HIGH-DENSITY EXPRESSIONS
IN THE *WAY OF THE POET-KING*

Andrew Ollett

This essay compares Śrīvijaya's treatment of the ornament of «condensed expression» in his *Way of the Poet-King* (*Kavirājamārgaṁ*), a ninth-century work of poetics in Kannada, to Daṇḍin's treatment of the same ornament in his *Mirror of Literature* (*Kāvyādarśa*). What does Śrīvijaya say, about the poetic possibilities offered by this ornament, and about the relationship between the Sanskrit and Kannada traditions, by reshaping Daṇḍin's discussion? And how can such literary ornaments, which are often dependent on language-specific strategies, form part of a discourse on literary art that bridges diverse languages and literary traditions?

INTRODUCTION

THE *Kavirājamārgaṁ* is a manual of poetics produced at the court of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Amōghavarṣa in the 860s CE.[1] The title can be analyzed to mean both «The Way (*mārga*) of the Poet-King (*kavirāja*)» and «The Royal Way (*rājamārga*) for Poets (*kavi*)». Given that scholarly consensus considers the text to have resulted from a collaboration between King Amōghavarṣa and his court poet Śrīvijaya, one further analysis is possible: «The Way of the Poet and the King».[2] It has the dual distinction of being the earliest Kannada text to survive in manuscript form, as well as being the earliest surviving text to engage at length with Daṇḍin's *Mirror of Poetry* (*Kāvyādarśa*). These two firsts are not coincidental. The goal of the *Way* was to do what Daṇḍin's *Mirror* had done about a century and a half previously, namely, to formulate and exemplify the principles of literary composition in a clear, concise, and attractive way. The *Way*, however, was oriented toward a different readership than the *Mirror*. It was for a nascent public of people who cultivated Kannada as a literary language. This vernacular orientation emphatically does not mean that the *Way* was com-

---

posed for people who were unable to read Sanskrit. In fact, the *Way* leaves no doubt that mastery of Sanskrit, including a deep familiarity with the work of classical Sanskrit poets, is a prerequisite for participation in the kind of Kannada literary culture that it envisions.[3] Nor should the *Way*'s vernacular orientation be understood as a form of regional or linguistic chauvinism. The *Way* evinces both a deep commitment to composing literature in Kannada and a conviction that this project, if it is to succeed, stands in dire need of articulated norms. It sought to demonstrate that Kannada could be used as the language of high literature, or *kāvya*. What better way to make this argument than to incorporate Daṇḍin's *Mirror*, the text that, more than any other, would define and exemplify what *kāvya* was for generations of readers?

Daṇḍin might have approved of the manner in which the *Way* has incorporated his *Mirror*. Nothing is merely copied or rendered by a word-for-word translation. Every section of the *Mirror* that appears in the *Way* is thoughtfully revised, just as every topic in the traditional systems of poetics provided Daṇḍin himself with something to playfully transform. Thus the *Way*'s close intertextual relationships with Daṇḍin's *Mirror* are not simply of literary-historical interest. They represent a thoughtful reading, and interpretation, of the *Mirror*. Moreover, with its insistence that Kannada poets must first study of theoretical works in Sanskrit, we can hardly doubt that the *Way*'s target audience would have known the *Mirror of Poetry* well and thus been alive to the *Way*'s resonances with it.

We can think of the relationship of the *Way* to the *Mirror*, then, not so much as a translation or adaptation, but as what the tradition of poetics in which they both stand calls *samāsōkti*, «condensed expression». This is an ornament of meaning in which what is spoken of evokes something unspoken. Almost every passage of the *Way* evokes corresponding passages in the *Mirror*, which is never explicitly mentioned, and foregrounds its own similarities with and differences from them. This is especially true in the *Way*'s third chapter, which is devoted to ornaments of meaning. And one striking example of this «condensation» is provided by the *Way*'s discussion of the ornament of condensed expression itself.

Stacked definitions

The *Way*'s treatment of condensed expression comprises a definition (3.126) and two examples, each with a brief commentary (3.127-130). Here is the definition:

---

[3] See *Way* 1.9: *adaṟiṁ paramāgama-kōvidan appudu pūrva-kāvya-racanegaḷaṁ tāṁ modaloḷ kaltaṅg'*, «therefore, one must be an expert in the highest traditions, by first studying the poetic compositions of the past».

taṟisandu manadoḷ ondaṁ
peṟataṁ matt' adane pōlvudaṁ kuṟipugaḷaṁ
kuṟimāḍimāḍi pēḻvudu
neṟeye samāsōktiy embud' int' adaṟa teṟaṁ (3.126)

When you have one thing in mind, and then effectively
        speak of something else that resembles it
by calling attention to each of the qualifiers, that is what is called
        condensed expression. This is the way it goes.

The ornament always involves two distinct elements (*viśēṣyas*) that are connected by qualifiers (*viśēṣaṇas*) that they hold in common. One of those elements is mentioned explicitly, whereas the other is merely called to mind. Whereas Bhāmaha, in his *Ornament of Poetry*, defined the ornament in terms of the evoked element, Daṇḍin defined it in terms of the expressed element.[4] In this respect the *Way* follows Daṇḍin, whose wording is rendered closely:

MIRROR OF POETRY	WAY OF THE POET-KING	TRANSLATION
vastu kiñcid abhiprētya tattulyasyānyavastunaḥ uktiḥ	*taṟisandu manadoḷ ondaṁ peṟataṁ matt' adane pōlvudaṁ pēḻvudu*	With one thing in mind another thing similar to it expression

Daṇḍin does not mention qualifiers in his initial definition. He does, however, assume that we know that the similarity between two things is effected by their shared qualifiers. This is clear from his distinction between two varieties of condensed expression on the basis of whether *all* or merely *some* of the qualifiers of the expressed element can be applied to the evoked element. Daṇḍin could make such an assumption because condensed expression had already been defined by earlier authorities – including Bhāmaha – precisely in terms of these shared qualifiers. By saying that condensed expression is accomplished «by calling attention to each of the qualifiers», the *Way* is not only reintroducing a term that was merely presupposed in Daṇḍin's *Mirror*, but also reintroducing Bhāmaha's *Ornament* as an intertext.[5] This is a typical maneuver for the *Way*, which draws primarily on the *Mirror* but always keeps an eye on the *Ornament* and engages with it where appropriate.[6]

---

[4] *Mirror of Poetry* 2.203: *vastu kiñcid abhiprētya tattulyasyānyavastunaḥ | uktiḥ saṁkṣiptarūpatvāt sā samāsōktir iṣyatē* ‖; *Ornament of Poetry* 2.79: *yatrōktē gamyatē 'nyō 'rthas tatsamānaviśēṣaṇaḥ | sa samāsōktir uddiṣṭā saṁkṣiptārthatayā yathā* ‖.

[5] For the relationship between intertextuality (understood as links between textual nodes in a discourse) and discursive presuppositions (understood as links between the said and the unsaid in a discourse), see CULLER (1976) and BRONNER (2010: 262).

[6] For example, in the discussion of the causes of poetic ability (1.11), which is adapted from *Ornament* 1.5 and 1.10.

This short phrase turns out to be important for three reasons. First, the intertextual background allows us to understand the Kannada word *kuṛipu* as the equivalent of the Sanskrit word *viśēṣaṇa*, without our being explicitly told so. Throughout the text, Kannada is pressed into service as a metalanguage for literature, with its own complement of technical terms. The *Way*'s project of «literarizing» Kannada, making it into a literary language, meant making it possible not only to write literature but also to talk about it in Kannada.[7] But the equivalence of *kuṛipu* and *viśēṣaṇa* – and this is true of Kannada and Sanskrit more generally as literary languages – is only a baseline over which some difference may be established. This brings us to the second reason. The term *viśēṣaṇa*, in principle, could apply to anything that qualifies the expressed element, but in the example given by Bhāmaha, the ornament is constructed with a series of adjectives.[8] There is thus a danger of understanding «qualifier» in the narrow sense of «adjective», which the *Mirror* seems to address by adducing an example that hardly employs adjectives at all. In Kannada, however, where qualification is accomplished primarily by non-finite verbal forms rather than adjectives, the term «qualifier» refers by default to a wider range of grammatical constructions than the equivalent Sanskrit term. We might say that the condensed expression in Kannada is less predetermined as to its form than its Sanskrit equivalent. And this brings us to the third reason. The presence of the «qualifier» phrase, found in the *Way*'s definition but not the *Mirror*'s, is correlated with the absence of the subdivisions of condensed expression that are found in the *Mirror*. The *Way* does not say whether all of the qualifiers (*kuṛipugaḷ*) of the expressed element apply to the evoked element, or only a few of them. Whatever the reasons for bypassing this distinction might have been, it seems to have had the effect of further opening up the scope of the ornament. Bhāmaha's condensed expression, although it does not explicitly require the two elements to share all of their qualifiers, does so implicitly, and his example fulfills this requirement. Daṇḍin, by introducing a distinction that does not appear in Bhāmaha's text, allowed something to count as condensed expression even if the two elements did not share all of their qualifiers. In the *Way*, there is no longer any indication that these «loose» kinds of condensed expression are in any way different from the «strict» kinds where all of the qualifiers line up. We will see below that this openness, in terms of grammatical and formal structure, will allow the *Way*'s concept of condensed expression to apply to important phenomena in Kannada literature, such as eulogistic allegory.

---

[7] For the production of philological texts (works on poetics, grammar, metrics, and lexicography) in Kannada from the ninth to the eleventh centuries, see POLLOCK (2004).

[8] *Ornament* 2.80: *skandavān ṛjur avyālaḥ sthiro 'nēkamahāphalaḥ | jātas tarur ayaṁ cōccaiḥ pātitaś ca nabhasvatā |* .

The *Way* omits the explanation of the ornament's name, which is found in both the *Ornament* and the *Mirror*. This is possibly because the Sanskrit names of the ornaments are treated as fixed expressions (*rūḍha*) not subject to analysis.

Lascivious bees

The first of the *Way*'s two examples is clearly modeled on Daṇḍin's first example:

> *tāmarey' araloḷ sarasa-ni-*
> *jāmōdadoḷ ondi nalidu makaranda-rajō-*
> *vyāmugdhadoḷ ī muguḷoḷam*
> *ā māḷkeyan⁹ aṟasi suḷivud' aḷi kelageladoḷ* (3.127)

> On coming to the lotus' blossom, and delighting
>   in its rich fragrance, the bee is now trying to find
> a way to do it with this bud, too, which is innocent of
>   nectar and pollen, rolling from side to side.

> *nered'¹⁰ ativiruddha¹¹-gaṇikā-*
> *suratāsava-sēvanā-kṛtārthanan¹² āgird'*
> *irade taruṇī-ratāntara-*
> *sarāgamaṁ pēḷvud' alli tumbiya nevadiṁ* (3.128)

> What is spoken of in the preceding verse is a man who,
>   after having met with courtesan who is completely off-limits,
> did not satisfy his addiction to the drug of sex with her,
>   and now desires to have sex once again with his young girlfriend,
> in the guise of a bee.

While the example still evokes, as Daṇḍin said, «the course of desire» (*icchā-vṛtti*) of a man with an inexperienced girl, the tone is transformed. In Daṇḍin's verse, at least as our editions read, the man has simply played around with (*baddharatilīla*) an older woman (*prauḍhāṅganā*). In the *Way*, he has become an out-and-out sex addict. And this is because he's sought out a courtesan whom he never ought to have visited in the first place. All editions of the *Way*, following the *editio princeps* of Pathak, emend *ativiruddha* («absolutely disallowed») to *atividagdha* («very skillful»), bringing the text perhaps

---

⁹ The manuscripts all read *māḷkeyan* (with the possible exception of GOML K1250, which has a flourish on the top of the *y* that might be read as an *i*), and Pathak's and Seetharamaiah's editions read *māḷkeyan*. Venkatachala Sastry has emended the text to *māḷkeyin*, which would mean «in that manner».

¹⁰ Both manuscripts (Kuvempu Institute K125 and K110) read *nerad* (GOML K1250 has a gap here), which all of the editions sensibly correct to *nered*.

¹¹ Both manuscripts read *ativiruddha*; *atividagdha* is a conjecture of Pathak's (see below).

¹² All manuscripts read *kṛtōdanan*, which seems impossible. Pathak emends to *kṛtaudanan*, and Venkatachala Sastry emends to *kṛtōdaran*. Seetharamaiah's suggestion, *kṛtārthanan*, seems most sensible.

closer to the scenario Daṇḍin envisioned, but further from the manuscripts. If we want to bring the texts closer together, however, we might notice that the *Way*'s description of the man is rather more consonant with the unattested reading *lōlasya* («greedy for …») rather than *līlasya* in the *Mirror*'s verse. Finally, whereas the bee in Daṇḍin's verse merely «kisses» the bud, the *Way*'s bee is up to something less delicate. Both verses are put in the mouth of a speaker who describes the expressed meaning for a listener, indicated by the word «look!» (*paśya*) in the *Mirror* and the deictic pronoun «this» (*ī*) in the *Way*. But whereas the tone of Daṇḍin's verse is wry and conspiratorial, the Kannada verse sounds judgmental and even scornful, as perhaps we might expect from an author who was a Jain monk and, according to one reading of the *Way*'s final verses, a lifelong celibate.[13]

It is possible, as Jennifer Clare argues in this issue, that the meaning of Daṇḍin's verse does not culminate in the «evoked» situation of a man and his young girlfriend, but extends further to a metapoetic statement. Whatever this statement may be – Clare suggests that the bee stands in for a reader who doesn't sufficiently distinguish between two meanings that have been identified – it is unclear whether the author of *Way* was aware of it. If so, however, the *Way*'s verse, which is rather harsher in tone than Daṇḍin's, would characterize what the bad reader does not simply as incorrect, but as blameworthy and inept.

The construction of this verse, like Daṇḍin's original, differs from more conventional examples of condensed expression, where the similarity between two things is effected by a string of adjectives. It turns, instead, on the conventions of reading erotic poetry, and in particular, an understanding that the bee is almost always a symbol of the errant lover. These associations mean that the relationship between the expressed and evoked meanings might be «loose»: the young woman, for example, cannot sensibly be described as «innocent of nectar and pollen», but this phrase guides us to understand her as sexually inexperienced, especially on account of the cognitive friction produced by the word *vyāmugdha*, which more readily applies to young girls than flower-buds. Since the similarity between the two scenarios is effected by the suggestion of qualifiers, propelled by conventions of reading, rather than by a strict alignment of qualifiers, the verse can be expressed in the left-branching syntax most natural to Kannada. Daṇḍin's example involves one participle (*piban*) attached to the main verb (*cumbati*); this example involves a chain of four verb phrases (headed by *ondi*, *naḷidu*, *aṟasi*, and *suḷivudu*).

The *Way*'s explanation of the verse is important because of the ongoing debate about suggestion (*dhvani*) provoked by Ānandavardhana's *Light on*

---

[13] See 3.223, describing the author, Śrīvijaya, as *īḍita-mahā-puruṣavrata-niścitaṁ*, «firm in the great and estimable vow of lifelong celibacy», a sense of *puruṣavrata* that SEETHARAMAIAH (1994: 413) finds in later Jain works in Kannada.

Suggestion. Daṇḍin's earliest known Sanskrit commentator, Ratnaśrījñāna, understood condensed expression to be identical with «suggestion», and adduced the use of *vibhāvyatē* in Daṇḍin's explanation of his example as evidence for this position: «*vibhāvyatē* means that it is understood, but not stated explicitly».[14] The equivalent expression in the *Way* is *pēḷvudu* («expresses»), reflecting an understanding of Daṇḍin's text that is virtually opposite to Ratnaśrījñāna's. It seems unlikely that author of the *Way* would admit that suggestion is involved in this verse, or in condensed expression more generally, for other reasons. In general, the *Way* does not share Ānandavardhana's enthusiasm for suggestion. What others prize as suggestion, the *Way* remarks, is often simply abstruseness or impreciseness.[15] But if not through suggestion, how is the evoked meaning communicated? Perhaps the *Way* means us to understand that, just as the words guide us to an apprehension of the expressed meaning, the conventions of reading guide us to an apprehension of the evoked meaning.

DOOMED ELEPHANTS

Here is the *Way*'s second example:

> *dāna-paranaṁ nijōnnata-*
> *mānanan ārūḍha-vipuḷa-vaṁśanan ant' ond'*
> *āneyan apāya-paṅkadoḷ*
> *ēnuṁ taḷv' illad' irdudaṁ kāṇisidaṁ* (3.129)

> Then he showed them how quickly an elephant
>   had fallen into a mud-pit of calamity:
>   rut pouring from his temples, massive in size,
>   with a lofty and broad back –
>   *free with his patronage, confident in himself,*
>   *the scion of a powerful family.*

> *tyāgādi-guṇa-gaṇōdaya-*
> *bhāgiyan ēnānum ond' upāyāntaradiṁ*
> *nīgal neṟeyadey' anupaman*
> *ī gaṇidadin āne-māḍi nuḍidaṁ bageyaṁ*[16] (3.130)

> When he was unable to rescue the one was on the rise
>   on account of his many good qualities, such as liberality,
> by any means whatsoever, Anupaman expressed his intended
>   meaning with this device by making him into an elephant.

This verse uses the technique of *śleṣa*, wherein the same text can be read with two different meanings. Accordingly, the qualifiers of the expressed element

---

[14] *vibhāvyatē, pratīyatē, na tu sākṣād ucyatē*. Commentary on 2.205.
[15] See *Way* 3.208, which lists suggestion as an ornament, and the discussion of the fault of understated meaning (*nēyārthaṁ*) in 1.101-103.
[16] *upāyāntaradiṁ* is Seetharamaiah's correction for the manuscripts' unmetrical *upāyāntaraṁ*.

can all be read, with different meanings, as qualifiers of the evoked element. This verse has no parallel in the *Mirror*, although the political theme resembles Daṇḍin's «tree» examples and the technique recalls his «ocean» example, and the negative outlook corresponds closely to Bhāmaha's example, wherein a mighty tree is felled by the wind.[17] It seems, rather, to be taken from an earlier Kannada text. The *Way* identifies the subject of the verb *kāṇisidan*, «he showed», with Anupaman, which seems to be the name of a character in the work from which the verse was cited.[18] Alternatively, but in my view less likely, Anupaman could be the author of the work. The reference to a specific narrative context is rare among the verses that the *Way* provides as examples. Most of them are generic and give the impression of being made to order, just like Daṇḍin's examples. Muḷiya Timmappayya argued that this verse is actually taken from a work that recounts the career of King Amōghavarṣa himself: in the early years of his reign, he faced a rebellion that was eventually put down by his cousin Karka, and this rebellion might be the «mud-pit of calamity» to which the poet alludes.[19] Although the connection to Amōghavarṣa's reign in particular is speculative, Timmappayya was right to emphasize the «political overtones» that distinctively characterize the *Way of the Poet-King*.[20] Throughout the *Way*, we encounter verses like this that speak of the military and governmental challenges of kingship. The king, and hence the realm of the political, is thus conceived differently in the *Way* than in the *Mirror*: whereas Daṇḍin very often speaks of the king in his role as a liberal patron, the *Way* both speaks *of* and speaks *to* the king in his role as a ruler, emphasizing his responsibilities to his subjects – not just to poets – and dispensing advice about topics such as the requisite qualities of a minister.[21]

Besides signposting its relationship with an earlier text, this example's narrative context also gives some indication of the ornament's «pragmatic contexts» – the discursive situations in which it is employed. One of the motivations for using condensed expression is some kind of constraint on saying the evoked meaning outright, which might cause pain or embarrassment. Political speech, as Indian literature constantly avers, is subject to more stringent constraints than almost any other. The *Way*'s example has Anupaman, possibly a minister, disclose that the king's situation is desperate beyond remedy, without saying as much and perhaps, since the verse only says that he «pointed out» the elephant, without saying anything.

---

[17] See the translations of these verses in Yigal Bronner's paper in this issue.
[18] T. V. Venkatachala Sastry has emended the text to *anupamam*, which is to be read as an adverb («in an incomparable way»), instead of retaining the reference to a person named Anupaman who is otherwise completely unknown.
[19] Timmappayya (1948: 40); Altekar (1934: 72-74). In favor of Timmappayya's argument, the phrase *guṇagaṇōdayabhāgi* recalls *guṇōdaya*, one of the titles of Amōghavarṣa.
[20] So Seetharamaiah (1994: 411).
[21] Timmappayya mentions a string of examples in the «lesson» (*nidarśana*) section (3.141-153).

Within Kannada literature, however, condensed expression is not general-
ly associated with politic ways of expressing hard truths, but rather with a
technique of eulogistic allegory: the poet's patron is loosely identified with,
and evoked by, the protagonist of the poem. I say «loosely» because, in con-
trast to *dvisandhāna* poems in which the poet tells two stories simultaneously,
the figure of the patron is only evoked very occasionally, for example by re-
ferring to the poem's protagonist with an epithet associated with the patron.
Sheldon Pollock has called this pattern «strategic disclosure». It is true that
this technique seems to be called condensed expression only in modern schol-
arship. «No Sanskrit rhetorician», Pollock writes, «would ever have used this
term to describe a structural feature of an entire narrative». But, as noted
above, Daṇḍin's relaxation of the requirement that all qualifiers must be iden-
tical, which the *Way* presupposes, may have opened the door to a broader
conception of the ornament.[22] Moreover, the way in which poets themselves
speak of this technique is precisely how the *Way* speaks of condensed expres-
sion in the second example: «by making *X* into *Y*» (*X-aṁ Y-māḍi*).[23] Pampa,
whose *Victory of Arjuna by Valor* (*Vikramārjunavijayaṁ*) provides the earliest
example of this technique, refers to earlier attempts, which may well have
been known to the author of the *Way*.

Conclusions

We can see more clearly the specific features of the *Way*'s engagement with
Daṇḍin's *Mirror* by first contrasting it with two later works of poetics in Kan-
nada: the *Ornament of Udayāditya* (ca. 1200 ce) and the *Ornament of Mādhava*
(ca. sixteenth century). Both of them follow the *Mirror* closely, evidently with-
out reference to, or even knowledge of, the *Way*. Brevity is the overarching
goal in *Udayāditya*. The discussion of the ornament there is so compressed –
even its name, *samāsōkti*, is shortened to *samāsaṁ* – that it is difficult to pick
up on its resonances with Daṇḍin's *Mirror*, which certainly provided the in-
spiration and plan of the work as a whole.[24] In the *Mādhava*, by contrast, the

---

[22] Pollock (2006: 360). He writes there that «[t]o apply [condensed expression] to Pampa's *Bhāratam*
is … to assimilate him to a nonexistent cosmopolitan tradition and so diminish what may very well have
been a vernacular innovation». But the *Way* shows that it is possible to recognize «vernacular innovation»
under the traditional concepts of poetics, so long as those concepts themselves were modified, or – to
state the matter more tendentiously – freed from the formal constraints that required them to operate
at the smallest level of meaning.

[23] See *Victory* 1.14 (*vipuḷa-yaśō-vitāna-guṇam illadanaṁ prabhu māḍi*, «by making someone who does not
merit the continuous extension of his good name into the hero»), 1.51 (*ene sanduṁ … kathānāyakaṁ māḍi*,
«by making that man into the hero of the story»), and compare *āne māḍi* «making him into an elephant»
in the *Way*'s example.

[24] V. 39: *puruḷ ondaṁ baged' adaroḷ pariyaṁ bēṟ' ondan usirvoḍ' aduve samāsaṁ | sirigandhaṁ tēḍoḍ' ad' ēṁ
parimaḷamaṁ tampan īvudaṁ māṇḍapudē||*, «Keeping in mind one meaning and saying another meaning
is known as samāsa (joining different meanings): when triturating sandalwood, will it give anything but
fragrance and coolness?» (tr. Ben-Herut and Sundaram). Although the definition is manifestly taken from
the *Mirror*, the example is different from anything found in either the *Mirror* or the *Way*.

entirety of Daṇḍin's discussion is integrated into the treatment of condensed expression. Its mode of adaptation differs from the *Way*'s, in that it prefers to use Daṇḍin's very words. It would almost produce the effect of reading the *Mirror of Poetry* in Kannada, were it not for the fact that it sometimes sacrifices Daṇḍin's grace and brevity in order to fill out the meter.[25]

The *Way* differs from *Mādhava* in that it does, in fact, compress Daṇḍin's discussion of condensed expression, from nine Sanskrit *ślōka*s to five Kannada *kanda*s; it makes meaningful selections, and diverges from Daṇḍin's text at key points. And it differs from *Udayāditya* in that it is still very possible to recognize the *Mirror* in the text. This «Goldilocks» strategy – neither too close to its source, nor too far from it – leads us consider the *Way*'s discussion of condensed expression as a coherent unit that does something different from the *Mirror*'s discussion of the same ornament. Its treatment, unlike Daṇḍin's and unlike that of *Udayāditya* and *Mādhava*, focuses on two examples, which we have so far examined separately. They function, however, as a unit, contrasting with and complementing each other. As a pair, they not only set out the parameters of condensed expression, but make a condensed argument about the character of Kannada literature and its orientation towards literary theory and practice in Sanskrit.

The theme of the first verse is erotic, and that of the second, political. Daṇḍin's examples, too, are divided along similar lines, but the *Way*'s pair of verses metonymically expresses the major divisions of courtly literature as a whole. The premise of condensed expression, the disclosure of one state of affairs by reference to an entirely different one, has a different valence in each case, according to their contrasting themes. In the «bee» verse, the ornament foregrounds the tension between secrecy and disclosure. The man's inner state is externalized in the form of the bee's eagerness, and in this form his private affairs are brought into the publicity of discourse, where – as the verses in both the *Mirror* and the *Way* show – there are not only speakers but listeners, and where private passions are liable to be subjected to judgment and scorn. In the «elephant» verse, the ornament discloses an unpleasant truth that is, however, subordinated to a very positive comparison. It thus holds two aspects of political speech, veridiction and benediction, in tension.

Thematic differences between these two verses link with differences in the pragmatic contexts in which the ornament is employed. The second example is motivated by the character's competing imperatives to get the king out of any difficulty – and thus never to admit total defeat – and to disclose the truth

---

[25] Vv. 203-211. As an example, consider the explanation of the «bee» verse in v. 205: *int' ā <u>praudha-rati-sukha-santatiyind' irpavaṅge vilasita-<u>bālā</u>-kānt<u>ēcchāvṛtti</u>karaṁ</u> tān tōrkuṁ bhāvadindam idaroḷ amōghaṁ*. I have underlined the words that also appear in the corresponding passage of the *Mirror*. Until a detailed study of the *Ornament of Mādhava* I am inclined to view the word *amōghaṁ* at the end of the verse as a coincidence rather than a sly reference to Amōghavarṣa.

of the political situation. The pragmatic contexts of the first example, which is more totally shorn from any narrative background, are more elusive. We might imagine that it is spoken by a young woman to her lover, in order to let him know that she is aware of his previous relations and disapproving of his present behavior, or perhaps spoken by one friend of the young couple to another. In either case, the ornament is motivated by the need for circumlocution in such sensitive matters, on the one hand, and the well-established convention of using symbolic referents to anonymize such situations, on the other.

The techniques used for condensed expression also differ pointedly. In the first example, the similarities between the expressed and evoked elements are suggested rather than stated outright. This actually leads to a certain degree of uncertainty as to which parts of the expressed meaning are carried over into the evoked meaning. Is the lover «rolling from side to side», or is this phrase merely meant to suggest his eagerness? This uncertainty is a positive feature of the ornament in this setting. From the expressed meaning we can derive not just one state of affairs, but a whole series of slightly different states of affairs. The loose and associative technique also allows the verse to unfold naturally, without any syntactic constraints. In fact, nothing prevents this technique from being applied to larger discursive units, up to and including an entire work. In the second example, by contrast, the similarities between the two states of affairs are expressed outright. The referential density that characterizes the ornament, where one state of affairs evokes another, is achieved here through the semantic density of *ślēṣa*, where the same linguistic signifiers stand for two different sets of meanings. This technique involves more constraints and greater predictability, in the sense that a reader who understands how the verse operates will be compelled to understand each element of the verse in two distinct ways. And ironically, because *ślēṣa* is equivocal by definition, this example is more univocal than the first because the evoked state of affairs is concretely characterized by the second set of meanings. The loose and strict techniques may even be combined – as one of Daṇḍin's examples (2.208) arguably demonstrates – although the *Way* doesn't provide an example.

The two verses differ, finally, along the dimension of intertextuality. The first would certainly have recalled to the *Way*'s readers the verse in Daṇḍin's *Mirror* of which it is manifestly an adaptation, and probably also a whole set of allegorical erotic verses in Sanskrit and Prakrit that are, in turn, recalled by Daṇḍin's example. The first example thus represents the *Way*'s orientation to Daṇḍin's *Mirror*, and thus to both Sanskrit literature and poetic theory. It instantiates the text's argument that the way (*mārgaṁ*) to compose literature in Kannada is best approximated by the ways described and exemplified in Sanskrit works. The second example, even if it is not drawn from narrative poems in Kannada, certainly calls them to mind. It represents the *Way*'s complemen-

tary orientation to an existing body of literature in Kannada, within which political poetry was likely well represented. And it gestures toward the device of eulogistic allegory that would be so important for subsequent works of Kannada literature.

This pair of verses thus present an implicit argument that condensed expression can be used to great effect in different genres, for different motivations, through different techniques, and with different effects. Exactly the same, of course, could be said of the *Mirror*. The *Way*'s discussion of the ornament differs not only because it is shorter and more pointed, but also because it is in Kannada. It argues, for the first time, for the application of condensed expression to traditions of vernacular literature, beyond Sanskrit and Prakrit. But the Kannada version of the ornament is not a separate phenomenon that is structurally similar to its Sanskrit and Prakrit counterparts. If we think of condensed expression as two states of affairs layered on top of each other, where only the top layer is expressed in linguistic form, then the *Way*'s examples simply add a layer on top of an already-condensed expression. This is most clearly evident in the «bee» example, where the Kannada verse evokes a set of meanings that were already evoked by the Sanskrit verse, but in so doing, also calls to mind the Sanskrit verse itself. Both examples, however, show that condensed expression in Kannada incorporates everything that makes the ornament possible in Sanskrit and Prakrit, from conventional and generically-determined associations, to compositional techniques, to the very words and meanings that the verses are fashioned from. The result is that the Kannada version of the ornament is even more condensed, in terms of its semantic, referential, and intertextual layers, than its Sanskrit counterpart.

The *Way* was intended as a model for a literary culture, not simply as a theoretical description of literary forms. The «how» is just as important as the «what». Daṇḍin's *Mirror* shows us, with abundant examples, how to use the ornaments it describes in endless combinations. The *Way* does this, too, but with an additional layer: it shows us how to use Daṇḍin's *Mirror*. The discussion of condensed expression illustrates this clearly. We learn the ornament not just through the definition, but also through the example. Both of them need to be internalized. The *Way* demonstrates this internalization by rearticulating both of them, rendering into Kannada not just their words but also their presupposed meanings. This process necessarily includes a degree of interpretation, which we see in the *Way*'s commentary on the first example. It also entails some critical analysis. The author of the *Way* must have decided that Daṇḍin's subdivisions of condensed expression either were not relevant to his purposes or, more likely in my view, privileged a more restrictive conception of the ornament over a more expansive one, and accordingly he left them out of his discussion. At this point, we are able to go «into the wild» and try to find compelling examples of the ornament in the traditions with which we are familiar. The *Way* has demonstrated this by citing an example from a

narrative poem that radically diverges in theme, tone, and execution from the original example but still conforms to the ornament's core definition. And the final test, which the *Way* presents to its readers, is whether we can use these ornaments to create literature of our own. This is all implicit in the *Way*'s titular metaphor: the literary past, conceived as a coherent set of practices that in this case span the Sanskrit and Kannada traditions – practices that have been systematized and rationalized in both the *Mirror* and the *Way* – provides the means of getting to the literary future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

The Mirror of Poetry (Kāvyādarśa) of Daṇḍin: *Kavyalakṣaṇa* [sic] *of Daṇḍin (Also Known as Kāvyādarśa), with Commentary Called Ratnaśrī of Ratnaśrījñāna*, ed. by Anantalal Thakur and Upendra Jha, Darbhanga, 1957.

The Ornament of Poetry (Kāvyālaṁkāra) of Bhāmaha: Appendix to the *Pratâparudrayaśobhûṣaṇa of Vidyânâtha*, ed. by Kamalâśaṅkara Prâṇaśaṅkara Trivedî, Bombay, 1909.

The Ornament of Mādhava (Mādhavālaṁkāra): *Mādhavālaṁkāraṁ*, ed. by H. Tippērudrasvāmi, Mysore, 1978.

The Ornament of Udayāditya (Udayādityālaṁkāraṁ): *Udayādityālaṅkāraṃ: A Compendium on Poetry Dedicated to King Udayāditya,* trans. by R. V. S. Sundaram and G. Ben-Herut, Mysore, 2015.

The Way of the Poet-King (Kavirājamārgaṁ): (1) *Śrīnṛpatuṅgadēvānumatam appa Śrīvijayakṛta Kavirājamārgaṁ*, ed. by M. V. Seetharamaiah, Bangalore, 2015 [1975]. (2) *Nṛipatuṅga's Kavirâjamârgga*, ed. by K. B. Pathak, Bangalore, 1898. (3) *Śrīvijayaprabhūtaṁ Kavirājamārgaṁ*, ed. by T. V. Venkatachala Sastry, Tumkur, 2011.

Victory of Arjuna by Valor (Vikramārjunavijayaṁ) of Pampa: *Pampa Bhārataṁ emba Vikramārjuna Vijayaṁ*, ed. by K. V. Puṭṭappa. Mysore, 2013.

Secondary Sources

ALTEKAR, ANANT SADASHIV (1934) *The Rāṣṭrakūṭas and their times*, Poona.

BRONNER, YIGAL (2010) *Extreme poetry: The South Asian movement of simultaneous narration*. New York.

CULLER, JONATHAN (1976) "Presuppositions and intertextuality", *Modern language notes* 91, 1380-1396.

POLLOCK, SHELDON (2004) "A new philology: From norm-bound practice to practice-bound norm in Kannada intellectual history", in JEAN-LUC CHEVILLARD (ed.), *South Indian horizons: Felicitation volume for François Gros*, Pondicherry, 389-406.

POLLOCK, SHELDON (2006) *Language of the gods in the world of men*, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

SEETHARAMAIAH, M. V. (1994) "The historical importance of *Kavirajamarga*", in B. R. GOPAL (ed.), *The Rashtrakutas of Malkhed: Studies in their history and culture*, Mysore, 410-416.

TIMMAPPAYYA, MUḶIYA (1948) *Kavirājamārgavivēka,* Mangalore.