

Yigal Bronner

## Back to the Future Appayya Dīkṣita's Kuvalayānanda and the Rewriting of Sanskrit Poetics\*

### I. INTRODUCTION

The “Joy of the Water Lily” (Kuvalayānanda), a manual on Sanskrit poetic ornaments written by the sixteenth-century polymath Appayya Dīkṣita, is a veritable preprint bestseller. Copied and circulated far and wide, this work has, perhaps, more manuscripts than any other work of its discipline.<sup>1</sup> It has attracted many commentators and even special treatises dedicated to either attacking or defending it.<sup>2</sup> The work's prevalence suggests its unquestioned status as *the* standard textbook on

---

\* This paper comes out of my work as a participant in the “Sanskrit Knowledge Systems on the Eve of Colonialism” (SKSEC) research group, headed by Sheldon Pollock. I am indebted to all group members for their continued stimulation and support. I am specifically grateful to Gary Tubb, with whom I have been collaborating more closely on the poetic discipline, and whose comments and insights have been invaluable. Special thanks also go to Catherine Rottenberg, Neve Gordon and Galila Spharim who made comments on earlier versions of this paper.

<sup>1</sup> Here is a small sample of the work's manuscripts in four major libraries. In the South, the Kuvalayānanda seems to be the most popular *Alaṃkāraśāstra* work. In Madras, for instance, the work accounts for nearly 13% of the *Alaṃkāraśāstra* titles found in the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, and 17% of the parallel section in the Adyar Library. In both cases it outnumbers Mammaṭa's popular *Kāvya prakāśa*. In the North the Kuvalayānanda seems slightly less dominant, yet still extremely popular. It takes up about 7% of the titles in the *alaṃkāra* portion of Poona's Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute collection, where the number of copies of Mammaṭa's *Kāvya prakāśa* is slightly higher. A similar picture emerges from Varanasi's Sarasvati Bhavan collection (though here percentages cannot be calculated since works in *kāvya* and *alaṃkāra* are listed together).

<sup>2</sup> An example is “The Attack on the Kuvalayānanda” (Kuvalayānandakhaṇḍana) by Bhīmasena Dīkṣita (not a relative of Appayya), a work probably styled after Jagannātha's famous *Citramīmāṃsākhaṇḍana* (a critique of Appayya's other book, the *Citramīmāṃsā*). Bhīmasena lived in Jodhpur in the late seventeenth or early eighteenth century. Some of the commentaries on the “Joy” were also quite critical of their root text. On the other hand, commentaries of Southerners (such as Gaṅgādharaḍhvarin) tend to be much more sympathetic to the author and defend him from his critics.

poetics. Generations of teachers in the last five centuries have used the “Joy” as their primer of choice, and to this day it is the first *alaṃkāra* text read in many South Asian institutions. Moreover, the “Joy,” along with another treatise by Appayya, the “Investigation of the Colorful” (Cītramīmāṃsā), inaugurated a new school of poetics – *navyālaṃkāra*, and dominated much of the later scholarship in the field. Many of the writers following Appayya criticized what they viewed as bold liberties he took in his treatises. It is quite astonishing, then, that the “Joy” is largely ignored by Indologists and its outstanding popularity remains totally uncharted. Indeed, the work is dismissed as redundant, a mere compilation of what was already there in the field.

More specifically, there exists a unanimous consensus among scholars that the bulk of the “Joy” is virtually identical with an earlier, and, till Appayya’s times, relatively unknown work, i.e., Jayadeva’s “Moonlight” (Candrāloka). This view seems to stand in stark opposition to the status enjoyed by the “Joy” within the tradition. It is, of course, not totally impossible that a derivative scholarly contribution would gain a preeminent position. Yet it seems highly unlikely that a non-original work would come under so much fire, as did the “Joy” in the generations following its composition. Moreover, assuming that the “Joy” is a mere rehash of the “Moonlight,” how is it that critics vehemently attack the former but spare the latter, which is supposed to be its original? Is it possible that there is, after all, something unique and genuine about Appayya’s treatise?

The amazing success of Appayya’s textbook needs to be explained, and in order to do so we must first explore its relations with the work it allegedly repeats. It should be stated at the very outset that while the texts certainly have something in common, they differ radically from one another. Still, the nature of their differences, and the reasons underlying them, are far from simple. Given the total misunderstanding of their complex textual relations, a detailed comparative analysis will form a major component of our discussion.

Yet even if the discussion will be primarily dedicated to patterns of agreement and, more so, divergence between the two texts, these will be interpreted within a larger framework. Appayya Dīkṣita lived at the threshold of a new era of Sanskrit scientific discourse, as attested by its participants. Appayya himself was a pivotal figure in several new or *navya* scholarly debates, in more than one discipline. This makes his work particularly important for those who wish to understand the nov-

elty of late precolonial intellectual production. As has been already noted, the innovativeness of *navya* scholarship is not easily detectable.<sup>3</sup> This is partly because the new intellectuals were preoccupied with the ancients, and their innovations were intimately connected with a move back to the past of their respective disciplines.<sup>4</sup> Appayya's "Joy" – a work which somehow retrieves and at the same time remakes Jayadeva's older "Moonlight" – appears to be a promising case-study of the nuanced connections between old and new in the Sanskritic scholarship on the eve of colonialism. Establishing and examining in detail the true ties between the two works is ultimately meant to highlight some uniquely novel features of intellectual production of the period.

## II. THE "MOONLIGHT" AND THE "JOY," CONFUSION AND RELATIONSHIP

Jayadeva, the author of the "Moonlight" and of the well known play Prasannarāghava, most probably lived in the thirteenth century.<sup>5</sup> The "Moonlight" is written in verse and contains some 350 stanzas. It is divided into ten chapters, or moonlight "rays" (*mayūkhas*), covering the entire range of *alaṃkāraśāstra* topics: the definition of *kāvya* and its place in the linguistic universe, the traditional triad of poetic qualities (*guṇas*), faults (*doṣas*), and sound- as well as sense-based speech-figures (*alaṃkāras*), aestheticized emotion (*rasa*), and the three linguistic capacities of denotation (*abhidhā*), metaphorical expression (*lakṣaṇā*), and suggestion (*dhvani*). The verses follow a unified pattern – all the stanzas are in the *anuṣṭubh* meter and contain definitions and examples. The latter are composed by Jayadeva himself, rather than quoted from actual poems. Jayadeva aims at being both comprehensive and concise – at presenting his readers with a sophisticated yet digestible synthesis of a field which in the preceding centuries has undergone dramatic changes.<sup>6</sup> As Jayadeva himself attests, the intended readership of this synthesis is the community of the learned and the literati.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Pollock 2001: 11.

<sup>4</sup> Bronner 2002: 441.

<sup>5</sup> For the date and identity of Jayadeva see De 1960: I/197-199.

<sup>6</sup> The work seems to presuppose a knowledge of Mammaṭa and of the different views of his commentators, as is indicated, for instance, by verse 1.8. I am grateful to David Mellins, who recently completed a Ph.D. dissertation dedicated to the "Moonlight," for bringing the significance of this verse to my attention.

<sup>7</sup> Jayadeva leaves no doubt as to his intended audience. In his opening verses (CĀ 1.1-3), in a signature stanza ending every "ray"-chapter (e.g. 1.16), and in the

The scope of Appayya Dīkṣita's "Joy of the Water Lily" is much more limited. Of the many topics that traditionally pertain to poetry, the "Joy" is dedicated solely to ornaments or sense-based speech-figures (*arthālaṃkāras*). Thus, unlike the "Moonlight," the work is not divided into chapters, and is thematically unified around its sole concern. Nonetheless, the book could be seen as made of three textual layers. The first consists of *anuṣṭubh* verses containing definitions and self-composed examples of ornaments, in the same pattern seen in Jayadeva's "Moonlight." Such verses of easily memorized definitions and examples are called *kārikās*. The "Joy" contains some 170 *kārikās*, which together define and illustrate exactly one hundred ornaments.

Following a *kārikā* presenting an ornament, Appayya adds at least one example from actual poetic practice, and often there are several such illustrations for different subtypes of the ornament. These illustrations form the second layer of the "Joy." A third layer consists of further discussion in prose. Such discussions often introduce basic analytical concepts of the *alaṃkāra* discipline, refer to views which differ from that of the author, and even engage in polemics. In this layer, other works on poetics are quoted and additional examples from the practice are cited. The discussions are learned and complex, albeit shorter and simpler than those found in Appayya's unfinished magnum opus, the "Investigation." The "Joy" also has an appendix-like section in which additional figures are listed, exemplified, and discussed, but not defined in *kārikās*.

That the "Joy" was intended as an introductory manual is made clear by the author's statement found at the very outset of the work: "In order to facilitate the engagement of beginners in poetic ornaments," says Appayya, "[I] compose an elegant summary of their definitions and illustrations."<sup>8</sup> Likewise, the differences between Appayya's "Joy" and his other major book on poetics, the "Investigation," strongly suggest a division of labor between the two works, in which the latter was meant to be a heavy-duty essay and the former a textbook.

From this brief description of Jayadeva's "Moonlight" and Appayya's "Joy," it should be clear that the two envision a different readership

---

work's concluding remarks (10.5), he repeatedly addresses the scholarly community, while constantly using vocabulary that may equally apply to the learned as well as to the gods (*buddhāḥ*, *sumanasah*, *vibudhāḥ*).

<sup>8</sup> KuĀ 4: *alaṃkāreṣu bālānām avagāhanasiddhaye | lalitaḥ kriyate teṣāṃ lakṣya-lakṣaṇasaṃgrahaḥ ||*.

and differ significantly in scope and style. Moreover, any possible convergence between the two must be limited to the fifth “ray” of the “Moonlight” and the first textual layer of the “Joy.” Both the fifth “ray” of the “Moonlight” and the first layer of the “Joy” are written in a *kārikā*-like style, both consist of made-up definitions and illustrations, and both are solely dedicated to sense-based ornaments.<sup>9</sup>

To be sure, the corresponding portions of the two works are related. Appayya himself claims at the beginning of his primer that “verses combining definitions and illustrations of ornaments which appear in the ‘Moonlight’ are, by and large, the very ones [employed] for them [here in the ‘Joy’], and for the remaining ones, new [such verses] are being composed.”<sup>10</sup> In other words, it would seem that the *kārikās* of Appayya’s work are, for the most part, really composed by Jayadeva, and that the second and third layers of the “Joy,” which expound on and expand these *kārikās*, are offered as a running commentary. Further support to this notion is supplied by the non-coincidental resonance between the works’ titles. The “Joy of the Water Lily” echoes the title “Moonlight,” based on the literary convention that the luster of the moon is relished by the water lily.<sup>11</sup> Such resonant naming is very common in the Sanskrit commentarial tradition.<sup>12</sup> All this strongly suggests that Appayya’s “Joy of the Water Lily” is nothing but a regular commentary on *kārikās* which are not his, but are borrowed from the fifth chapter of Jayadeva’s “Moonlight.”

As we shall see, however, the relationship between the two works is far more complex. In fact, Appayya’s statement cited above itself hints at this complexity. After all, commentators are supposed to *comment* on their root text, but not to *modify* it. And yet Appayya states outright that he adds new definitions to ornaments not found in the “Moon-

---

<sup>9</sup> Actually, the first and minor portion of the fifth “ray” is dedicated to sound-based figures, a topic not dealt with in the “Joy.” It is only the second and more weighty portion that is dedicated to sense-based tropes.

<sup>10</sup> KuĀ 5: *yeṣāṃ candrāloke dr̥śyante lakṣyalakṣaṇaślokāḥ | prāyas ta eva teṣāṃ itareṣāṃ tv abhinavā viracyante ||*.

<sup>11</sup> The conscious choice of title is made explicit by Appayya himself at the end of the work, KuĀ 172.

<sup>12</sup> Abhinavagupta’s commentary on Ānandavardhana’s “Light on Suggestion” (Dhvanyāloka), to take an example from the discourse on poetics itself, is playfully titled the “Eye” (Locana), for an eye is capable of making good use of that light thrown on suggestion.

light,” and that even the *kārikās* for ornaments dealt with in the “Moonlight” resemble the original only “by and large” (*prāyas*). Even so, scholars referring to Appayya’s “Joy” either overlooked his self-attested modification of his root text, or took it to mean that the *kārikās* of both works are essentially identical. There is thus a consensus that the “Joy” is a straightforward commentary on the “Moonlight.”<sup>13</sup>

This mistaken conclusion may partly stem from a similar confusion manifest in the manuscript tradition of both works. Some copyists of the “Moonlight,” when coming to the portion which deals with ornaments (*arthālamkāras*), inserted the text of Appayya’s “Joy” instead of the corresponding section of the “Moonlight,” only to return to Jayadeva’s original in the next (sixth) chapter. Presumably these scribes, when facing the vast disagreements between the two sets of *kārikās*, soon to be described, preferred what they regarded as the more authentic or more popular version of Appayya. Even more confusing is the fact that manuscripts titled the “Moonlight” in fact embody nothing but the *kārikās* of Appayya’s “Joy.” One must assume that some editors and copyists were simply not familiar with the independent textual tradition of Jayadeva’s earlier work and, presuming Appayya’s work to be an exegesis on the *kārikās* earlier composed by Jayadeva – a position which seems to be supported by Appayya’s own statement – saw no problem in extracting them from Appayya’s “commentary” and editing them separately as Jayadeva’s original.<sup>14</sup> These errors also carried over to printed editions. Thus a very popular booklet titled the “Moonlight” – printed in Madras by V. Ramaswamy Sastrulu & Sons in 1973 as a standard textbook for Sanskrit students – consists solely of the *kārikās* of the “Joy,” and there are many similar examples.

Given the confusion regarding the affinities between the “Moonlight” and the “Joy,” the first step of our study must be a careful, statistically-backed comparison of their corresponding textual portions. Only

---

<sup>13</sup> The vast majority of scholars simply refer to the “Joy” as a commentary on the “Moonlight,” overlooking even the possibility of slight modification (e.g., Krishnamachariar 1937: 227-228, Gerow 1977: 286). Others acknowledge Appayya’s own testimony, but claim nonetheless that the “Joy” is a “wholesale appropriation” of Jayadeva’s fifth chapter; a work which “bodily incorporates the *kārikās* of this section (with only slight modification), [Appayya] himself only writing a running commentary and adding a few supplementary figures” (De 1960: I/ 201, 200). For a very similar assessment see Kane 1971: 292, 317.

<sup>14</sup> For both types of confusion see De 1960: I/201.

a detailed comparative analysis of both sets of *kārikās* will allow us to begin to realize the exact nature of Appayya's project in composing the "Joy." Taking the metrical quarter (*pāda*) as the basic meaning-carrying unit of a *kārikā*, I classified Appayya's first textual layer (the *kārikās*) into three categories: 1. *pādas* which are exactly identical to those found in the fifth chapter of Jayadeva's "Moonlight." 2. *pādas* which are similar, yet not quite identical to those found in Jayadeva. 3. *pādas* which are absolutely new. As can be seen in Table 1, only 27% of Appayya's text fall in the first category, namely *pādas* incorporated from Jayadeva's work verbatim. An additional 13% of the *pādas* belong to the second category of similar yet modified text. 60% of the *pādas* in the *kārikā* portion of Appayya's "Joy" are absolutely new.<sup>15</sup>

Table 1: A *pāda* comparison of Appayya's *kārikās* to the corresponding set of Jayadeva

Type of Pādas:	Identical	Modified	New	Total
Amount	177	84	397	658
Percentage	27%	13%	60%	100%

Obviously, these numbers provide us with only a rudimental understanding of the relationship between the works. The second category of modified *pādas* is particularly problematic in this regard. At times it accounts for extremely minute textual divergence, which could very well result from differences in transmission or even scribal error. At other times the variances seem to be the result of purposeful alteration, and yet at other times it is hard to decide whether one is dealing with a modified or altogether new *pāda*. Thus we need a closer analysis of the rather insensitive category of "modified" text.

Even regarding the identical portions of both works, the numbers supply only partial information and can even be misleading. Borrowed textual portions may be used by Appayya in different contexts or for different purposes than in Jayadeva's original. For instance, it is very common for Appayya to retain Jayadeva's example within the context of a modified definition (*lakṣaṇa*), or, *vice versa*, to keep the definition while altering the illustration (*lakṣya*). Occasionally he even uses an illustration given by Jayadeva for one ornament as an instance of an-

<sup>15</sup> The figures are rounded. The actual percentages are: 26.89 % (177 *pādas*), 12.76% (84 *pādas*), 60.3% (397 *pādas*) respectively.

other.<sup>16</sup> In such cases it is clear that the works disagree in some crucial sense, and that Appayya is resorting to playful repetition. But since he quotes the original verse verbatim, it is counted in the first category, where textual portions are identical.

Yet whatever the shortcomings of simply classifying textual units into categories of new, identical, and modified, and then adding them up, the picture presented by the numbers is clear in one respect – the “Joy” and the “Moonlight” are *not* the same. The vast majority of Appayya’s *kārikās* are partly or totally new; only about a quarter of them form direct quotes from Jayadeva’s fifth chapter. Thus the former can by no means be seen as a straightforward commentary on the latter. Indeed, Appayya’s textual practices follow no known precedent in the Sanskrit discursive world. No commentary has ever rewritten its root text – certainly not to the extent of producing a virtually new work, nor did any original treatise subsume a large set of old *kārikās* and combined it with many new ones and a commentary on both. There is something totally new not only in Appayya’s actual words, but also in his textual practices.

### III. APPAYYA’S INNOVATIVE AGENDAS

A closer comparison of the “Joy” and the “Moonlight” reveals that Appayya’s alterations and innovations pertain to every possible aspect of Jayadeva’s work: he changes the order and grouping of *alaṃkāras*, makes small adjustments in already existing definitions or examples, replaces either or both with totally new sets of *lakṣaṇas* and *lakṣyas*, inserts and defines new subcategories and abolishes old ones, and finally eliminates old ornaments and throws in new ones. Contrary to the expectations of scholars, the introduction of new *alaṃkāras* accounts for a relatively minor portion of Appayya’s innovative agenda – only 20% of the new *pādas* deal with *alaṃkāras* not recognized by the “Moonlight.” In other words, the vast majority of Appayya’s textual innovations are within the very verses he himself claims to be, “by and large,” identical with those of his predecessor.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Take, for instance, Appayya’s discussion of *nidarśanā*. One of its subtypes, according to Appayya, is called *padārthavṛtti*, and the example cited is identical to Jayadeva’s illustration of what he calls *lalitopamā*.

<sup>17</sup> Appayya introduces 19 new *alaṃkāras* in 20 *kārikās*. Thus only 80 of the 397 new *pādas* (20.1%) are used to define and exemplify new *alaṃkāras*.

The sheer extent and range of Appayya's innovations preclude an exhaustive analysis within the limited scope of this paper. In what follows, I shall concentrate on identifying, exploring, and briefly exemplifying four major innovative agendas which inform Appayya's massive rewriting of Jayadeva's work. It is important to stress that our discussion will be mostly limited to the *kārikā* layer of Appayya's work. This means that some of the original aspects of the two other layers of the "Joy"—its verse-citation and scholarly prose—will, for the most part, be ignored.

### III.1. NEW PEDAGOGY, NEW TEXT

One of the distinctive characteristics of *navya* movements is a new concern for pedagogy. Manuals written for pupils appear across disciplinary systems from the sixteenth century onwards. These works reformulate and rearrange traditional materials and present them in a manner designed to ease and facilitate the process of learning.<sup>18</sup> Appayya's "Joy" is one of the earlier instances of this trend. It is likely to be the first treatise in the history of the *alaṃkāra* tradition which is written primarily and self-avowedly as a students' textbook.

This is not to say that earlier *ālaṃkārikas* were not interested in pedagogy. Already in the earliest extant works of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin (seventh to eighth centuries) traditional topics—*alaṃkāras*, *guṇas*, and *doṣas*—are presented in a way that would facilitate memorization and understanding. Then, following the centuries of heated scholarly debates surrounding suggestion (*dhvani*) and its place in poetic theory, we find works which attempt to synthesize the various theoretical agendas in a unified, coherent, and reader-friendly manner, and Jayadeva's "Moonlight" may well have been a harbinger of this trend. Nonetheless, Appayya's own reworking of Jayadeva reveals an unprecedented attention to clarity, both stylistic and conceptual, and an uncompromising commitment to systematic exposition and logical systematicity, both of which seem to typify a *navya* kind of pedagogy. Let us briefly exemplify how these concerns motivate Appayya in transforming the work of Jayadeva.

---

<sup>18</sup> The best known example is, of course, the reorganization of the grammatical curriculum by Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita in his *Siddhāntakaumudī*.

As a starting point, let us observe Appayya's separation between definition and example. Jayadeva's *kārikās* usually give each an equal and separate space of half a stanza. Yet occasionally there is no such neat distinction. In discussing the central figures of simile (*upamā*) and metaphoric identification (*rūpaka*) – the two quintessential figures of the discipline – definitions are devised so as to form an instance of the very phenomenon they characterize. The result is two of the most appealing *kārikās* in the “Moonlight.” Yet, however poetic, these *kārikās* are potentially less than transparent for the beginner and require extra explanation. In the “Joy,” Appayya replaces these *kārikās* with ones which exhibit a clear-cut separation between exposition and illustration.<sup>19</sup>

More significantly, Appayya routinely alters Jayadeva's language, in what appears to be an attempt to make it more lucid and straightforward. Take for instance the figure of *viśama*, wherein a union of two entities is singled out for its inherent dissonance (e.g., “how can the fever of love be contained in the body of this [lady], soft as the *śirīṣa* flower?”<sup>20</sup>). Compare the definition given by Jayadeva to that of Appayya:

The “Moonlight”: *viśama* is an association (*anvaya*) of several based on unfitness (*anaucitya*).

The “Joy”: *viśama* is when a joining (*ghaṭanā*) of an incompatible pair (*ananurūpayoh*) is described.<sup>21</sup>

While both definitions (*lakṣaṇas*) refer to the same poetic domain (*lakṣya*), the latter attempts to tighten the syntax of the former and replace two of its ambiguous terms – *anvaya* and *anaucitya* are loaded terms in the poetic discourse – with less ambiguous ones (*ghaṭanā*, *ananurūpa*). The outcome, as in the case of *upamā* and *rūpaka*, seems less in need of elucidation.

There are numerous other instances in which differences between the “Moonlight” and the “Joy” appear to be informed by Appayya's striv-

<sup>19</sup> Compare CĀ 5.11 and 5.18 to KuĀ 6-9 and 17-20. In the case of *upamā* Appayya retains the main body of the definition, but supplies an illustration that stands on separate thematic and syntactic grounds. In the case of *rūpaka* he leaves nothing of the original. More on his definition of *rūpaka* below.

<sup>20</sup> KuĀ 88cd: *kveyaṃ śirīṣaṃṛdvaṅgā kva tāvan madanaḥvaraḥ ||*.

<sup>21</sup> CĀ 5.80ab: *viśamaṃ yady anaucityād anekānvayakalpanam |*; KuĀ 88ab: *viśamaṃ varṇyate yatra ghaṭanānanurūpayoh |*.

ing for clarity, and not just in the definitions. A large share of the illustrations undergo conceptual and clarificatory changes. For just one example, let us look at *sambandhātīśayokti*, a figure where two entities which are not in direct contact with one another are nonetheless said to be united. Here Appayya modifies both the definition and the example given by Jayadeva:

The “Moonlight”: *sambandhātīśayokti* (excellence of contact) is when it (i.e., contact) is stated even though it is absent. “Look, the disc of the moon appears to be adjoining the palace roofs.”

The “Joy”: *sambandhātīśayokti* (excellence of contact) is when contact is imagined while there is no such contact. “The palace roofs of this town touch the disc of the moon.”<sup>22</sup>

It is clear that both *kārikās* are very similar, and that the two authors have exactly the same figure in mind. Yet it is also obvious that Appayya is using Jayadeva's text as a kind of draft which he can change at will whenever it is not sufficiently straightforward. Jayadeva's *kārikā* uses the name of the figure it sets to define as part of the explanation. His pronoun “it” in the definition refers to the word “contact” found in the figure's name “excellence of contact.” In Appayya's *kārikā*, the term is kept separate from its explanation, and the words “contact” and “no contact” replace the rather ambiguous “it” and “its absence.” The example portion is likewise revised. Jayadeva's illustration could be interpreted to express only near contact between the two entities (depending on the dual meaning of the verb *vibhāti*). This has the potential of confusing the student, as the definition requires a statement of actual contact. Appayya's modified version, which states unequivocally that the roofs touch the moon's disc, is thus more faithful to the definition. Appayya's language is, in this case, “by and large” the same as Jayadeva's, but there is a conscious attempt to make it clearer.

Another of Appayya's pedagogical principles – often leading to far more dramatic alterations than we have seen thus far – is his commitment to systematic exposition. It is very common for Jayadeva to settle for a single illustration for each *alaṃkāra*, even if that *alaṃkāra* has several subtypes. As a rule, Appayya extends such *kārikās* by adding a separate illustration for every subtype. In doing so, he introduces an altogether

<sup>22</sup> CĀ 5.44: *sambandhātīśayoktiḥ syāt tadabhāve 'pi tadvacāḥ | paśya saudhāgrasamsaktam vibhāti vidhumaṇḍalam ||*; KuĀ 39: *sambandhātīśayoktiḥ syād ayoge yogakalpanam | saudhāgrāṇi purasyāsya sprśanti vidhumaṇḍalam ||*.

new text. Take for instance the ornament of *vyājastuti*, in which praise is disguised as reproach and *vice versa*. Here is Jayadeva's definition and his single example, followed by Appayya's expanded text:

The "Moonlight": *vyājastuti* is an expression of praise or blame by means of blame or praise [respectively]. "Have you no judgment? You lead even the sinful to heaven?"

The "Joy": *vyājastuti* is an expression of praise or blame by means of blame or praise [respectively]. "Where's your judgment, Heavenly River [Gaṅgā]? You lead the sinful to heaven!" "Well done, messenger, well done indeed! What more could you do for me, now that you got yourself injured by both teeth and nails for my own sake?"<sup>23</sup>

Here Appayya's definition follows Jayadeva's verbatim. His first illustration, however, slightly modifies Jayadeva's original. The "criticism" directed against the river Gaṅgā for its absolute purificatory power is still the theme, yet Gaṅgā's epithet "Heavenly River" is inserted into the verse in the vocative, so as to clarify its addressee and context. Then a whole new verse is added to exemplify the complementary category of reproach disguised as praise. A female messenger who was sent by a girl to her beloved returns with clear signs of love-making, and is "praised" for her "altruism." Unlike in Jayadeva's work, the student is not expected to come up with such an example on his own.<sup>24</sup>

Appayya very frequently uses his examples not only to illustrate a specific poetic phenomenon but also in order to distinguish it from a similar one. Thus if there is a set of closely related categories, whether types or subtypes, illustrations are made identical in all respects but the distinctive feature of their category. Take, for instance, Appayya's remarkably new presentation of metaphorical identification (*rūpaka*). Tossing aside Jayadeva's exposition altogether, Appayya sees metaphorical identification as two-fold: distinguishable (*tādrūpya*) and indistinguishable (*abheda*). Each is further divided into three, depending on whether the subject of identification (*viśaya*) is said to have an advan-

<sup>23</sup> CĀ 5.71: *uktir vyājastutir nindāstutibhyāṃ stutinindayoḥ | kas te viveko naya-si svargaṃ pātakino 'pi yat ||*; KuĀ 70-71: *uktir vyājastutir nindāstutibhyāṃ stutinindayoḥ | kaḥ swardhuni vivekas te pāpino nayase divam || sādhu dūti punaḥ sādhu kartavyaṃ kim atah param | yan madarthe vilūnāsi dantair api nakhair api ||*.

<sup>24</sup> On only one occasion have I found Appayya's *kārikās* to supply a single example for a twofold trope. In the case of *vakrokti* (KuĀ 159), Appayya's *kārikās* exemplify only the *śleṣa*-based category of *vakrokti*, but the other instance based on intonation (*kāku*) is supplied in the work's second layer.

tage with respect to the entity with which it is identified (*viṣayin*), a disadvantage, or neither. All this may seem quite confusing, but Appayya's illustrations make these divisions clear. Take for instance the examples of the three subtypes of an indistinguishable *rūpaka*:

This one is Twisted Hair [Śiva] in front of our eyes, by whom the enemy-cities were burnt down instantly.

Here sits Śambhu [Śiva], without a third eye.

Śambhu [Śiva] protects the entire world, now that he has adopted an even-eye.<sup>25</sup>

All three examples are built around the same convention – the identification of a king with Śiva. In the first, the king is simply identified with that god of mythic deeds, nothing more and nothing less. In the second, the king is said to lack something which Śiva has, a third eye in his forehead, and hence this is a case of identity in disadvantage.<sup>26</sup> The third describes not only the same identity of king and Śiva, but also the very same distinction – the king has a pair of eyes, while Śiva has three. Yet unlike in the second line, this distinction is now phrased as an *advantage* – the king has acquired an even, rather than odd, gaze, which suggests his impartiality. The three examples are designed and arranged so that each new one forms the counterpart of the preceding. Thus they facilitate the student's understanding of the definition's three categories and the differences between them.<sup>27</sup>

To summarize what we have seen so far: Appayya rewrites and adds to Jayadeva's work whenever the original does not meet his new pedagogical methodology. He illuminates numerous points of potential misunderstanding, supplies illustrations when these seem lacking, and strives to make the system more systematic. The alterations of the "Joy" are devised so as to ease the demands from the student and his teacher. The result of these changes is a clearer, more organized and

---

<sup>25</sup> KuĀ 18-19b: *ayam hi dhūrjatiḥ sāksād yena dagdhāḥ purah kṣaṇāt | ayam āste vinā sambhus tārtīyikaṃ vilocanam || sambhur viśvam avaty adya svīkrtya samadṛṣṭitām |*.

<sup>26</sup> Of course, this is only a disadvantage in a narrow linguistic sense. In essence, Śiva's fiery third eye is a source of constant fear and its absence is an advantage.

<sup>27</sup> This method is used by Jayadeva as well, although rarely, and on such occasions his text is retained as it is. See for instance the paired examples of *arthāpatti* and *kāvyaṅga* (CĀ 5.37-38) which are quoted verbatim by Appayya, even as he modifies the definitions (KuĀ 120-121).

more self-apparent set of *kārikās* than those found in Jayadeva's work, or, for that matter, in any earlier *ālaṃkāra* text.

### III.2. RENEWING BY REINSTATING THE OLD

Elsewhere, in discussing Appayya's "Investigation of the Colorful," I argued that it manifests the author's unprecedented and acute interest in the past of his tradition. This new historicity, I claimed, characterizes the newness of *navyālaṃkāraśāstra*, heralded by Appayya, and underlines many of its theoretical innovations.<sup>28</sup> The reworking of the "Moonlight" in the "Joy" also demonstrates, in more than one way, Appayya's new regard for, if not fascination with, thinkers of old. Indeed, one of the most striking features of Appayya's project of textual renovation in the "Joy" is his common habit of replacing and supplementing Jayadeva's words with those of many other scholars – an entire galaxy of *ālaṃkārikas*. This practice of "innovative repetition" accounts for a significant portion of Appayya's new text.

Thus Jayadeva's definitions are often supplanted, or, in the case of added types and subtypes, supplemented by either adaptations or direct quotes from the entire historical span of *Alaṃkāraśāstra*. Table 2 lists some of these new-old formulations found in the "Joy" and its earlier sources. The table also reports whether Appayya directly quotes or modifies these sources. The information is given in the chronological order of the sources drawn upon by Appayya.

A very similar picture emerges when we turn to the example-portion of the *kārikās*. Much of what is "new," in the sense that it does not appear in the "Moonlight," is in fact "old" in that it appears earlier, mostly in works predating Jayadeva. Here too, Appayya may quote such examples verbatim – though only when the examples are already in the *anuṣṭubh* meter – or, more commonly, adapt old examples (from other metrical patterns, prose passages, and even *kāvya* in other languages, but also from examples already in *anuṣṭubh*). It should be noted that it is not uncommon to find what had been an example for one figure being cited or adapted by Appayya as an illustration for some other figure. Table 3 lists some such instances.

---

<sup>28</sup> Bronner 2002: 449-452.

Table 2: Definitions of figures in the "Joy" which adapt or quote from other poets

Figure	Source	Quote / Adaptation	Notes
<i>paryāyokta</i> II (KuĀ 69)	Daṇḍin (KĀ 2.293)	Adaptation	
<i>nīdarśanā</i> III (KuĀ 55)	Daṇḍin (KĀ 2.346c)	Adaptation	Also echoes Bhāmaha (KāB 3.33), who is quoted by Vāmana (KS 4.3.20)
<i>arthāntaranyāsa</i> (KuĀ 122)	Rudraṭa (KāR 8.79, 82)	Adaptation	
<i>leśa</i> (KuĀ 138ab)	Rudraṭa (KāR 7.100ab)	Adaptation	
<i>yathāsamkhyā</i> (KuĀ 109)	Mammaṭa (KP 10.108)	Direct quote	
<i>utprekṣā</i> (KuĀ 32)	Mammaṭa (KP <i>sūtra</i> 137)	Close adaptation	
<i>sāra</i> (KuĀ 108)	Ruyyaka (AS 56)	Direct quote	Ruyyaka's own definition follows Mammaṭa (KP 10.123)
<i>vyāghāta</i> (KuĀ 103ab)	Ruyyaka (AS 52)	Close adaptation	
<i>vikalpa</i> (KuĀ 114)	Ruyyaka (AS 64)	Close adaptation	
<i>viśama</i> (KuĀ 88)	Vidyācakravartin <sup>29</sup>	Close adaptation	Cakravartin's formulation is based on Ruyyaka (AS 45)
<i>arthāpatti</i> (KuĀ 120)	Vidyānātha (PR 228)	Adaptation	

<sup>29</sup> For Vidyācakravartin, see p. 162 of the AS (Janaki's edition).

Table 3: Illustrations for figures in the “Joy” which adapt or quote from other poeticians

Figure	Source	Quote / Adaptation	Notes
<i>nīdarśanā</i> II (KuĀ 55-56)	Daṇḍin (KĀ 2.347-348)	Close adaptation	Two examples from Daṇḍin
<i>paryāyokta</i> II (KuĀ 69)	Daṇḍin (KĀ 2.294)	Adaptation	Also cited by Bhoja (SK 4.214)
<i>vibhāvanā</i> (KuĀ 78)	Daṇḍin (KĀ 2.322)	Adaptation	Originally used to illustrate a different ornament, <i>viśeṣokti</i>
<i>utprekṣā</i> (KuĀ 33cd)	Daṇḍin (KĀ 2.224ab)	Direct quote	A set example later used by many authors. Daṇḍin himself took it from the Mṛcchakaṭīka.
<i>ākṣepa</i> III (KuĀ 75cd)	Daṇḍin (KĀ 2.141)	Adaptation	Cited also by Mammaṭa and Ruyyaka
<i>paryāyokta</i> I (KuĀ 68cd)	Ānandavardhana (DĀ under 2.19)	Adaptation	A famous verse cited by a whole host of Kashmiri authors: Abhinava, Kuntaka, Ruyyaka
<i>śleṣa</i> (KuĀ 64)	Ānandavardhana (DĀ under 2.21)	Adaptation	A famous verse cited by Mammaṭa, Ruyyaka etc.
<i>viṣama</i> I (KuĀ 88cd)	Mammaṭa (KP 10.537)	Adaptation	
<i>viṣama</i> II (KuĀ 89cd)	Mammaṭa (KP 10.539)	Adaptation	Example also cited by Ruyyaka
<i>atadguṇa</i> (KuĀ 144cd)	Mammaṭa (KP 10.564)	Adaptation	Adapted from Prakrit, cited by Ruyyaka as well
<i>viśeṣa</i> (KuĀ 100cd)	Ruyyaka (under AS 50)	Adaptation	Famous Amarūśataka verse
<i>ākṣepa</i> (KuĀ 74cd)	Ruyyaka (under AS 38)	Adaptation	Adapted from Prakrit
<i>vyāghāta</i> (KuĀ 103cd)	Ruyyaka (under AS 52)	Adaptation	A prose passage from Bāṇa’s Harṣacarita adapted to verse

The information presented in Tables 2 and 3 is partial, as it is not based on a systematic comparison of all of Appayya's new *pādas* with the entire corpus of Alaṃkāraśāstra works. A further examination, I suspect, may account for more instances of earlier textual bits which Appayya weaves into the "Joy." We begin to realize, then, that the "Joy" is a very complicated text, an intricate brocade thoroughly chequered with references to an entire universe of scholarly and poetic writers. And we have seen only a part of the picture, given our emphasis on the *kārikās* of the "Joy." A quick look into the work's other layers reveals that they amplify this intricacy. In his additional verse-illustrations, Appayya constantly invokes examples already given by his predecessors (and here he often identifies his sources), and again not infrequently citing a verse for a different category than the one it originally exemplified. The prose layer, in its turn, often explains a new or modified definition, as well as a reappropriation or modification of an earlier example, by referring to, citing, and, at times, refuting other opinions (of authors mentioned in Tables 2 and 3, as well as others).

Taken together, Appayya's discussion is an elaborate discursive setting, wherein textual bits from various sources – among which the "Moonlight" is but one – are inlayed, at times faithfully and at others playfully, alongside with Appayya's own words. The intricate outcome – a puzzling combination of the seemingly contradictory trajectories of preservation and alteration, on more than one level – requires serious consideration if we are to understand Appayya's project in the "Joy." I believe that several agendas drive his intertextual practice. In the remainder of this section, however, I will concentrate only on the added pedagogical value of this method. Whereas Jayadeva's "Moonlight" is designed to instruct its readers about the central concepts of its tradition – *alaṃkāras*, etc. – the "Joy" has an expanded mission. Its aim is to introduce its students into the *field* of poetics – to its key authors, its dynamics, and its major controversies – in addition to the *alaṃkāras* themselves.

To be sure, the "Joy" does not supply its readers with a historical narrative of Alaṃkāraśāstra. The work, after all, is arranged, just like the fifth chapter of the "Moonlight," according to the ornaments it defines and illustrates. The order of the exposition is determined by affinities between ornaments, not by any chronology of the field. But Appayya's text does not present the ornaments as frozen, ahistorical entities, as does Jayadeva. Rather, his presentation is meant to lend them historical depth, through his unique method of constant referentiality.

As indicated by Tables 2 and 3, Appayya's *kārikās* constantly refer to other works. To borrow a term from intertextual theory, we may say that many of the *kārikās* are made of "connectives," phrases which force the student, and most certainly a teacher using the "Joy" in a classroom setting, to search for and activate an intertext.<sup>30</sup> This is most apparent in the case of famous, set examples. Verses such as *limpatīva tamō 'ṅgāni* used as an illustration of *utprekṣā*, *prāsāde sā pathi pathi ca sā* for *viśeṣa*, or *cakrābhīghātaprasabhājñayaiva* for *pariyāyokta*, must have existed *kanthastha*, that is, on the tip of the tongue of Sanskrit literati. Stumbling upon an unmistakable adaptation of them, the student (with the possible aid of his teacher) would have immediately been reminded of the original and its multiple historical contexts (poetic, scholarly). To some extent, this may have also been the effect of the definitions borrowed or adapted by Appayya, especially those of the famous Kashmirian scholars, Mammaṭa and Ruyyaka.

The *kārikās*, then, intentionally lead the students to realize the historical depth of their tradition, a process the outer layers of the "Joy" facilitate and expand, by identifying the sources and mapping the different views on many topics. It is no coincidence that following the presentation of the hundredth and last *alaṃkāra*, Appayya concludes by saying: "Thus a hundred *alaṃkāras* have been defined and exemplified, while observing throughout the opinions of both ancients and moderns" (*prācām ādhunikānām ca matāny ālocya sarvataḥ ||*).<sup>31</sup> This stanza neatly sums up the pedagogical goal of introducing the student into the *field* of poetics rather than merely teaching him its concepts.

More specifically, Appayya consistently attempts to accommodate into the "Joy" many categories which former thinkers have defined and exemplified, and which were not allowed a place in Jayadeva's system. It is as if Appayya fears the loss of older material – formulations of ornaments, subtypes thereof, and good examples – all of which may fail to reach the generations to follow, so that he constantly accommodates them into his flexible scheme of one hundred *alaṃkāras*. In particular, Appayya seems keen to preserve the insights of Daṇḍin and rescue them from oblivion.<sup>32</sup> Yet as the system of *alaṃkāras* has undergone a

<sup>30</sup> Riffaterre (1990: 58) describes "connectives" as a type of textual stumbling blocks which *force* us to actively search for an intertext, and are hence "both the problem, when seen from the text, and the solution to that problem when that other, intertextual side is revealed."

<sup>31</sup> KuĀ 169.

<sup>32</sup> See also Bronner 2002: 449-450.

significant change since Daṇḍin's times, this often means that Daṇḍin's categories have to be reconciled as subcategories within a larger domain, or even as parts of altogether different figures. Thus the process of restoration often results in dislocation and alterations of the original. And, as we shall see, it also modifies the system itself.

Daṇḍin is not the only poetician whose contributions Appayya is eager to preserve. Another scholar whose examples and categories are often worked into the scheme inherited from Jayadeva is Ruyyaka, who has exerted an important influence on Appayya.<sup>33</sup> There is, however, a difference between Appayya's treatment of the two great scholars, indicating his distinct understanding of the tradition's remote past (Daṇḍin) and more recent legacy (Ruyyaka). I shall now turn to describe the precise nature of this historical vision, and its significant influence on Appayya's renovation of the "Moonlight."

### III.3. NEW HISTORICITY AND THEORETICAL INNOVATIONS

So far we have seen Appayya modifying Jayadeva's text in two general cases. One was when he found the *kārikās* of the "Moonlight" inaccurate, confusing, or unfaithful to the very ornaments they were meant to define and illustrate. In other words, the mode of presentation of an otherwise perfectly valid conceptual system was found lacking and was hence improved. The other case was when the *kārikās* of the "Moonlight" were found incomplete in the sense that they failed to account for a deeper history, and hence a wider range of figurative phenomena. Here too, we saw Appayya rewriting the "Moonlight" so as to fully account for a system of ornaments, which in itself was believed to be solid. Changes of both types, with occasional overlap, account for a substantial share of Appayya's new material. Yet, another significant portion of Appayya's novel text reflects his theoretical innovations, his own vision of the system.

It is by no means easy to generalize about Appayya's theoretical innovations. One reason is that his major theoretical work, the "Investigation," was left incomplete. On several occasions Appayya promises that a certain bold novelty in the "Joy" will be explained in detail in the "Investigation," yet he apparently did not live to deliver on these prom-

---

<sup>33</sup> Thus Jagannātha frequently refers to Ruyyaka as Appayya's inspiration. For instance, while discussing Appayya's position on *paryāyokta*, Jagannātha calls Ruyyaka's book his "root text" (*tanmūlagrantha*, RG p. 555).

ises.<sup>34</sup> Another reason is that Appayya never explicitly articulates an overall theoretical agenda in either work. The result is that Appayya's innovations may appear *ad hoc*. At one point he adds an ornament or a subcategory thereof, at another he abolishes one; here he makes the taxonomy more systematic, there he appears to make it more problematic.

Still, not all of Appayya's innovations in the "Joy" are as haphazard as they may appear. One impetus generalizable to many of the work's new points, across the board, is the wish to reclaim for the earlier *alamkāra*-paradigm poetic material that was either appropriated or silenced by the dominant and later theory of suggestion. Up to the mid-ninth century, the central analytical category of *Alamkāraśāstra* was the *alamkāra*, literally the ornament of poetry. Then, around the year 850, Ānandavardhana revolutionized the analysis of poetry by placing the production of aestheticized emotion (*rasa*) at its center, and argued that a hitherto unrecognized capacity of language, namely suggestion (*dhvani*, *vyāñjanā*), is capable of bringing *rasa* about. Ānanda called this capability of poetic language the "soul" of poetry, and viewed all the other poetic components as subordinate to it. After a few generations of heated debate, Ānanda's groundbreaking theory became to be upheld unanimously.

Ānanda's theory impinged on the *alamkāra* taxonomy and on the analysis of his predecessors in three major ways. First, he made *alamkāras* subject to the all-important telos of *dhvani*, and hence somewhat peripheral to the understanding of poetry. Secondly, some poetic passages which involve insinuation, and which were formerly classified as *alamkāras*, were now redefined as *dhvani*. This resulted in a significant narrowing of the scope of some figures, in particular those in which one meaning is related to another through irony (*aprastutapraśamsā*, *vyājastuti*), word-play (*śleṣa*, *samāsokti*), or other types of indirection (*paryāyokta*, *ākṣepa*, *viśeṣokti*, etc.). Thirdly, the language used to analyze these *dhvani*-like figures was changed. It was now dominated by complex considerations of cognitive processes, considerations which were required in order to decide whether the meaning of an utterance was suggested, which would make it a case of *dhvani*, or directly understood, making it an *alamkāra*.

It seems that for Appayya the "infringement" of the *dhvani* paradigm on *alamkāras* has gone too far, and he sets out to redeem them. To be

---

<sup>34</sup> For instance the figures of *prastutāṅkura* and *śleṣa*, to be discussed below.

sure, Appayya, like all poeticians after the twelfth century, aligns himself with the notion of *dhvani* as the soul of poetry. Moreover, he never goes against Ānanda himself, who, like Daṇḍin, is held by him as an authority. Rather, his criticism is always directed against later thinkers, who took the difficult task of systematizing Ānanda's ambiguities and clarifying the distinction between *dhvani* and *dhvani*-like *alaṃkāras*. For Appayya, they were unfaithful to Ānanda's true intentions.

Appayya's redeeming project can be seen in three closely related types of innovations in the "Joy": 1. An expansion of the domain of old *alaṃkāras* so as to include within them material which was either silenced or appropriated by *dhvani*. 2. A radically new understanding of the cognitive processes involved in several such *alaṃkāras*, resulting, occasionally, in major revisions of their scope and taxonomy. 3. The invention of new ornaments which are devised to redeem *dhvani*-like material. We shall briefly exemplify these innovations in this order.

It is not a coincidence that several of the *alaṃkāras* which Appayya re-expands by inserting Daṇḍin's definitions and illustrations are those which resemble *dhvani* and which have been significantly narrowed down following Ānanda's revolution. A particularly obvious case here is *pariyāyokta*, or roundabout speech, an *alaṃkāra* which figured prominently in the debate over *dhvani*. The *dhvani* proponents were anxious to distinguish their category of "suggestion of a content" (*vastudhvani*) from this figure which, their opponents argued, made it redundant. As a result, the understanding of *pariyāyokta*, originally accounting for a suggested excuse, was dramatically changed, and its scope narrowed.<sup>35</sup>

To realize this process of narrowing and Appayya's re-expansion, let us first look at Daṇḍin's definition and illustration of *pariyāyokta*:

When one avoids stating one's desired goal directly, yet resorts to a statement in a different fashion in order to achieve that very goal, that is *pariyāyokta*.

The cuckoo is biting the blossom of the mango tree.

I'll go and ward it off.

The two of you should take your time and stay here.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>35</sup> I am currently writing a detailed historical account of *pariyāyokta*.

<sup>36</sup> KĀ 2.293-294: *artham iṣṭam anākhyaṃ sāksāt tasyaiva siddhaye | yat prakā-rāntarākhyaṇam pariyāyoktam tad īdṛśam || daśaty asau parabhr̥taḥ sahakārasya mañjarīm | tam ahaṃ vārayiṣyāmi yuvābhyāṃ svairam āsyatām ||*

A friend who arranged a rendezvous for a couple is now excusing herself, and tells them that this is their opportunity to consummate their union. Of course, she does not state her purpose in so many words. She cannot explicitly tell them “I’m going so that you can make love in privacy.” Still, she achieves that very goal by resorting to the obvious excuse of leaving to protect a mango tree. This, for Daṇḍin, is *pariyāyokta* – speaking “in a different fashion.” One can see why this type of poetry seemed threateningly close to suggestion, and was basically ignored by Kashmiri thinkers when discussing *pariyāyokta*. As if worried about possible trespassing on the domain of *dhvani*, later *ālaṃkārikas* such as Mammaṭa and Ruyyaka were extremely brief in their discussion of *pariyāyokta*, and cited each only a single example of it – one which is patterned on the type approved by Ānanda. Jayadeva’s “Moonlight” follows suit and presents an equally narrow notion of this figure.

It is here – against the consensus of centuries of preceding scholars – that Appayya re-expands *pariyāyokta* by reintroducing into its domain Daṇḍin’s old example, when he writes:

They also termed *pariyāyokta* the accomplishment of one’s desired goal by means of a pretext.

I’m going to check on that mango tree. The two of you should stay here.<sup>37</sup>

The echo of Daṇḍin’s words is unmistakable, and Appayya sees no problem in reinstating this silenced type of indirection, within the paradigm of *ālaṃkāras*.

It is in the prose layer of the “Joy” that Appayya explains, at least in part, such theoretical shifts. In doing so he often throws fresh light on the cognitive processes involved in *dhvani*-like *ālaṃkāras*, the second domain in which we can identify his theoretical innovations. Below we will return to the figure of *pariyāyokta*, but let us first observe the presentation of *śleṣa* in the “Joy,” in the *kārikās* as well as in the prose.

*śleṣa* is a case where two meanings are understood due to a manufactured polysemy, and often there is some kind of figure relating the two (e.g., simile). I have elsewhere argued that Ānanda views the *śleṣa* of his predecessors, Rudraṭa in particular, as a very wide poetic phenomenon, potentially infringing on his newly devised category of *dhvani*, and that as a result he significantly reduces its domain. For Ānanda,

---

<sup>37</sup> KuĀ 69: *pariyāyoktaṃ tad apy āhur yad vyājenēṣṭasādhanam | yāmi cūtalatāṃ draṣṭuṃ yuvābhyām āsyatām iha ||*.

the realm of *śleṣa* includes either cases of pure polysemy (where no other *alaṃkāra* is involved), or cases when another *alaṃkāra* is explicitly indicated by words such as “like” (which directly denotes similitude). If an *alaṃkāra* is understood without such explicit indication, this is not *śleṣa* but rather a special category of suggestion which is based on the power of the words (*śabdaśaktimūladhvani*). Another distinction is that *śleṣa* delivers its meaning instantly, whereas *dhvani* based on the power of the words is grasped after a brief interval, like the reverberating of a bell.<sup>38</sup>

This position became standard following Mammaṭa, who attempted to systematize Ānanda's somewhat confusing discussion of *śleṣa*. Mammaṭa maintained that in polysemic passages, both the second register and the figure connecting it to the first (such as a simile) are imparted by suggestion.<sup>39</sup> Ruyyaka, who has a very different notion of *śleṣa* than Mammaṭa, nonetheless concurred with his predecessor on this point.<sup>40</sup>

Appayya, who in his *kārikās* presents *śleṣa* very much like Ruyyaka, and who even adapts an example given both by Ruyyaka and Mammaṭa, sets out in his prose to restore the wider domain of *śleṣa*. In essence, Appayya argues that whatever second meaning is understood by means of polysemy, whether immediately or after an interval, it *must always* be a case of *śleṣa*. Only the existence of a second figure – simile, etc. – may be the result of *dhvani*. In other words, all the cases of *śleṣa* which his predecessors have explained by resorting to the linguistic capacity of suggestion are thus reappropriated to *śleṣa* by Appayya. Moreover, Appayya argues that this, in fact, was the intention of the ancients (*prāñcaḥ*).<sup>41</sup> This should be taken as a reference to Ānanda himself, as we learn from Appayya's third work on poetics, *Vṛttivārttika*, where the same argument is laid out more elaborately.<sup>42</sup> Finally, against the opinion of *all* participants in a millennium of elaborate debate regarding *śleṣa*, Appayya abolishes the internal distinction between sound-based and sense-based *śleṣas*, and argues that, in essence, all *śleṣas* are based on meaning. This move seems closely related to his redefinition of the figure vis-à-vis *dhvani*, yet we cannot know that for sure. Ap-

<sup>38</sup> See Bronner 1999: 294-324.

<sup>39</sup> KP 2 under *sūtra* 32 (p. 67-68 in Jhalkikar's edition) and chapter 4 under *sūtra* 53 (p. 128-129); cf. Bronner 1999: 341-342.

<sup>40</sup> AS p. 129-130 in Janaki's edition.

<sup>41</sup> KuĀ under verse 65.

<sup>42</sup> VV p. 47; cf. Bronner 1999: 342-343.

payya delegates the reasoning for his revolutionary argument to the “Investigation,” which he never completes.

Returning to Appayya’s discussion of the first and main category of *paryāyokta*, we find a similar agenda of redrawing the boundaries between figuration and suggestion, leading to a large-scale reapportionment of the system of *alaṃkāras*. In his *kārikā* Appayya presents this figure in a seemingly conservative manner, in a language which combines Ruyyaka’s definition with Ānanda’s famous example:

Ānanda’s example: It took a single discus-stroke, his definitive command, to ultimately transform the love festival of Rāhu’s wives. “From their fancy orgies, consisting of passionate embraces, only a kiss is left.”<sup>43</sup>

Ruyyaka’s definition: The speech (*abhidhāna*), even of the thing being suggested (*gamya*), by a different manner (*bhaṅgyantara*) is *paryāyokta*.<sup>44</sup>

The combination of the “Joy”: The expression (*vacas*) of the suggested meaning (*gamya*) based on some other mode (*bhaṅgyantara*) is *paryāyokta*. “Homage to him who made the breasts of Rāhu’s wives useless.”<sup>45</sup>

The Demon Rāhu was beheaded by Viṣṇu’s discus immediately after he sipped a mouthful of *amṛta*, the nectar of immortality, a monopoly of the gods. He is thus dead, yet his head lives on. All this is obliquely referred to by the poet, as he mentions that Rāhu’s elaborate love-life has been reduced to a kiss. For Ruyyaka, Jayadeva, and most of the post-Ānanda thinkers, the oblique nature of this statement is analyzed in that an explicitly expressed *effect* (Rāhu’s orgies reduced to a kiss) implies its *cause* (Rāhu’s beheading).

Here too, Appayya’s *kārikā* seems to concur, yet his prose is radically innovative. First, he takes the totally unprecedented position that it is not the beheading of Rāhu which is implied in a *paryāyokta*, but rather his slayer, lord Vāsudeva, in a unique manner (*svāsādhāraṇarūpeṇa*).<sup>46</sup>

<sup>43</sup> DĀ p. 225: *cakrābhīghātāprasabhājñayaiva cakāra yo rāhuvadhūjanasya | āliṅganoddānavilāsavandhyaṃ ratotsavaṃ cumbanamātraśeṣam ||*

<sup>44</sup> AS 36: *gamyasypī bhaṅgyantareṇābhidhānam paryāyoktam |*

<sup>45</sup> KuĀ 68: *paryāyoktam tu gamyasya vaco bhaṅgyantarāśrayam | namas tasmai kṛtau yena mudhā rāhuvadhūkucāu ||*

<sup>46</sup> Note that his *kārikā*’s adaptation of the verse into an expression of homage to the god somewhat alters the original example, and seems more in line with his new interpretation.

Then he moves to directly attack Abhinava (and, indirectly, Ruyyaka) for misusing “the example of the ancients” (*prācīnodāharaṇa*). Finally, he quotes and takes on Abhinava's discussion, which is meant to differentiate suggestion from the *alamkāra* domain. The attack runs as follows: Why is Abhinava so afraid of the implications of the traditional definition, which he himself accepts, namely that it is the suggested meaning *itself* which is expressed in a roundabout manner? Why did he have to argue that the *cause* is suggested and the *effect* expressed? Clearly there are numerous cases where the suggested is expressed in some other form (*pradarśitāni hi gamyasyaiva rūpāntareṇābhidhāne bahūny udāharaṇāni*). Here, for instance, it is clearly Lord Vāsudeva who is suggested, and that is what we mean when we talk about *paryāyokta*.<sup>47</sup>

Appayya does not deny that an effect can suggest its cause. Yet this poetic phenomenon, he argues, is in the domain of a hitherto unknown *alamkāra* which he terms *prastutāṅkura* (“an offshoot of the context”). He defines this ornament as follows:

When one contextual [meaning] is insinuated by another, that is *prastutāṅkura*.

Hey Bee! When the jasmine is there why bother with the thorny bush?<sup>48</sup>

A couple is taking a walk in a garden. The woman is reproaching a nearby bee (in the masculine) for preferring a thorny flower over the fragrant jasmine. This is meant to be heard by her man, who is to understand that by seeing a lesser woman, probably a prostitute, he gravely insults a far more worthy woman like her. As the bee is actually there, in the garden, and is indeed addressed, the first meaning is pertinent to the context. The insinuated message is, of course, equally pertinent to the situation. Thus, one contextual meaning is leading to another. Similarly, Rāhu's head-only type of love making, as well as his beheading, are both pertinent to the context of the previous verse, and hence it too is an instance of *prastutāṅkura*. The new understanding of the distinction between suggestion and figuration is thus related to a new analysis and division of the *alamkāras* themselves, at times resulting in the introduction of new figurative categories.

<sup>47</sup> KuĀ p. 94; cf. Abhinava's comments on DĀ, p. 117-119.

<sup>48</sup> KuĀ 67: *prastutena prastutasya dyotane prastutāṅkuraḥ | kiṃ bhr̥ṅga satyāṃ mālatyāṃ ketakyā kaṇṭakeddhayā ||*.

This brings us to Appayya's third mode of redeeming *dhvani*-like material. The new category of *prastutāṅkura* not only appropriates what was earlier seen as the domain of other figures, primarily *pariyāyokta*, but it also recovers poetic passages from the *dhvani*-realm. Here Appayya seems to directly contradict Ānanda, yet once again he directs his attack at Abhinava. For Abhinava, says Appayya, *prastutāṅkura* would be a case of *dhvani*, not an *alaṃkāra*. "Yet in fact," he says, "this too is an *alaṃkāra* and not *dhvani*." And once more, substantiation of this radically new argument is relegated to a never-written section of the "Investigation."<sup>49</sup>

Other *alaṃkāras* are introduced by Appayya for similar purposes. For instance, *gūḍhokti*, or concealed speech, is a new ornament thus presented in the "Joy":

An utterance which appears to address one, but really addresses another, is concealed speech (*gūḍhokti*).

Hey bull! Come back from the neighbor's field! The owner of the field is returning!<sup>50</sup>

A man is having sex with the wife of another, when suddenly the husband returns. The lover is warned by means of a speech which is concealed as an address to a bull (there is a not-too-subtle pun on this word) regarding his trespassing on someone else's field. This is arguably a case of *vastudhvani*, but for Appayya it serves as a separate, new *alaṃkāra*.

In the "Joy," then, Appayya rethinks the two major concepts of Sanskrit poetics, *dhvani* and *alaṃkāra*, a process that leads also to a renewed classification of the latter. This revision is uncelebrated, yet it is nonetheless there, as an overall innovative agenda, and it is clear that it is predicated upon Appayya's new vision of his tradition's past. His commitment to Ānanda's understanding of *dhvani* as the soul of poetry notwithstanding, Appayya resists what he sees as an excess in poetic phenomena identified as *dhvani*. For this he blames not Ānanda, but Ānanda's followers, Appayya's more immediate predecessors. Thus many of his innovations are meant to reinstate the *alaṃkāra* as the locus for discussing and analyzing poetry expropriated by the *dhvani* proponents. By this Appayya returns to the practice of pre-Ānanda

<sup>49</sup> KuĀ p. 90: *vastutas tv ayam apy alaṃkāra eva na tu dhvanir iti vyavasthāpitam cītramīmāṃsāyām*.

<sup>50</sup> KuĀ 154: *gūḍhoktir anyoddeśyaṃ ced yad anyam prati kathyate | vṛṣāpehi parakṣetrād āyāti kṣetrarakṣakah ||*.

scholars, and in particular Daṇḍin, for whom *alaṃkāra* was always *the* site for such an analysis. The way to the future of the poetic discipline happens to take it back to its past.

#### III.4. IS NEWNESS EVER PROMPTED BY NEW STUFF?

So far we discussed Appayya's innovations which stem from a fresh look at the past of his own intellectual tradition. Before concluding, it is worthwhile to briefly consider the possibility that Appayya's novel ideas may also be related to new developments in the ever-evolving world of Sanskrit poetry – the actual poetic practice of his day. This possibility seems, at first, highly implausible, given the dominance of theoretical concerns in Appayya's writing. So much of the discussion in the "Joy" seems to take place in a universe where no other reality besides that of previous thinkers and their categories exists.

Still, there is some indication that Appayya's poetic theory may not be totally insulated from the practice. One such clue is found in Appayya's habit of constantly citing additional examples. Around three hundred verses are quoted in the "Joy," making it a mini anthology of sorts. Keeping in mind the declared didactic purpose of the work, it seems only reasonable to assume that Appayya's policy of immersing his textbook with citations, in total contrast to Jayadeva's strictly self-composed, *kārikā*-styled illustrations, reflects, in part, his wish to introduce his readers to a poetic canon.<sup>51</sup> As such, it is interesting to note that Appayya quotes from numerous sources, ancient as well as contemporary; famous and unknown.

Moreover, Appayya's invention of new *alaṃkāras* occasionally seems based on his observation of poetic trends, which are not accounted for within the *alaṃkāra* system. An example is the new figure of *mudrā* or

---

<sup>51</sup> Obviously, there may be other motivations as well. For one thing, citing actual poetry after the made-up example allows the student to practice recognition of the trope "in the real world." Appayya also exploits the cited illustrations in order to introduce new concepts, at times by indicating the distinctions between them and the examples in the *kārikās*. And, of course, the verses are often cited in order to prove some point within the context of some argument. Still, the sheer mass of citations is impressive, and seems to be an end in itself. It is interesting, in this respect, to note that the "Investigation" also includes nearly three hundred poetic passages, while dealing with only twelve *alaṃkāras*. Had the work been completed, it would have been one of the larger existing anthologies of *kāvya*.

“signature.” This ornament is introduced in recognition of poetic passages which, in addition to communicating their primary meaning, also indicate their work’s subject-matter.<sup>52</sup> It is interesting to note the type of literary genres Appayya refers to in his brief prose discussion. In addition to plays, whose habit of using the prologue to insinuate the work’s subject matter has long been recognized by drama theorists, Appayya refers to two types of compositions which are not the most typical material for *alaṃkāra* discourse. First, Appayya cites scientific (*śāstra*) texts. More specifically he mentions works which discuss metrics, whose illustrative verses include the names of the meters. Secondly, he exemplifies *mudrā* by referring to several latter-day devotional hymns (*stotras*), which are usually marginal in *alaṃkāra* works and yet are not infrequently cited in the “Joy.”<sup>53</sup>

Another pair of invented *alaṃkāras* relevant to this discussion are *lokoti* and *chekoti*. The first occurs where poetry echoes a popular saying; the second is a playful reworking of such a proverb. The additional illustrations cited for these two figures are worth noting. For the former Appayya quotes a verse he himself composed in praise of King Varadarāja. For the latter he anonymously cites a verse which, he says, “imitates a well known saying common to the people of Andhra” (*āndhrajātiprasiddhalokavādānukārah*).<sup>54</sup>

All this suggests that, while Appayya’s innovations are mostly driven by the internal concerns of his discipline, his theoretical framework is widened to include a growing circle of discourses: the classics of Sanskrit poetry, later and possibly less-known works of literature, contemporary political and religious poetry, and also scientific literature in Sanskrit and the lively world of proverbs in the vernacular. That Appayya’s work, however occasionally and obliquely, reaches out to address such discourses, and, indeed, introduces new theoretical concepts to accommodate them, is far from trivial. It may, for instance, indicate a change in the intellectual identity of Sanskrit literati of the new period, one which is predicated on changes in their scholarly environment and their interaction with the Persian and vernacular cultural spheres. It may be, for example, that the new pedagogical vision seen

<sup>52</sup> KuĀ 139.

<sup>53</sup> KuĀ p. 158 (under verse 139). The works referred to are Navaratnamālā and Nakṣatramālā, possibly a hymn to Namaḷvar. For another example of religious poetry see the illustrations of *anujñā*, under verse 137.

<sup>54</sup> KuĀ 158-159, p. 174-175.

in Appayya's work is in itself related to such changes. In order to explore such hypotheses, however, the mostly uncharted social dimension of new scholasticism must first be more fully documented.

#### IV. CONCLUDING REMARKS

This paper began by asking whether or not the *kārikās* of Appayya Dīkṣita's "Joy of the Water Lily" are identical with those found in the fifth chapter of Jayadeva's "Moonlight." Establishing that the two sets of *kārikās* are *not* the same was relatively simple. That the two are different should be clear to anyone who has actually read both, and there are, indeed, several scholars who have done so and share this "secret" knowledge. The statistical data presented in section II allowed us to go further and conclude that the divergence between the two texts is by no means trivial. In fact, the different portions clearly outnumber the similar ones.

Much more work was required to establish how and why the two texts differ – to suggest, in other words, what may stand behind Appayya's radical revision of his predecessor's work. Several initial answers were offered above. I argued that Appayya renovates those *kārikās* which, to his mind, fail to meet contemporary pedagogical standards, do injustice to the historical dimension of the discussion, or ignore old material which deserves to be preserved. I also maintained that Appayya develops a new vision of the history of his tradition, on the basis of which he tries to counter trends of the post-Ānanda generations, and return, to some extent, to earlier thinkers such as Daṇḍin. In particular, I exemplified his renewed emphasis on the *alaṃkāra* as the locus for analyzing various *dhvani*-like phenomena. There is, after all, a message in Appayya's choice to reduce Jayadeva's panoramic exposition of poetic topics – with *dhvani* at its fore – to a discussion solely dedicated to *alaṃkāras*.<sup>55</sup> Finally, I suggested that Appayya's observation of the poetic practice occasionally led him to expand his theoretical matrix, possibly through interaction with other discursive realms.

---

<sup>55</sup> As is also true of his *Citramīmāṃsā*, dedicated to *citra* ("colorful"), that is, non-*dhvani* literature. Perhaps it is no coincidence, then, that his *Vṛttivārttikā* covers only the first two capacities of language, denotation and metaphoric implication, and does not deal with the third – suggestion. This practice stands in stark opposition to that of his most influential critic, Jagannātha, whose own magnum opus, the *Rasagaṅgādhara*, restores the entire panorama of poetic phenomena.

Appayya's innovations allow us a better understanding of the great success of the "Joy," as well as of the uproar it has stirred. The "Joy" became so popular not because it simply reproduced and commented upon Jayadeva. Rather, Appayya used the "Moonlight" as a kind of a platform on which to stage a new pedagogy, one which must have appealed to readers and students of his time, and a new theoretical vision which attracted both criticism and support, and at any rate, could not be ignored.<sup>56</sup> Yet what, we may ask, is the role of the original platform – Jayadeva's "Moonlight" – in such a project?

We have come a long way in asking this question. Existing scholarship has led us to explore Appayya's "redundancy" – his apparent recycling of an earlier work – only to find his text to be remarkably new. But if the work is so novel, why did the author not compose it from scratch? Why did he retain many of its definitions and illustrations, sometimes going out of his way in order to restore half a verse from Jayadeva, within an otherwise utterly transformed textual environment? Moreover, why does Appayya credit Jayadeva for more than he really has to? Why, in other words, does he masquerade his mostly original *kārikās* as, "by and large," those of his predecessor?<sup>57</sup>

In order to gain a better understanding of Appayya's unique textual practices, we should note that this type of over-crediting appears to be a recurring pattern in his writing. Concluding his introduction to the "Investigation," Appayya unmistakably echoes his remarks in the "Joy," and states that "with reference to our subject matter, namely the domain of colorful (*citra*) poetry, the verses [consisting] of definitions and illustrations, which are worthy of presentation in this work, are, by and large (*prāyeṇa*), the very ones composed by the ancients."<sup>58</sup> And there too, Appayya's own definitions are often unprecedented, whereas the definitions of his predecessors are brought in only to be tossed away, as unreasoned or false (*ayuktam*).<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> How Appayya's rethinking of the *dhvani*-like *alamkāras* was central to the later debate is discussed in a forthcoming paper by Tubb and Bronner.

<sup>57</sup> As Vidvan H.V. Nagaraja Rao has put it, usually the problem is that writers do not sufficiently credit their influences. Yet in Appayya Dīkṣita's case we find precisely the opposite problem: over-crediting (H.V. Nagaraja Rao, oral communication, summer of 2002).

<sup>58</sup> CM p. 30: *cintye 'tra citravarge pradarśyayor lakṣyalakṣaṇayoh | prācīnānām eva ślokāḥ prāyeṇa likhyante ||*.

<sup>59</sup> See Bronner 2002: 444-449.

How are we to understand these puzzling statements? Are they meant to be taken tongue-in-cheek? As lip service to the tradition or as a means of recruiting the ancients to prove the validity (*prāmāṇya*) of Appayya's new arguments? As a sincere statement of his effort to connect himself with the discipline's glorious past? Well, perhaps the answer is "all of the above." Appayya's decision to create the first textbook of his tradition by radically rewriting an existing work, and then to present the remarkably novel work as a mere paraphrase, best epitomizes the ambivalence inherent in his new historicity. On the one hand, he sets out to confirm the basic notions of a millennium-long discussion, and in particular the most basic and oldest concept which lend its name to the tradition, that of the *alaṃkāra*. Appayya ratifies the general understanding of these entities, their overall taxonomy, their grouping together into larger groups, and their further analysis into subtypes.

Yet at the same time, Appayya is also worried about the legacy of his predecessors, especially his more recent ones. He feels that in several important ways they have weakened the system of *alaṃkāras* and left it vulnerable. I have elsewhere, in discussing the "Investigation," showed this to be the case with respect to the definitional practices of the post-Ānanda generation.<sup>60</sup> In the "Joy," however, the post-*dhvani* re-mapping of the figurative domain is what primarily worries Appayya, and he tries to compensate for this trend by restoring the older insights he feels it may have obscured.

This ambivalence – the constant dual trajectory of preserving and modifying, of moving backward and forward in time – makes Appayya's puzzling employment of Jayadeva's work more comprehensible. Aligning with the "Moonlight" is an act of confirmation of what it summarizes, remaking it is an act of repairing the damages it also represents, and reusing as many bits of it as possible is part of Appayya's overall impetus of preservation. The complicated textual and intertextual practices of Appayya in the "Joy" reflect his nuanced, novel understanding of the discourse and his role as a participant in it. It is this new self-awareness and novel method that play a major role in the later discussion on poetics, significantly contributing to the creation of new *Alaṃkāraśāstra*.

---

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., p. 456.

## Abbreviations

- AS Alaṃkārasarvasva of Ruyyaka with the commentary of Vidyācakravartin, ed. S.S. Janaki and V. Raghavan. Delhi: Meharchand Lachhmandas, 1965.
- Bronner 1999 Yigal Bronner, *Poetry at its Extreme. The Theory and Practice of Bitextual Poetry (Śleṣa) in South Asia*. University of Chicago Dissertation, 1999.
- Bronner 2002 Id., What is New and What is Navya: Sanskrit Poetics on the Eve of Colonialism. *JIP* 30 (2002) 441-462.
- CĀ Candrāloka of Jayadeva (“Moonlight”), ed. Mahādeva Gaṅgādhara Bākre. Bombay: Gujarati Printing Press, 1939 (first edition 1915).
- CM Citramīmāṃsā of Appayya Dīkṣita (“The Investigation of the Colorful”), ed. Jagadīśa Chandra Miśra. [*Kashi Sanskrit Series* 207]. Varanasi: Chowkhamba, 1971.
- DĀ Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana with the Locana commentary of Abhinavagupta and the Bālapriya of Śrīrāmaśāraka, ed. Pattābhirāma Śāstrī. [*Kashi Sanskrit Series* 135]. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1940.
- De 1960 S.K. De, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*. 2 vol. Calcutta: Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyay, 1960.
- Gerow 1977 Edwin Gerow, *Indian Poetics*. [*A History of Indian Literature*, ed. Jan Gonda, V/3]. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1977.
- KĀ Kāvyaśāstra [= Kāvyaśāstra] of Daṇḍin with the commentary Ratnaśrī of Ratnaśrījñāna, ed. Anantalal Thakur and Upendra Jha. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute, 1957.
- KāB Kāvyaśāstra of Bhāmaha, ed. B.N. Sarmā and Baldeva Upādhyāya. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1928.
- Kane 1971 P.V. Kane, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1971 (reprint 1987).
- KāR Kāvyaśāstra of Rudraṭa with the commentary of Nemisādhu, ed. Satyadev Chowdhri. Delhi: Vāsudev Prakāśan, 1965 (reprint 1990).
- KP Kāvyaśāstra of Mammaṭa, ed. Vamanacharya Jhalkikar. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1965 (reprint 1983).
- Krishnamachariar 1937 M. Krishnamachariar, *History of Classical Sanskrit Poetry*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1937.
- KS Kāvyaśāstrasūtravṛtti of Vāmana with the Commen-

- tary Kāmadhenu of Gopendra Tripuraha Gopal, ed. Hargovinda Shastri. Varanasi: Chaukhamba, 21995.
- KuĀ Kuvalayānanda of Appayya Dīkṣita ("The Joy of the Water Lily") with the Alamkārasurabhi Hindi commentary of D. Bholashankar Vyas. Varanasi: Chowkhamba, 41994.
- Pollock 2001 Sheldon Pollock, New Intellectuals in Seventeenth-Century India. *The Indian Economic and Social History Review* 38.1 (2001) 1-31.
- PR Pratāparudrīya of Vidyānātha with the commentary Ratnāpaṇa of Kumārasvāmin, ed. V. Raghavan. Madras: The Samskrit Education Society, 1979.
- RG Rasagaṅgādhara of Jagannātha Paṇḍitarāja with the commentaries of Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa and Mathurā Nāth Śāstrī. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1983.
- Riffaterre 1990 Michael Riffaterre, Compulsory Reader Response: The Intertextual Drive. In: *Intertextuality. Theories and Practice*, ed. Michael Worton and Judith Still. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990, p. 56-78.
- SK Sarasvatīkaṅṭhābharāṇa of Bhoja with the commentaries of Rāmasiṃha and Jagaddhara, ed. Vasudeva Sarman. Varanasi: Chaukhambha, 1987.
- VV Vṛttivārttika of Appayya Dīkṣita, ed. Brahma Mitra Awasthi and Indu Awasthi. Delhi: Indu Prakashan, 1977.

