

# ***Bhāṣāśleṣa* of the Other Kind: Four Examples from the *Haravijaya* and One from the *Kapphiṇābhyudaya***

*Peter Pasedach*

The ca. 9th-century poetician *Rudraṭa*, in the 4th chapter of the *Kāvyaḷaṃkāra*, dealing with different types of *śleṣa*, describes two rhetoric techniques or *alaṃkāras* which are both called *bhāṣāśleṣa*. He first deals with the difficult variant of the technique, in which a text can be read in two languages, with two separate meanings.<sup>1</sup> In “Der *Bhāṣāśleṣa* — eine Besonderheit kaschmirischer Dichter und Poetiker?” Michael Hahn (2012) has given us a beautiful and exhaustive introduction to this kind of *bhāṣāśleṣa*, by discussing Rudraṭa’s examples for it, and a few other ones.

The current paper deals with what might be considered the easier variant of the technique. In it, the text has the same meaning in either language. Rudraṭa (in 4.16) calls it *apara bhāṣāśleṣa*, i.e. the “other *bhāṣāśleṣa*”, giving examples for different two-language combinations in the following verses.<sup>2</sup> Thereupon, in 4.22, he states that depending on the skill of the poet, in the same way three and more languages can be written.<sup>3</sup> He concludes his treatment of *bhāṣāśleṣa* with an example for a *bhāṣāṣaṭka* in 4.23.<sup>4</sup> A prominent

---

1 *Kāvyaḷaṃkāra* 4.10–15.

2 4.17 Prakrit, 4.18 Māgadhī, 4.19 Paiśācī, 4.20 Śaurasenī, 4.21 Apabhraṃśa.

3 Its 11th-century commentator Namisādhu, after stating that there are fifteen possible two-language combinations, lists 20 permutations for three languages, fifteen permutations for four languages, six permutations for five languages, and the one possibility for six languages. In practice, so far, I have only encountered examples of Sanskrit with one other language, or *bhāṣāṣaṭkas*.

4 I was tempted to include a translation of *Kāvyaḷaṃkāra* 4.16–23 in the current paper. I would have wanted to do so together with the available commentaries on it. Also Vallabha-deva appears to have written a commentary on it, which he refers to in a few places in his commentary on the Śiśupālavadhā (cf. Kane 1971, 155), but no manuscript of it is known to survive. So far only Namisādhu’s commentary on it has been published. Their edition for this short passage would be an interesting undertaking, but beyond the scope of the current paper.

early example for this variant of *bhāṣāsleṣa* is the *Bhaṭṭikāvya*'s 13th canto, which is almost entirely composed in it.<sup>5</sup>

Both Hahn's<sup>6</sup> and my motivation for dealing with *bhāṣāsleṣa* are the 19th canto of the *Kapphiṇābhyudaya* (KA) of Śivasvāmin, which is entirely composed using the difficult variant of this technique. Hahn, after gaining access to superior manuscript material from Nepal not available to Gauri Shankar, its first editor, had re-edited the *Kapphiṇābhyudaya*,<sup>7</sup> and begun to translate the poem into German and English, publishing his translations of canto 8<sup>8</sup> and canto 20.<sup>9</sup> Most other cantos have also been translated by him and/or participants of a workshop organized 2013 by Shrikant Bahulkar and Mahesh Deokar in Pune. These translations have not been published yet.<sup>10</sup> Three cantos (6, 18 and 19) had been spared on account of their degree of difficulty and the non-availability of their commentary at that time.<sup>11</sup>

I have been working for a number of years on the *Haravijaya* (HV) of Ratnākara, likely a senior contemporary of Śivasvāmin. I thank Yuko Yokochi for drawing my attention to Śivasvāmin's *Kapphiṇābhyudaya* and its commentary. In January 2020, just few days before the first COVID-19 lockdown,

---

5 Narang (1969, 16–24) dates Bhaṭṭi to the 6th century, and locates him in Valabhi, in present day Gujarat, which proves that at least the easy variant of the technique was not “eine Besonderheit kaschmirischer Dichter und Poetiker.”

6 Cf. Hahn 2012, 77.

7 Hahn has published three editions of the KA, Hahn 1989 is a reprint of the *editio princeps*, to which had been added an appendix with editions of some of the cantos, based on the newly found manuscript material. Hahn 2007 is his actual critical edition of the work, containing also a diplomatic transcript of his most important witness, as well as its facsimiles. Hahn 2013 is an edition in Devanāgarī script, aimed at an Indian audience.

8 See Hahn 2007, 15[29]–23[46] and Hahn 2013, 237–259. The canto is a description of the six seasons. A new translation of this canto, together with the edition and translation of its commentary, will appear in Pasedach, forthcoming(b).

9 See Hahn 2007, 260–280. Before him, the canto had already been translated by Gibbons (1985).

10 In 2018 Mitsuyo Demoto was so kind to borrow to me Michael Hahn's box of *Kapphiṇābhyudaya*-related materials, the content of which I was thus able to scan, and some computer files.

11 Canto six, the description of the mountain, contains many difficult *yamakas*. Sloane Geddes and Yuko Yokochi are currently working on it. Canto eighteen, the description of the battle, abounds in *citrakāvya*. A major part of it has been read in 2018 during a number of sessions organized by Alessandro Battistini at Kyoto University. Of Canto 19, Gauri Shankar (1937) has made an attempt of preparing a Sanskrit *chāyā*. Unfortunately, for his edition he had only manuscript material which, particularly in these difficult cantos, had highly corrupt readings. The poor state of the text also led to Shankar not identifying the bilinguality of the text.

I was lucky to at the China Tibetology Research Center see, and for a few days consult, copies of the only known manuscript of any commentary on the *Kapphiṇābhyudaya*.<sup>12</sup> A commentary thus being available now, and funding for the task having been granted by the DFG, a translation of the bilingual canto 19 is currently being undertaken. The bilinguality of this canto hints at the possibility of a second meaning of the entire poem.<sup>13</sup> As an example, KA 19.1 is given in the following. The first rendering of the verse shows the word divisions in Śaurasenī Prakrit, the second one those in Sanskrit:

aha tosā vuddho raṇa-vahe pahū taṃmi thova-dhīreṇa |  
purisa-vareṇa khamamse dūrā dūḍho sa-bhāsāhi || 1 ||

a-hato 'sāv ud-dhoraṇa-vahe 'pa-hūtaṃ mitho 'va-dhīreṇa |  
puri sa-vareṇa kham amse dūrād ūḍho 'sabhāsā hi || 1 ||

Which, following the commentary,<sup>14</sup> can be translated as follows (Śaurasenī):

Then, the Lord Buddha is milked by the best of men [Kapphiṇa]  
of forgiveness, because of satisfaction, on that battlefield,  
[Kapphiṇa] being of low firmness,  
from afar, by his [Kapphiṇa's] own words.

and (Sanskrit):

This one, who has not been beaten in the battle,  
was, reciprocally without any call for challenge,  
by the one who had understood the firm ones,  
who was confined to his body [and] without shine,  
lifted on the shoulder,  
from afar, because he is [like] space.

12 The manuscript had been identified as what it is by Steinkellner in 2007. Michael Hahn had intended to consult it, but unfortunately that never happened. See Pasedach 2019 for my discussion of Steinkellner's provisional manuscript description, and Pasedach, forthcoming(a) for a preliminary inspection of it based after my own consultation of it.

13 Yuko Yokochi (2012) suggests a hidden Śaiva layer to be present throughout the poem. It is unlikely though that the commentary by Bhikṣu Tathāgatendra, who is a Buddhist monk, would reveal it. So far I have not come across any hint at that. We can observe, however, the poet in places taking reference to Śaiva theology, and the commentator displaying a basic familiarity with it.

14 See Pasedach, forthcoming(a) for the full discussion of this verse, including the edition and translation of the commentary on it.

As an acclimatization exercise preparing for the edition and translation of this extremely difficult canto, together with its commentary, and in order to examine also the use of the easier version of this technique in these two closely related *mahākāvyas* from 9th-century Kashmir, the current paper deals with the four occurrences of *bhāṣāśleṣa* in the *Haravijaya*, all of which belong to the easy variant of the technique, and the single occurrence of this variant of *bhāṣāśleṣa* in the *Kapphiṇābhyudaya*. Luckily, to understand these verses, it is enough to translate them from Sanskrit only, as the meaning remains the same in the other languages. A thorough check of the grammatical correctness of the verses in all relevant languages remains a desideratum. For now, I will note only a few points of doubt.

### The *bhāṣāśleṣa* verses in the *Haravijaya*

All but one of the *bhāṣāśleṣa* verses of the *Haravijaya* are in its fourth canto, the description of the mountain, on whose top Śiva's royal city is located. The main metre of the canto is Vasantatilaka. One more verse is found in canto 48. As I have not yet critically edited the concerned cantos,<sup>15</sup> where not otherwise noted, the verses are rendered as given in the *editio princeps*, and only important variants from the oldest manuscript are reported.<sup>16</sup> Where available, also Alaka's commentary is included.

#### HV 4.11

rolambasaṃkulakarāladalāravinda -  
saṃbaddhahaṃsavalayāmalasindhutoyam |  
siddhāvaruddhamaṇikaṃdaragāḍharāsa -  
saṃrambhaghorahariṇāri<sup>17</sup>gaṇābhirāmam || 11 ||  
(bhāṣāsamāveśaḥ)

---

15 The edition of the *Haravijaya* by Goparaju Rama (1982-83) does collate a number of manuscripts, but all of them were in Devanāgarī script, and he did not have access to the manuscript from Jaisalmer. His edition does not include any commentary.

16 Durgaprasad and Parab 1890a (E). The other siglum used here, J, stands for Jaisalmer 408, which dates to 1171 CE. This manuscript was not available to the previous editors, and, although certainly not free of errors, is very helpful, particularly where later witnesses are lacunose, or transmit a problematic text.

17 °gaṇābhirāmam] J; °ghanābhirāmam E.

kallolabhaṅgaghāṭitapratibimbacakram  
aikṣiṣṭa yaṃ pṛthuni kūrmakavāṭapṛṣṭhe |  
tuṅgaṃ vibhajya bahudheva vapur bhramantam  
āloḍanāya jaladheḥ suradaityalokaḥ || 12 ||  
(yugalakam)

rolambā bhramarāḥ | valayaḥ samūhaḥ | sindhavaḥ saritaḥ | rāsaḥ śabdaḥ |  
hariṅnārayaḥ simhāḥ || 11 || 12 ||

One can observe that the actual *bhāṣāśleṣa* verse consists of two very long compounds only, which apparently qualify the relative pronoun *yaṃ* in 12b. These two verses form a *yugalaka*, a syntactic unit spanning two verses.

[11ab] The waters of the rivers [of which mountain],  
shining by their groups of swans,  
were filled with lotuses  
whose wide opened petals were crowded with bees;  
[11cd][and which mountain] was lovely by the groups of lions  
frightening by the vehemence of their strong roar  
as the *siddhas* kept them back  
from the jewel caves;

[12] a multitude of its reflections  
created by the breaking of the waves,  
the people, gods and demons,<sup>18</sup>  
saw it whirling around  
on the broad door-like back of the tortoise,  
as if manifoldly dividing its body,  
in order to stir up the ocean.

What is the second language entering here? We have to assume it to be generic Prakrit, i.e. Māhārāṣṭrī. Normally, in Prakrit one should not have dental *n*, but it may be permissible as an orthographic variant for the *anusvāra*. Furthermore, an absence of intervocalic *k*, *g*, *c*, *j*, *t* and *d* would normally have been required. But at the beginnings of compound members, as in °*karāla*°, °*dala*°, °*kaṃdara*°, °*gāḍha*° and °*gaṇa*° here, these vowels apparently are probably not considered intervocalic anymore.

18 Probably *sura* and *daiṭya* forms a *dvandva*, which forms a *karmadhāraya* with *lokaḥ*.

## HV 4.26

In the next verse to be examined, we find a similar *yugalaka*-pattern: The main sentence is contained in verse 4.27 while the actual feat happens in the verse preceding it, containing three compounds only which qualify the relative pronoun *yam*.

āsannabhānum asitopalajālanaddha -  
sopānatīranalinīnatanāgayūtham |  
nākādhirūḍhanavanīlatamālavallī -  
baddhāndhakāragahanātanusānukuñjam || 26 ||  
(piśācabhāṣāsamāveśaḥ)

ābaddhavāsukiphaṇāgaṇaphūtṛtāgni -  
tāpasphuṭadvikaṭakoṭīśikhāśmakūṭam |  
kodaṇḍam indumukuṭaḥ svabharakṣamaṃ yam  
ādāya dānavapurīḥ kila nirbibheda || 27 ||  
(yugalakam)

Also for this verse-pair, the commentary is rather minimal, with only three glosses for verse 27, which will however help us to understand case and number in which Alaka took them to be when analysing the compounds they belong to:

26 || koṭīśikhāsu śrīngāgreṣu | āśmakūṭāḥ pāṣāṇarāśayaḥ | indumukuṭo haraḥ || 27 ||

[26ab] on which [mountain],  
as the sun was setting on it,  
a multitude of elephants  
bent down towards  
the lotus ponds,  
the steps on whose banks were inlaid  
with multitudes of dark blue precious stones,<sup>19</sup>  
[26cd] [and] on which was bound  
by *Tamāla* creepers whose black was fresh  
and which were ascending into the sky  
the impenetrable thicket of darkness  
which were the bowers on whose huge ridges,  
[27ab] the heaps of stones  
on the tops of whose formidable peaks

---

<sup>19</sup> *asitopala* could be lapislazuli or cat's eye.

became visible  
 by the glow of the fire  
 from the hissing of the multitude of hoods  
 of Vāsuki bound [onto it]  
 [27cd] having taken up which [mountain], [as a] bow,  
 suitable of bearing its load,  
 [Śiva,] the one, on whose crest is the moon,  
 was said to have pierced the cities of the demons.

Here, the second language entering is Paiśācī, the “language of the ghouls,” of which only a few fragments survive.<sup>20</sup> Again, luckily, in order to translate the verse, its knowledge is not needed, as the meaning in it remains the same.

°*baddhāndhakāra*° in *pāda* d violates the two-more law normally applicable to all of Middle Indic. But in Buddhist Apabhraṃśa such exceptions do occur. In a citation contained in *Sekanirdeśapañjikā* ad *Sekanirdeśa* 22 this law is violated five times in a mere two verses.<sup>21</sup>

### HV 4.35

In a verse composed in Sragdharā metre, the fourth verse of the *praśasti*<sup>22</sup> of his *Haravijaya*, Ratnākara boasts about the eloquence of his language that it “does not become fragile even in a *language-hexad*.” This most likely refers to HV 4.35. In order to get a full syntactic unit, it has to be read together with the following verse 36, with which it constitutes a *yugmam*.

līlāvilolakalakaṇṭhavihaṃgakeli -  
 kolāhalākulakulāyakuḷāmālāṅke |  
 kakkolakandakadalīlavalīlavaṅga -  
 mālālāmajalamañjulakūlakacche || 35 ||  
 (bhāṣāṣaṭkasamāveśaḥ)

20 See Ollett 2014 for an in-depth treatment of this language. Ollett has included a list of these fragments, which we can expand by this verse, HV 4.26, and the two *bhāṣāṣaṭka* verses HV 4.35 and KA 18.128.

21 See Isaacson and Sferri 2014, 399 n. 2.

22 *Haravijaya Praśasti* 4:

dhārā kāvyaprabandhapraṇihitamanasaḥ śrotrapeyā kavīnām  
 bhāṣāṣaṭke 'pi yasya kvacid api na gatā bhāratī bhaṅguratvam |  
 prāptajñeyāvasānasphuradamalataraprātībhajñānasampat  
 so 'haṃ ratnākaraḥ te sadasi kṛtapadaḥ kṣmāpa vāgīśvarāṅkaḥ || 4 ||  
 For discussions of this verse see Smith 1985, 104.

yasmin salīlam asitonnatagaṇḍasāila -  
nāgaḥ karoti vikarālakarāvamarṣāt |  
raktātāpābhīnavapallavabhaṅgam arka -  
bimbālavālavayasya dinadrumasya || 36 ||  
(yugmam)

kulayo nīḍam | āmalādyās tarulatābhedāḥ | mañjulā ramaṇīyāḥ || 35 || karā raś-  
mayāḥ karaś ca hastāḥ || 36 ||

[35ab] [On that mountain,] which had as its mark  
Āmala-trees,  
on which nest-houses  
were filled by the sound  
from the play of birds  
playfully moving to and fro  
and with soft sound,  
[35cd] on which there were banks  
on lovely pools  
whose water was being marked with garlands  
of Kakkola-berries, garlic,<sup>23</sup>  
plantain tree, star-fruit, and cinnamon.<sup>24</sup>  
[36ab] on which, playfully,  
because of the touch of the formidable rays<sup>25</sup>  
the serpent from its black, tall side-rock  
made the  
[36cd] breaking up  
of the shoots, fresh as the red sun,  
of the day-tree,<sup>26</sup>  
for which the disk of the sun  
was the circle of its watering moat.

---

23 Garlic seems somewhat inauspicious. Maybe *kanda* is to be understood as the bulb or root of the preceding plant, *kakkola*?

24 This pāda also features a *yamaka*, *līlavālīlava*.

25 Alaka specifies that *karāḥ* are rays (using plural forms), and that *karāḥ* is the hand (using the singular forms). I wonder what the significance of the difference in number is here.

26 What is a day-tree?

We can assume that the six languages are the set defined by Rudraṭa in *Kāvyaśleṣa* 2.12, namely Prakrit, Sanskrit, Māgadhi, Paiśācī, Śaurasenī and Apabhraṃśa.<sup>27</sup>

## HV 48.50–53

Apart from these three exemplars from the *Haravijaya*'s fourth canto, only one more *bhāṣāśleṣa* verse has so far been identified in the remaining *Haravijaya*. It occurs in canto 48, which, together with canto 43, is one of the two cantos named *Citrayuddhavarṇanam*. It is a common feature of *Mahākāvya*s to contain such cantos. Alaka's commentary does not survive beyond canto 46, nor does any other commentary,<sup>28</sup> such that we are now on our own when attempting to translate the verses. We can assume the feminine personal pronoun *sā* to refer to the goddess Caṇḍī, to whom a devotional hymn is sung in canto 47.<sup>29</sup> She plays a preeminent role in the battle.

The *editio princeps* does not mark 50 (Upajāti metre) and 51 (Upendra-vajrā metre) as a *yugmam* or *yugalakam*, still, the pattern seems to be the same as in the verses from the fourth canto: Each verse half is a single compound, which are attributes to elements of the next verse.

bhayaṃkarairāvaṇadantaṇḍasaṃghaṭṭadhūmrāvīlamerukuñjā |  
amandarīḍhoragabāṇaviddhaviṭaṅkaṭaṅkāurabāhudaṇḍā<sup>30</sup> || 50 ||  
(bhāṣāsamāveśaḥ)

gabhīradhīrāvarīṇabhīruraṇādarā dāruṇavāraṇā sā |  
abhaṅgurā vīravirūḍhahāvasurāṅganādakṣakataṅkṣamokṣaiḥ || 51 ||  
(pādaniravadyaḥ)

[50ab] because of whom the bowers on Mount Meru  
became grey and polluted  
by her rubbing together of the sticks which are the teeth  
of Indra's terrible elephant,<sup>31</sup>  
[50cd] whose stick-like arms<sup>32</sup>

27 See Ollett 2017, 138f.

28 The statement by Sharma (1990, 11) "Ratnakaṅṭha's commentary on the fifty cantos also indicates the authorship of a single poet" has haunted me for a while. See also Pasedach 2017, 15.

29 For a preliminary study of this canto see Pasedach forthcoming(c).

30 MS *ka* of the *editio princeps* reads °*daṇḍam*.

31 It is difficult to interpret this as a *bahuvrīhi* qualifying *sā* in 51.

32 If the reading with final °*ā* is correct, this compound will be a *bahuvrīhi* qualifying *sā*. If we assume a final °*aṃ*, it can be taken adverbially.

pierced with arrows,  
which actually were the intensely licking serpents,  
the demons whose pride was at its pinnacle,  
[51ab] her attention being toward the battle,  
which was frightening as it emitted  
a deep and long noise,  
she, dreadful in her defense,  
[51cd] was firm  
by the shootings  
of fully grown coquettish gestures for the heroes  
[and] of amorous glances  
befitting celestial women.

The tag *pādaniravadya* with which HV 48.51 (Upajāti metre) is labeled is a curious one. Balasubramanyam 2006, 313f. lists this stanza, together with the two following it, under the heading *niravadyah*, in the *Niyamam* section of his book. He does not, however, give an explanation as to how this technique works. Apparently, it is very closely related to *bhāṣāśleṣa*, using which technique one part of the verse is composed in, and the *niravadya* part can be read in Sanskrit only.<sup>33</sup> For this reason, the following two stanzas, which are composed in Upajāti (52) and Ākhyānikī (53) metres, and which are also composed using this closely related technique, are also included here:

prabhāmayenāricamūs tadānīm salīlam āsphālitacāpayaṣṭiḥ |  
virūḍhasamrambhāsurāribāṇasambhārasamruddhakarīrakuñjā || 52 ||  
(prāgardhaniravadyah)

[52ab] By a lightning<sup>34</sup>  
she was then playfully striking her bow  
towards the armies of the enemies,  
[52cd] holding back from the bamboo bowers  
the multitude of arrows  
of the enemies of the gods  
in whom excitement had fully arisen.

---

33 This fact was thankfully pointed out to me by Shankar Rajaraman in a mail forwarded to me and the Indology mailing list by Nagaraj Paturi on 30 March, 2022. See <<https://list.indology.info/pipermail/indology/2022-March/055991.html>>. Also Narang (2003, 63) lists a few verses in the *Bhaṭṭikāvya*'s 13th canto which are either labeled as *niravadya*, or referred to as such by their commentators.

34 Maybe. *prabhāmaya* lit. means “made out of light.” Alternatively this could be a name of a *gana*, together with whom the goddess might be fighting here.

*āsph* (52b) should normally not be possible in middle Indic, as it violates the two-more law.

ārūḍharīḍhāmarabāṇavidhdaturamgamālā raṇarāgamūḍhā |  
nītā vihatstatvam itaiḥ<sup>35</sup> sahātha suvarṇasānor gahanāny avikṣat || 53 ||  
(caramārdhaniravadyaḥ)

[53ab] [The inimical army,<sup>36</sup>  
its series of horses  
pierced by her divine arrows  
which she had mounted [on her bow] and kissed,  
[53cd] confused by the passion of the battle,  
led together with those who lost their arms,  
entered the thickets  
of [the mountain] whose ridges were golden.

## KA 18.128

The *Kapphiṇābhuyudaya*, apart from its 19th canto which is in its entirety composed using the technique of difficult *bhāṣāśleṣa*, also contains one exemplar of the easy variant of the technique, contained in its 18th canto, also titled *Citrayuddhavarṇana*. This verse, composed in Anuṣṭubh, also uses all six languages simultaneously:

caṇḍapaṭṭisakuntāsipharatomarabhāsure |  
turaṅgakuṅjarāviddhe sambaddho bhīmasaṅgare || 18.128 ||  
bhāṣāṣaṭkasamāveśaḥ ||

We can observe that Śivasvāmin's verse does not follow the pattern of Ratnākara's *bhāṣāśleṣa* verses, which all contained only two long compounds each spanning an entire verse-half, which are only attributes of elements of the verses following them, containing the actual main structure of the sentence. Here, the second verse-half does contain three separate words, one of which, a past participle, might very well be the predicate of the entire sentence. The commentator supplies a *sa*, glossing it with *Kapphiṇa*, thus

35 *vihatstatvam itaiḥ* is the reading of J, the reading of the edition, *vihatstatvabhibhaiḥ* makes no sense.

36 I am rather unsure how to understand this verse. For now, I assume its subject to be *aricamū*, but now in singular. J seems to read the verb as *adhikṣat*, "it anointed/besmeared," perhaps expressing a bloodbath.

the verse is complete in itself. It can be translated as follows, with some uncertainty about *pāda* c, which corresponds to the last two lines in the translation.

He fully immersed himself  
into the frightening battle,  
which was resplendent  
with terrible axes, spears,  
swords, shields, and lances,  
and which was one in which  
horses and elephants clashed [against each other].

## Conclusion

The current paper is just a preliminary treatment of a few examples of the technique of the “other” *bhāṣāśleṣa*. Ideally, one would have had at hand checklists for each language combination, using which one could evaluate whether the poet’s application of the technique has been successful or not, and which would be handy as a means to restore problematic passages. However, I am not aware of the existence of such checklists, thus they would have to be created basing oneself on the native grammars of middle Indic. Namisādhu’s earliest surviving multilingual grammar, embedded into his commentary on *Kāvyaḷaṃkāra* 2.12, probably would be a good point of departure for that task. Also a first edition of the other so far unedited commentaries on *Kāvyaḷaṃkāra* 4.16–23 would promise to shed new light on this technique.

## Bibliography

- Balasubramanyam, V. 2006. *Chitram: Poetry of Sound*. Vol. 1. New Delhi.
- Durgaprasad & Parab (eds.) 1886. *The Kāvyaḷaṃkāra: a treatise on rhetoric of Rudrata. With the commentary of Namisādhu*. Kāvyaṃālā 2. Bombay: Nirṇaya-Sāgara-Press.
- 1890. *The Haravijaya of Rājānaka Ratnākara with the Commentary of Rājānaka Alaka*. Kāvyaṃālā 22. Bombay: Nirṇaya-Sāgara-Press.
- Gibbons, George 1985. “A Translation of Canto XX of the Kapphiṇābhyudaya”, in: *New Paths in Buddhist Research*, edited by A.K. Warder, 1–8. Durham.

- Hahn, Michael 1989. "Appendix and Revised Romanized Version of Cantos i–viii and xix." Gauri Shankar. *Śivasvāmin's Kapphiṇābhyudaya or Exaltation of King Kapphiṇa*. Reprint of the Edition from 1937, with an Appendix and Romanized Version of Cantos i–viii and xix by Michael Hahn. New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan, 1989.
- 2007. *Kapphiṇābhyudaya or Kapphiṇa's Triumph: A Ninth Century Kashmiri Buddhist Poem*. Ryukoku University Studies in Buddhist Culture 18. Kyoto.
- 2012. "Der *Bhāṣāśleṣa*—eine Besonderheit kaschmirischer Dichter und Poetiker?", in: *Highland Philology*, edited by Roland Steiner, 77–106. *Studia Indologica Universitatis Halensis* 4. Kashmir Panel, 31st Deutscher Orientalistentag, September 22, 2010. Halle an der Saale: Universitätsverlag Halle-Wittenberg.
- 2013. *Śivasvāmin's Kapphiṇābhyudaya*. Delhi: Aditya Prakashan.
- Isaacson, Harunaga, & Francesco Sfera (eds.) 2014: *The Sekanirdeśa of Maitreyanātha (Advayavajra) with the Sekanideśapañjikā of Rāmapāla: Critical Edition of the Sanskrit and Tibetan Texts with English Translation and Reproduction of the MSS*. Manuscripta Buddhica 2. Napoli.
- Kane, P.V. 1971. *History of Sanskrit Poetics*. Fourth Edition. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Narang, Satya Pal 1969. *Bhaṭṭi-Kāvya: A Study*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- 2003. "An Analysis of the Prākṛta of Bhāṣā-Sama of the Bhaṭṭi-Kāvya (Canto XIII)", in: *Vāṇī Jyotiḥ: Prof. Mahapatra G.N. Felicitation Volume*. Bhuvaneshwar: Utkal University.
- Ollett, Andrew 2014. "Ghosts from the past: India's undead languages", in: *The Indian Economic and Social History Review*, no. 51 (4): 405–456. (<<https://doi.org/10.1177/0019464614550761>>).
- 2017. *Language of the Snakes: Prakrit, Sanskrit, and the Language Order of Premodern India*. University of California Press. (<<https://doi.org/10.1525/luminos.37>>).
- Pasedach, Peter 2017. "*Bhagavatstutivarṇana* or the Description of the Praise of the Divine: A Critical Edition of Text and Commentaries, and Annotated Translation of the Sixth Canto of Ratnākara's *Haravijaya*." PhD diss., Universität Hamburg.
- 2019. "A First Glimpse of a Commentary on the *Kapphiṇābhyudaya*", in: *Indo-Iranian Journal* 62 (4): 384–397. (<<https://doi.org/10.1163/15728536-06204004>>).

- Pasedach, Peter Forthcoming (a). “On the Kapphiṇābhyudayasāravivṛti of Bhikṣu Tathāgata Indrasimha”, in: *Sanskrit Manuscripts in China IV*, edited by Francesco Sferra, Horst Lasic, & Xuezhū Li. China Tibetology Publishing House.
- Forthcoming (b). “Sarvartuvarṇanam The Description of all the Seasons in Kapphiṇābhyudaya 8, including the commentary of Bhikṣu Tathāgata Indrasimha”, in: *Sanskrit Manuscripts in China IV*, edited by Francesco Sferra, Horst Lasic, & Xuezhū Li. China Tibetology Publishing House.
- Forthcoming (c). “The Caṇḍīstotra in the Haravijaya: The Textual Situation”, in: *Proceedings of IIGRS 11*, edited by Yiming Shen and Valters Negribs. Puṣpikā 5, Oxford. Heidelberg: HASP.
- Rama, Goparaju, ed. 1982-83. *Haravijayam by Rājānaka Ratnākara*. Ganganatha Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapitha Text Series 16 and 17. Allahabad: Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan.
- Shankar, Gauri 1937. *Śivasvāmin’s Kapphiṇābhyudaya or Exaltation of King Kapphiṇa*. Lahore.
- Sharma, Santosh Kumari 1990. *The Haravijaya of Ratnākara (A Criticism)*. Agra: Bankey Bihari Prakashan.
- Smith, David. 1985. *Ratnākara’s Haravijaya: An Introduction to the Sanskrit Court Epic*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Yokochi, Yuko 2012. “Triumph of Buddhism or Śaivism? A Study in the Ninth Century Kashmirian Poem Kapphiṇābhyudaya”, in: *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 60, no. 3 (March): 1153–1160.