṣābhidhītsayā ākṣēpa iti taṃ santaḥ śamsanti dvidham yathā</i>
That wherein what one wished [to say] appears to be contradicted, with a desire for [Bhā.: with a desire to express] some special feature, is called <i>ākṣēpaḥ</i> , “dismissal,” which is twofold by the distinction of present and past. <sup>37</sup>	

In the following pair of definitions, the reading of the *Mirror* speaks in favor of a variant in the text of Bhāmaha’s *Ornament*.

E. *Viśēṣaḥ* or “Distinction”

<i>Mirror of Ornaments</i> 56	<i>Ornament of Literature</i> 3.22
<i>vigaē vi ekkadēsē guṇantarēṇaṃ tu saṃthui jattha kiraī visēsapaḍaṇakajjēṇaṃ sō visēso tti</i>	<i>ēkadēsasya vigaṃē yā guṇāntarasamstutiḥ viśēṣapathanāyāsau viśēṣōktir matā yathā</i>
When, for the sake of making something’s distinction clear, it is praised on account of one of its qualities, even as another one is absent, that is called <i>viśēṣaḥ</i> , “distinction.” <sup>38</sup>	

These pairs of definitions show that one of the two texts was dependent on the other for the definitions. But they do not provide, in themselves, any evidence about the directionality of borrowing. There are, of course, differences in wording, but these can easily be explained by the different form of the two texts — the Sanskrit *anuṣṭubh* in the one case, and the Prakrit *gāhā* in the other. Arguments about the directionality of borrowing that are based exclusively on a subjective evaluation of style are not probative.<sup>39</sup> One other important difference must be noted. The definitions in Bhāmaha’s *Ornament* are very rarely shorter than a complete *ślōkaḥ*, whereas in the *Mirror*, many of

<sup>36</sup> Here Bhāmaha’s *Ornament* shows that we should read *vi* in the *Mirror*’s second line as the concessive particle, rather than as part of the following word, as Nāhaṭā and Bhayani took it (*visarisa-*).

<sup>37</sup> The manuscript reads *sasīhia*, followed by Nāhaṭā and Bhayani. I have corrected it to *samīhiassa*. A word of that metrical shape is necessary in any case.

<sup>38</sup> The word *saṃthui* should correspond to *saṃstutiḥ*, which is found in quotations of Bhāmaha in Abhinavagupta, Jayamaṅgala, and Pratihārēndurāja (see Trivedi’s ed. *ad loc.*). The manuscripts of the *Ornament* give the reading *saṃstithiḥ*. I have read *visēso tti* (= *visēṣa iti*) in the *Mirror*. The reading *visēsotti* (= *visēṣōktiḥ*) would be closer to Bhāmaha’s text.

<sup>39</sup> As Wright (2002) attempted to do (calling Daṇḍin’s formulations “pedestrian,” “fragmented,” and “vague” (p. 329), “pedestrian” again (p. 330), and “contrived” (p. 333) relative to those of the *Subōdhālaṅkāro*).

the definitions occupy only half of a *gāhā*. Even in such cases, however, it is often difficult to identify elements of Bhāmaha’s definition that are lacking in the *Mirror*’s. Here is one example:

F. *Aprastutaprasaṅgaḥ* (or *-prasaṁsā*) or “Introduction out of context”

<i>Mirror of Ornaments</i> 108ab <i>appatthuappasaṅgō</i> <i>ahiāravimukkavatthuṇō bhaṇaṇaṁ</i>	<i>Ornament of Literature</i> 3.29 <i>adhikārād apētasya vastunō ’nyasya yā stutiḥ</i> <i>aprastutaprasaṁsēti sā caiva kathyatē yathā</i>
<i>Aprastutaprasaṅgaḥ</i> “introduction out of context” is mentioning something outside of its proper context. [Bhā.: The introduction of another thing, outside of its proper context, is called <i>aprastutaprasaṁsā</i> .]	

The repertoire of ornaments is not exactly the same across the two texts. The *Mirror* defines 42 ornaments, and the *Ornament*, 38. The ornaments which appear in the former, but not the latter, are *bhāvaḥ* (different from Bhāmaha’s *bhāvikatvam*), three kinds of *uttaram*, *rōdhaḥ* (different from *virōdhaḥ*, which the *Mirror* defines separately), *ādarśaḥ*, *udbhēdaḥ*, *valitam*, and *anyaparikaraḥ*. One ornament which Bhāmaha mentions, but explicitly refuses to define and exemplify, is *hētuḥ*, the statement of an inferential reason (2.86). The *Mirror* defines and exemplifies an ornament called *anumānam* (108), which seems to be identical to *hētuḥ*. Similar is the case of *jātiḥ* or *svabhāvōktiḥ*, the description of things as they are, which is included in the *Mirror* (61). Bhāmaha does include it (2.96–97), but with the ambivalent comment that “some people” (*kēcit*) consider it to be an ornament. He had stated previously that an ornament generally requires indirect speech (2.86). It is certainly the case that Bhāmaha had rejected some ornaments found in earlier texts, and two of these ornaments, *anumānam* and *jātiḥ*, are given without apology in the *Mirror*. This might lead us to think that the *Mirror* was one of Bhāmaha’s sources. Two considerations, however, might cast doubt on this hypothesis. The first is that Bhāmaha does not so much as mention several other ornaments included in the *Mirror*, such as *rōdhaḥ*, whereas he might have been expected to do so if he really used the *Mirror* as a source. The second is that two other ornaments that Bhāmaha found in earlier works and rejected, namely *sūkṣmaḥ* and *lēśaḥ* (2.86), are not mentioned at all in the *Mirror*.

Related to Bhāmaha’s rejection of ornaments that are included in the *Mirror* is the different treatment of *upamā* or “comparison” in both texts. The *Mirror* defines and exemplifies seventeen subvarieties of comparison. Bhāmaha, by contrast, provides one subvariety — *prativastūpamā* or “counterpart comparison,” whose definition was given above — and then remarks that “it would be useless to include the whole long list of subvarieties, such as *mālōpamā* or ‘garland comparison,’ since their general properties have already been pointed out.”<sup>40</sup> “Garland comparison” is actually included in the *Mirror* (19). There must, however, have been other texts besides the *Mirror* that provided such a “list of subvarieties,” because Bhāmaha mentions a threefold classification of comparisons into those that praise, blame, or merely describe their subjects. Although the *Mirror* includes subvarieties of comparison that praise their subject in the guise of blaming it (31) or blame their subject in the guise of praising it (34), it does not present a classification like the one Bhāmaha mentions.

The ornaments included by Bhāmaha that are not found in the *Mirror* are fewer than the reverse. They are *upamēyōpamā*, *ananvayaḥ*, and *bhāvikatvam*. Of these, we should perhaps exclude *upamēyō-*

<sup>40</sup> *Ornament* 2.38: *sāmānyaguṇanirdēśāt trayam apy uditam nanu ~ mālōpamādīḥ sarvō ’pi na jyāyān vistarō mudhā ~.*

*pamā*, as it is essentially identical to a subvariety of comparison that the *Mirror* calls “mutual comparison” (*ekkekāvamā* or *anyōnyōpamā*, 28). These three ornaments are clustered at the very end of Bhāmaha’s treatment (3.37, 3.45, and 3.53). Their position suggests, given Bhāmaha’s roughly historical treatment — beginning with ornaments that are found in the earliest texts, such as the triad of *upamā* “comparison,” *rūpakam* “identification,” and *dīpakam* “illumination,” and proceeding to those that have been recognized more recently — that they were relatively recent additions to the repertoire. Before concluding, however, that Bhāmaha had added these ornaments from a source that postdates the *Mirror*, we must observe that several other ornaments found at the end of Bhāmaha’s treatment are also defined in the *Mirror*, such as *utprēkṣāvayavaḥ*, *saṁsṛṣṭiḥ*, and *āśiḥ*. In terms of the organizational logic of Bhāmaha’s *Ornament*, there are reasons to put *saṁsṛṣṭiḥ* “mixture” and *āśiḥ* “blessing” towards the end, regardless of where they might have been located in a strictly historical ordering of ornaments, mixture being a commingling of two of the previously-defined ornaments, and blessing being an appropriate way to conclude the discussion.

We can thus envisage two scenarios: either the author of the *Mirror* relied on Bhāmaha’s *Ornament*, or a text nearly identical with it, in fashioning his or her own definitions, or Bhāmaha relied on the *Mirror*, or a text nearly identical with it, in fashioning his. In the first case, the author of the *Mirror* must have found some other source for the definitions of a handful of ornaments that Bhāmaha either ignored or rejected, and omitted an even smaller handful of ornaments that Bhāmaha had included. In the second scenario, we must imagine Bhāmaha ignoring or rejecting several ornaments that were treated in the *Mirror*, and adding, towards the end, a small number that were not treated in the *Mirror*. There is nothing implausible about either scenario in itself, but the second seems more likely for two reasons. First, we already know that Bhāmaha did subject the ornaments collected by earlier authors to critical scrutiny. Bhāmaha proudly enunciates the principle of indirectness (*vakrōktiḥ*) for determining whether an ornament that has been proposed by earlier authors is actually an ornament.<sup>41</sup> By applying this principle, he explicitly rejects several ornaments, one of which, as noted before, is actually found in the *Mirror*. He may well have silently rejected several others, either because they also did not pass his “indirectness test,” or for other reasons. Second, we already know that Bhāmaha utilized a number of different sources in compiling his *Ornament*, perhaps including Rāmaśarman (2.19) and Mēdhāvin (2.88). By contrast, in the first scenario, we would have to assume that the author of the *Mirror* followed Bhāmaha’s definitions in the main, but went his or her own way at certain critical moments. Hence, in treating of the sub-varieties of comparison, this hypothesis would require us to believe that the author of the *Mirror* followed Bhāmaha in the definition of “counterpart comparison,” but either invented his own definitions, or found them elsewhere, for all of the other sub-varieties.

The author of the *Mirror* does refer, at one point, to earlier “creators of systematic knowledge” (*satthaāra-*, 80). Interestingly, however, this reference occurs in the definition of *anyāpadēśaḥ* or “symbolic reference,” which the author of the *Mirror* considers to be a subvariety of an ornament called *bhāvaḥ* or “inner feeling” (78). Bhāmaha does not refer to either *bhāvaḥ* or *anyāpadēśaḥ*. Their earliest appearance in the tradition of Sanskrit poetics is in Rudraṭa’s *Ornament*.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>41</sup> As noted by Bronner and Cox (forthcoming).

<sup>42</sup> See Rudraṭa’s *Ornament*, 7.38 and 7.84. Bhāmaha’s *bhāvikatvam* is different.

#### 4. Conclusion

From the time of the *Treatise on Theater* (*Nāṭyaśāstram*), which cannot be dated more precisely than the early centuries of the common era, up to around 600 CE, poetics grew into a relatively stable system of knowledge, organized around the analysis of discrete literary devices, and particularly of “ornaments,” or figures of sound and sense. The definition and exemplification of these ornaments would come to be the central concern of South Asian poetics, from which the entire discourse — *alaṅkāraśāstram*, “the systematic knowledge of literary ornaments” — drew its name. The earliest surviving representatives of this tradition, namely Bhāmaha’s *Ornament of Literature* and Daṇḍin’s *Mirror of Literature*, built upon a foundation laid by a number of earlier authors. Despite many differences in their treatment of individual ornaments, both authors present an inventory of around forty ornaments, which largely coincides, in turn, with the inventory of ornaments exemplified in *Bhaṭṭi’s Poem*. Did the tradition prior to Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin include any works composed in Prakrit? Prakrit literature, after all, occupied a central place in systematic thought about literature in South Asia, and Prakrit examples were cited in Sanskrit works on poetics from at least the time of Udbhaṭa in the eighth century.<sup>43</sup> Daṇḍin relates, in his *Story of Avantisundarī*, that his great-grandfather Dāmōdara “provided South India with analyses of works of both Sanskrit and Prakrit literature.”<sup>44</sup> J.C. Wright also suggested, albeit on the basis of a tendentious argument about the sources of Daṇḍin’s *Mirror of Literature*, that the authors of Pali works of poetics, such as *Ornaments Made Easy* (*Subōdhālaṅkāro*) had availed themselves of Prakrit sources.<sup>45</sup>

The discovery of the *Mirror of Ornaments* among the manuscripts at Jaisalmer in the early twentieth century, and the very close relationship between this text and Bhāmaha’s *Ornament of Literature* — noted first by H.C. Bhayani — raises an important question of priority. If the *Mirror* preceded the *Ornament*, then it would be the earliest surviving work specifically dedicated to poetics in South Asia. It would also show us how an earlier tradition was integrated and transformed into a tradition that we now know as “Sanskrit poetics.” If the reverse is true, then it would point to the creation of systematic knowledge in Prakrit on the basis of existing works in Sanskrit. There is a third possibility, namely, a third text, prior to both the *Mirror* and the *Ornament*, that both of them drew upon for their definitions.

Certainty is elusive in this matter, at least until a thorough comparison of the *Mirror* and Bhāmaha’s *Ornament* is completed. At present it seems more likely to me that the *Mirror of Ornaments* was earlier than, and served as one of the principal sources for, Bhāmaha’s *Ornament of Literature*. First, this scenario would accord better with what we know about the history of systematic knowledge in Prakrit. For it seems that, in general, very few works of systematic knowledge were translated from Sanskrit into Prakrit, whereas we have numerous examples of works originally composed in Prakrit being utilized as sources, either directly or indirectly, for Sanskrit works. Second, the asymmetries between the text create the impression that Bhāmaha self-consciously rejected several ornaments, or subvarieties of ornaments, that were found in the *Mirror*. The path from the *Mirror* to the *Ornament* is more straightforward than the reverse, which would involve restoring ornaments that Bhāmaha had rejected.

<sup>43</sup> One Prakrit verse (*taṁ ṇatthi kiṁ pi paññō*) is found in the fragments of Udbhaṭa’s commentary on Bhāmaha’s *Ornament* (see Gnoli 1962: 40). For Prakrit verses in Sanskrit works on poetics, the standard reference work is Kulkarni 1988.

<sup>44</sup> *Story of Avantisundarī*, p. 11 (*sarīskṛtaprākṛtānām ca kāvyānām lakṣaṇair dakṣiṇāpatham sanātham akarōt*).

<sup>45</sup> Wright 2002: 341.

One type of argument that could be decisive for this question has to do with the translation from one language into another. I have not yet found any examples in which the text of the *Ornament* can only be explained by a misunderstanding of the text of the *Mirror*, or *vice versa*. If Bhāmaha did indeed use the *Mirror* as a source, he was a competent reader of Prakrit. In that connection, we might mention another text that is ascribed to someone named “Bhāmaha.” The earliest surviving grammar of Prakrit — mentioned by Abhinavagupta, and hence earlier than 1000 CE — is the *Light on Prakrit* attributed to Vararuci.<sup>46</sup> “Bhāmaha” is the author of a commentary called *Charming* (*Manōramā*) on this grammar, but it has long been unclear whether he is identical with the author of the *Ornament of Literature*. The *Charming* commentary is extremely practical, even pedestrian, whereas the *Ornament* reveals an authorial persona that is erudite, cantankerous, and sarcastic. If, however, Bhāmaha the literary theorist and Bhāmaha the Prakrit grammarian are one and the same, it would become all the more likely that Bhāmaha the literary theorist would have utilized Prakrit sources. Evidence that the author of the commentary on the *Light* was familiar with the Prakrit *Mirror*, were it to be found, would speak strongly in favor of the *Mirror*’s priority to the *Ornament*.

### References

#### PRIMARY SOURCES

- Compendium of Syllable- and Mora-Counting Meters* (*Vṛttajāṭisamuccayaḥ*) of Virahāṅka: H. D. Velankar (ed.). 1962. *Vṛttajāṭisamuccaya of Kavi Virahāṅka*. Jodhpur: Rajasthan Prachya Vidya Pratisthana.
- Illumination of Prakrit* (*Prākṛtaprakāśaḥ*) of Vararuci: E. B. Cowell (ed.). *Prākṛita-Prakāśa: or, The Prākṛit Grammar of Vararuchi, with the commentary (Manoramā) of Bhāmaha*. Hertford: Stephen Austin.
- Long History* (*Mahāpurāṇam*) of Jinasēna: Pannālāla Jaina (ed.). 1951. *Śrīmadbhagavajjināsēnācāryapraṇītam Mahāpurāṇam: Prathamō vibhāga: Ādipurāṇam*. 2 vols. Varanasi: Bhāratīya Vidyāpīṭha.
- Mirror for Poets* (*Kavidappaṇam*): H. D. Velankar (ed.). 1962. *Kavidarpaṇa of an Unknown Author*. Jodhpur: Rajasthan Prachya Vidya Pratisthana.
- Mirror of Literature* (*Kāvyaḍarśaḥ*) of Daṇḍin: Anantalal Thakur and Upendra Jha (eds.). 1957. *Kavyalakṣaṇa [sic] of Daṇḍin (Also Known as Kāvyaḍarśa), with Commentary Called Ratnaśrī of Ratnaśrījñāna*. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning.
- Mirror of Ornaments* (*Alaṅkāradappaṇam*): [1] Palm-leaf ms. no. 326.2 at Jinabhadrasūri Tāḍapatrīya Granth Bhaṇḍār, Jaisalmer. [2] See Nāhaṭā and Nāhaṭā (1968). [3] H. C. Bhayani (ed.). 1999. *Alaṅkāradappaṇa*. Ahmedabad: L. D. Institute of Indology.
- Ornament of Literature* (*Kāvyaḷaṅkāraḥ*) of Bhāmaha: Kamalāśaṅkara Prāṇaśaṅkara Trivedī (ed.). 1909. Appendix VIII in *The Pratāparudrayaśobhūshaṇa of Vidyānātha*. Bombay: Government Central Press.
- Ornament of Literature* (*Kāvyaḷaṅkāraḥ*) of Rudraṭa: Pandita Durgāprasāda and Kāśīnātha Pānduranga Paraba (eds.). 1886. *The Kāvyaḷaṅkāra (a treatise on rhetoric) of Rudrata. With the commentary of Namisādhū*. Bombay: The Nirṇaya-sāgara Press.
- Story of Avantisundarī* (*Avantisundarīkathā*) of Daṇḍin: Sūranād Kunjan Pillai (ed.). 1954. *Avantisundarī of Ācārya Daṇḍin*. Trivandrum: Bhāskara Press.

#### SECONDARY LITERATURE

- Bhayani, H.C. 1973. “Some Further Light on Harivṛddha, and His Novel Classification of Literary Prakrit and Apabhraṁśa.” *Vidyā (Humanities Section)* 16 (1): 1–6.
- 1993 [1975]. “The Prakrit Poets Harivṛddha, Sātavāhana, and Āḍhyarāja.” In *Indological Studies: Literary and Performing Arts, Prakrit and Apabhraṁśa Studies*, 162–177. Ahmedabad: Parshva Prakashan. [Originally published in *Sanskrit and Indological Studies: Dr. V. Raghavan Felicitation Volume*, ed. R.N. Dandekar, R.K. Sharma, Mandan Mishra, Satyavrat, and S. S. Janaki, 61–76. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.]
- 1997. “Deśya Lexicography Prior to Hemacandra.” *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bombay* 72: 36–41.
- Bronner, Yigal. 2012. “A Question of Priority: Revisiting the Bhāmaha–Daṇḍin Debate.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy. Journal of Indian Philosophy* 40 (1): 67–118. DOI 10.1007/s10781-011-9128-x.

<sup>46</sup> In my view (Ollett 2018: 159) “Vararuci” is a Brahminizing reascription of the grammar, which likely originated in a Jain milieu.

- Bronner, Yigal and Whitney Cox. Forthcoming. "Sanskrit Poetics Through Dandin's Looking Glass: An Alternative History." In *Dandin's Mirror of Poetry and the Making of Asian Literature*, ed. Yigal Bronner.
- Chintamani, B.M. 1971. "Notices of Thirteen MSS in Prakṛt with Special Reference to Their Scientific and Technological Contents." *Indian Journal of History of Science* 6 (2): 168–172.
- Dalal, C.D. 1923. *A Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Jain Bhandars at Jesalmere*. Baroda: Central Library.
- Dundas, Paul. 1996. "Jain Attitudes Towards the Sanskrit Language." In *Ideology and Status of Sanskrit: Contributions to the History of the Sanskrit Language*, ed. Jan E.M. Houben, 137–156. Leiden: Brill.
- Gāndhī, Lālacandra Bhagavān. 1949. "Prašnōttaramālā kā kartā?" In *Varṇī-Abhinandana-Grantha*, ed. Kṣuśālacandra Gōrāvālā, 419–422. Sāgara: Śrī Varṇī Hīraka Jayanta Mahōtsava Samiti.
- Gnoli, Raniero. 1962. *Udbhaṭa's Commentary on the Kāvyaḷaṃkāra of Bhāmaha*. Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
- Jain, Hiralal. 1945. "Traces of an Old Metrical Prakrit Grammar." In *Bhārata-Kaumudī: Studies in Indology in Honour of Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji*, 1: 315–322. Allahabad: Indian Press.
- Jambūvijaya. 2000. *A Catalogue of Manuscripts in Jaisalmer Jain Bhandars*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Kane, P.V. 1961. *History of Sanskrit Poetics*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition.
- Kulkarni, V.M. 1988. *Prakrit Verses in Sanskrit Works on Poetics*. Delhi: B.L. Institute of Indology. 2 vols.
- Nāhaṭā, Agaracandra and Bhaṃvaralāl Nāhaṭā. 1968. "Prākṛtabhāṣā kā ēka mātra Alāṃkāra-Śāstra: Alāṃkāra-dappaṇa." In *Marudhara Kēsari Muniśrī Miśrimalajī Mahārāja abhinandana grantha*, 430–458. Jodhpur: Marudharakēsari-Abhinandanagrantha-Prakāśana-Samiti.
- Niklas, Ulrike. 1993. *Amitacākarar iyārriya yāpparuṅkalakkārikai, Kuṇacākarar iyārriya uraiyuṭaṅ* (*The verses on the precious jewel prosody*). Pondichéry: Institut Français de Pondichéry.
- Ollett, Andrew. 2017. *Language of the Snakes: Prakrit, Sanskrit, and the Language Order of Premodern India*. Oakland: University of California Press.
- . 2018. "The Taraṅgavatī and the History of Prakrit Literature." In *Jaina Studies: Select Papers Presented in the 'Jaina Studies' Section at the 16<sup>th</sup> World Sanskrit Conference, Bangkok, Thailand, and the 14<sup>th</sup> World Sanskrit Conference, Kyoto, Japan*, eds. Nalini Balbir and Peter Flügel, 129–164. Delhi: DK Publishers.
- Pollock, Sheldon. 2011. "The Languages of Science in Early Modern India." In *Forms of Knowledge in Early Modern Asia: Explorations in the Intellectual History of India and Tibet, 1500–1800*, ed. Sheldon Pollock, 19–48. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Upadhye, A.N. 1977. "A Note on the Haremekhalā." In *Some Aspects of Indo-Iranian Literary and Cultural Traditions (Commemoration Volume of Dr. V.G. Paranjpe)*, ed. Suniti Kumar Chatterji, R.N. Dandekar, V. Raghavan, H.P. Schmidt, T.G. Mainkar, and S.N. Gajendragadkar, 158–159. Delhi: Ajanta Publications.
- Vyas, Bhola Shanker. 2007. *Prākṛita-Paiṅgalan: A Text on Prākṛita and Apabhraṃśa Metres, Part 2*. Ahmedabad: Prakrit Text Society.
- Wright, J. Clifford. 2002. "The Pali Subodhāḷaṅkāra and Daṇḍin's Kāvyaḷaṅkāra." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 65 (2): 323–341.