3

"May It Always Be about Adding Beauty to Beauty"

The Story of the *Mirror* in Sri Lanka

Edited by Charles Hallisey

Contributors
Charles Hallisey (Section 3.8)
Charles Hallisey and P. B. Meegaskumbura (Sections 3.1–3.5)
Alastair Gornall, Charles Hallisey, and P. B. Meegaskumbura (Sections 3.6–3.7)

. . a mass of detail
to interrelate on a new ground, difficultly;
an assonance, a homologue
triple piled

pulling the disparate together to clarify
and compress[1]
—William Carlos Williams

3.1. Introduction

Charles Hallisey and P. B. Meegaskumbura

The story of Dandin's *Mirror of Literature* in Sri Lanka is long, broad, and deep.

It is long insofar as it begins early in the *Mirror*'s general reception history. *Poetics for This Language of Ours* (*Siyabaslakara*; hereafter, *Our Own Poetics*), "a translation of Dandin's *Mirror* modified and adapted to suit Sinhalese literature and language,"[2] is among the earliest engagements with the *Mirror*. It was likely composed after the ninth-century Kannada-language adaptation of the *Mirror*, the *Way of the Poet-King*, but before the first extant Sanskrit commentary, written in the tenth century by the Buddhist monk Ratnashrijnana (hereafter Ratna),

[1] Williams 1995: 19.
[2] Wijayawardhana 1963: 135.

A Lasting Vision. Yigal Bronner, Oxford University Press. © Oxford University Press 2023.
DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780197642924.003.0004

himself a "Master born [on the island of] Sinhala."[3] Moreover, engagement with the *Mirror* in Sri Lanka continued, albeit in quite varied forms and modes, into the twentieth century, and endures even today.

The story is broad because of the degree to which the *Mirror* has impacted literary culture in Sri Lanka. By the thirteenth century, there were three major adaptations of the *Mirror* in the island, two in Sinhala (the aforementioned *Our Own Poetics*, and the thirteenth-century *Compendium of Language and Its Meaning*, or *Sidatsaňgarā*) and one in Pali (the thirteenth-century *Lucid Poetics*, or *Subodhālaṅkāra*), as well as eight different exegetical works in those two languages. Moreover, Ratna's tenth-century Sanskrit commentary was also known and studied in Sri Lanka. Indeed, it is possible that this work itself was at least inflected by interpretations of Dandin already current in Sri Lanka. It is also possible that some engagement with the Tamil version of Dandin was also ongoing in Sri Lanka, contiguous with those in Sinhala, Pali, and Sanskrit.[4] Most importantly, the Sri Lankan engagement with Dandin was not limited to such scholastic discussions. The *Mirror*'s presence is centrally visible in the island's literary history, as the model set in motion by these earlier engagements remained foundational to the literary culture for centuries, as we shall trace in section 3.7 below.

The story of the *Mirror* in Sri Lanka is broad also because Dandin's ideas and values ramified religious and political culture in Sri Lanka. Elements of Dandin's *Mirror* were combined and recombined with various kinds of cultural activity, with results that extended far beyond Dandin's own project in the *Mirror*. These include the formation of collective identities, as in the narrow example of Buddhist monastic literary affiliations and in the larger example of Sinhala ethnic identity; the moral and religious education of individuals, particularly as Buddhists; and the display of what was perceived as a shared ethos and rectitude of language, religion, politics, society, and the world in general.[5]

The story of the *Mirror* in Sri Lanka is broad also because it forms an important part of the wider Buddhist reception of Dandin in Asia, particularly in Burma (through the Pali *Lucid Poetics*), Tibet (through Ratna's Sanskrit commentary), and the aforementioned Tamil Buddhist community. As Bronner

[3] We briefly discuss the dating of *Our Own Poetics* in section 3.2. The quote on Ratna's identity is from the colophon to his commentary: *kṛtir iyam ācāryaratnaśrījñānasya siṃhalajanmanaḥ* (KĀ p. 282; see p. 66 for another mention). Similar language is found in two of Ratna's other works, his Bodh Gaya inscription and the *Reflections on Word and Meaning* (*Śabdārthacintā*); see Dimitrov 2016: 29, 35, 577, 589, 593.

[4] The interaction between the reception of Dandin in Tamil, Sinhala, and Pali remains unstudied, although we know of an ongoing exchange between Sri Lanka and Tamil Nadu at least since the time of Dandin. The continuing recourse to Tamil Buddhist scholarship in Sri Lanka is indicated by the fact that Totagamuve Shri Rahula, a fifteenth-century poet-monk, cites the *Demaḷajatakagäṭapada*, a Tamil-language exegetical glossary to the stories of the Buddha's previous lives, in his work on Pali grammar, *Pañcikāpradīpaya* (Somadasa 1990: 373). For the Tamil reception of Dandin, see Clare and Shulman, Chapter 4 in this volume.

[5] The fifteenth-century *Hill Myna Messenger* (*Säḷalihiṇisandeśaya*) is a particularly notable example of this complex interface in medieval Sri Lanka, wherein Dandin's *Mirror* played a major role; see Hallisey forthcoming.

argues, Dandin's own work is consistently nonsectarian and is consciously meant to cater also to Buddhist literati, so that "the vast success of the *Mirror* throughout the expanding network of Buddhist centers of learning is also clearly not an accident."[6] However, there is still much more that we need to learn about the reason for this success, and the story of the *Mirror* in Sri Lanka offers some important clues. As Anne Monius has noted about the Tamil reception of Dandin, "the interest in using extant theory in new ways—and thus pushing both literary form and theory forward . . . reflects much wider Buddhist patterns of innovation and creativity."[7] The same is true of Sri Lanka as well.

Finally, the story of Dandin's *Mirror* in Sri Lanka is deep because the enduring engagement with its ideas, values, and example was integrative and generative. That is to say, Dandin reached a broad spectrum of people in Sri Lanka, including those who never read the various Sinhala or Pali adaptations of the *Mirror*, let alone the Sanskrit original.

In short, Dandin's *Mirror* quickly became a classic in Sri Lanka—a classic in Italo Calvino's sense of "a book which has never exhausted all it has to say to its readers"[8]—and remained so for centuries. This is so, even if this classic spoke, at least in part, through the mediation of its Sinhala and Pali surrogates, such as *Our Own Poetics*, and through its Sinhala and Pali standard-bearers, that is, literary works that exemplified the *Mirror*'s lessons to such a degree that they could convey its pedagogy no less than it could itself. These standard-bearers include the twelfth-century Sinhala court epic, *Crest-Gem of Poetry* (*Kavsiḷumiṇa*), the fifteenth-century Sinhala poem about the Buddha's previous life as the musician Guttila (*Guttilakāvyaya*), and the twelfth- or thirteenth-century Pali poems, *Career of the Conqueror* (*Jinacarita*) and *Ornament of the Conqueror* (*Jinālaṅkāra*), all discussed in section 3.7 below.

There is an abundance of material relevant to the story of Dandin in Sri Lanka, but the nature of that material—embedded as it is in various kinds of cultural work and inflected as it is by different social processes—means that telling the story of Dandin always runs the risk of becoming subsumed within other, larger stories. The story of Dandin in Sri Lanka is part of Sri Lanka's literary history, of course, but it is also part of its intellectual, religious, cultural, social, and even political history. It is also part of Sri Lanka's connected history with other parts of South and Southeast Asia, and ultimately with the rest of the world in the time period that Sheldon Pollock has called "the vernacular millennium."[9]

As important as these larger histories are, they can easily obscure whatever it is about the *Mirror* that made Dandin so appealing to Sri Lankans over the course of centuries and the particular ways in which they appreciated and learned from the *Mirror*. In other words, keeping our eyes on the details in the story of Dandin

[6] See Bronner, sections 1.2 and 1.4 in this volume (the quote is from the latter).
[7] Monius 2013: 128.
[8] Calvino 1991: 5.
[9] Pollock 1998: 41–74.

in Sri Lanka is not easy, but doing so can help us see more clearly what is special about the *Mirror* and what led to its extraordinary reception history across Asia. Focusing on these details can also help us to explore the historically specific ways in which the *Mirror* was received and transmitted in Sri Lanka, and, as a result, to understand better Sri Lanka's cosmopolitan particularity as part of the larger story of Dandin's *Mirror* in Asia. Just as Ratna explained with respect to Dandin's insistence that a "factual statement" (*svabhāvokti*) must reveal "the multifaceted nature of something," focusing on "just one aspect will not do; the description has to be rich in detail."[10]

Just a few of these details and aspects are the focus of this chapter. We try to bring them into higher relief in two ways. First, a variety of interpretive categories (such as "complex word" and "textual community") are used heuristically, that is, as provisional means to illuminate some of the details and aspects of the multifaceted reception of the *Mirror* in Sri Lanka and to interrelate them on new grounds, as the quotation from William Carlos Williams at the head of this chapter commends. Second, particular statements found in various Sri Lankan texts are taken in a second-order, metapoetic way as comments on the reception of Dandin in Sri Lanka. Using particular statements metapoetically can guide us through some of the interpretive challenges that present themselves when we try to pull "the disparate together to clarify and compress," to invoke Williams again. When the details and aspects are seen in this way, they begin to suggest answers to two large-scale questions key to this volume. The first is "why Dandin?": what is it about the *Mirror* that contributed to its extraordinary reception history in Sri Lanka? The second is "how Dandin?": what were the particular ways in which the *Mirror* was received and transmitted in Sri Lanka?

3.2. *Our Own Poetics*: Reconfiguring This Language of Ours

Charles Hallisey and P. B. Meegaskumbura

It may be best to begin tackling these questions by taking a panoramic look at *Our Own Poetics*. It is not an exaggeration to say that in deploying some of the resources found in the *Mirror*, the author of *Our Own Poetics* reconfigured Sinhala literature and culture irreversibly.[11]

But who was this author?

[10] Ratna ad KĀ 2.8, translation from Bronner forthcoming.

[11] On translation as a culturally creative and transformative activity, rather than a reproductive and transmissional activity, see Saussy 2017.

A verse at the end of *Our Own Poetics* identifies him as a king named Salamevan (Pali: Silāmeghavaṇṇa; Sanskrit: Śilāmeghavarṇa).[12] Nothing more is known about him, his deeds, or his other compositions.[13] An adjacent verse reports that a minister named Amaragiri Kasub requested Salamevan to compose his text. It has been argued that key to identifying the king is determining "who this Amaragiri Kasub was," but that too has so far proved impossible.[14]

Wijayawardhana observed in 1963 that the authorship and date of *Our Own Poetic*s had long been the topic of wide-ranging views,[15] but they have recently attracted renewed interest. This follows speculations by Sheldon Pollock and Dragomir Dimitrov, both of whom suggest that setting a date for *Our Own Poetics* might be aided by connecting its old Sinhala gloss to Ratna, whose dates can be established independently.[16] Dimitrov believes that *Our Own Poetics* "was composed in the reign of King Kassapa V (r. 913–923)," and on the basis of his speculation that Ratna was the author of its old Sinhala paraphrase (*-sannaya*) on *Our Own Poetics,* he concludes that "*Our Own Poetics* (*-sannaya*) was written probably in the early 920s. . . ."[17]

Be that as it may, for our purposes here, determining the text's exact date is less important than setting it within a relative timescale. Fortunately, here the conclusions of scholars are in more substantial agreement, and this was so even when Wijayawardhana made his aforementioned observation. As he notes:

> It is agreed on all sides that [*Our Own Poetics*] belongs to the earliest phase of the extant Sinhalese literature; that it is the earliest extant work of a literary character and the earliest to be written in verse; that it is the oldest known Sinhalese work on the subject of poetics, and the only one exclusively devoted to that subject.[18]

Wijayawardhana also raises the possibility that "[t]he selection of [the *Mirror*] for adaptation [into Sinhala] would have been due to the fact that Dandin's

[12] SBL 407. On the challenges of interpreting this verse and a connected one (406) that also provides information about *Our Own Poetics*'s author, see Dimitrov 2016: 105–11.

[13] A number of medieval Sri Lankan kings adopted the throne name (*biruda*) "Salamevan," and it has proved impossible to determine just which of them authored *Our Own Poetics*. For a review of the possibilities and a suggestion about which one is the most likely, see Dimitrov 2016: 109–10.

[14] Godakumbura 2010: 329.

[15] Wijayawardhana 1963: 135.

[16] Pollock 2005; Dimitrov 2016: 117–22, 710 (where one can find a valuable survey of previous scholarship as well as a comprehensive overview of the evidence available for establishing Ratna's date).

[17] Dimitrov 2016: 710. Dimitrov and Pollock (Pollock 2005) both conjecture that Ratna may have authored the Sinhala *sannaya* (gloss) to *Our Own Poetics*, and Dimitrov suggests that this *sannaya* "is perhaps the earliest work with which Ratna involved himself as a young and promising scholar" (Dimitrov 2016: 710), but the evidence for either possibility is not conclusive. There is general agreement, however, that the old Sinhala gloss "appears to have been written soon after the composition of the text itself" (Godakumbura 2010: 330).

[18] Wijayawardhana 1963: 135.

text enjoyed great popularity among Sinhalese scholars (as it did among Tamil scholars too)."[19] In other words, it may be that the *Mirror* was already popular in Sri Lanka even before its first Sinhala adaptation.[20] Kanchipuram, Dandin's hometown, had long been a center of Theravada Buddhist religious culture and scholastic learning by the time of the *Mirror*'s composition, and the routine movements of monks and traders between Kanchipuram and Sri Lanka would have provided the conditions for Dandin's work to become known among scholars in Sri Lanka.[21] Moreover, it could be that there were ongoing discussions of poetics in Buddhist circles in Kanchipuram that Dandin himself was aware of and even, as J. C. Wright has argued in a series of essays, that there is "a link between Pali tradition and Dandin's fundamental formulation of Sanskrit poetic theory."[22] This remains, of course, entirely hypothetical, but the idea that Dandin's work was known to scholars in Sri Lanka even before its first Sinhala adaptation merits consideration.

Curiously, *Our Own Poetics* never names the *Mirror* directly, and it mentions Dandin only once in a list of six teachers "who knew what makes language literature"; three of those teachers are gods (Mahabrahma, Shakra, and Bhrihaspati), while the other three are historical figures (the sage Kashyapa, Vamana, and Dandin).[23] A reader familiar with Dandin's *Mirror*, however, immediately recognizes that it is the primary source for *Our Own Poetics*. A comparison of the structure and contents of the two works makes this clear. Like the *Mirror*, *Our Own Poetics* consists of three chapters, each of which closely parallels Dandin's, both in terms of specific elements included and sequence. For example, in the second chapter, devoted exclusively to defining and illustrating various ornaments, Dandin's list of thirty-five ornaments is taken up in the same order and method of treatment. Definitions and illustrative verses for these ornaments are also largely the same; only four illustration verses for ornaments in *Our Own Poetics* (out of dozens) are not close to Dandin's.[24] Indeed, most verses in *Our Own Poetics* come across as faithful translations of those found in the *Mirror*.

[19] Wijayawardhana 1963: 136.

[20] A minimally attested comment in the Sinhala gloss on *Our Own Poetics* suggests that there may have been an independent Sinhala gloss on the *Mirror* available to that text's author; that Sinhala gloss might be a text now lost, or it might be the *Old Sinhala Paraphrase on the Mirror of Literature* (*Kāvyādarśapurāṇasannaya*). For a careful discussion of this comment, see Dimitrov 2016: 141–43.

[21] On the sustained religious, intellectual, and commercial ties between Tamil Nadu and Sri Lanka in the relevant period (political competition notwithstanding), see Liyanagamage 2001, especially pp. 29, 54; and Kerr 2021: 1–27.

[22] Wright 1996: 59; see also Wright 2000. See also Jaddipal 2010.

[23] SBL 2. Note that the *Hṛdayaṅgama*, an anonymous commentary on the *Mirror* probably later than both SBL and Ratna, also names Kashyapa as a predecessor to Dandin (*Kāvyādarśa* 1910: 3, ad KĀ 1.2); Kashyapa is also named in Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*. Dimitrov argues, together with others and with some manuscript-witness support, that the name "Vamana" in this verse should be emended to "Bhamaha"; see Dimitrov 2016: 152–53.

[24] The four fall under "embrace" (*seles*; *śleṣa*), "praise of the irrelevant" (*nopat vänum*; *aprastutapraśaṃsā*), "setting an example" (*nidasun*; *nidarśana*), and "mixture" (*musu*; *saṅkīrṇa*).

While *Our Own Poetics* mirrors the structure and contents of Dandin's *Mirror*, it is also different in significant ways. The Sinhala work is considerably shorter than the *Mirror*, with 408 verses compared to the latter's 659.[25] Different reductions create different effects. *Our Own Poetics* omits some of the subtypes of Dandin's ornaments. For example, it includes examples of only twelve of the twenty-four subtypes of "dismissal" (*ākṣepa*) found in the *Mirror*. In such instances, omissions have the effect of making a category more clear-cut and straightforward. At the same time, they can serve as occasions for significant conceptual innovation, as can be seen in the discussion of "condensed speech" (*samāsokti*), which in the Sinhala text is tied to other ornaments (in ways not seen in Dandin) and to the post-Dandin notion of "suggestion" (*dhvani*).[26]

Our Own Poetics omits parts of the *Mirror* that carry some of Dandin's most distinctive theoretical insights, as in the case of his understanding of "flavor" (*rasa*). For Dandin, this ornament is a case when a "basic emotion" (*sthāyibhāva*) is intensified to the point where it is transformed into an aesthetic flavor. Dandin was given credit for this theoretical insight by subsequent theorists, such as Abhinavagupta, but *Our Own Poetics* omits this point completely.[27]

The omission of one part of a discussion in the *Mirror* sometimes has the effect of emphasizing another. One example is Dandin's listing of the languages that make literature (Sanskrit, Prakrit, Apabhramsha) and his mapping of genres onto a linguistic grid.[28] *Our Own Poetics* omits this, even though it is one of Dandin's signature discussions, and proceeds directly to Dandin's survey of the ten poetic "virtues" (*guṇa*) which it renames "life-breaths" (*prāṇa*; more on this terminology below), in effect emphasizing the latter's place in its own understanding of the body of literature.

In a few cases, *Our Own Poetics* offers new Sinhala terminology for Dandin's categories, although the new terminology typically captures salient features of Dandin's conception of that category.[29] For example, the poetic virtue "charm" (*kānti*) is renamed "pleasing to the people" (*dana kal*; *janakalya*), and the Sinhala name seems directly informed by Dandin's explanation that "'charm' is what charms all people because it does not go beyond the usual meaning of words."[30] Likewise, Dandin's first and very important ornament, "factual statement" (*svabhāvokti*), is renamed "describing a thing" (*vat kiyaman*), again, in

[25] Dandin's three chapters number 106, 365, and 187 verses; the chapters of *Our Own Poetics* contain 67, 272, and 68 verses, respectively.

[26] See Hallisey 2017: 139–43. It is worth noting Ratna also connected "condensed speech" with *dhvani* (ad KĀ 2.203).

[27] See Wijayawardhana 1963: 154–55; and Lawrence McCrea in section 5.3 in this volume. *Our Own Poetics* is, however, aware of *sthāyibhāva*s, as can be seen in its discussion of "misrepresentation of the arts" (*kalāvirodha*; SBL 390, cf. KĀ 3.170).

[28] KĀ 1.32–39.

[29] Wijayawardhana 1963: 178.

[30] KĀ 1.85.

fitting with Dandin's own definition.[31] Other cases are more complex. "Integrity" (*bhāvika*), Dandin's last ornament, equally important and something of a bookend to "factual statement," is called *häṅgum*, "intersubjective perception" or "suggestion," which is not quite what Dandin has in mind (for Dandin, it is about the whole work being integrated).[32] Independent nomenclature is also found in the thirteenth-century handbook for poets, the *Compendium of Language and Its Meaning* (*Sidatsaṅgarā*; hereafter the *Compendium*). Such independence suggests that Sri Lanka's literary culture felt free to develop and innovate within received categories of poetic theory, something that is also visible in Tamil, at least by the time of the composition of the *Compendium*.[33]

Our Own Poetics also creatively builds upon and adds to the *Mirror*. In its survey of the varieties of simile (*upamā*), for example, *Our Own Poetics* adds a new subtype, "compounded simile" (*samas uvam*; *samāsopamā*), to Dandin's already extensive list, explaining it as "a simile in which the word expressing similarity is elided."[34] Dandin does hint that a compounded form of simile is possible,[35] but *Our Own Poetics* takes up this hint and presents a separate variety of simile with its own examples.[36] In doing so, *Our Own Poetics* exemplifies Dandin's "emphasis on ornaments' subtypes as the main arena for creative variation."[37]

Some omissions and additions suggest the possible influence of Sanskrit poetic theorists other than Dandin. For instance, *Our Own Poetics* omits Dandin's long discussion of riddles (*prahelikā*s), which raises the possibility that its author was more sympathetic to Bhamaha's dyspeptic dismissal of riddles than to Dandin's appreciation of them; riddles are, however, centrally visible in the practical legacy of Dandin in Sri Lanka, as we will see below in section 3.7. Wijayawardhana has shown that *Our Own Poetics* betrays awareness of developments in Sanskrit poetic theory after Dandin.[38] These include a discussion of poetic virtues that resonates with Vamana's concept of style or diction (*rīti*), a possible familiarity with Anandavardhana's theory of suggestion, and the idea of poetic inference associated most famously with Mahima Bhatta.[39]

[31] KĀ 1.8.

[32] SBL 335; KĀ 3.361. The *Old Paraphrase on Our Own Poetics*, however, interprets this verse in a manner which brings it more in line with Dandin's emphasis on the integration of the whole work. The view that *häṅgum*, as an ornament, includes a quality of suggestion resonates more closely with Rudrata's ornament called *bhāva* (RKA 7.38–40); Rudrata was also active in the tenth century.

[33] On Tamil, see Monius 2000; Claire 2017: 107–22; and Clare and Shulman in Chapter 4 in this volume.

[34] SBL 121. This new type closely agrees with Udbhata's in KASS 1.18 and with Dandin's own "compounded identification" (*samastarūpaka*; KĀ 2. 67–68).

[35] KĀ 1.61.

[36] See Wijayawardhana 1963: 154–55.

[37] Bronner forthcoming.

[38] Wijayawardhana 1963: 135–36; Wijayawardhana 1964.

[39] Wijayawardhana 1963: 22, 136, 154.

In short, there are close affinities between the *Mirror* and *Our Own Poetics*, but it is precisely these affinities that allow for our understanding of how the latter found its own path and emphasis. In what follows, we examine these changes of emphasis in three case studies: a detailed comparison of the works' opening verses, a juxtaposition of their discussion of poetic virtues, and a discussion of a key term in *Our Own Poetics* that does not appear in the *Mirror*. Taken together, these case studies bring us closer to answers for both the "why Dandin" and the "how Dandin" questions.

3.3. The First Verse of *Our Own Poetics*: Training a Capable Reader

Charles Hallisey and P. B. Meegaskumbura

Dandin opens his *Mirror* with an invocation to the goddess of learning, poetry embodied:

caturmukhamukhāmbhojavanahaṃsavadhūr mama |
mānase ramatāṃ nityaṃ sarvaśuklā sarasvatī ||
May all-white Sarasvati—a goose
in a forest of lotuses that are the mouths
of the four-faced Brahma—forever delight
in the lake of my heart.

Compare this to the first verse of *Our Own Poetics*, noting especially the phonic texture of the Sinhala verse:

sadāvā muv taṁbara—venenada sivumuvā,
sarasaviya hasa sav sudu—kivi sit pul madovu vil.
May it always be about adding beauty to beauty
whenever an all-white goose, Sarasvati, takes flight
from the forest of lotuses, Brahma's four mouths, and rises
into that flooding pool in the Milky Way—the poet's heart.

Leaving content aside for the moment, readers who know both Sanskrit and Sinhala will immediately note marked differences in phonology, morphology, and word order. For one thing, there is not a single Sanskrit loanword (*tatsama*) in the Sinhala, although there are derivations (*tadbhava*s), such as "four-faced" (Sanskrit: *caturmukha*; Sinhala: *sivumuvā*) as an epithet for Brahma. For another, words in the Sinhala are placed quite differently than in the Sanskrit. Consider once again, the epithet "four-faced" (*caturmukha*/*sivumuvā*): in the *Mirror* it

opens the first line, and in *Our Own Poetics*, it closes it. Likewise, the name of the goddess Sarasvati closes Dandin's second line but opens that of the Sinhala (*sarasaviya*). In terms of word placement, the Sanskrit and Sinhala verses look almost like mirror images.

Now consider the morphological contrast, the full significance of which will become apparent when we discuss poetic virtues in the following section (3.4). In striking contrast to the long compound that comprises almost the entirety of the first line of Dandin's verse, there is only one small compound in the Sinhala. For Dandin, the use of long compounds is emblematic of the poetic virtue of "power" (*ojas*), and although he allows for their presence in verse written in the northeastern style, they are not particularly welcome in the much-preferred path of southerners. The minimal compounding in the first verse of *Our Own Poetics* comes across, then, as a statement on holding Dandin to his principles. Indeed, when coming to the topic of "power," *Our Own Poetics* explicitly disapproves of using many compounds in Sinhala verse.[40]

Other differences in phonic texture between the two verses further instantiate a contrast between the expressive ecologies of Sanskrit and Sinhala, a contrast similar to the one that Indian thinkers often made between Prakrit and Sanskrit. They spoke of Prakrit's "softness," exemplified in the avoidance of heterogenetic consonant combinations and aspirate consonants, and some of these very same qualities are evident not only in the first verse of *Our Own Poetics* but throughout the Sinhala text. Indeed a "soft" phonic texture was the norm for Sinhala poetry before and after *Our Own Poetics*.[41] The phonic texture typical of Sinhala poetry can be further described as always containing what Dandin calls the poetic virtues "tenderness" (*sukumāratā*) and "concision" (*śliṣṭa*).

Another key difference is in prosodic structure. *Our Own Poetics* opens with a *gī* meter, a verse form that is immediately recognizable as Sinhala, analogous to Dandin's *anuṣṭubh* for readers of Sanskrit. Dandin's verse uses a syllable-counting prosody, with eight syllables in each quarter, while *Our Own Poetics* uses a mora-counting prosody. Typically, *gī* meters have an uneven number of units (*mātrā*) in each quarter, and this is the case here, too: the distribution of units along the four quarters is 10/9/11/11. *Gī* meters place the general metrical repertoire of Sinhala poetry on a continuum with the poetry of literary Prakrit *gāthā*s, and the basic association of both *gī* and *gāthā* with song and music—etymologically and practically—is important to their poetic character.[42] That said, "[t]he system of

[40] KĀ 1.80, SBL 51; see Wijayawardhana 1963: 144.

[41] On the softness and sweetness of Prakrit's phonic texture, see Ollett 2017: 88–94. The Kannada *Way of the Poet-King* also highlights a contrast of phonetic texture between Kannada and Sanskrit, having to do with the harshness of some sounds in Sanskrit (see Ollett and Pierce Taylor, section 2.2 in this volume).

[42] See Ollett 2017: 85–110.

Sinhalese prosody has an individuality of its own," and if "to write in Prakrit was to a very large extent, to write in *gāthā*s or related *gaṇa*-counting meters," then writing poetry in Sinhala at the time of *Our Own Poetics* was to a large extent to write in *gī*.[43] Thus, with respect not only to language identification but also to expressive ecologies, including aesthetic registers of phonic texture and prosody, the first verse of *Our Own Poetics* would seem, by its very form, to be making a strong statement about what makes poetry feel like "our own" to its readers.

But there is more to the metrical structure here than first meets the ear. *Our Own Poetics*'s first verse fits no known pattern of the *gī* varieties that would have been familiar to its first readers. Those familiar with the received tradition of Sinhala poetry of the time would probably have initially tried to recite it in the *Yāgī* pattern, which is the most common meter and which looks similar to our verse initially.[44] This would have led to incongruous results, of course, but not ones that would have been entirely surprising to readers familiar with the tradition of prosody as represented in the Sigiri graffiti and perhaps with the now lost texts on Sinhala metrics that are mentioned in *Our Own Poetics*.[45] In fact, as Paranavitana puts it, "irregularity is the keynote of *gī* metres, but it is an irregularity which should have a pleasing sound effect" based on the poetic virtues intrinsic to Sinhala.[46]

The use of a completely original meter in the first verse of *Our Own Poetics* sets the stage, metapoetically, for its readers to anticipate similar discoveries in the rest of the work, an anticipation that what is to come might be novel and, precisely for this reason, pleasing. The author states this explicitly later in his work:

> Any poetic feature created from within the poet's being is faultless,
> For a person with merits, what will not be effective in accomplishing his objective?[47]

In the *Mirror*, this verse is found in the context of Dandin's disagreement with Bhamaha on whether or not it makes sense to distinguish between two narrative genres, *kathā* and *ākhyāyikā*. Omitting this context enables *Our Own Poetics* to make a more general point, of which its first verse is a particular example: there

[43] Quotes are from Paranavitana 1956: clxxvi, and Ollett 2017: 96, respectively.

[44] *Yāgī* has the syllabic instant (*mātrā*) pattern of 9/11/11/11. Here, by contrast, we have 10/9/11/11; even if one reads *venen ada* in the second foot, it would still be one syllabic instant short of a second foot in *Yāgī*.

[45] One such text is mentioned anonymously, and the other is named *Our Own Language* (*Siyabas*) and is described as a "treatise on Sinhala meters" (*siṃhala chandas śāstraya*) in its paraphrase (SBL 15, 386). For an authoritative overview of the tradition of prosody as represented in the Sigiri graffiti, see Paranavitana 1956: clxxv–clxxxix.

[46] Paranavitana 1956: clxxxiii.

[47] SBL 28, cf. KĀ 1.30.

will always be new poetic features that emerge from the creative imaginations of poets.

With such self-conscious innovativeness in phonic texture, prosody, and expressive ecology in mind, let us turn our attention to the content of the first verse of *Our Own Poetics*, here offered again in translation:

> May it always be about adding beauty to beauty
> whenever an all-white goose, Sarasvati, takes flight
> from the forest of lotuses, Brahma's four mouths, rising
> into that flooding pool in the Milky Way—the poet's heart.

The similarity of both the Sanskrit and Sinhala verses is obvious.[48] The Sanskrit and the Sinhala verses both highlight four-mouthed Brahma, all-white Sarasvati, and the poet's mind by matching them with a bed of lotuses, a female goose, and a watery home for this goose. It is worth noting, first, that despite being addressed to an audience whose members would likely think of themselves religiously as Buddhist, *Our Own Poetics* preserves Dandin's invocation to the goddess Sarasvati, together with the reference to Brahma. This tells us something important about the composite nature of the literary culture that embraced Dandin's *Mirror* and about its complex intersections with religious culture in tenth-century Sri Lanka. Indeed, there is an apparent accommodation of "Hindu" details throughout *Our Own Poetics*.[49]

By opening with a verse that directly repeats the vocabulary and imagery of Dandin's opening stanza, *Our Own Poetics* makes a clear statement about its tight intertextual relationship with the *Mirror*. A microanalysis of the contents of the two verses can tell us more about this relationship. Note, first, some key features of Dandin's own invocation. The speaker directly connects himself to the divinity Brahma (in his four-faced form, the origin of language and of the Vedic scriptures) and to Brahma's active creative force, Sarasvati, goddess of poetry. The latter, he hopes, will take pleasure in his heart, in the manner of a female goose in Lake Manasa (near Mount Kailash), where geese come to mate. Dandin thus evokes in his first verse what Yigal Bronner calls the "pleasure principle" in literature, in a way that is directly connected to erotic pleasures, and what enables

[48] Just as is their similarity with a verse from the opening of the Kannada *Way of the Poet-King*; for the Kannada verse, see Ollett and Pierce Taylor, section 2.2 in this volume. See also *Kavirājamārgaṃ* 2017: 3 and note 4 to the translation.

[49] For instance, SBL 79 preserves the description of Shiva from KĀ 2.12, and SBL 45 keeps the allusion to Vishnu's boar incarnation from KĀ 1.74. Manuscripts and printed editions of *Our Own Poetics* generally include an invocation to the Buddha, such as "*namavu muni saraṇa*" or "*namo buddhāya*." Such paratexts lightly "Buddhicize" the work, even while calling attention to the fact that it does not begin like a conventional Buddhist text. By contrast, *Lucid Poetics*, the Pali transposition of Dandin's *Mirror*, tellingly avoids Dandin's invocation of Brahma and Sarasvati (see section 3.6 below).

Dandin to make this connection is not only the identification of Sarasvati with a female goose, but also the bitextual "embrace" (*śleṣa*) in the word *mānasa*, which conveys both "heart" and the name of the Himalayan lake.[50] Dandin, in his usual confident voice, suggests that he already has Sarasvati immersed in his heart, and the wish he expresses is far bolder: he wants her there forever. This adverb, "forever" (*nityam*), may mean as long as he lives, but it could also suggest the power of poetry to overcome death by immortalizing its subject, a topic to which Dandin returns in the *Mirror* more explicitly a few verses down.[51]

Turning to the Sinhala verse, we can note three subtle but important departures from its Sanskrit intertext. First is the shift from first to third person: the wish for eternal poetic pleasure is no longer for Dandin, speaking of himself, or even the author of *Our Own Poetics*, but for poets (*kivi*) in general, and perhaps an entire line of Sinhala poets that is projected into the future as the embodiment of Dandin's "forever." Second, the pun on *mānasa* in Sanskrit does not carry over smoothly to Sinhala, and it is creatively replaced by a suggestive identification between the poet's heart and a heavenly river (*madovu* [*Mandākinī*],[52] here translated as "the Milky Way"). It is as if the author of *Our Own Poetics* wanted to suggest a body of water that is even loftier than Dandin's, one which forms another conduit between the divine and human worlds: here it is not only the white goose that is Sarasvati that fuses the worlds, but also the body of water in which she takes pleasure, a river that springs in heaven before cascading down to earth (as the Ganges does). The already vast vision of Dandin is expanded even further in *Our Own Poetics*, temporally, spatially, and in terms of the community of poets it now includes.

Finally, and relatedly, note the all-important verb with which the Sinhala verse opens: *sadāvā*. *Sadāvā* is from *sadanavā*, carrying overt connotations of "making" as well as "adorning." Used here in the optative, the verb can have a range of meanings, from "may it join" to "may it ornament" and "may it beautify." This verb is glossed in the tenth-century Sinhala paraphrase on *Our Own Poetics* as *sajjita karāvā*, which brings a wider range of meanings into play: making flow, setting free, moving forth, creating (the Sanskrit cognate is *sṛj*), and producing, as well as getting and receiving. Moreover, on its own, the initial *sadā* part in *sadāvā* means "always" and "ever," and if one were to take this as a semantic free association, it resonates with the "forever" (*nityam*) in Dandin's verse, otherwise not found in the Sinhala. It is difficult to translate such a verb containing such a free association, and a literal translation cannot do justice to its many resonant meanings. We thus opt for an admittedly nonliteral combination of some of

[50] See Bronner, section 1.6 in this volume.
[51] KĀ 1.5.
[52] Mandākinī is also named in earlier Pali commentaries as one of seven great lakes in the Himalayas; it is said to never grow hot and to dry out only at the end of an aeon (*kalpa*).

them that, we believe, also articulates the opening tacit metapoetic statement of *Our Own Poetics*: "May it always be about adding beauty to beauty."

The first verse of *Our Own Poetics* thus helps us understand the work as a whole and, indeed, it also illuminates the larger story of Dandin in Sri Lanka. Key to this understanding is recognizing when and how beauty can be added to beauty. It is clear from *Our Own Poetic*'s first verse that its ideal readers would be alert to both the received heritage of Sinhala poetry and that of Sanskrit, including Dandin's *Mirror*. The verse also shows how the text trains its readers to read. Above all, readers must become skilled in the practice of re-reading texts with sustained attention—the ability to re-read the same text over and over while constantly seeking to find out something new about it. It also seems anticipated that a capable reader will be able to read a text with its intertexts, too, as is possible here with the *Mirror*'s first verse and that of *Our Own Poetics*. Reading as a literary practice itself is thus another way that beauty is added to beauty. This, then, is yet another sense in which *Our Own Poetics* became a classic in Italo Calvino's sense: "A classic is a book which with each rereading offers as much of a sense of discovery as the first reading."[53]

3.4. Body, Virtues, and Flaws in *Our Own Poetics*

Charles Hallisey and P. B. Meegaskumbura

To say that the story of Dandin in Sri Lanka is about adding beauty to beauty does not mean that it can be reduced to taking ideas and models from the *Mirror* and applying them to poetry in Sinhala and Pali.

There are theoretical discussions in *Our Own Poetics* which differ quite substantially from the *Mirror*'s. The most prominent example is its treatment of "the body of literature." Overall, the discussion of "body" (*śarīra*) is not one of the most satisfying in the *Mirror*, where it seems little more than a convenient heading under which to stick and briefly discuss certain received topics, such as genre, language, and their intersection, without much elaboration or particular coherence. It may be, however, that the apparent looseness, even blandness, of this notion in the *Mirror* actually masks what constitutes its "translatability," in Walter Benjamin's sense of those contours of a text that have a specific significance inherent in the original and which manifest themselves more overtly in its translation.[54] Significantly, it is in the discussion of "the body of literature" in *Our Own Poetics* that we see its author thinking *with* Dandin and, as a result, discovering Sinhala's potential as a literary language in new ways.

[53] Calvino 1991: 5.
[54] Benjamin 2002: 254.

We can begin to see how this happens by noting the differences from the *Mirror* in the parallel "body" section of *Our Own Poetics*. These primarily have to do with what the author sees as the particularities of the expressive ecology of Sinhala, those elements that are "suitable to the people of the Island of Gems (Sri Lanka)."[55] It is thus not surprising that, as we already have noted, *Our Own Poetics* completely omits the *Mirror*'s overview of different literary languages (Sanskrit, Prakrit, Apabhramsha, and mixed).[56] It also does not try to appropriate Dandin's notions of southern and northeastern paths (*mārga*), but instead silently ignores them.[57] It is as if these specific options make sense in Sanskrit literary production but have no clear usefulness for identifying possibilities in Sinhala.

At the same time, *Our Own Poetics* sees new possibilities for Sinhala in the light of the *Mirror*, when the plotting of genres is tweaked to expand the expressive ecology of Sinhala. Literary works in a mixture of prose and verse, which for Dandin embodies the genre of *campū*, apparently had not yet been written in Sinhala (although *Our Own Poetics* does recognize the combination of prose and verse as existing in stage plays).[58] Hence, Dandin's description of *campū* is replaced in *Our Own Poetics* by an explicit prescriptive encouragement for such works to be composed.[59]

Such new possibilities for literary expression in Sinhala are inflected by a sensitivity to the appropriateness of subject matter in the local religious community. *Our Own Poetics* plots appropriate topics onto Dandin's matrix of genres. Verse, for instance, is to be used for narrating the past and present lives of the Buddha, while prose is to be used for stories and biographies (*vat sirit*) and other ancient lore. These prescriptive associations are not based on anything in Dandin, and it "is reasonable to assume that [they] were based on a long tradition of Sinhalese works which were in existence when [*Our Own Poetics*] was composed."[60] Judging from elsewhere in the text, it does seem that the converse of this prescription is not normative: while the life of the Buddha is to be told in verse, verse can be used to tell other stories, even those from outside the Buddhist tradition. Indeed, as we have already noted, *Our Own Poetics*, following the *Mirror*, is openly ecumenical in its outlook.

[55] SBL 32.
[56] KĀ 1.32–38.
[57] KĀ 1.40.
[58] SBL 20.
[59] SBL 13: "It would be good if there were to be in our own language beautiful *campū* poetry which brings together both verse and prose" (*vanu mänavi siyabasi / nēkavi baňda siridu yam / vadan pabaňdekda kiyu / peden visituru sapu [campū] yī*). Some later works in Sinhala, such as the fifteenth-century *Message of Kuveni* (*Kuveṇi asna*) and *History of Hatthavanagala Monastery in Sinhala* (*Eḷu attanagalavaṃśaya*), can be seen as realizations of this prescription.
[60] Wijayawardhana 1963: 145.

A more significant theoretical departure of *Our Own Poetics* when compared to the "body" section of the *Mirror* is in framing the discussion of poetic virtues (*guṇa*). For Dandin, the poetic virtues belong constitutively to the southern path (*Vaidarbhī mārga*), as distinct from the northeastern (*Gauḍī*), and they are even said to form the "life breaths" (*prāṇa*) of this preferred regional path or style. Indeed, for Dandin this framing of the poetic virtues is part of his decisive argument against Bhamaha, who considered the distinction between the southern and northeastern paths futile.[61] *Our Own Poetics*, by contrast, is totally uninterested in this argument, as it is in any similar argument between Bhamaha and Dandin, and there are several such squabbles in the parallel section of the *Mirror* (e.g., what constitutes a suitable plot structure and whether or not there is a difference between the two genres of storytelling). Such squabbles seem to be taken as intra-Sanskrit matters that are of no concern "to the people of the Island of Gems," the readers of *Our Own Poetics*, and they are thus safely omitted. Through such omissions, *Our Own Poetics* actually reframes Dandin's entire discussion of poetic virtues. It retains the vocabulary of "life breath" and uses it far more thoroughly than the *Mirror* does: "life breath" (*paṇa*) becomes the official name of the poetic virtues and is used consistently as such. This move makes the "body" metaphor far more robust than it is for Dandin: these life breaths animate the literary body itself, rather than serving as a device to identify styles within it. Even more importantly, according to *Our Own Poetics*, Sanskrit's division into "regional" styles is not to be replicated in Sinhala, in contrast to what is presented for Kannada in the *Way of the Poet-King*. Rather, the virtues/breaths are what unify the entire body of literature in "this language of ours."

Close behind this general reorganization comes a significant theoretical recasting. *Our Own Poetics* accepts the existence of what for Dandin was already a fixed list of ten poetic virtues, just as there are thirty-five ornaments that serve to decorate the literary body. But it immediately alerts its readers to possibilities of variability within this larger set:

> The life breaths (*paṇa*) that produce literature are only ten, and there are thirty-five ornaments (*lakara*), from these I will describe the ones needed for the people of this Island of Gems.[62]

Note the generative power allotted to the breaths "that produce literature," which again highlights their importance and lends the "body" metaphor coherence. But note also the process of selection: it is at this point that the text proceeds

[61] See Bronner and Cox, section 5.5 in this volume.
[62] SBL 32: *dasa pamaṇa kivikamä paṇalakara vē pantis / meyin ruvan divhi dananaṭa yut kiyat pat.*

to describe and illustrate only seven of the received list of ten, leaving out "concision" (*śleṣa*), "evenness" (*samatā*), and "tenderness" (*sukumāratā*). The summarizing verse at the end of *Our Own Poetics* that explicitly says that ten poetic virtues were included in the text reaffirms the idea that all ten virtues always need to be acknowledged, even if only seven needed to be practically described "for the people of this Island of Gems."[63]

There are two ways to explain this omission of descriptions and illustrations of three of the ten poetic virtues. One is to see it as an attempt to define the uniqueness of Sinhala literature by its constitutive selection from the larger menu of "life breaths." According to this approach, each literary tradition has its own preferences, and the seven life breaths defined and illustrated in *Our Own Poetics* are those that best represent Sinhala literature. Understood in this rather straightforward way, the Sinhala text would have another indication of some indebtedness to Vamana, who analyzed differences among literary styles on the basis of the degree to which they lack some and favor others from the standard list of ten.[64]

Wijayawardhana proposes a second, somewhat bolder interpretation. In his reading of *Our Own Poetics*, "concision," "evenness," and "tenderness" are omitted from the list not because they are absent from or inimical to literature in Sinhala, but because they are inherent in its expressive ecology.[65] Thus their presence in a work of Sinhala literature cannot be a mark of any special skill or achievement on the part of a competent poet.

Put differently, *Our Own Poetics* normatively expects all ten virtues to be found in Sinhala whenever that language is used as a medium for literature. In finding no need even to describe "concision," "evenness," and "tenderness," it seems to go beyond saying that Sinhala's expressive ecology favors these three and implies that, because of its constitution, Sinhala cannot but contain them. In this sense, *Our Own Poetics* presents Sinhala as forming a "maximal southern way," and it thus comes as no surprise that at the end of its first chapter, it describes Sinhala as "the good path," and anything in another style as "other."[66] At the same time, and somewhat contradictorily, when introducing four of the virtues individually—"clarity" (*pahan*; *prasāda*), "sweetness" (*miyuru*; *mādhurya*), "power" (*oda*; *ojas*), and "charm" (*danakal*; *kānti*), *Our Own Poetics* notes that an alternative, differing from the "good" Sinhala embodying these ten poetic virtues and closer

[63] SBL 408.

[64] Thus, for Vamana, the southern way invariably has all ten virtues, the northeastern way lacks "sweetness" and "tenderness" but favors "power" and "charm," and the western way lacks "power" and "charm" but favors "tenderness" and "sweetness" (KASū 1.2.11–13).

[65] Wijayawardhana 1963: 139, 200.

[66] SBL 67: *manā merum maga*. The *Old Paraphrase on Our Own Poetics* makes the point more strongly and says that what is other than the southern way is not good.

to Dandin's northeastern way, is also appreciated by some; each such alternative is also illustrated.[67]

We conclude this section with a few observations about a topic that is closely related to poetic virtues, that of poetic flaws, which appear at the very end of *Our Own Poetics*, just as they do in Dandin's *Mirror*. The Sanskrit and Sinhala passages on flaws are close in letter and spirit, but those in Sinhala demonstrate tendencies similar to those we have seen in the discussion of poetic virtues. For one thing, *Our Own Poetics* totally sidesteps another squabble between Bhamaha and Dandin, this time over whether flaws in logical reasoning apply to poetry as well.[68] For another, we find processes of selection and recasting at work once again. Thus, whereas the *Mirror* has ten flaws in its third chapter, establishing a symmetry with the poetic virtues in its first chapter, *Our Own Poetics* has only nine because it silently omits "flawed sandhi" (*visandhika*) from Dandin's list. Euphonic changes are not as rule-bound in Sinhala as they are in Sanskrit, and it is thus largely meaningless to speak of negligence of sandhi as a literary flaw in Sinhala. Just as *Our Own Poetics* includes without discussion the virtues of "concision," "evenness," and "tenderness" because Sinhala poetry cannot exist without them, so it excludes "flawed sandhi" because it simply cannot render Sinhala poetry flawed.

A particularly noteworthy feature of Dandin's conception of the ten poetic flaws is their contingent nature. In some settings, a flaw may cease to be so and actually may become a source of relish.[69] The only exception to the redeemability of flaws is in the case of "defective meter" (*bhinnavṛtta*), which for Dandin is intrinsically deficient. *Our Own Poetics* concurs and takes this norm as applying to Sinhala *gī* meters, naming *Piyum* as an example for all of those meters, while simultaneously sending us back to the citation of a book on Sinhala metrics that is mentioned in its first chapter.[70] *Our Own Poetics* also affirms explicitly that three of its nine flaws have the contingent nature that Dandin describes and illustrates—"incoherency" (*apārtha*), "repetition" (*ekārtha*), and "impropriety in terms of place etc." (*deśādivirodha*).[71] The status of the other five is less clear,

[67] SBL 34, 38, 47, 52, and 58.
[68] KĀ 3.127; Wijayawardhana 1963: 165.
[69] See Bronner, section 1.4 in this volume.
[70] SBL 385. The reference is to SBL 15. The placement of this cross reference here is itself significant. It turns the reader's mind back to the discussion of the "body" of literature in which, as we have seen, "the *prāṇa*s in [*Our Own Poetics*] bear the mark of absolute virtues" (Wijayawardhana 1963: 141). Defective meter is, in the same light, an "absolute flaw." The cross reference here thus reinforces *Our Own Poetics*'s sense of the "natural" normativity of Sinhala's expressive ecology, a topic to which we will return in section 3.5.
[71] SBL 379, 382, 388.

as the text does not provide any illustrations of how they might cease to be poetic flaws in an appropriate textual context.[72]

Our Own Poetics's section on poetic flaws hints yet again at a broad spectrum of Sanskrit sources available to its readers, similar to what we have already noted with hints toward Vamana, Bhamaha, Udbhata, Anandavardhana, and Mahima Bhatta in section 3.2 above. There is another such hint in its discussion of "misrepresentation of the arts" (*kalāvirodha*). In the *Mirror*, two examples are given for this flaw, one concerning literature, the other, music.[73] This is also the case in *Our Own Poetics*, but its example of misrepresentation of music—pertaining to the precise number of *svara*s, *grama*s, and *murchana*s in a musical piece—is far more erudite than Dandin's, and the verse in *Our Own Poetics* may even be a reference to Chapter 28 of Bharata's *Treatise on Theater*.[74] The level of detail in this illustrative verse suggests that *Our Own Poetics* expected at least some in its audiences to be familiar with Sanskrit technical terms used to analyze music, just as they were expected to be with Sanskrit terms used to analyze literature.[75]

Taken together, these changes in the discussion of poetic virtues and flaws turn our attention to two additional key contours in the story of Dandin in Sri Lanka. The first is the perdurance of Sinhala's expressive ecology, and especially the degree to which this expressive ecology was seen as needing to be intentionally preserved in something of a fixed state according to its "natural" norms. The second contour is about what other Sanskrit works besides Dandin became part of his story in Sri Lanka.

3.5. Naturalizing Normativity: *Niyara*

Charles Hallisey and P. B. Meegaskumbura

So far we have mainly followed cases in which *Our Own Poetics* uses, sometimes selectively and creatively, conceptual tools already found in the *Mirror*. But telling the story of Dandin's reception in the "Island of Gems" also requires that we pay attention to how the *Mirror*'s conceptual toolkit was enlarged in ways that inflected the subsequent reception of Dandin.

[72] Wijayawardhana suggests that this is informed by the work's "marked tendency to be more concise and succinct," and that "it is possible to conclude that [*Our Own Poetics*] too subscribes to the view that dosas are anitya—variable" (Wijayawardhana 1963: 158, 164).

[73] KĀ 3.170.

[74] SBL 390 (possibly referring to *Nāṭyaśāstra* 28.7, 24, 27–31).

[75] The *Grandmaster Commentary* on *Lucid Poetics* (*Subodhālaṅkārapurāṇaṭīkā*), a Pali engagement with the *Mirror* discussed in section 3.6 below, names Bharata in the course of a discussion about the varieties of *rasa*s. The fifth chapter of *Lucid Poetics* is devoted to the topic of the varieties of *rasa*s, and its discussion also uses the technical vocabulary of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. All this suggests that the *Nāṭyaśāstra* was indeed known in Sri Lanka at this time; see the *Grandmaster Commentary* (*Subodhālaṅkārapurāṇaṭīkā*) ad Subodh v. 340, p. 272, for the reference to Bharata by name.

Before turning to one particularly important conceptual tool, let us first note how *Our Own Poetics* positions itself between two kinds of heritages and addresses two kinds of audiences:

> It's for two groups of people
> that I will tell a bit
> about the characteristics of our own literature:
> those who don't know those little books of old,
> and those who don't know the Language of the Gods.[76]

The "little books of old" mentioned here are usually taken to be Sinhala works on "poetics and other allied subjects such as prosody" that predated *Our Own Poetics*.[77] We know next to nothing about these works and the received heritage they constituted, but this verse does require us to entertain, once again, the likelihood that Sri Lankan authors and readers brought their own critical resources to their engagements with the *Mirror*. The "Language of the Gods" is a familiar epithet for Sanskrit, including resources such as Dandin's *Mirror*. This verse seems to imply that *Our Own Poetics* aims to bring together two groups of readers that did not entirely overlap: those versed in the world of Sanskrit and its terminology, and those steeped in local literature. What, we may ask, was the conceptual contribution of the local heritage to the text?

The term *niyara*, often deployed in *Our Own Poetics*, is one possible contribution. As we shall see, *niyara* is a complex word in William Empson's sense of a pervasively present term bearing "unnoticed propositions" and having the potential of becoming a "compacted doctrine" with a unified meaning that gradually grows in the reader's mind.[78] There are a number of complex words in Empson's sense already in Dandin's *Mirror*. *Mārga*, poetic path or "way," is a particularly salient example of a term that Dandin brings up repeatedly, in different contexts, highlighting not only literature's infinitely myriad ways, but also the constitutive unity that pervades its "inherently plural reality."[79] Sheldon Pollock has traced the broader contours of *mārga* as a term that, in the tradition of Sanskrit poetics, refers to a rule-bound method, a mode, or a style. Pollock also identifies a "somewhat more speculative" sense that "may be said to work at a sort of Heideggerian level of etymological determination:"

> Given that the modes of composition in Sanskrit poetry are geographically coded, *mārga* as the term chosen to express them may carry some deep

[76] SBL 3: *Derāsvas kiyam peragat sakev nidu vū / nodata nodata devbas siyakav lakuṇinek des.*
[77] Wijayawardhana 1963: 135.
[78] Empson 1985: 39.
[79] Bronner, section 1.3 in this volume.

resonance with "marches" and "marshes"—terms to which *mārga* may be etymologically related—meaning the regions with their accompanying borders of the world of literary culture.[80]

Pollock's speculation about a deep resonance between *mārga* and margins appears quite prescient when we turn to the use of *niyara* as a conceptual tool in *Our Own Poetics*. *Niyara* is an example of what the *Compendium* calls a "native" word (*nipan*; Sanskrit *niṣpanna*), a word which is "unmixed with any other language manifest in the Sinhala island (*heḷadivä*)."[81] That is, it is neither a loanword (*tasama*/*tatsama*) nor a word adapted from Sanskrit (*tabava*/*tadbhava*). Dandin already brings such a tripartite division into poetics in the context of defining the three sources of Prakrit vocabulary, and the incorporation of this division in the *Compendium* suggests that Sinhala, too, had already become part of Dandin's open-ended continuum of Prakrit by this time.[82]

Niyara, as a native word, is thus unlike other complex words in *Our Own Poetics* which are all taken from the *Mirror*'s Sanskrit. This is significant in itself and highlights the self-consciousness about bringing together two distinct heritages, one originating in the island, the other coming from elsewhere, already seen in the verse just quoted. As is the case with *mārga* in Sanskrit, *niyara* is multivalent in Sinhala, with meanings ranging from "reality" or "fact" (*ākāraya*, *tattvaya*) to "process" or "order" (*kramaya*), and "border" or "inhabited region" (*vēlla, janapadaya*).[83] These meanings resonate closely with those of *mārga* in Sanskrit, and this closeness may be part of the significance of introducing the Sinhala native term in *Our Own Poetics*. Especially noteworthy is that, like *mārga* can seem to do in Dandin's Sanskrit, *niyara* refers to "regions with their accompanying borders."

*Niyara*s, in the narrowest usages, are "bunds" or "dikes"—the earthen boundaries that distinguish one paddy field from another—and it is perhaps this meaning that is most revelatory metapoetically. This is because these bunds not only separate one field from another, fence-like; they also retain the water when the paddy field is flooded to enable the growth of rice seedlings. *Niyara* are thus essential points of contact between paddy fields, for water passes from one field to another through them, either through seepage downhill or human-made sluices. Since young rice plants can only grow in standing water, *niyara* are a sine qua non for rice agriculture. Moreover, *niyara*s take advantage of natural features of the landscape, such as a gentle sloping terrain or a hillside that is suitable for making terraced paddy fields. At the same time, they are products of human

[80] Pollock 2006: 209.
[81] Gair and Karunatillake 2013: 7 (Ss I.11).
[82] KĀ 1.33, 35; see also Bronner, section 1.1 in this volume.
[83] Sorata 1963: 514, s.v. *niyara*.

vision and effort, in both their making and their maintenance. It could even be said that *niyara* are forms in the landscape, elaborated and improved (*saṃskṛta*) from potentials discerned in nature (*prākṛta*).

The metapoetic connotations and subsequent implications of *niyara* as a complex word are thus manifold, but they always include the necessary conditions for the generation of things that would not otherwise exist. In the realm of literature, this includes the constitutive interaction between the given and the improved, as well as between the divided and the shared. *Niyara*s in language represent bunds that connect and separate distinct expressive ecologies and create wholes that are larger than the sum of their parts. *Niyara*s thus are constitutive of literature writ large, just as rice farming is constituted by many individual paddy fields.

To better understand the semantic field and the range of use of *niyara* in *Our Own Poetics*, let us consider the many key topics on which the term is brought to bear throughout the text. We begin with Dandin's most basic categories. Under the aforementioned "body of literature," the *Mirror* lists three basic types of composition: verse, prose, and a mixture of both; for *Our Own Poetics*, these are the three *niyara*s of the literary body.[84] Likewise, meters of Sinhala poetry (all of which would be considered *jāti* in Dandin's binary classification into *vṛtta* and *jāti*) are identified as the *niyara*s of poetic composition.[85] With respect to ornaments, the largest topic in both texts, *Our Own Poetics* finds ample scope for the use of this term. Thus, taking up Dandin's statement that "things made of speech" (*vāṅmaya*)—which, as Ratna explains, refers in this context to the entire field of ornaments—are divided into factual and crooked statements (*svabhāvokti* and *vakrokti*), *Our Own Poetics* calls these "the two *niyara*s of all ornaments taken together."[86] Likewise, the two foundational ornaments that bookend Dandin's inventory, "factual statement" (*svabhāvokti*) and "integrity" (*bhāvika*), are each defined as "*niyara*s of speech."[87] Dandin offers a basic subdivision of "factual statements" of "genera, attributes, actions, and individual entities"—a crucial division that he will later reuse in conceptualizing other ornaments; *Our Own Poetics* adds that "these four *niyara*s are supreme in all books and also well-known in poetry."[88] When Dandin says he will describe the vast universe (*prapañca*) of his quintessential ornament, simile, the author of *Our Own Poetics* tells of describing both its *niyara* and its vast expansiveness (*vitara*; *vistara*).[89] Additional examples can be supplied.[90]

[84] KĀ 1.11; SBL 12.
[85] KĀ 1.11; SBL 16–18: *pada baňdumehi niyara me*.
[86] KĀ 2.360 (see Ratna's comments on p. 196); SBL 337.
[87] SBL 75, 336; compare KĀ 2.8, 2.361, respectively.
[88] KĀ 2.13; SBL 80.
[89] KĀ 2.14; SBL 81.
[90] For example, long compounds, which Dandin identified as key to the poetic virtue "power," are now its *niyara* (SBL 51; compare KĀ 1.80–84). Apropos the virtue of "manifest meaning" (*arthavyakti*), *Our Own Poetics* asks: "could there be a *niyara* of language whose meaning is not

Note that the use of the native Sinhala *niyara* to describe discrete basic topics found in the *Mirror* (and the basis on which they stand) adds an entirely new foundational metaphor to the discussion; that is to say, *niyara* takes its place as a complex word alongside "body," "path," "ornament," and *rasa*. Although *Our Own Poetics* uses *niyara* in place of a variety of Sanskrit words found in the *Mirror*,[91] it consistently uses it to imply "that what the word names is really there and worth naming."[92] In effect, *Our Own Poetics* understands Sinhala to reconfigure Sanskrit knowledge, even as Sanskrit reconfigures Sinhala. Indeed, the use of independent nomenclature is also found in other Sri Lankan engagements with the *Mirror*, especially in the *Compendium*, suggesting a more general disposition toward this sort of reconfiguration.[93] Note also that *Our Own Poetics* is not unique in its usage of *niyara*; it is also found in Sinhala exegetical texts on Buddhist literature of the time.[94]

In the light of the use of *niyara* as a complex word in *Our Own Poetics*, we find it striking that "the Sinhala Master" Ratna, in commenting on Dandin's *Mirror*, says that its entire first chapter is about *khila*, a term that refers, among other things, to the land dividing cultivated fields, while the rest of the *Mirror* constitutes what is common (*samam*) to "different fields."[95] Perhaps in distinguishing the different parts of Dandin's *Mirror* with a close analogy drawn from agriculture, Ratna was trying to articulate some of the metapoetic connotations of *niyara* that he had learned in Sri Lanka before he wrote his Sanskrit commentary on Dandin in India.

To realize the full significance of *niyara* in *Our Own Poetics*, we must keep in mind the term's basic agricultural connotations. Consider, for example, the discussion of the virtue "sweetness," in the course of which Dandin addresses occasions of unintended vulgarity.[96] *Our Own Poetics* refuses to provide examples lest they end up becoming acceptable; it warns against the likelihood that the use

manifest?" (SBL 46: *no haňgavana tama arut–vadaniyara ätda kavara*; KĀ 1.75; for more on this passage in Dandin and Ratna, see Bronner and Cox, section 5.6 in this volume). See also SBL 272 for the use of *niyara* apropos the rasa-related ornaments.

[91] For example, *vyavasthita*; *parāyaṇa*; *avasthā*; and *nyāya*.

[92] Empson 1985: 39.

[93] See Wijayawardhana 1963: 177–78, especially 178: "The three figures uba-bas [*aprastuta-praśaṁsā*], nidi-pasas [*nindā-praśaṁsā*] and an-alap [*samāsokti*] in [the *Compendium*] are conspicuous by their unusual nomenclature. In spite of the fact there are well known terms in Sanskrit for each of them, [the *Compendium*] gives them new names whose Sanskrit equivalents are not in common use."

[94] In such exegetical texts, *niyara* is used as a gloss for *ākāra* (form, condition), *tattva* (real, true nature), *janapada* (inhabited country), and *maryādā* (boundary, bund, shore). See Sorata 1963: 514.

[95] Ratna ad KĀ 1.105, p. 66: *mataṃ khilaprāyam ihāsti daṇḍinaḥ | tad etad atra prakṛtaṃ parisphuṭam | itaḥ purastāt samam eva vartate | tad atra nāsmābhir abhāvito vidhiḥ ||*. See Dimitrov 2016: 576–77 on this verse. A discussion of Ratna's use of the semantically relevant term *maryādā* (e.g., ad KĀ 1.4) is beyond the scope of our concerns here.

[96] KĀ 1.62–67.

of a word or a phrase that is considered vulgar by contemporary standards will be later justified on the basis of such earlier usage in illustrations, "because as time goes on, will not this language of ours change, unlike Sanskrit?"[97] Although the term *niyara* is not used in this passage, we can see how, like earthen bunds of rice fields, the particular *niyara*s that distinguish languages according to their different expressive ecologies require vigilant maintenance. *Niyara*, in this sense, is not only an attempt to naturalize normativity, but also to normalize the nature of Sinhala poetic language.[98] We should also not lose sight of the crucial nature of *niyara*s, noted earlier, as forms in the landscape that have been elaborated and improved (*saṃskṛta*) from potentials initially discerned in nature (*prākṛta*). *Niyara*s are not only features that separate and distinguish, they also connect and supplement. Above all, as both connections and supplements, they make it possible to share what is needed for growth between otherwise separate fields. To be alert to the role of *niyara* in literature is thus to be mindful that literature should "always be about adding beauty to beauty."

3.6. A Textual Community

Alastair Gornall, Charles Hallisey, and P. B. Meegaskumbura

Constellation, not sequencing, carries truth.[99]

—Olga Tokarczuk

A key way in which the reception of Dandin became enlarged and reconfigured in Sri Lanka is by further engagements with the *Mirror* during the three or four centuries after the composition of *Our Own Poetics*. These number no less than eight, in three different languages—Sanskrit, Pali, and Sinhala—thus keeping the issue of language choice at the center of the story. In this section we introduce this larger, multilingual group of works, discuss their textual and linguistic practices, and speak of them heuristically as a textual community. They embody not only complex connections with the *Mirror*, but also reflexivities and intersectionalities that connect them with each other and organize them within a single history, much as A. K. Ramanujan has suggested is broadly typical of cultural traditions across South Asia.[100]

This latter lineation comes to the fore especially with two of these eight interpretive engagements. They are both, like *Our Own Poetics*, adaptations

[97] SBL 42–43.

[98] A similar point can be made on Ratna's discussion of the two paths of poetry, ad KĀ 1.40 (see also Pollock 2006: 214 and his discussion of Sri Lanka therein).

[99] Tokarczuk 2018: 77.

[100] Ramanujan 1989: 189.

of the *Mirror* to new language contexts. One is in Sinhala, the *Compendium (Sidatsaṅgarā*), and the other is in Pali, Sangharakkhita's *Lucid Poetics* (*Subodhālaṅkāra*). In this section we show that these two texts expand the discursive field centered around the *Mirror* in a variety of ways, one of which is through their own commentaries. Indeed, all of the adaptations of Dandin in Sinhala and Pali, and Dandin's original, too, attracted exegeses in Sri Lanka, totaling five additional works.

Our Own Poetics, not surprisingly, has the earliest commentary, the *Old Paraphrase on Poetics in Our Own Language* (*Siyabaslakarapurāṇasannaya*), written shortly after its root text.[101] Sangharakkhita's *Lucid Poetics* has an auto-commentary in Pali (the *Subodhālaṅkārapurāṇaṭīkā*, also known as the *Grandmaster Commentary* [*Subodhālaṅkāramahāsāmiṭīkā*]) and a distinct paraphrase in Sinhala (the *Subodhālaṅkārapurāṇasannaya*). The *Compendium* also has an old Sinhala paraphrase (*Sidatsaṅgarāpurāṇasannaya*). In addition, there is a Sinhala exegesis directly on Dandin's Sanskrit treatise (*Kāvyādarśasannaya*).[102] To these eight works composed in Sri Lanka—three adaptations, four commentaries thereon, and one Sinhala elucidation of Dandin—we may add a ninth, Ratna's Sanskrit commentary on Dandin, which, although written in the mainland in the tenth century, was in circulation in the island shortly thereafter.

There are many things that can be said about this varied and complex textual field, but let us begin with a basic observation: Dandin's *Mirror* was known in Sri Lanka not only as a Sanskrit text composed in mainland South Asia, across the Palk Strait, but also through a variety of local translations, adaptations, and secondary as well as tertiary engagements in several languages that were read in partially overlapping circles during the first centuries of the "vernacular millennium." These varied engagements established the *Mirror* locally, and they are a key reason that the *Mirror* has had a continuing presence in Sri Lanka.

One particularly noteworthy feature of this continuing presence is the way in which secondary exegetical works, when commenting on adaptations of the *Mirror*, sometimes reach out to make direct connections with the *Mirror* itself, taking it as the root of their root texts. In some cases, the connection is simple, but sufficient enough to ensure that discussions in the local adaptations would be easily seen in the light of the contents of the *Mirror* itself. For example, the *Old Paraphrase on the Compendium* consistently provides Sanskrit loanwords

[101] On the date of the *Old Paraphrase on Our Own Poetics*, see section 3.2 above and especially note 20.

[102] The authorship and date of the latter are the subject of widely differing views. Godakumbura dates it to the twelfth century (Godakumbura 2010: 328), Bechert to the twelfth or thirteenth (cited in Dimitrov 2016: 126), and Ven. Välivitye Sorata to the fifteenth (Sorata 1963: XXXVIII). Dimitrov places it in the tenth century on the basis of his argument that its author was Ratna himself (Dimitrov 2016: 142–43). As he himself acknowledges, however, sustaining his hypothesis awaits further research (Dimitrov 2016: 144–46), and we take this cautioning as relevant generally to his overarching argument about the very large corpus of works that should now all be credited to Ratna.

(*tatsama*) that make it easy to connect particular ornaments in the Sinhala text to their counterparts in the *Mirror*.[103] More elaborately, the Sinhala-language paraphrase on *Lucid Poetics* often quotes Dandin in Sanskrit, and also—rather unusually for a work in this Sinhala genre—in what may be original Pali translations of the Sanskrit.[104]

Moreover, the commentators, perceiving a gap between the *Mirror* and one of the translations and adaptations, often tie their root texts back to Dandin. This tendency can even be detected in Ratna's commentary, in response to what he apparently perceived as Dandin's occasional departure from his own principles, as Bronner and Cox argue in Chapter 5 of this volume.[105] A prominent example of this general disposition to return to the *Mirror* is seen in the Pali and Sinhala commentaries on Sangharakkhita's *Lucid Poetics*. Although *Lucid Poetics* clearly draws on the *Mirror*, it also departs from it in many overt ways. Consider, for example, Sangharakkhita's auto-commentary in Pali, known as the *Grandmaster Commentary* (*mahāsāmiṭīkā*), on account of the fact that he held the position of "grandmaster" of the Sangha at the time of its composition.[106] In his auto-commentary, Sangharakkhita sometimes returns to the *Mirror* to supplement his more selective use of Dandin in the root text. For example, in *Lucid Poetics*, Sangharakkhita entirely omits Dandin's extensive treatment of "twinning" (*yamaka*) —the use of phonetically identical duplicates, each with a different meaning—because he deemed this topic too demanding for students.[107] He does, however, deal with "twinning" and other complex figurations such as riddles (*paheḷikā*, Skt. *prahelikā*) in his own *Grandmaster Commentary* in a manner that relies heavily on Dandin's analysis.[108]

We see similar patterns in the Sinhala *Old Paraphrase on Lucid Poetics*. The *Old Paraphrase* sometimes deviates from Sangharakkhita's auto-commentary to provide a more detailed treatment of particular topics and occasionally to link his ideas back to the *Mirror*.[109] For example, when commenting on the figure "reciprocity" (*parivutti*, Skt. *parivṛtti*), in which an interaction between two entities is depicted as a barter exchange, the *Old Paraphrase* supplements Sangharakkhita's example with an analysis of Dandin's own, perhaps because Sangharakkhita's

[103] For example, *vastūpamā* is supplied for *vatuvam*, *adbhutopamā* for *abutuvam*, *śleṣopamā* for *selesuvam*, and *nindopamā* for *niňdi uvam* (ad Ss XII. 2, 3, 4, 7).

[104] For example, *Subodhālaṅkārapurāṇasannaya*, ad v. 3.48 (E^{e} v. 163), p. 91, quoting KĀ 1.103; ad 4.4 (E^{e} v. 167), p. 93, paraphrasing KĀ 2.4–7.

[105] See Bronner and Cox, section 5.6 in this volume.

[106] Some have cast doubt on Sangharakkhita's authorship of this commentary, but Petra Kieffer-Pülz has provided evidence to show that he elsewhere quotes it as his own work (Kieffer-Pülz 2017: 31–34, *contra* Wright 2002: 323–41).

[107] Subodh, v. 33. For *twinning*, see Bronner and Tubb, section 1.5 in this volume.

[108] See *Subodhālaṅkāraporāṇaṭīkā*, ad vv. 31–33 (Subodh 47–63).

[109] For example, *Subodhālaṅkārapurāṇasannaya*, ad v. 3.48 (E^{e} v. 163), p. 91, quoting KĀ 1.103; ad 4.4 (E^{e} v. 167), p. 93, paraphrasing KĀ 2.4–7.

was deemed unclear.[110] The same pattern is visible in the Sinhala-language *Old Paraphrase on Our Own Poetics*. It too restores aspects of the *Mirror* that *Our Own Poetics* omits.[111] Similarly, the *Paraphrase on the Compendium* seems to have the *Mirror* at hand when it clarifies places where the *Compendium* itself seems unclear. For example, just after an overview of six kinds of similes, the *Compendium* introduces an ornament that it calls *viruduvā*: "If one were to display a special quality by denying something that does exist or affirming something that does not exist, that is *viruduvā*."[112] On the basis of its placement right after an overview of simile subtypes, some modern readers have derived *viruduvā* from the Sanskrit *viruduvam* (*virodhopamā*), "simile phrased as antithesis," indeed one of the varieties of simile distinguished by Dandin and a plausible derivation in its own morphological right.[113] But this contradicts the *Compendium*'s own definition of the ornament as well as its illustrative verse, both of which are closer to Dandin's ornament of "antithesis" (*virodha*).[114] The *Old Paraphrase on the Compendium* seems to anticipate this confusion, and it glosses *viruduvā* with *viroddhokti*, an equivalent of Dandin's *virodha* ("antithesis").[115]

A key player in this dense web of texts turns out to be Ratna's Sanskrit commentary on Dandin. To begin with, there is a very close connection between his commentary and the Sinhala *Paraphrase on the Mirror*, so much so that Dimitrov notes that "[i]f one compares the [*Paraphrase*] with [Ratna's commentary] more closely, very quickly the impression will arise that the author of the [former] was extremely well-acquainted with [the latter] and felt at ease adopting comments, examples, and references from it."[116] It is also the case, as Dimitrov also points out, that the Sanskrit text of the *Mirror* found in the *Paraphrase* consistently matches the text that Ratna has.[117] But an awareness of Ratna is also apparent in other engagements with the *Mirror* in Sri Lanka. For example, the *Compendium* and its *Old Paraphrase* introduce the figure "simile involving an embrace" (*śleṣopamā*) with a definition that seems to owe more to Ratna's commentary than to Dandin's

[110] *Subodhālaṅkārapurāṇasannaya*, ad v. 4.163 (E^e v. 326), p. 159. It is noteworthy that the *Old Paraphrase*'s take on Dandin's verse here does not follow Ratna's.

[111] For example, the *Old Paraphrase on Our Own Poetics* restores Dandin's attention to authorial intention in "integrity" (*bhāvika*; ad SBL 338), and we have already noted (footnote 32) that it interprets *häṅgum* in a manner which brings it more in line with Dandin's emphasis on the integrity of the whole work.

[112] Ss XII.8: *äti näti kärä hota—näti guṇa kärä da äti sē / pavasata veses arutak—e viyū viruduvā nam.*

[113] For instance, Gair and Karunatillake 2013: 131 gloss it as "comparison by means of contradictory characteristics of the two terms of the comparison."

[114] Ss XII.8–9, which in turn is comparable to KĀ 2.333–40a (note the similar allusion to Karna in KĀ 2.339). On this point in the *Compendium*, we draw here from Wijayawardhana 1963: 179.

[115] *Sidatsaṅgarāpurāṇasannaya*, ad Ss XII.8, p. 250.

[116] Dimitrov 2016: 138. For a detailed survey of the similarities between the two texts, see Dimitrov 2016: 137–52.

[117] Dimitrov 2016: 127. As Dimitrov notes, the two texts match each other only up to verse 3.158 in the *Mirror*, at which point all available manuscript witnesses for the *Paraphrase* end.

own presentation.[118] Sangharakkhita's *Grandmaster Commentary* reveals that he, too, was reading the *Mirror* through Ratna's eyes.[119] A good example is Sangharakkhita's gloss of the definition of "intensification" (*atiśayokti*) with a close Pali version of Ratna's Sanskrit paraphrase.[120]

The texts in this group sometimes share their silences. No adaptation of Dandin in Sri Lanka includes any discussion of his basic principle that literature has a plurality of paths (*mārga*), and a key point of the *Mirror*'s first chapter, namely the polarity between the southern and northeastern regional styles (*mārgavibhāga*), is likewise unanimously ignored.[121] This is significant from the larger perspective of the *Mirror*'s life in Asia, and even more so, for its particular story in Sri Lanka. Apparently, there were aspects of Dandin's theory that seemed mainland-specific in the eyes of its otherwise highly receptive adaptors in the island. In their presentations of a single style for Sinhala and an internally diverse one for Pali, respectively, *The Compendium* and *Lucid Poetics* apparently assume normative stances similar to those that *Our Own Poetics* put forward, even though neither of them explicitly refers to that earlier text.

Related textual practices become visible around the same time in works beyond those engaging Dandin directly. For instance, passages quoted in Sanskrit from the *Mirror* are found in Sinhala-language commentaries on major works of literature as well. A twelfth-century Sinhala paraphrase on Kalidasa's *Cloud Messenger* cites from Dandin to illuminate Kalidasa's beginning his poem with the indefinite pronoun "someone" (*kaścit*), although without naming the *Mirror*.[122] The likely contemporaneous *Paraphrase on When the Buddha Was a Hare* (*Sāsadāvatasannaya*) cites the *Mirror*, this time by title, apropos of its root text's use of various ornaments that Dandin defined and illustrated.[123] Notably, this same exegetical work quotes passages from Mammata's eleventh-century *Light on Literature (Kāvyaprakāśa*) in Sanskrit at least six times.[124] The Pali commentary to the *Ornaments of the Conqueror* (*Jinālaṅkāra*), a twelfth-century poetic biography of the Buddha in Pali that we return to in section 3.7, refers readers to Dandin's account of "twinning" (*yamaka*) apropos of verses that

[118] The *Compendium* distinguishes two types of "simile involving an embrace"—one "by word," the other by "meaning"—using the same distinction that Ratna introduces in his comments (see Ratna ad KĀ 2.28, cf. Ss XII: 4–6, Gair and Karunatillake 2013: 128).

[119] Dimitrov 2016: 99–101; Kieffer-Pülz 2016: 10 n5.

[120] *Subodhālaṅkāraporāṇaṭīkā*, ad v. 173, p. 160, 26f.; Ratna ad KĀ 2.212, p. 135, 8–9.

[121] Although recall that *Our Own Poetics* does allow variation between "good" and "other" expressions of some of the "life breaths" of literature.

[122] *Meghadūtapurāṇasannaya*, 2; cited in Godakumbura 2010: 141. Based on KĀ 1.15, the *Old Paraphrase* explains that the indefinite pronoun indicates that the story, while not based on history (*itihāsa*), has some other (*itara*), true or good source (*sadāśraya*).

[123] *Sāsadāvatasannaya* 53 (on verse 179, citing KĀ 2.331; *tulyayogitā*), 34 (on verse 109, referring to KĀ 2. 97, 99; *kriyādīpaka*).

[124] *Sāsadāvatasannaya* 17 (twice), 24, 29, 34, 42.

contain similar rhyming effects.[125] In a similar vein, albeit from some two centuries later, the *Paraphrase on the Gem-Mine of Meters* (*Vṛttaratnākarasannaya*), a Sinhala commentary on the ubiquitous tenth-century Sanskrit work by Kedara Bhatta, cites the *Mirror* by title and includes a Sanskrit quotation of Dandin's definition of the flaw of "broken meter" (*bhinnavṛtta*) apropos of its root text's own definition of it.[126]

Such interpretive engagements with the *Mirror* and the practice of citing from it in a variety of Sinhala- and Pali-language exegetical works show that it was not only known through its translations and adaptations. Rather, the *Mirror*'s Sanskrit text continued to have an independent and vital presence in Sri Lanka throughout the first centuries of the vernacular millennium. Indeed, the examples cited above suggest that Dandin's *Mirror*, in Sanskrit, had assumed the stature of an authoritative text, resorted to for legitimation, clarification, and guidance in a variety of contexts. This status is particularly impressive when we realize that the multilingual scholastic discussions in Sri Lanka remained open to other Sanskrit sources on poetics, including new ideas that were formed in Kashmir in the centuries after Dandin. This is clear not only from *Our Own Poetics* (as noted in section 3.2 above), but also from *Lucid Poetics*, *The Compendium*, and their commentarial literature. Thus, to give just one example, Sangharakkhita in his *Lucid Poetics* and his auto-commentary betrays his familiarity with the "peaceful" (*śānta*) as a ninth rasa, first introduced by Udbhata in the first part of the ninth century, with Anandavardhana's text (which he cites) from the second part of that century, with the notion of "propriety" (Pali *ocitya*, Sanskrit *aucitya*), perhaps as promoted in Kshemendra's eleventh-century *Elucidation of Propriety* (*Aucityavicāracarcā*), and so on.[127] Sangharakkhita also refers to earlier, pre-Dandin thinkers, such as Bharata's *Treatise on Theater* and Ramasharma's (Pali: Rāmasammā) now-lost text.[128] In addition, the inclusion of a discussion of poetics in its final chapter suggests that *The Compendium* was likely influenced by Tamil grammatical works.[129] Yet this openness to conversations beyond the island actually highlights that in Sri Lanka, Dandin's *Mirror* remained far more

[125] Dimitrov 2016: 279 n121.

[126] *Vṛttaratnākarasannaya*, 23 ad *Vṛttaratnākara* 1.13, citing KĀ 3.156.

[127] For *śānta*, see Subodh, vv. 354, 367 (E^{e} pp. 289, 303); *Subodhālaṅkāraporāṇaṭīkā* and *Subodhālaṅkārapurāṇasannaya* on the same verses. For quotes from Anandavardhana, see, for example, *Subodhālaṅkāraporāṇaṭīkā*, ad v. 2 (E^{e} p. 7). For *aucitya*, Subodh, vv. 61, 103–5, 293, 301; *Subodhālaṅkāraporāṇaṭīkā*, ad vv. 1, 8, 20, 59–62, 67, 103–6, 139, 293, 301, 338, 344, 350, 361 (cf. Gornall 2020a: 158; see Gornall 2020a: 155–59). For *aucitya*, see also Ss XI.14 (cf. Gair and Karunatillake 2013: 122; Wijayawardhana 1963: 171).

[128] For Ramasharma, see Subodh, v. 2, which notably does not mention Dandin (who is named only in the *Grandmaster Commentary* and actually much later in the text (Subodh, v. 270; for other mentions of him in earlier Sanskrit texts, see BKA 2:19, 58; *Ratnaśrīṭīkā*, ad KĀ 2.7, 3.106; see also Bronner 2012: 83–86).

[129] Gair and Karunatillake 2013: xvi.

important than any other text on poetic theory, and its primacy was never really in question.

It was, however, also met with some detectable rancor. For example, the *Dambadeṇi Katikāvata*, an authoritative code for monastic behavior from the thirteenth century, prohibits monastic involvement in "despicable arts like poetry and drama" and adds that "foolish poets who liken the face of a woman to a lotus will be born as worms inside the bellies of those women." Lotus and moon are, of course, the standard comparands for the face of a beautiful woman in the *Mirror* and in *Our Own Poetics*.[130] Ambivalence about the poetic arts has a long history in the Theravada Buddhist tradition, and such rancor may be just another instance of this.[131] It may also be simply that the *Mirror* came to command great authority in Sri Lanka, and authority is often met with resistance.

The stature of the *Mirror* in Sri Lanka, a text which was repeatedly revisited and quoted in Sanskrit for writers and readers in Sinhala and Pali, spurs us to think of it as the core of a thriving "textual community" in Brian Stock's sense of a putative group oriented toward one major text and sharing similar textual praxes.[132] For Stock, a "textual community" is a tangible group whose life, thought, sense of identity, and relations with outsiders are organized around an authoritative text.

Stock argues that a text comes to have such a key organizational role in a textual community through education and religion. With this in mind, Dandin's celebration of education in the ideal literary community that he imagines for his audience appears sociologically significant. It is also not a coincidence that Ratna, in his commentary, switches gears in providing an elaborated image of Dandin's "gathering of the sophisticated" (*vidagdhagoṣṭhī*) as an ideal community of the learned who compose, read, and recite poetry.[133] As for religion, Buddhist monks are central to the ongoing reception of the *Mirror* in Sri Lanka, beginning with the author of the *Old Paraphrase on Our Own Poetics*[134] and continuing with Ratna and the authors of *Lucid Poetics* and the *Compendium*, all of whom embody Sri Lankan Buddhist ideals of education.

There are, moreover, patterns of received religious thinking that become illuminated with Stock's notion of a textual community. For example, there is a long-standing homology in Theravada Buddhist thought between the state of the Buddha's Dhamma and that of the world. The reception of Dandin's *Mirror*

[130] *Dambadeṇi Katikāvata* paragraphs 49, 50, 268; on lotus, moon, and the face of a woman as comparands in Dandin's investigation of the simile, see Bronner 2007.

[131] On this ambivalence, see Collins 2003: 669–70, and the references therein.

[132] Stock: 1983. We use Stock's notion only heuristically here, alert to the warnings, found in Heath: 2018, of the dangers of its overuse in extended applications.

[133] KĀ p. 62, ad 1.105. For a discussion of this passage, see Bronner and Cox, section 5.5 in this volume.

[134] See Dimitrov 2016 for a careful consideration of his identity.

in Sri Lanka served to extend this homology to the correct composition of literature in Pali and Sinhala. Dandin connects the condition of the world (*lokayātrā*) with knowledge of literature and the correct use of language more generally. Ratna expands on this sense of the sociomoral aspect of poetic language: since literature brings forth social values, literary erudition partly reveals one's own moral and social condition. Ratna extends Dandin's metaphor and says that those who know scientific works (*śāstra*s, poetics included) are to be treated like gods, whereas those who do not are nothing more than beasts (*paśu*).[135] Sangharakkhita, the monastic author of the Pali *Lucid Poetics*, takes up these ideas and reproduces a similar sociomoral vision in the introduction to his own work. For Sangharakkhita, to possess discriminating literary tastes is part of being wise, and he places the science of poetry (*alaṅkārasattha*) alongside the Buddhist canon (*tipiṭaka*), philosophy (*takka*), and grammar (*vyākaraṇa*) as a source of wisdom (*paññā*).[136]

Even while valuing what Stock's notion of textual community helps us to see, we should not forget the important differences between the works brought together within this textual community. This is especially the case with the *Compendium* and *Lucid Poetics*. Unlike *Our Own Poetics*, neither of these refers to either Dandin or the *Mirror* by name, and neither displays any obvious connection to the *Mirror* in structure. Both seem to be heirs to reception histories of the *Mirror* that are distinct from the one to which *Our Own Poetics* belongs, as well as different from each other. The full significance of these differences will be clearer in the next section, but to help us to keep such distinctive particularities in mind, we close this section with a brief overview of both texts.

The *Compendium* is a text that is somewhat anomalous in the general reception history of Dandin in Sri Lanka. It is both more than and less than Dandin's *Mirror*. It is less, insofar as it includes only a very cursory introductory treatment of poetics, in just two out of its twelve chapters, and in the second of those two, it treats only seven ornaments. It is more than the *Mirror* because the rest of the text is devoted to an introductory overview of the writing conventions and grammatical rules needed for writing poetry in Sinhala.[137] In this, the *Compendium* complements *Our Own Poetics*'s emphasis on preserving the expressive ecology "in this language of ours" (*siyabasä*) as inherited from the past.[138] As we noted above, in its combination of phonology, grammatical concepts and rules, and poetics in a single work, the *Compendium* is sometimes said to have been influenced by comparable texts in Tamil, but in its actual discussion of grammar,

[135] KĀ p. 4–5, ad I.6. A few canonical Buddhist texts, in contrast, call poetry "a bestial form of knowledge and a wrong livelihood" (Collins 2003: 670).
[136] *Subodhālaṅkārapurāṇaṭīkā*, ad vv. 4–5 (Subodh 12).
[137] Ss I.1–3; Gair and Karunatillake 2013: 1–3.
[138] Ss I.5; Gair and Karunatillake 2013: 3.

it owes more to the traditions of grammatical thinking in Sanskrit and Pali than to anything in Tamil.[139] Finally, in terms of locating the *Compendium* in its various contexts, note how its opening verse embeds the text firmly within Buddhist religious culture:

> Praise to the feet of the Sage!
> Having made my heart a perfumed home for him [*sic*] who is omniscient,
> I write the *Compendium of Language and Its Meaning* for the knowledge of beginners.[140]

This opening verse is markedly different from those in the *Mirror* and in *Our Own Poetics* (see section 3.3 above) and, as we shall see, also from that in *Lucid Poetics*. It thus seems to hint at the text's general independence of thought. As Wijayawardhana has noted:

> For its material, [the *Compendium*] is indebted not to one particular source. The author culls material from diverse sources in Sanskrit to suit his purpose. Out of a vast stock of material he selects a few topics which he thinks important and representative. Although the material is drawn from Sanskrit sources, the selection and the presentation are his own. In some instances, the author appears to have composed his own illustrative verses. Thus, when compared to [*Our Own Poetics*], [the *Compendium*] finds greater opportunity to display originality.[141]

A verse in the *Compendium*'s colophon identifies its author as the chief incumbent of the Patiraja monastic college (*Patirājapiruvan*; *Patirājapirivena*), but this identification appears only when the verse is properly arranged in a wheel pattern (*cakrabandha*), itself an example of the "difficult" (*duṣkara*) and "flashy" (*citra*) poetry that Dandin includes in the third chapter of the *Mirror*.[142] The colophon also says that the work was composed at the request of a minister named Patiraja "who protects the whole of south Sri Lanka."[143] Just as is the case with the author of *Our Own Poetics*, it has not proven possible to identify conclusively who was the author of the *Compendium*, or to narrow down its absolute date of

[139] See Gornall 2020b.

[140] Ss 1.1; Gair and Karunatillake 2013: 1: *namavu munisaraṇa / mahada gaňdakiḷi—savnē gevā dathaṭa / duhunan dānum saňdahā—karanem sidatsaňgarā*.

[141] Wijayawardhana 1963: 167.

[142] Gair and Karunatillake 2013: xiii, 140; on "difficult poetry" (KĀ 3.186) in Dandin, see Bronner and Tubb, section 1.5 in this volume.

[143] Ss Colophon, v. 5; Gair and Karunatillake 2013: 139. An illustrative verse for the ornament the text calls "dialogue" (*ubabas*; *ubhayabhāṣā*) names a Patiraja as a conquering "world-lord"; Ss XII.1, Gair and Karunatillake 2013: 132.

composition.[144] The references to both a monastic and a political leader are significant, however, as they remind us that we should not assume a divide between religious and political roles within the textual community focused on the *Mirror*, nor within the broader Sinhala literary culture of its time of composition.

As already noted, only two chapters in the *Compendium* are dedicated to poetics: one to different aspects of prosody and literary flaws (*dos*; *doṣa*) and the other to ornaments (*lakara*; *alaṅkāra*). But the *Compendium* is overtly dedicated to the larger project of *Our Own Poetics*, namely, to identify norms for the expressive ecology of Sinhala poetry. This becomes clear when we keep in mind that the *Compendium* does not provide a comprehensive grammar of contemporaneous Sinhala, but only that of the special variety of language that was considered proper for poetic composition. In addition to being a treatise on poetic language, the *Compendium* is, in itself, an example of it, composed in that very variety of language.[145] As Gair and Karunatillake observe, the *Compendium* is a prescriptive text "in that it attempts to define the allowable elements and the limits of the language of poetry," but like the *Mirror*, its "appeal for authority in all cases is to 'the usage of the erudite.'"[146]

The *Compendium* shows its independence of thought especially in its treatment of both literary flaws and ornaments, as is already visible in the enumeration and nomenclature for each.[147] There are also significant differences at deeper conceptual levels. The most striking conceptual difference between the *Mirror* and *Our Own Poetics*, on the one hand, and the *Compendium*, on the other, is that the latter treats all literary flaws as irredeemable, regardless of context, and thus ignores a key part of the flexibility that is constitutive of Dandin's overall vision.

Turning to Sangharakkhita's *Lucid Poetics*, it is immediately apparent that, despite being the first known engagement with the *Mirror* in Pali, the translocal language of Theravada Buddhism, its difference is more than a difference in language. What stands out, at first, is *Lucid Poetics*' substantial difference in structure and scope, suggesting that this is a work of a very different nature and agenda from other engagements with Dandin that we have thus far examined. That said, *Lucid Poetics* is still a direct adaptation of Dandin, and as such, it is closely indebted to its source.[148] Like *Our Own Poetics* and the *Compendium*,

[144] For a survey of the arguments for possible authors and dates, see Gair and Karunatillake 2013: xiii–xv.

[145] Gair and Karunatillake 2013: xxii.

[146] Gair and Karunatillake 2013: xix. For Dandin, the erudite can sanction even nongrammatical forms (see KĀ 3.148 and Bronner, section 1.2 in this volume).

[147] Wijayawardhana 1963: 176–78.

[148] Dimitrov gives a comprehensive list of the close parallels between the texts, concluding, *pace* Jaini in his edition of *Lucid Poetics*, that Sangharakkhita "has translated more or less faithfully nearly sixty stanzas (or *pāda*s thereof) from Daṇḍin's treatise. Several other passages in the Pali treatise are clearly inspired from the *Kāvyādarśa*." He further observes that Sangharakkhita clearly knew Ratna's commentary, and that "he was probably also one of the very last Sinhalese scholars who were able to make direct use of Ratna's major contribution in the field of Sanskrit poetics" (Dimitrov 2016: 100–1).

Lucid Poetics is firmly embedded in the Buddhist religious culture of the time, but more than any of the other texts in the Sri Lankan textual community centered on the *Mirror*, it reflects the devotional nature of medieval Sinhala Buddhist life.[149] The redirection of Dandin's tools for very particular Buddhist purposes is hinted at from the start in *Lucid Poetics*' benedictory verse. Whereas Dandin describes Sarasvati as dwelling in the mouth of Brahma, and whereas *Our Own Poetics* has no qualms in retaining this imagery, Sangharakkhita offers instead an explicitly Buddhist image of Vani (speech embodied) as "born in the womb of the Buddha's lotus-like mouth" (while still asking her to gladden his mind so that he may compose his work effortlessly).[150] When commenting on his opening verse, Sangharakkhita explains that although Vani is commonly thought to be identical with Sarasvati, she is in fact the goddess of the Buddha's true Dhamma (*saddhamma*).[151]

Sangharakkhita's counteractive echo of Dandin's original opening encapsulates to a large extent his general strategy for creatively adopting and adapting the *Mirror*. In part, this is to suit an audience that is not only overtly Buddhist, but also probably monastic. Indeed, following this opening statement, the full punch of which depends on readers' familiarity with its Sanskrit and Sinhala intertexts, the author continues his programmatic replacement of most of Dandin's illustrative verses with ones about the Buddha; he does, however, seem "unwilling to illustrate faults with verses on Buddhist themes [and] retained traditional examples."[152] Consider, for example, his treatment of "factual statement" (*svabhāvokti*). Sangharakkhita largely replicates Dandin's key division between ornaments based on "factual statement" and those based on "crooked speech."[153] Nonetheless, all four of Dandin's examples of "factual statement," including the one that depicts the revelation of Lord Shiva, Dandin's personal deity, are replaced with a single dense example featuring a revelatory moment of the future Buddha:

> Beautiful with his graceful stride,
> constantly looking about in every direction,
> the little Bodhisatta glowed
> while speaking a lofty declaration.[154]

[149] For an in-depth account of the significance of Sangharakkhita's *Lucid Poetics* as part of the history of medieval religious culture in Sri Lanka, see Gornall 2020a: 145–67.

[150] Subodh, v. 1: *munindavadanambhojagabbhasambhavasundarī | saraṇaṃ pāṇinaṃ vāṇī mayhaṃ pīṇayataṃ manaṃ ||*.

[151] *Subodhālaṅkāraporāṇaṭīkā*, ad v. 1, p. 2, 16–26.

[152] Wright 2002: 332.

[153] Subodh, vv. 165–67, 281–88.

[154] Subodh, v. 166: *līlāvikantisubhago disā thiravilokano | bodhisattaṅkuro bhāsaṃ viroci vācaṃ āsabhiṃ ||*.

Similarly, in some of his illustrative verses, Sangharakkhita adopts Dandin's tropes of courtly love but transforms them into religious devotion, as, for instance, in the example he offers for "intensification" (*atiśayokti*):

> They drink in the charms of your body
> their eyes filled like cupped hands:
> Conqueror, you are a destroyer of desire,
> So why can't you destroy theirs?[155]

The *Old Paraphrase* explains that the first part of this involves "intensification" because the Buddha's physical charms exceed the limits of worldly desire.[156] It adds that the question in the second part is itself an ornament, "irony" (*vakrokti*; translated as *vācābhaṅgī* in the Pali *abhinavaṭīkā*).[157] Sangharakkhita conjures such scenes of passionate worship in order to place the Buddha's transcendence in sharper relief, and his Pali examples are often designed both to evoke and to subordinate the emotional registers of Sanskrit court poetry, especially those that are overtly erotic. He also seems to suggest that only poetry about the Buddha is a worthy pursuit for a Pali-reading Buddhist community, echoing and expanding on the prescription in *Our Own Poetic* that the life/lives of the Buddha are to be told in verse.[158]

While *Lucid Poetics* is consonant with *Our Own Poetics* on the question of what in the *Mirror* is critically important, its structure and order of presentation are visibly different from both those works. *Lucid Poetics* has five chapters in contrast to their three, and its organization is strikingly different. It opens with two chapters on poetic flaws (*dosa*), a topic relegated to the closing chapters of the *Mirror* and *Our Own Poetics*. Its third chapter presents the ten poetic virtues, which are treated in the *Mirror*'s first chapter, immediately following Dandin's overview of the "body of Literature"; as we saw in section 3.4, *Our Own Poetics* reframes the virtues and gives them greater prominence than the *Mirror* itself. "Ornaments of meaning" (*atthālaṅkāra*) are covered in the fourth and longest chapter of *Lucid Poetics*, just as is the case in the counterpart chapter of the *Mirror*, the second chapter on ornaments. The fifth and last chapter treats literary experience, considered in terms of the nine "poetic sentiments" (*rasa*) then

[155] Subodh, v. 175: *pivanti dehakantī ye nettañjalipuṭena te | nālaṃ hantuṃ Jin' esaṃ tvaṃ taṇhaṃ taṇhāharo pi kiṃ ||*.

[156] *Subodhālaṅkārapurāṇasannaya*, ad v. 4.12 (E^e v. 175) ≈ *Subodhālaṅkāra-abhinavaṭīkā*, ad v. 175 (Subodh 162).

[157] *Subodhālaṅkārapurāṇasannaya*, ad v. 4.12 (E^e v. 175) ≈ *Subodhālaṅkāra-abhinavaṭīkā*, ad v. 175 (Subodh 163).

[158] See section 3.3 above.

current in Kashmir, and gives attention to the conditions (*ṭhayibhāva*s), excitants (*vibhāva*s), and subsequent experiences (*anubhāva*s) appropriate for each.[159]

One could argue that in opening with an expansive treatment of literary flaws and their removal, Sangharakkhita was following Vamana, rather than the *Mirror*.[160] It is noteworthy, however, that Sangharakkhita's organizational logic also bears comparison with the structure of personal transformation enshrined in texts about monastic training. This structure begins with the identification of flaws inherent in a person and the praxes designed to restrain and then remove them. This is followed by diverse praxes of mental cultivation (*bhāvanā*), in which good qualities (*guṇa*) are progressively developed and realized. The process culminates in various experiences, preeminently those of reflexive insight (*vipassanā*) and wisdom (*paññā*).[161]

Consider the analogous threefold sequence in the *Lucid Poetics*. The middle portion—chapter 3 on understanding virtues (*guṇāvabodha*), and chapter 4 on understanding ornaments (*atthālaṅkārāvabodha*)—now takes on a crucial significance. Chapter 3 serves as something of a fulcrum in the text itself, as well as in the process of literary production that it prescribes. It effectively highlights and emphasizes Dandin's list of ten poetic virtues even more than *Our Own Poetics*, by alotting them an entire chapter and by placing it in such a crucially central place. *Lucid Poetics* begins this chapter by saying:

> Now that poetic flaws (*dosa*) have been overcome,
> poetic virtues (*guṇa*) can arise (*sambhavanti*), and, consequently, out of those,
> I will explain the ones which add beauty (*sambhūsayanti*) to words.[162]

After this opening verse, Sangharakkhita immediately introduces the same poetic virtues found in the *Mirror* and *Our Own Poetics*. Like the latter, *Lucid Poetics* omits Dandin's overview of different literary languages and his notions of distinct southern and northeastern paths within Sanskrit literature. Thus this text, too, silently recontextualizes and recasts Dandin's list of virtues, although now in the service of a very different project. As we saw in section 3.4, *Our Own Poetics* takes a prescriptive turn and finds the virtues of Dandin's southern path naturally normative for Sinhala. In contrast, *Lucid Poetics* takes an irenic position

[159] Wright has argued that this fifth chapter "is surely an accretion" (Wright 2002: 337; see pp. 337–39 for his reasoning supporting this conclusion).

[160] For a comparison of the similarities between *Lucid Poetics* and the *Aphorisms* in their treatment of literary flaws, see Gornall 2020a: 150–51.

[161] The locus classicus in the Theravada Buddhist traditions of Sri Lanka and Southeast Asia for this trifold pattern of personal transformation is Buddhaghosa's fifth-century training handbook, *The Path of Purification* (*Visuddhimagga*). See Nanamoli 1999.

[162] Subodh v. 116: *sambhavanti guṇā yasmā dosāṅ' evam atikkame | dassessaṃ te tato dāni sadde sambhūsayanti ye ||*.

and completely ignores the contrastive framework that undergirds Dandin's entire discussion. Dandin describes one set of virtues as typical of the southern way and laconically says that "the opposite of these" (*eṣāṃ viparyayaḥ*) is typical in the northeast.[163] With respect to individual poetic virtues, however, Dandin is less consistent in his deployment of this contrastive framework, using it for some of the virtues while effectively treating others in terms of only differences of degree.[164] *Lucid Poetics* treats all ten poetic virtues in terms of differences of degree, rather than differences of kind, thereby describing Pali literature as consisting of a single, albeit internally diverse path. It thus leaves ample room for Pali literature to be composed in the ornate style of the northeastern path, and, as we shall see in the next section, this reflects one aspect of the state of literary Pali in Sri Lanka.

In short, *Lucid Poetics* is a nuanced model of and a generative model for Pali literature in the context of multilingual Sri Lanka. Yet it is also part of the textual community centered around the *Mirror*, and some of its textual practices, such as its more irenic adaptation of Dandin's virtues, are conditioned by this complex web of texts, for instance, by the important Sinhala adaptation, *Our Own Poetics*, whose restrictive and prescriptive tendencies it seemingly modulates. Moreover, *Lucid Poetics* also participates in wider discussions of poetics, as can be seen in the affinities that its discussion of the ten poetic virtues has with Vamana's. Both Vamana and Sangharakkhita elevate the poetic virtues to a central place in their understanding of literature, and both distinguish between virtues of sound and those of sense (Sangharakkhita by occasionally classifying Dandin's set in this way, and Vamana by supplying two such separate sets).[165]

We must also acknowledge that equally significant for appreciating *Lucid Poetics* as an engagement with Dandin is the manner in which it creatively enriches our understanding of the *Mirror* by bringing to bear heuristic resources directly from Pali as a language, just as we saw *Our Own Poetics* doing with heuristic resources from Sinhala as a language. One particularly beautiful example of this is found in its presentation of the virtue "charm" (*kanti*, Skt. *kānti*):

lokiyatthānatikkantā kantā sabbajanāna pi |
kanti nāmā ti vuttassa vuttā sā parihārato ||

[163] KĀ 1.42.

[164] Six of Dandin's virtues are presented through their opposites: *śleṣa* (*śithila*), *prasāda* (*vyutpanna*), *samatā* (*vaiṣamya*), *sukumāratā* (*dīpta*), *arthavyakti* (*neyatva*), and *kānti* (*atyukti*), while four are presented as different in degree: *mādhurya*, *udāratva*, *ojas*, and *samādhi*.

[165] See Subodh, vv. 123, 135, and 147; see also *Subodhālaṅkārapurāṇaṭīkā*, ad Subodh, v. 117 (Subodh 121). Admittedly, Sangharakkhita generally considers the poetic virtues as "ornaments of sound" (*saddālaṅkāras*); see Gornall 2020a, 151. For Vamana, see KASū 3.1–2.

Not overstepping the bounds of reality and beloved by all,
"charm" is so called because it avoids the fault of overstatement.[166]

This definition of "charm" follows that of the *Mirror* closely, but, as Wright has pointed out, Sangharakkhita adds a special twist with a linguistic "embrace" between the verbs *kram-* (to go) and *kām* (to please) that is possible in Pali but not in Sanskrit. This homophony, in turn, reveals an underlying closeness between "not overstepping the bounds of reality" and being "beloved by all," the key two aspects of "charm"; this closeness is already seen at work in Dandin (KĀ1.85 *sarvajagatkāntaṃ laukikārthānatikramāt*), but without the pun that the Pali supplies.[167]

We conclude this section with three takeaways. The first is a historical reminder about the wider Asian dimensions of the continuing story of Dandin in Sri Lanka. The textual community that evolved around Dandin's *Mirror* in Sri Lanka was not limited to the island. *Lucid Poetics* traveled far and wide in the Buddhist Theravada world, and it had a particularly influential life in Burma. It, too, did not travel alone: a late Pali commentary on *Lucid Poetics* that was composed in Burma essentially translates the Sinhala *Old Paraphrase* into Pali. This part of Sri Lanka's textual community, it seems, was easily exported.[168] The second is the metapoetic realization that this diverse assemblage of texts within a single textual community, when taken as something of a constellation, is one in which texts illuminate one another by "adding beauty to beauty." To borrow an insight from Kshemendra, mentioned earlier in this section, "just as a virtuous good person stands out when surrounded by friends abundant in virtue," so Dandin's *Mirror* stands out all the more because of the different textual "friends" that form its textual community.[169] This leads us to our third and final point, another clue to answering our "why Dandin" question. Dandin's sketch of the ten poetic virtues highlighted in this section provided invaluable tools of discernment, and with those tools, writers and thinkers in Sri Lanka could see how literature flourishes variously in different languages, as well as how it flourishes variously within a single language. When Dandin said that "the way (*mārga*) of speech is multiple," they saw that acting on this multiplicity is also "about adding beauty to beauty."

[166] Subodh, v. 146, adopting the text and adapting the translation from Wright 2002: 325; cf. Subodh, v. 146 (Subodh, 142). Cf. KĀ 1.85.

[167] Wright 2002: 325. For other ways in which Sangharakkhita enhances Dandin's notion of "charm," see Wright 2002: 326.

[168] See Kirichenko, Lammerts, and Ruiz-Falqués, section 7.2, and Ruiz-Falqués, section 7.3 in this volume. For the movement of people and texts between these two Buddhist centers, see Frasch 1998, 2001, 2017; Luce and Shin 1969; and Sirisena 1978.

[169] *Aucityavicāracarcā*, *kārikā* 23, where the topic is our understanding of a noun thanks to its fitting adjectives (*viśeṣaṇaiḥ samucitaviśeṣyo'rthaḥ prakāśate | guṇādhikair guṇodāraḥ suhṛdbhir iva sajjanaḥ ||*).

3.7. "The Way of Speech Is Multiple": The *Mirror* Enlarged in Literary Praxis

Alastair Gornall, Charles Hallisey, and P. B. Meegaskumbura

We know of no new adaptation of the *Mirror* in Sri Lanka after the thirteenth century, nor did the *Mirror*'s Sinhala and Pali adaptations attract new commentaries after that point. This is not to say that the *Mirror* was forgotten or superseded in Sri Lanka—quite the contrary. The lessons of the *Mirror* and its adaptations continued to be learned, but this happened as much through creative praxes as through received scholastic exegeses. As a result, we must look for the *Mirror*'s continuing presence in Sri Lanka by turning to the ways that it inflected the composition of new literature for centuries throughout Sri Lanka's premodern literary history. Since the *Mirror*'s impact is so ubiquitous, to give even a basic overview of its continuing presence risks losing sight of the *Mirror* itself against the background of the multilingual literary history of Sri Lanka.

There is another danger, however. It has become commonplace among some contemporary students of Sri Lanka to prejudge the impact of Sanskrit on Sinhala and Pali literature as intrinsically deleterious. The prevailing sentiment is that, to quote Martin Wickramasinghe, "the main fount of inspiration of the earlier writers [of poetry in Sinhala] seems to have been the later Sanskrit *alaṅkāra* and, of course, the Sanskrit poetry that was composed under its decadent influence," and that "the Sinhalese poets who slavishly imitated their Sanskrit models spoilt [their Buddhist] stories by introducing into them erotic descriptions not in keeping with the religious sentiments of the stories themselves."[170] Such judgments, their colonial and postcolonial roots notwithstanding, highlight an enduring problematic that needs to be faced: On what grounds do we judge the aesthetic achievements of literature from the past? As noted by Daniel Ingalls, "surely in the inspection of ancient literature it should be possible to arrest our judgment long enough for appreciation to grow in our minds of ideals and goals other than our own."[171]

We should keep this large-scale problematic in balance even as tracing the story of Dandin in Sri Lanka turns our attention, once again, to things on a smaller scale, and especially to the "hows" of the reception of the *Mirror*. The grappling with such things—"a mass of detail to interrelate on a new ground, difficultly," to remind ourselves once again of how William Carlos Williams puts it[172]— affords initial and fleeting glimpses of a possible large-scale literary

[170] Wickramasinghe 1963: 18. For a recent, more nuanced take which replaces Wickramasinghe's "slavish imitation" with a notion of "cultural appropriation" marked by "a kind of 'anxiety of influence,'" see Berkwitz 2016: 32.
[171] Ingalls 1965: 58.
[172] Williams 1995: 19.

history that could be an alternative to the ones which we currently have. We see, in addition to adaptation and imitation, also creativity, innovation, and confident discovery through experimentation. Moreover, as we trace the engagement of Dandin through creative praxes, we also see more distinctly some key aspects of the *Mirror*'s "translatability" (again, in Walter Benjamin's sense), in particular, its own orientation to experimentation and Dandin's aesthetic appreciation of the literary features that are "considered difficult" (*duṣkarābhimata*).[173] Attention to such praxes turns our thoughts once again to the large "why Dandin" question.

In this section, we try to catch just a few glimpses of the *Mirror*'s tacit presence in literature in Sri Lanka by looking at some of these creative praxes. As we do so, we will note a contrast that took form between the Dandin inscribed in Sinhala literature and the Dandin who articulated the grounds for a new kind of poetry in Pali. That is to say, a single, albeit composite literary culture in Sri Lanka gave rise to two distinct literary trajectories, both of which are comfortable with Sanskrit, but in different ways. As Dandin says, "the way of speech is multiple."[174]

We begin our turn to literary praxis by reminding ourselves of its presence in all of the texts we have considered so far. Recall that Dandin himself never quotes an existing work of poetry in the *Mirror*.[175] He wrote all of his illustrative verses himself, and the author of *Our Own Poetics* did the same, almost always taking Dandin's verses as the basis for his Sinhala creations. But Dandin also urges his readers to extend their understanding of the ornaments by turning their attention to "the practice of poets."[176]

Ratna seems to follow suit. He supplements Dandin's illustrative verses with some of his own, but he also extends Dandin's insights with examples drawn from the wider world of *kāvya* literature, citing a variety of texts, including some that are Buddhist and some that are now lost.[177] We see a selection of Ratna's supplementary examples included in the Sinhala *Paraphrase on the Mirror*.[178] Close in spirit to Ratna is the *Compendium* insofar as its author not only includes illustrative verses of his own composition, but also situates his work within the wider world of Sinhala literary history through the quotation of then-known texts. This practice of illustrative quotation effectively reimagines the received tradition of literature in Sinhala as it is illuminated in the reflective light of the *Mirror*. This appreciation of received works on new grounds is a reminder that, as John Berger notes, "imagination is not, as it is sometimes thought, the ability to invent; it is the capacity to disclose that which exists."[179]

[173] KĀ 3.38.
[174] KĀ 1.40.
[175] The one known exception is KĀ 2.224.
[176] KĀ 2.169, 2.307.
[177] Bronner and Cox, sections 5.5–7, this volume.
[178] Dimitrov 2016: 73, 136.
[179] Berger 1960: 61.

It is clear that the *Mirror* teaches not only by example and by studying received literary texts, but also by asking its students to write their own verse. As Dandin affirms at the end of the *Mirror*'s second chapter: "Here ends our tour of the path of ornaments, abridged though it was: the options are boundless, while this presentation has its limits. To discover the particular devices populating the domains that we have not addressed, you will simply have to practice."[180] In other words, some of Dandin's most important lessons are to be learned by means of original composition as an imaginative practice of discovery. The creative expansions of the *Mirror* to which we now turn are ones that have taken this general pedagogical orientation to heart.[181]

The Sinhala texts quoted by the *Compendium* are a good place to begin exploring this part of the story of Dandin in Sri Lanka. The texts quoted are three poetic biographies of the Buddha, in apparent agreement with the prescription in *Our Own Poetics* that the Buddha's lives are the most appropriate subject matter for verse,[182] and one "messenger poem" (*sandeśa*; more on this genre below). Also quoted are two Sinhala verses that have close parallels in Sanskrit. The first, an example of "seeing as" (*upēlakarā*; *utprekṣālaṅkāra*), is very similar to a verse said to be composed by Kalidasa when King Bhoja asked his poets to describe a scene of a girl playing with a ball and a lotus falling from her hair.[183] The second illustrates what the *Compendium* calls "dialogue" (*ubabas*; *ubhayabhāṣā*) and is very similar to an example that Appaya Dikshita later gives for "praise of the irrelevant" (*aprastutapraśaṃsā*).[184]

A final quotation is from a lost and unnamed Sinhala version of the *Kusajātaka*. This small example is telling insofar as it displays what looks like a clear imprint of the *Mirror* in an original work of poetry in Sinhala. It is found as part of a grammatical exposition of Sinhala, illustrating the dative case: "As she went down into the pond for water sports, dividing the water with waves, the face of Prabhavati gave shame to the red lotuses."[185] There are several aspects of this admittedly short illustration that we find arresting. First, the insertion of "water

[180] KĀ 2.364–365, translation by Bronner forthcoming.

[181] A fuller account of the transmission of the *Mirror* through literary praxis than is possible here would include the formation of a "pedagogical canon" of literature that possibly was engaged and transmitted in a "discursive tradition" (as conceptualized in Asad 2009); it would also include attention to the history of educational institutions that were the sites for the teaching and learning of this discursive tradition of literature in Sri Lanka (see Hallisey 2003: 692–93 for some preliminary comments on medieval Buddhist monasteries in this context).

[182] See section 3.3 above.

[183] "The Lotus is worried. / 'Why is she hitting the ball? / Is she mad at it for looking like her breasts? / But I look like her eyes!' / In a panic, / it falls pleading / at her feet" (Narayana Rao and Shulman 1998: 44). The Sinhala parallel is in Ss XII.16–17 (Gair and Karunatallike 2013: 135).

[184] See Wijayawardhana 1963: 180–81; cf. *Kuvalayānanda* of Appayya Dikshita, p. 87. Gair and Karunatillake dub this "indirect praise" (Gair and Karunatillake 2013: 132).

[185] Ss IV.11; Gair and Karunatillake 2013: 46–47: *taḷakeḷiyehi tarañga de bērā baṭa pabavata vat taṁbarānaṭa nigā din*.

sports"; in the earlier Pali version of the story, Prabhavati enters the pond only to bathe.[186] In the cited lost work, however, this verse seems part of a longer erotic description befitting the pattern of a grand poem (*mahākāvya*), and indeed, in his list of episodes to be included in such a poem, Dandin mentions "games in water and parks, drinking liqueur, and feasts of lovemaking."[187] The poet of this lost work probably structured the recommended topic of the Buddha's former life with the checklist of set pieces for a *mahākāvya* as stipulated by Dandin.

Second, note that as soon as Prabhavati enters the water, her face immediately incites shame in the red lotuses (whose mention in the dative is the occasion for this citation). We immediately recognize here Dandin's basic materials (face and lotus), building blocks (simile, seeing as), and method for combining them, all of which serve to heighten the erotic ambience of water sports. Indeed, Dandin's illustration of this particular combination ("simile involving seeing as") involves a competition between a woman's face, the moon, and a lotus.[188] The simile in the Sinhala quotation is far from a mechanical imitation of anything in Dandin; rather, it reveals a keen understanding of Dandin's subtle conception of this ornament and of his overall modular system. Thus, the lost Sinhala poem, only a verse of which is cited in the *Compendium*, must have demonstrated a careful assimilation of the *Mirror*, from the micro to the macro levels.

One might object, however, that all this could have been gotten directly from the practice of Kalidasa and his fellow poets, with their fair share of water sports and ashamed lotuses. What, one might ask, directly pinpoints to Dandin here? It is hard to supply incontrovertible evidence. But in a way, the tacit presence of the *Mirror* in the literary practices of Sri Lanka is among its greatest accomplishments. Once it has been adapted and readapted and repeatedly commented upon, once its generative principles were internalized, and once its advice to follow the practice was heeded, one could no longer view the works of Kalidasa and his fellow poets in its absence. Thinking with the *Mirror* became organic to Sinhala poetry.

Indeed, one may view some of the later grand poems in Sinhala as vehicles that assume the *Mirror*'s pedagogical mantle as a means for learning and furthering Dandin's ideas. Consider two fifteenth-century works, *Crown-Jewel of Poetry* (*Kāvyaśekhara*) and *Guttila* (*Guttilakāvyaya*; about the Buddha's previous life as the musician by this name), where we find what Thomas M. Hunter calls "ornament blocks": clusters of verses that teach and explore the possibilities inherent in a single ornament.[189] For example, in *Guttila*, we find twenty-one verses in very close proximity, all employing the ornament "magnificence" (*udātta*), and other

[186] Francis 1905: 149.
[187] KĀ 1.16: *udyānasalilakrīḍāmadhupānaratotsavaiḥ*.
[188] KĀ 2.23.
[189] Hunter, sections 8.3–4 in this volume.

extended passages that feature "causation" (*hetu*; a clear favorite of Dandin), and "seeing as" (*utprekṣā*).[190] Similarly, in the *Crown-Jewel of Poetry*, we find thirteen verses all exemplifying the ornament "integrity" (*bhāvika*) in a single passage.[191] Their presentation in verses clustered together improves conditions for learning individual ornaments inductively, but it also provides occasions for subtle innovation and fine distinctions therein.

In addition to grand poems, the other main genre of premodern Sinhala poetry was that of messenger poems; this is one of South Asia's most productive genres that encompasses numerous works inspired by Kalidasa's *Cloud Messenger*. The *Mirror* and the *Cloud Messenger* were received in Sri Lanka at approximately the same time as something of a composite package. This genre often foregrounded certain ornaments described in the *Mirror*, such as "seeing as" (*utprekṣā*), "misperception" (*bhrānti*), "citing another case" (*arthāntaranyāsa*), and "factual statement" (*svabhāvokti*), and Sinhala messenger poetry has some of this general pattern, too. For the sake of brevity, we will supply just one example of the way the composite package of Kalidasa and Dandin was creatively received in Sinhala messenger poetry, involving a combination of some of these ornaments. Let us turn to a rather randomly chosen verse from the fourteenth-century *Peacock Messenger* (*Mayūrasandeśa*):

> Women walk
> on balconies of sapphire
> gleaming like lakes
> deep within which are visible
> the reflections of the moon and the stars,
> As if the moon had mistaken their faces
> for lotuses that were too proud to close when he rose,
> and enraged by their insolence,
> had plunged into the lake
> to yank them up by their roots.[192]

Much of what we see here is typical in messenger poetry. Places are often represented by their women folk and their amorous activities. Tall balconies, too, are favorite topics, visible as they are to flying messengers and connoting the close proximity of heaven and earth. Indeed, the focus on the tiles of the terraces

[190] *Guttila*, vv. 406, 408–10, 412, 414, 418–24, 427, 434, 436–37, 442–44, 448 ("magnificence"); vv. 498–502, 506, 508, 509 ("causation"); 321, 324, 338, 340–44, 346 ("seeing as"). The identification of the ornaments in this case is by the editor, W.F. Gunawardhana.

[191] *Kāvyaśekhara*, vv. 16–23, 26, 32, 33, 37, 41. The identification of the ornaments in this case is by the editor, Sucarita Gamlat.

[192] *Mayūrasandeśa*, v. 8: *disi miṇi nil säṅdäliyä liya vata kamala / däkä no malana pul piyumä yi kärä kuhula / saṅda piḷibiṁbu turu sen samaṅgin sakala / udurana lobin baṭa väni baṭ piyum ala.*

as reflecting both moon and stars harks back to a specific depiction of the city of Alaka in Kalidasa's intertext, where "stunning women / linger on the rooftops of moonstone, inlaid / with flowers to mirror the stars."[193] So where is Dandin in all of this? Note the amazing intensification in the second part of the verse, which reflects on the "factual statement" and simile of the first. The presence of the moon and the stars is not the result of mere reflection or similitude, but of a mini-narrative that involves attributing human motives ("seeing-as") and "misperception" (*bhrānti*) to the moon, and on invoking the poetic convention that the day lotuses shut at moonrise. It is as if, the poet tells us, the moon plunged into the depths of the balconies' floors in order to execute revenge against the faces of the women, which he mistook for lotuses that did not show him due respect when they continued to bloom at night. Anyone who has read Dandin will recognize his fingerprints at once. It is not just that his own example of "seeing as" involves a plunge into a lake (by an elephant) as an act of revenge against the day lotuses (given their kin with the tormenting sun); rather, it is the masterful internalization of the entire apparatus of generative modularity from one source, the *Mirror*, to intensify another, in this case Kalidasa's *Cloud Messenger*.[194] Reading this single verse, it becomes fully clear what the Sinhala method of adding beauty to beauty meant, and how it was used to improve upon its source.

The literary landscape of Pali appears similar to that of its contemporary Sinhala in many ways, but it is also significantly different. An observation of Steven Collins provides help in preparing to attend to this difference:

> [W]hen monks in Sri Lanka began to compose *kāvya* in Pali . . . more than a thousand years after Pali texts were first composed, they did so in a consciously high-literate, Sanskritizied manner, deliberately adopting the specifically *kāvya* mode of literary expression. One might call this the *problem* of literature in Pali.[195]

The "problem" that Collins identifies has two aspects: first, why was a specifically *kāvya* mode of literary expression adopted at this particular time, and second, why was a translocal language like Pali subjected to processes similar to those transforming local (*deśī*) languages like Kannada and Sinhala at the beginning of the "vernacular millennium"? To find a solution to this problem, we must consider Sri Lankan literary culture in the second millennium as a single multilingual system, with Sinhala and Pali engaging with one another as well as with Sanskrit. One could even say more specifically that, eyeing one another, authors

[193] *Meghadūta* 2.5, translation from Bronner and Shulman forthcoming.
[194] KĀ 2.220.
[195] Collins 2003: 649–50.

who chose Sinhala and authors who chose Pali pushed the models offered by the *Mirror* in different directions.

Consider, first, the question of literature's "difficult way" (*duṣkaramārga*) and, in particular, Dandin's extensive discussion of "twinning" (*yamaka*) and his detailed illustration of "riddles" (*prahelikā*).[196] This aspect of Dandin's vision is downplayed in *Our Own Poetics* and *Lucid Poetics* and is omitted almost completely in the *Compendium*.[197] This makes it all the more striking that such aesthetic turns are so prominent in some Pali texts. For example, the twelfth-century *Ornaments of the Conqueror* (*Jinālaṅkāra*), a poetic biography of the Buddha, seems to go out of its way to give prominence to "twinning."[198] A long section of sixty-one verses (49–110) experiments with patterns that become progressively more complex, culminating with "twinning" in phonetically identical duplicates that are verse-long; verses consisting of only one consonant class, such as gutturals, palatals, etc., (*ekaṭhānika*, 101–4); or verses made up of only one letter (*akkharuttarika*, 105–8). It also includes a verse with a riddle (*paheḷi*, v. 109). Here, to give a taste of these verses, is an example composed only in guttural sounds (*ka*, *kha*, *ga*, *gha*, *ṅa*, *ha*), whose phonetic aspect is clearly more prominently featured than its meaning:

ākaṅkhakkhākaṅkhaṅga kaṅkhāgaṅgāghāgahaka
kaṅkhāgāhakakaṅkhāgha hā hā kaṅkhā kahaṃ kahaṃ.[199]

The author of *Ornaments of the Conqueror*, a monk named Buddharakkhita, also groups different types of "twinning" together in something of the same pedagogical fashion as the ornament blocks found in the Sinhala poetic texts mentioned above.

The Pali commentary on the *Ornament of the Conqueror* is itself closely connected to the *Mirror*. It explicitly refers readers to Dandin's definition of "twinning," using an original Pali translation of the Sanskrit, when commenting on relevant verses.[200] Moreover, many of the "twinning" instances found in the

[196] Bronner and Tubb, section 1.5 in this volume. The quote is from KĀ 3.96.

[197] Recall, however, that the *Compendium*'s author is identified only when the verse is properly arranged in a wheel pattern (*cakrabandha*), and that Sangharakkhita returns to both topics in his commentary (as noted in section 3.6 above).

[198] For a careful discussion of the text of the *Ornaments of the Conqueror*, its commentary, its date, and its author, see Dimitrov 2016: 261–88. For a fuller reading and contextualization of the same text, see Gornall 2020a: 179–212.

[199] *Jinālaṅkāra*, v. 101. The meaning can be translated roughly as: "O one whose senses [can obtain what they] desire, whose form removes doubt, who does not hold on to the suffering that is the river of doubt, who destroys the doubts of those who hold them—Oh, Oh! Where, oh where can there be doubt?"

[200] Dimitrov 2016: 279–80.

Ornament of the Conqueror can be directly connected with Dandin's own treatment of the topic.[201]

Dandin's delight in this "difficult way" was clearly contagious to many authors in Sri Lanka, Sinhala writers included. One classic and early example of this in Sinhala poetry is the ninth chapter of the twelfth-century *Crest-Gem of Poetry* (*Kavsiḷumiṇa*), which also collects together a variety of "twinning" verses and picture poems (*citrabandha*). Verses employing only one syllable (*ekākṣara*), or one vowel, and others that can be read identically both forward and backward are likewise found in this work, just as they are in the Pali *Ornaments of the Conqueror*. Indeed, such poetic experiments are found across a wide range of Sinhala poetry, so much so that "riddle poems" are a genre in their own right.[202] A verse in the fifteenth-century *Parrot Messenger* (*Girāsandeśaya*) describes how travelers entertained themselves, as they rested for the night at waystations, by sharing riddle poems and happily elucidating them with each other.[203]

If both Pali and Sinhala poets ventured out onto Dandin's "difficult path," a clearer bifurcation emerges if we turn our attention to Dandin's different regional paths and the poetic virtues that embody them. As we saw in section 3.4, *Our Own Poetics* describes Sinhala, in what amounts to Dandin's southern path (*Vaidarbhī*), simply and normatively as "good" and anything in another style just as "other"; the *Old Paraphrase on Our Own Poetics* goes even further and says that what is other than the southern way is simply not good Sinhala.[204] By and large, Sinhala poets followed this normative stance and tried to embody the ethos of clarity, sweetness, charm, and avoidance of overdoing that are the hallmarks of the *Mirror*'s southern way. In the context of such prescriptive limits for Sinhala, by contrast, the Pali language offered an inviting space for the creative exploration of Dandin's depiction of the way of speech as multiple.

Consider the *History of the Great Bodhi Tree* (*Mahābodhivaṃsa*), which is among the first Pali poetic texts to experiment boldly with Dandin's northeastern path and which, like *Our Own Poetics*, is tentatively dated to the tenth century.[205] As its title indicates, the work narrates how the Bodhi tree came to Sri Lanka, but it starts the story much earlier, with the future Buddha's encounter with the former Buddha Dipankara. The text continues with an account of the Buddha's enlightenment under the Bodhi tree in Bodh Gaya, then the first three monastic

[201] For a list, see Dimitrov 2016: 263. For another example of a Pali work highlighting *yamaka* (in its opening verse, as noted by Dimitrov 2016: 524), see the *Jinacarita* (also discussed below).

[202] Coperahewa 2012.

[203] *Girā sandeśaya*, v. 115.

[204] SBL 67.

[205] Collins notes that "[i]f the suggested dating to the last quarter of the tenth century is correct, the *Mahābodhivaṃsa* would be the earliest extant example of later Pali *kāvya*" (Collins 2003: 655). For an overview of issues concerning the date and authorship of the work, see Dimitrov 2016: 157–206; Dimitrov argues for connecting the work and a Sinhala exegesis on it (the *Mahābodhivaṃsagäṭapadaya*) to Ratna.

councils dedicated to the care of the Buddha's heritage, and finally the arrival of Buddhism to Sri Lanka by the son and daughter of the emperor Ashoka, Mahinda and Sanghamitta. Sanghamitta is associated with bringing a Bodhi tree sapling, grown from a seedling of the original Bodhi tree, to Sri Lanka.

What stands out about the *History of the Great Bodhi Tree* for us here is less its subject matter and more its language. It is mainly in prose, with long sentences consisting of strings of long compounds. The text has a very distinctive phonic texture with alliteration and the deliberate use of particular consonant sounds. Much of its vocabulary, moreover, consists of loanwords directly from Sanskrit (*tatsama*s) or Pali versions (*tadbhava*s) of Sanskrit words; it would be difficult to understand the text without knowing both the original Sanskrit terms and the rules for changing Sanskrit into Pali. To give a sense of the unprecedented phonic texture of the work's language, we provide here a transliteration and translation of a single clause extracted from a sentence that extends for two and a half pages (in the Pali Text Society's edition; pp. 2–4.) The clause is from a sentence that describes the future Buddha, Sumedha, on his way to practice meditation in the forest:

> *ketakāsokatilakacampakādinekavikacakusumanikaraparimalatarusaṇḍamaṇḍitaṃ migaturaṅganāgavyagghādiaparimitacatuppadakadambakānucaritaṃ kuraracakoramayūrabhiṅkārādisakuntānatakūjitaṃ devadānavasiddhavijjādharādinānābhūtasatatanisevitaṃ marakatarajatakanakaphalikādivividhasikharisatasamujjalaṃ nekanākananāyakanikāyakāminīkucakalasaluḷitavanasarasahassūpasobhitaṃ himadharaṇīdharābharaṇabhūtaṃ sisirasīkarāsāranijjharasatasahassasaramaṇīyaṃ anekavidharatanākaraṃ surakinnaranāgaraṅgamaṇḍalaṃ himavantam ajjhohetvā . . .*
>
> Having plunged into the Himalaya [region], which was made beautiful by *ketaka* [flowers], trees such as the *aśoka*, *tilaka*, and *campaka*, and many masses of blossoming flowers and groves of fragrant trees; it was crowded with *kadambaka* [plants] and innumerable four-footed [animals] such as deer, horses, elephants, and tigers; it resounded endlessly with [the songs of birds] such as osprey, partridges, peacocks and *bhiṅkāra*s; it was always busy with [the comings and goings of] many kinds of beings, such as gods, demi-gods, magicians, and wizards; it shone with hundreds of various precious stones such as emeralds, silver, gold, and quartz; it glistened with thousands of forest lakes, stirred up by the jug-breasts of numerous groups of women devoted to Indra; it was an ornament for the snowy mountains; hundreds of thousands of cascades of cool water in fine rain and heavy showers made it lovely; it was a mine of many kinds of jewels and a playground for gods, *kinnara*s, and *nāga*s. . . .[206]

[206] Text and translation from Collins 2003: 654–55. A translation of the full sentence in which this clause occurs is available in Dimitrov 2016: 178.

The language in this clause is typical of the *History of the Bodhi Tree* as a whole. It is highly Sanskritized, and bears many of the virtues that Dandin and Vamana after him associate with the northeastern path, such as alliteration (*anuprāsa*), unusual and difficult words, and an abundance of compounds.[207] Of course, this sort of prose is highly reminiscent of the prose art of Bana, Subandhu, and Dandin himself too, in his own right as a poet.

The *History of the Bodhi Tree*, however, indicates only one of several directions the new Pali literature took. Other examples include quite a number of poems: the tenth-century (?) *Cauldron of Oil Verses* (*Telakaṭāhagāthā*), the aforementioned twelfth-century *Ornaments of the Conqueror* (*Jinālaṅkāra*), the twelfth- or thirteenth-century *Career of the Conqueror* (*Jinacarita*), and the thirteenth-century *Nectar of Poetry* (*Pajjamadhu*), all works of praise or biographies of the Buddha written by monks. There is also a Pali *campū*, the thirteenth-century *History of the Monastery at Attanagalla* (*Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa*), which draws upon Bana's *Kādambarī* and Aryashura's *Jātakamālā*. When this corpus of Pali literature is considered as a whole, we see a range not only of genres, but also of expressive ecologies, with some texts, like the *Cauldron of Oil Verses* seemingly closer to Dandin's southern way,[208] while others, like the *Nectar of Poetry*, exemplify Dandin's observation that long compounds are to be used in verse composed in the northeastern style.[209] Still others, like the *Career of the Conqueror* and *Ornaments of the Conqueror*, include verses in a variety of styles within a single text.

For example, the *Career of the Conqueror* includes the following verse that is in a quite simple, unadorned style. It is about Sumedha, who was the subject of the passage from the *History of the Great Bodhi Tree* quoted above:

> *sumedho nāma nāmena vedasāgarapāragū |*
> *kumāro 'si garūnaṃ so avasāne jinaṃkuro ||*
> There was a prince named Sumedha, a future conqueror,
> who had crossed the ocean of the Vedas, and had reached
> the limits of his teachers' knowledge.[210]

[207] KĀ 1.40, 46, 54, 80, 92; KASū 1.2.12.

[208] See Gornall and Ruiz-Falqués 2018: 55–100.

[209] For Dandin's comment, see KĀ 1.83. The very first verse of *Nectar of Poetry* begins with a pair of long compounds occupying all (or almost all) of its pair of opening metrical quarters: *uṇṇāpapuṇṇasasimaṇḍalato galitvā / pādambujaṅgulidalaṭṭhasudhālavānaṃ / pantī va satthunakhapanti pajā visesaṃ / pīṇetu suddhasukhitam manatuṇḍapītā ||* (v. 1).

[210] *Jinacarita*, v. 12. Note how the same idea is expressed in the *History of the Great Bodhi Tree*, where we find both shared vocabulary and the distinct difference in virtues: *sumedho nāma sukumāro kumāro hutvā, vasantakantimadditavilāso vedasāgarapārago sakalakalācariyabhāvam upagato garucaraṇapāricariyāvasāne*; "a prince was born who was extremely intelligent and was [thus] named Sumedha (i.e., one of high intelligence). After he [first enjoyed] the subjugating dalliance of love in springtime, and [then later] crossed the ocean of the Vedas, he acquired the status of a master in all arts. At the end [of his studies], when due respect had to be paid to his teacher . . ." (Dimitrov 2016: 175, 177).

But the same work also includes verses like the following, about the conception of the future Buddha, which is composed in a far more ornate style with obvious phonic flourishes in terms of alliteration and prominent compounds in each line:

pādāravindakarapallavasundarāya |
sovaṇṇavaṇṇatanuvaṇṇavirājitāya ||
sīlādinekaguṇabhūsanabhūsitāya |
māyāya rājavanitāyupagañchi kucchiṃ ||
He approached the womb of Maya, beloved of the king,
who was adorned with ornaments of various virtues beginning with morality,
the beauty of her body resplendent with its golden complexion,
and more beauty was added by her lotus-like feet and blossom-like hands.[211]

We also see experiments with rhyming sound and meaning, like what we saw above with the Sinhala poem *Guttila*; for example, this verse in the *Ornaments of the Conqueror* reproduces the sounds and rhythms of the dancing of the Buddha's wife before he went forth in the Great Renunciation:

pāde pāde valayaviravā mekhalāvīṇānādā |
'gītaṃ gītaṃ patiratikaraṃ gāyatī gāyatī sā ||
hatthe hatthe valayacalitā sambhamaṃ sambhamantī |
disvādisvā iti ratikaraṃ yāti hāhā kim īhā ||
With the jingling of anklets on each foot,
and the lute-like tinkling of her girdle,
she, Gāyatrī, sang a song not sung before
to entice her lord,
shaking the bangles on each hand,
and whirling around in excitement.
Though seeing her amorous advances,
it is as if he does not see and leaves.
Oh no, why the effort?[212]

Finally, there is the example of Vedeha, a monk who lived in the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century. He composed two Pali works in distinctly different styles: the *Rasavāhinī*, a story collection primarily in prose, is written in a comparatively unadorned style, whereas his *In Praise of Mount Samanta* is a highly ornate poem.[213]

[211] *Jinacarita*, v. 78.
[212] *Jinālaṅkāra*, v. 77; translation Gornall 2020a: 198.
[213] See Rahula 2015. The twelfth-century Sinhala author Gurulugomi also clearly experimented with different literary styles in his major works, *Flood of the Deathless* (*Amāvatura*) and *Lamp on the*

To conclude, Pali and Sinhala poets both engaged closely with the *Mirror*'s models, but they did this in rather different ways. Whereas Sinhala poets were, by and large, constrained by the norms of the "good" path set in place by *Our Own Poetics*, the *Compendium*, and the exegetical works connected with them, Pali poets felt free to experiment with the entire range of paths and possibilities. This, then, is our answer to the "problem" Collins has raised: among the attractions of Pali as an experimental literary site was precisely that it was unlike Sinhala. It provided a laboratory in which Dandin's adage that the way of speech is multiple could be repeatedly explored, extended, and confirmed.

For our purposes, however, and by way of answering our "why Dandin" and "how Dandin" questions, it is important to see how the *Mirror* enabled these partially distinct stylistic ranges, within a single literary culture in Sri Lanka, and precisely at a time when the *Mirror*'s textual community in the island was at its height. Once this period ended, after the fourteenth century, far fewer Pali works were composed in the more ornate style. Pali *kāvya* and the *Mirror*'s textual community were, it seems, symbiotic with each other.

3.8. Conclusion: Coming Back to the *Mirror*

Charles Hallisey

Our telling of the story of Dandin in Sri Lanka has so far been guided by an intent to illuminate "a mass of detail" and "to interrelate [it] on a new ground."[214] To this end, we have kept references to broad patterns of change in medieval Sri Lanka's religious, cultural, social, and political histories to a minimum. Admittedly, however, there has been a tacit temporal order to the different sections. Each considered distinct developments that emerged sequentially over the course of a single long period which began around the tenth century, with the composition of *Our Own Poetics*, and continued through the Kotte kingdom in the fifteenth. This century in particular saw a flourishing of the literary praxes in Sinhala that served as effective vehicles for the transmission of the *Mirror*'s lessons. Some of the greatest works of Sinhala literature, such as Sri Rahula's *The Hill Myna Messenger* (*Säḷalihiṇisandeśaya*) and his *Crown-Jewel of Poetry* (*Kāvyaśekhara*, as well as Vättäva's *Guttilakāvyaya* about the Buddha's previous life as the musician Guttila, were produced in Kotte).

Dharma (*Dharmapradīpikā*, ostensibly an exegetical work on the *History of the Great Bodhi Tree*); see Liyanage 2004.

[214] Williams 1995: 19.

A different period in this sequence must be acknowledged before we conclude this chapter, a period brought about by European imperialism and colonialism. These began in Sri Lanka with the Portuguese in the early sixteenth century, followed by the Dutch, and finally with the British, who ultimately established direct rule over the island in 1815.[215] Each of these colonial regimes lasted about 150 years. When characterizing this complex and multilayered era, whose pace of change in different spheres of life was uneven,[216] historians starkly differ in either emphasizing rupture or continuity. The same is true of the literary sphere: some scholars argue that the political turmoil of the period meant that "[t]he flame of the poetic tradition that had prevailed since the 10th century faded away,"[217] while others maintain that the Sinhala poetic tradition continued "in an unbroken flow up to the nineteenth century," at which point "it abruptly stops."[218]

Both perspectives—rupture and continuity—are apt, as can be seen in the example of the Sinhala poetry of Alagiyavanna. Alagiyavanna lived in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries and served under both Sinhala and Portuguese rulers.[219] The expressive ecology of Alagiyavanna's poetry is different from that of the Sinhala poetry considered above. He was open to new soundscapes and literary forms, and the results often seem close to the conventions of folk poetry. New genres of Sinhala poetry emerged, most notably war poetry, and Alagiyavanna composed a work in this new genre himself, the *War of Constantine* (*Koustanīnuhaṭana*), in praise of the Portuguese general Constantino de Sá de Nornha (1586–1630).[220] At the same time, it is obvious that Alagiyavanna saw himself as an heir to earlier poetic tradition, and he composed one work in the genre of messenger poetry, *The Cock's Message* (*Sävulsandeśaya*), and two based on Buddhist Jataka stories, *The Poem of King Dhammasonda* (*Dahamsoṅḍakava*) and *The Birth Story of King Kusa* (*Kusajatakakāvyaya*); the latter tells the same story of Kusa and Prabhavati that the *Crest-Gem of Poetry* does, and as did the *Kusajataka* text quoted in the *Compendium* (see section 3.7 above).

Dandin's understanding of the poetic virtues is only vaguely visible in Alagiyavanna's work, and the range of ornaments found in the *Mirror* seems attenuated, but there is no question that Alagiyavanna embraced his "difficult path" (*duṣkaramārga*). *The Cock's Message* includes an example of Dandin's

[215] For overviews of the history of colonial Sri Lanka, see de Silva 1997 and Rogers forthcoming.
[216] Blackburn 2010.
[217] Paranavitana 2007: 61.
[218] Sarachchandra 1982: 209.
[219] See Berkwitz 2013 for a comprehensive exploration of Alagiyavanna's corpus against the backdrop of early modern Sri Lankan history.
[220] On the *War of Constantine*, see Berkwitz 2013: 163–201; for Sinhala war poetry from this period in general, see Paranavitana 2007.

"pinched twinning" (*sandaṣṭa yamaka*), in which the first part of a line repeats the last part of the preceding one, each time with a different meaning.[221] Another verse in *The Cock's Message* is a bitextual "embrace" (*śleṣa*), insofar as it can be read as a description of a forest and as a description of a city.[222] This verse also invites sustained reflection on the relationship between the forest and the city that is brought to the surface by the bitextual embrace, and we may even take it metapoetically as inviting reflection on the social and aesthetic grounds on which literary practices were valued and cultivated in the context of colonialism.

For reasons of space, it is not possible to give even a cursory account of the large and varied corpus of Sinhala literature that was composed in the context of colonialism or the much smaller and more fragmentary corpus of Pali literature composed in the same context. But there is no doubt that the large-scale changes in all domains of life in the colonial period meant that the reception of the *Mirror* now took place on new grounds and in new ways in Sri Lanka. Colonial educational institutions neglected the kinds of study and practice that the *Mirror* envisioned for a literary community, and the skills and tastes of authors and connoisseurs waned. New standards for estimating good literature emerged and contested those that had been defined by the *Mirror* and maintained across centuries in Sri Lankan literary culture. The same norms and values that had long framed the reception of the *Mirror* became grounds for rejection rather than appreciation, and the poets who wrote within these norms were denigrated and their works dismissed as derivative and imitative precisely on these grounds.[223] Munidasa Cumaratunga, a leading literary figure of the twentieth century, went further and charged that someone like Totagamuve Shri Rahula, the author of the *Crown-Jewel of Poetry*, did not even deserve to be called a "poetaster" but rather a literary "thief": "The poet imitates the shadows of another poet's meaning. The poetaster takes the meaning. The thief takes the words."[224]

In the twentieth century, reflection on the significance of Dandin's *Mirror* for the history of literature in Sri Lanka became caught up in more general reflections on the diverse cultural heritages of a colonized society anticipating independence. The generative role of the *Mirror* in the appreciation of Sinhala literature, especially as represented by *Our Own Poetics*, was sometimes now completely revalued in a negative fashion. Martin Wickramasinghe, for example, argued that "Sinhalese literature began under rather unfortunate auspices"; that the "rise of an independent spirit in literature was, therefore, greatly impeded by . . . the rules of *alaṅkāra* and the decadent literature of India"; and Sri Lankan poets showed "neglect of their own environment" and merely slavishly "imitated

[221] *Sävulsandeśaya*, v. 151; see Berkwitz 2013: 52. For Dandin, see KĀ 3.51.
[222] *Sävulsandeśaya*, v. 138; for a translation of the verse in both ways, see Berkwitz 2013: 52–53.
[223] See Dharmavardhana 2010.
[224] Quoted in Field 2017: 37.

the artificial Sanskrit creations which went under the designation of poems."[225] Yet even as Wickramasinghe dismisses the past as emblemized by Dandin as not *his* past and as a betrayal of the future he envisions for himself and for his Sinhala readers, he also affirms the necessity of going back to that past to make "a correct estimate . . . of all those treasures which we have received as our national heritage."[226]

The necessary conditions for coming back to the *Mirror* in the manner that Wickramasinghe advocates were created in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries with the publication of printed editions of the central works that constituted the *Mirror*'s textual community. These were some of the first works to be published with the introduction of print capitalism in colonial Sri Lanka, and their publication meant that these works could reach a broader audience than was possible when they were only accessible through manuscripts. Their priority in coming into print also suggests that they were highly valued at the time as well. If the number of printed editions is any indication of importance, the *Compendium* has pride of place; it was published four times between 1865 and 1900 (1865, 1877, 1892, and 1896). *Our Own Poetics* was published, together with its paraphrase, in 1892,[227] *Lucid Poetics* with its Sinhala paraphrase in 1910, and an edition of the Sinhala *Paraphrase* on the *Mirror* (including materials from a Sanskrit commentary published in Calcutta in 1863) in 1925.[228] Publication of new editions of these works continued through the twentieth century.[229] The publication in 1852 of James d'Alwis's translation of the *Compendium* precedes that of all of these printed editions, but it has a special place of its own because of its long introduction, which gives a vigorous defense of the Sinhala literary tradition as it was framed by the legacy of Dandin's *Mirror*.[230] For example, d'Alwis says about the fifteenth-century *Hill Myna Messenger* that its "writer's thoughts, brilliant and original, sparkle as we go along his elegant and flowing rhymes."[231] Such editions created new conditions for coming back to the *Mirror* and were foundational for its modern reception.

Printed texts, while necessary, are not sufficient: capable readers are needed, too. In the twentieth century, educational changes created new conditions for the formation of capable readers of Sinhala literature. Perhaps most significant of these changes was the inclusion of premodern Sinhala

[225] Wickramasinghe 1963: 21, 22.
[226] Wickramasinghe 1963: 205.
[227] Information based on Wickramasinghe 1901.
[228] See Dimitrov 2016: 125–35 for a revealing account of this composite edition.
[229] Of all the works central to the *Mirror*'s textual community, only Ratna's Commentary remained inaccessible in print in the island.
[230] See Dharmadasa 1992: 47–85, for an overview of d'Alwis's career and contribution to making "the Sinhala language . . . a nationalist cause."
[231] d'Alwis 1966: cxcii.

classics in the annual A-level examinations that serve as prerequisites for university entrance in Sri Lanka. Standardized materials provided to the teachers preparing students for these examinations routinely include categories and ideas that derive from works like *Our Own Poetics*. The national teacher's manual for 2019, for example, emphasizes the importance of "integrity" (*bhāvika guṇaya*) as a distinctive literary quality, just as it was for Dandin, and glosses Dandin's term with one almost identical to that coined by *Our Own Poetics* (*häňgīma*).[232]

The success of a national examination system to shape sensitive readers of premodern literature is likely to be mixed. But there is at the very least anecdotal evidence of modern readers acquiring new sensibilities. Here, for example, is the testimony of a young monk remembering his first encounter with the *Hill Myna Messenger* as part of his preparation for his A-level examinations; first is a translation of the verse, followed by a part of his report:

> With your mind set on crossing to the other shore,
> fly on, friend, from Kontagam's ferry where red lotus petals
> have fallen to the water's surface around
> the white lilies blanketed in moonbeams.[233]

> The above verse presents a very beautiful natural incident happening at night nearby the place called Kontagamtota. We know that it is naturally very beautiful to watch the sky being on a bank of a river where the river connects the ocean, and the sky can directly be seen without any interruption created by flora and fauna, and spend some time there at a night when the moon shines and flowers are blossoming. But, the poet's description on this incident adds far more beauty to it. Those particular flowers called "Kumudu" blossom only at night. The simile about the moonlight on flowers is fascinating here, it is not said that the flowers are just getting moonlight, but it is just as the flowers are putting something (a blanket) on them covering themselves. So, the moonlight is compared to what they put on them (the blanket). And, the withered "Tambara-petals," the petals of a so-called flower, have dropped onto the water and they are then sinking in the water. The petals are of course withered, but they are still colorful, and thousands of them on the surface of the water of the river are a very attractive sight to watch at night when the whole area is being illuminated by moonlight. The gorgeous picture of this incident drawn in my mind by this amazing description of the poet, I should say, could not

[232] *Siṃhalabhāṣāva hā sāhityaya* 2019: 59. See section 3.2 for a discussion of *häňgum*.
[233] *Säḷalihiṇisandeśaya*, v. 20 (most modern editions number it as verse 21).

be experienced even having been to that exact place in person, but only by descriptions of this kind of peerlessly skilled poets.

This way, I was very much amazed and captivated after reading this poetry by Totagamuve Shri Rahula and I liked and loved it more and more every time I read it. I cannot still forget the verses that I learned by heart those days nearly ten years ago that were my favorites.[234]

This young monk's personal testimony is a good place for us to finish. It is an invaluable reminder that the story of Dandin is about personal experiences just as much as it is a story about social and cultural processes. When we turn our attention to the latter, we rightly focus on how the reception of Dandin's *Mirror* is inevitably about change as well as continuity, about negotiation and contestation as well as creative transmission and adaptation. But this personal testimony of a young monk remembering what he gained from his studies—his required studies—is a reminder that the story of Dandin in Sri Lanka is still unfolding and, just as importantly, it is still a story about relishing beauty and about adding beauty to beauty, just as the author of *Our Own Poetics* hoped it would be a thousand years ago when he began his translation of Dandin's *Mirror* with the words:

"May it always be about adding beauty to beauty."

Abbreviations

BKA	*Kāvyālaṅkāra* of Bhāmaha
Guttila	*Guttilakāvya* of Vättäve
KĀ	*Kāvyādarśa*, *Mirror of Literature*, *Mirror*
KĀps	*Kāvyādarśa (purāṇa) sannaya*
KASS	*Kāvyālaṃkārasārasaṃgraha* of Udbhaṭa
KASū	*Kāvyālaṅkāra Sūtra* of Vamana
Ratna	Ratnaśrījñāna. See *Kāvyādarśa* in bibliography
RKĀ	*Kāvyālaṅkāra* of Rudrata
SBL	*Siyabaslakara*
SBLps	*Siyabaslakarapurāṇasannaya*
Ss	*Sidatsaṅgarā*
Subodh	*Subodhālaṅkāra*

[234] Anonymous, personal communication by email, July 2, 2018.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Aucityavicāracarcā of Kṣemendra in *Minor Works of Kṣemendra*. Edited by V. Rāghavāchārya, and D. G. Padhye. Hyderabad: Sanskrit Academy Osmania University, 1961.

Girāsandeśaya [*Girā sandēśaya*]. Edited by Ven. Makuludeve Piyaratana. Colombo: M. D. Gunasena, 1964.

Guttilakāvyavarṇanā [*Guttila kāvya varṇanā*] of Vättäve. Edited by W.F. Gunawardhana. 4th edition. Colombo: Eksat Pravritti patra Samagama (United Newspaper Company), 1962.

Haṃsasandeśaya. Edited by K.D.P. Vikramasinha. Colombo: M. D. Gunasena, 1979.

Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa. Edited by C.E. Godakumbura. London: Pali Text Society, Luzac, 1956.

Jinacarita or "The Career of the Conqueror." Edited and translated with notes by Charles Duroiselle. Rangoon: British Burma Press, 1906.

Jinālaṅkāra or "Embellishments of the Buddha" by Buddharakkhita. Edited and translated by James Gray. London: Luzac, 1894.

Kavirājamārgaṃ of Śrīvijaya. *The Way of the King of Poets*. Edited and translated by R. V. S Sundaram and Deven Patel. New Delhi: Manohar, 2017.

Kāvyādarśa [Kāvyalakṣaṇa] of Daṇḍin, with the commentary of Ratnaśrījñāna. Edited by A. Thakur and U. Jha. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning, 1957.

Kāvyādarśa of Daṇḍin, with the commentary of Taruṇavācaspati and the anonymous Hṛdayaṅgama. Edited by M. Rangacharya. Madras: Brahmavadin Press, 1910.

Kāvyādarśa of Daṇḍin, with the commentary of Jibanand Vidyasagara. Edited by P. K. Panda. Translation by V. V. Sastrulu. Delhi: C. P. Gautam, 2008.

Kāvyādarśasannaya. Edited by Ratmalane Dharmakirti Sri Dharmarama. Colombo: S. Godage, 2009 (reprint of 1925 edition).

Kāvyālaṅkāra of Bhamaha. Edited by B. N. Śarmā and B. Upādhyāya. Varanasi: Chaukhamba, 1981.

Kāvyālaṅkāra of Rudrata. Edited by Pandita Durgaprasada and Kasinatha Panduranga Paraba. Kāvyamālā 2. Bombay: Nirnayasagara Press, 1928.

Kāvyālaṃkārasārasaṃgraha of Udbhaṭa, with the *Laghuvṛtti* of Indurāja. Edited by N. D. Banhatti. 2nd ed. Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series 79. Poona: Bhandrakar Oriental Research Institute, 1982.

Kāvyālaṃkārasūtrāṇi of Vāmana, with the Kāmadhenu commentary of Gopendra Tripurahar Bhupal. Edited by H. Shastri. 2nd ed. Varanasi: Chaukhamba, 1995.

Kāvyaśekhara of Totagamuve Sri Rahula. Edited by Sucarita Gamlat. Colombo: Sarasavi, 2015.

Kavsiḷumiṇa hevat kusadāvata [*Kav siḷumiṇa hevat kusadāvata*]. Edited by M. B. Ariyapala. Colombo: Godage, 2004.

Kuvalayānanda of Appayya Dikshita. Edited by Narayana Rama. Bombay: Nirnayasagara Press, 1955.

Mayūrasandeśavivaraṇaya [*Mayūra sandēśa vivaraṇaya*]. By Kumaratunga Munidasa. Colombo: M. D. Gunasena, 1963.

Meghadūtapuraṇasannaya [*Meghadūta puraṇa artha varṇṇanā sahitayi*] *Meghaduta a Sanskrit Poem by Kalidasa with a Sinhalese Paraphrase*. Edited by T. B. Panabokke. Colombo: G. J. A Skeen, Government Printer, Ceylon, 1893.

Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharatamuni. Vol. 4. Edited by K. L. Joshi. Delhi: Parimal Publications, 2012.

Säḷalihiṇisandeśaya [*Säḷalihiṇi sandeśaya purātana sanna sahita*] *of Totagamuve Shri Rahula*. Edited by H. Jayatilaka. Colombo: Godage, 2009 [1st ed. 1900].

Sasadāvatasannaya [*Sasadāvata sannaya*]. Edited by Venerable Aturuvällē Dhammapāla. Välitara: M. M. P. Vijayaratna Appuhami, 1925.

Sävulsandeśaya [*Sävul sandeśaya*] *of Alagiyavanna*. Edited by J. Samaradivakara. Colombo: Godage, 2009 [1st ed. 1889].

Sidatsaňgarā [*Sidat Saňgarā*]: *Text, Translation and Glossary*. Edited and translated by James Gair and W.S. Karunatillake. New Haven, CT: American Oriental Society, 2013.

Sidatsaňgarāpurāṇasannaya [*Sidat Saňgarā purāṇa sannaya*]. Edited by Ven. Kodagodha Shri Ñanalokanayaka. Colombo: Anula Printers, 1971.

Siyabaslakara [*Siyabas Lakara*] *or Siṇhalese Rhetoric by King Silāmeghavarṇa paraphrased by Ratnamadhvāchārya Mahā Thera (Siyabas lakara: svābhāṣālaṅkāra*). Revised by Hendrick Jayatilaka. Colombo: Lakrivikiraṇa Press, 1892.

Siyabaslakaravivaraṇaya [*Siyabas lakara vivaraṇaya*]. Edited by Ven. Bentara Dhammasena. Colombo: M. D. Gunasena, 1948.

Siyabaslakaravistaravarṇanāva [*Siyabaslakara vistaravarṇanāva*]. Edited by Ven. Henpitagedara Ñanasiha: H. K .D. Candrasena and Sons, 1964.

Subodhālaṅkāra, Porāṇa-ṭīkā (Mahāsāmi-ṭīkā) by Saṅgharakkhita Mahāsāmi, Abhinava-ṭīkā (Nissaya) (anonymous). Edited by Padmanabh S. Jaini. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2000.

Subodhālaṅkārapurāṇasannaya. Edited by Ven. Dodhanduve Dharmasena. Välitara: M. M. P. Vijayaratna Appuhami and R. W. D. Salman Appuhami, 1910.

Vṛttaratnākarasannaya: Vṛttaratnākaraya hā Vṛttaratnākaraparišiṣṭaya vū Vṛttālaṅkāraya. Edited by Ven. C. A. Silaskandhabhidhana. Colombo: Godage, 2013 [1st ed. 1837].

Secondary Sources

Asad, Talal. 2009. "The Idea of an Anthropology of Islam." *Qui Parle* 17: 1–30.

Benjamin, Walter. 2002. "The Task of the Translator." In *Selected Writings*, Vol. 1: *1913–1926*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Berkwitz, Stephen. 2013. *Buddhist Poetry and Colonialism: Alagiyavanna and the Portuguese in Sri Lanka*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Berkwitz, Stephen. 2016. "Sinhala Buddhist Appropriations of Indic Cultural Forms: Literary Imitations and Conquests." *Religions of South Asia* 10: 31–53.

Blackburn, Anne. 2010. *Locations of Buddhism: Colonialism and Modernity in Sri Lanka*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bronner, Yigal. 2007. "This Is No Lotus, It Is a Face: Poetics as Grammar in Daṇḍin's Investigation of the Simile." In *The Poetics of Grammar and the Metaphysics of Sound and Sign*, edited by David Shulman and Sergio la Porta. Leiden: Brill, 89–108.

Bronner, Yigal. 2010. *Extreme Poetry: The South Asian Movement of Simultaneous Narration*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Bronner, Yigal. 2012. "A Question of Priority: Revisiting the Debate on the Relative Chronology of Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 40: 67–118.
Bronner, Yigal. Forthcoming. *An* Alaṅkāra *Reader: Classical Indian Poetics*.
Calvino, Italo. 1991. *Why Read the Classics?* Translated by Martin McLaughlin. New York: Houghton, Mifflin Harcourt.
Clare, Jennifer. 2017. "Embracing Traditions: The Figure of Condensed Speech in Tamil," *Rivista degli Studi Orientali*, n.s. XC(1–4): 107–22.
Collins, Steven. 2003. "What Is Literature in Pali?" In *Literary Cultures in History: Reconstructions from South Asia*, edited by Sheldon Pollock. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 649–88.
Coperahewa, Sandudas. 2012. "Buddhist Riddle poems of the Kotte Period." *Daily News* (Sri Lanka). http://archives.dailynews.lk/2012/12/20/fea25.asp.
d'Alwis, James. 1966. *A Survey of Sinhala Literature (Being an Introduction to a Translation of the Sidat Sangarāva*. Colombo: Government Press.
de Silva, C. R. 1997. *Sri Lanka: A History*. 2nd ed. Delhi: Vikas.
Dharmadasa, K. N. O. 1992. *Language, Religion, and Ethnic Assertiveness: The Growth of Sinhalese Nationalism in Sri Lanka*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Dharmavardhana, Bemtota Enulasiri. 2010. *Kukavi Vāda Tattva Satya Prakāśanī*. Colombo: Godage.
Dimitrov, Dragomir. 2016. *The Legacy of the Jewel Mind: On the Sanskrit, Pali, and Sinhalese Works by Ratnamati*. Napoli: Università degli di Napoli "L'Orientale."
Empson, William. 1985. *The Structure of Complex Words*. London: Hogarth Press.
Field, Garrett. 2017. *Modernizing Composition: Sinhala Song, Poetry, and Politics in Twentieth-Century Sri Lanka*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Francis, H. T., translator. *The Jataka, or, Stories of the Buddha's Former Births*, Vol. V. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1905.
Frasch, Tilman. 1998. "A Buddhist Network in the Bay of Bengal: Relations between Bodhgayā, Burma and Sri Lanka, c. 300–1300." In *From the Mediterranean to the China Sea: Miscellaneous Notes*, edited by Claude Guillot, Denys Lombard, and Roderich Ptak. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 69–92.
Frasch, Tilman. 2001. "The Buddhist Connection: Sinhalese-Burmese Intercourse in the Middle Ages." In *Explorations in the History of South Asia: Essays in Honour of Dietmar Rothermund*, edited by Georg Berkemer, Tilman Frasch, Hermann Kulke, and Jürgen Lütt. Delhi: Manohar, 85–97.
Frasch, Tilman. 2017. "A Pāli Cosmopolis? Sri Lanka and the Theravāda Buddhist Ecumene, c. 500–1500." In *Sri Lanka at the Crossroads of History*, edited by Zoltán Biedermann and Alan Strathern. London: UCL Press, 66–76.
Godakumbura, C. E. 2010. *Sinhalese Literature*. Colombo: Department of Cultural Affairs [1st ed. 1955].
Gornall, Alastair. 2020a. *Rewriting Buddhism: Pali Literature and Monastic Reform in Sri Lanka, 1157–1270*. London: UCL Press.
Gornall, Alastair. 2020b. "Sources of the *Sidat Saṅgarā*, the First Grammar of Sinhala." In *Linguistic and Textual Aspects of Multilingualism in South India and Sri Lanka*, edited by Giovanni Ciotti and Erin McCann. Puducherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry, École Française d'Extrême-Orient, 411–28.
Gornall, Alastair, and Aleix Ruiz-Falqués. 2018. "Verses of a Dying Arahant: A New Translation and Revised Edition of the *Telakaṭāhagāthā*." *Journal of the Pali Text Society* XXXIII: 55–100.

Hallisey, Charles. 2003. "Works and Persons in Sinhala Literary Culture." In *Literary Cultures in History: Reconstructions from South Asia*, edited by Sheldon Pollock. Berkeley: University of California Press, 689–746.

Hallisey, Charles. 2017. "Learning from *Samāsokti* in Sri Lanka." *Rivista degli Studi Orientali*, n.s. XC(1–4): 127–45.

Hallisey, Charles. Forthcoming. "When Seeing Comes after Words: Messenger Poetry in Sri Lanka."

Heath, Jane. 2018."'Textual Communities': Brian Stock's Concept and Recent Scholarship on Antiquity." In *Scriptural Interpretation at the Interface between Education and Religion*, edited by Florian Wilk. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 5–35.

Ingalls, Daniel H. H. 1965. *An Anthology of Sanskrit Court Poetry: Vidyākara's* Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Jaddipal, V. V. 2010. "Buddhist Ālaṅkārikās and Pre-Bhāmaha Period Alaṅkāraśastra." In *Universal Message of Buddhist Tradition*, edited by R. Tripathi. Delhi: Rastriya Samskrita Samsthan, 369–87.

Kerr, Sean M. 2021. "The Literary Abhidhamma Text: Anuruddha's *Manual of Defining Mind and Matter (Nāmarūpapariccheda)* and the Production of Pali Commentarial Literature in South India." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Kieffer-Pülz, Petra. 2016. "Reuse of Text in Pāli Legal Commentaries." *Buddhist Studies Review* 33: 9–45.

Kieffer-Pülz, Petra. 2017. "Saṅgharakkhita Mahāsāmi's Oeuvre Based on the Inter-textual Links in his Texts." *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* (*ARIRIAB)* XX: 23–55.

Liyanagamage, Amaradasa. 2001. "A Forgotten Aspect of the Relations between the Sinhalese and the Tamils." In *Society, State and Religion in Premodern Sri Lanka*. Kelaniya: University of Kelaniya (University of Kelaniya Anniversary Series, Vol. 2), 15–72.

Liyanage, Wasantha A. 2004. "Narrative Methods of Sinhala Prose: A Historical and Theoretical Study of Sinhala Prose from Twelfth Century Narratives to Post-Realist Fiction." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Wisconsin–Madison.

Luce, Gordon H., and Bo-hmu Ba Shin. 1969. *Old Burma—Early Pagán*, Vol. I: *Artibus Asiae. Supplementum* 25. Locust Valley, NY: Artibus Asiae and the Institute of Fine Arts, New York University.

Monius, Anne. 2000. "The Many Lives of Daṇḍin: The '*Kāvyādarśa*' in Sanskrit and Tamil." *International Journal of Hindu Studies* 4: 1–37.

Monius, Anne. 2013. "'Sanskrit Is the Mother of All Tamiḻ Words': Further Thoughts on the *Vīracōḻiyam* and Its Commentary." In *Buddhism among Tamils in Tamilakam and Ilam: Part III: Extensions and Conclusions*, edited by Peter Schalk and Astrid van Nahl. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Historia Religionum, 32. Uppsala: Uppsala University Library, 103–29.

Ñanamoli, Ven, translator. 1999. *The Path of Purification* (*Visuddhimagga*). Seattle: BPS Pariyatti Editions.

Narayana Rao, V., and David Shulman. 1998. *A Poem at the Right Moment: Remembered Verses from Premodern South India*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ollett, Andrew. 2017. *Language of the Snakes: Prakrit, Sanskrit, and the Language Order of Premodern India*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Paranavitana, Rohini. 2007. "Sinhalese War Poems and the Portuguese." In *Exploring the Links: Histories and Constructed Histories between Portugal and Sri Lanka*, edited by Jorges Flores. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 49–61.

Paranavitana, Senarat. 1956. *Sigiri Graffiti: Being Sinhalese Verses of the Eighth, Ninth and Tenth Centuries*, Vol. I (Introduction and Plates). London: Oxford University Press.

Pollock, Sheldon. 1998. "India in the Vernacular Millennium: Literary Culture and Polity 1000–1500." In *Early Modernities*, edited by Shmuel Eisenstadt, Wolfgang Schluchter, and Björn Wittrock, special issue of *Daedalus* 127 (1998): 41–74.

Pollock, Sheldon. 2001. "The Social Aesthetic and Sanskrit Literary Theory." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 29: 197–229.

Pollock, Sheldon. 2005. "Ratnaśrījñāna." In *Encyclopedia of Indian Wisdom: Dr. Satya Vrat Shastri Felicitation Volume*, edited by R. K. Sharma. Delhi: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, 637–43.

Pollock, Sheldon. 2006. *Language of the Gods in the World of Men: Sanskrit, Culture, and Power in Premodern India*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rahula, Ven. Telwatte, editor and translator. 1981. "Rasavāhinī: Jambudipuppattivatthu." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Australian National University, Canberra.

Ramanujan, A. K. 1989. "Where Mirrors Are Windows: Toward an Anthology of Reflections." *History of Religions* 28: 187–216.

Rogers, John. Forthcoming. *A Concise History of Sri Lanka*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sarachchandra, Ediriwira. 1982. "Tradition Overturned: A Modern Literature in Sri Lanka." In *Asian and Western Writers in Dialogue*, edited by Guy Amirthanayagam. London: Macmillan, 209–20.

Saussy, Haun. 2017. *Translating as Citation: Zhuangzi Inside Out*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Siṃhalabhāṣāva hā sāhityaya, 11th ed. 2019. Pitakotta: Adhyapana Prakasana Departmentuva.

Sirisena, W. M. 1978. *Sri Lanka and South-East Asia: Political, Religious and Cultural Relations from A.D. c. 1000 to c. 1500*. Leiden: Brill.

Somadasa, K. D. 1990. *Catalogue of the Hugh Nevill Collection of Sinhalese Manuscripts in the British Library*, Vol. 4. London: The British Library and the Pali Text Society.

Sorata, Ven. Välivitye. 1963. *Śrī Sumangala Śabdakoṣaya*, Part 1. Colombo: Anula Press.

Stock, Brian. 1983. *The Implications of Literacy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Tokarczuk, Olga. 2018. *Flights*. New York: Riverhead Books.

Wickremasinghe, Don Martino de Zilva. 1901. *Catalogue of the Sinhalese Printed Books in the Library of the British Museum*. London: British Museum.

Wickramasinghe, Martin. 1963. *Landmarks of Sinhalese Literature*. Colombo: M. D. Gunasena.

Wijayawardhana, Gamage Don. 1963. "The Influence of Sanskrit Alaṁkāra Śāstra on Early Sinhalese Poetry." Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Ceylon, Peradeniya.

Wijayawardhana, G. D. 1964. "Siya-bas-lakara and a Theory of Suggestion." *University of Ceylon Review* XXII: 21–27.

Williams, William Carlos. 1995. *Paterson*. New York: New Directions.

Wright, J. C. 1996. "'Sithila, kathā,' and Other Current Topics in Pali." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 59: 44–62.

Wright, J. C. 2000. "Make an Island for Yourself: *karohi dīpaṃ attano*." In *Harānanandalaharī: Volume in Honour of Professor Minoru Hara on his Seventieth Birthday*, edited by Ryutaro Tsuchida and Albrecht Wezler. Reinbek: Verlag für Orientalistische Fachpublikationen, 481–504.

Wright, J. C. 2002. "The Pāli *Subodhālaṅkāra* and Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa*." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 65: 323–34.