

English Summary*

Śabdālamkāradoṣavibhāga – Differentiation of Figures of Sound and Faults. Critical Edition of the Third Chapter of Daṇḍin’s *Kāvyaḍarśa* and its Tibetan Rendition *Sñan ñag me loñ*, with the Sanskrit Commentary by Ratnaśrījñāna, the Tibetan Commentary by Dpañ Blo gros brtan pa, and a German Translation of the Sanskrit Text. By Dragomir Dimitrov.

It has long been recognized that a critical edition of Daṇḍin’s *Kāvyaḍarśa* (“Mirror of Poetic Art”) and the *Sñan ñag me loñ*, its Tibetan translation, is an important desideratum and an indispensable prerequisite for any serious study of Indian and Tibetan poetics. In 2002 the present author took the first step in fulfilling this desideratum and published a book entitled *Mārgavibhāga* (“Differentiation of Styles”) with the critical edition of the first chapter both in Sanskrit and Tibetan, a study of the transmission of the *Kāvyaḍarśa* and the *Sñan ñag me loñ*, an outline of the history of the Tibetan rendition, a complete German translation of the first chapter, glossaries, various appendices, concordances, and indices.

As a sequence to this publication the present work on the third chapter called *Śabdālamkāradoṣavibhāga* (“Differentiation of Figures of Sound and Faults”) has been prepared. This new book represents the next necessary step in filling the gap. In addition to the critical edition of the third chapter both in Sanskrit and Tibetan, this book contains a new edition of the *Ratnaśrīṭikā*, the earliest known Sanskrit commentary by Ratnaśrījñāna (tenth century), and an *editio princeps* of the *Dpañ Ṭikā*, Dpañ Lo tsā ba Blo gros brtan pa’s (1276–1342) seminal Tibetan commentary on the *Sñan ñag me loñ*. Besides this, the present publication includes an introduction, a German translation of the third chapter, philological notes on the two commentaries, a facsimile edition with a diplomatic transcript of the manuscript witnesses of the *Ratnaśrīṭikā* and the *Dpañ Ṭikā*, appendices, concordances, and indices for quick references. This work is a revised and enlarged version of my doctoral thesis prepared under the supervision of Professor Michael Hahn (Marburg) and submitted to the Faculty of Foreign Languages at the University of Marburg (Germany) on April 15, 2004. This doctoral thesis was awarded the Ernst Waldschmidt Prize for the year 2004, and also the Dissertation Prize for the years 2003–2004 by the University of Marburg.

There are various reasons for dealing with the third chapter of the *Kāvyaḍarśa* ahead of its second chapter. After examining the transmission of the *Kāvyaḍarśa* and the

* I would like to thank Dr Jayandra Soni very much for checking the English of this summary.

Sñan ñag me loñ in Nepal and Tibet on the basis of the textual material of the first chapter, it was deemed necessary to study in greater detail the earliest available and most influential commentaries on this treatise. As is shown in the present work, the *editio princeps* of the *Ratnaśrīṭīkā* published in 1957 is both unreliable and incomplete. Thus, it was considered worthwhile to undertake a new edition based on the other only known and accessible codex of the *Ratnaśrīṭīkā*, namely an undated Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript written most probably in the twelfth or thirteenth century. Since this manuscript, too, is incomplete and preserves only about one half of the commentary on the second chapter and almost ninety percent of the commentary on the third chapter, enabling us to fill a big lacuna in THAKUR's and JHA's edition, it appeared most suitable to focus on the third chapter. This chapter represents beyond doubt the most fascinating and linguistically most intriguing part of Daṇḍin's treatise, in which the figures of sound (*śabdālamkāra*), including sixteen types of riddles (*prahelikā*), and the ten faults (*doṣa*) in poetry are treated.

Despite its demanding and sophisticated nature, this part of the *Kāvyaḍarśa* has not yet been studied extensively and satisfactorily, especially because of the unreliable textual basis available until now. Due to its linguistic intricacies, it is imperative to present the root text in accordance with and accompanied by a reliable and learned Sanskrit commentary, such as the *Ratnaśrīṭīkā*. On the other hand, due to the special relationship between the *Ratnaśrīṭīkā* and the *Dpañ Ṭīkā*, it is helpful and indeed necessary, to compare and edit both commentaries side by side. The necessity of offering simultaneously four editions, namely of the root texts in Sanskrit and Tibetan and of the respective commentaries, accounts for the inevitable voluminous presentation.

The publication begins with an extensive introduction (1. Introduction) in which four major topics have been dealt with. First, various issues concerning the contents, the title and the structure of the third chapter of the *Kāvyaḍarśa* are discussed (1.1). It is shown that Daṇḍin has offered a remarkably systematic analysis of the various figures of sound, starting with a presentation of almost all imaginable varieties of a *yamaka*¹ in the beginning of a verse, most of which are easy to compose (*sukara*), some, however, being difficult (*duṣkara*). It is important to note that Daṇḍin has not used the word *duṣkara* as a *terminus technicus* and there are certainly no *sukara* and *duṣkara* sections in his treatise, as has been assumed before.²

After the analysis of the contents and the structure of the third chapter of the *Kāvyaḍarśa*, the different versions of the title of this chapter as attested in the subcolo-

¹ In his *Glossary of Indian Figures of Speech* GEROW defines *yamaka* as follows: "a figure in which a part of a verse, specified either as to length or position or both, is repeated within the confines of the same verse, usually in such a way that the meaning of the two readings is different; word play (one of the meanings usually given to *paronomasia*)." (GEROW 1971, p. 223, s. v. *yamaka*).

² Cf. e.g. SÖHNEN 1995, p. 513 ff.

phons of various manuscripts have been discussed. The conclusion arrived at is that the oldest versions, such as *Duṣkaraparichedas tr̥tīyaḥ* or *Duṣkaranāma tr̥tīyaḥ paricchedaḥ*, aim to stress the most intriguing subject-matter of this chapter, whereas the title *Śabdālamkāradoṣavibhāga* found only in some modern editions clearly refers to the two major sections in this chapter, namely the section about the figures of sound (the *yamakas*, the *pratilomayamakas*, the *bandhas*, the *niyamas* and, as a kind of appendix, the *prahelikās*) and the section about the ten faults in poetry.

Due attention has been paid to the figures of sound analysed by Daṇḍin. A special notation for the schematic presentation of the various *yamaka* structures has been developed, the exemplification of the *yamakas* in the *Kāvyaḍarśa* has been discussed in detail, a list of all *yamakas* illustrated in this treatise has been prepared, many important aspects of the repetitions of sound sequences have been dealt with, and their formal features have been analysed. The underlying structures of the *ardhabhrama*³ and the *sarvatoḥhadra*⁴, arguably the most difficult and ingenious figures of sound, have also been explained. The first section of the introduction ends with an analysis of the metres used in the third chapter of the *Kāvyaḍarśa*.

In the second section the available information about Ratnaśrījñāna, the earliest known commentator of the *Kāvyaḍarśa*, has been evaluated, and the question of his dates has been considered (1.2). The *Ratnaśrīṭīkā* was completed under the patronage of a Rāṣṭrakūṭa ruler in the twenty-third reigning year of king Rājyapāla (circa 917–952). It can be concluded that a learned scholar and Buddhist monk from Siṃhala (Sri Lanka) who flourished in the first half of the tenth century is most probably identical with Ratnaśrījñāna, the author of an inscription in Bodh Gayā written at the time of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa ruler Tuṅga Dharmāvaloka.⁵ Furthermore, there is strong evidence that the author of the *Ratnaśrīṭīkā* and the Buddhist grammarian Ratnamati, the author of the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā* who is sometimes referred to as Ratnaśrī, Ratnaśrīpāda and Ratnaśrījñāna, are one and the same person. From his own account in the *Ratnaśrīṭīkā* it is known that Ratnaśrījñāna composed the grammatical work *Śabdārthacintāvivṛti*. The same scholar is probably also the author of the *Candrakārikā*.⁶ None of the scholars and translators mentioned in

³ “A type of word play in which a verse, each of whose four *pādas* is written on a separate line, can be read either in the normal way or as a helix, from outer verticals inwards. [...] Reading as a helix, that is, downwards on the first column, upwards on the eighth, then downwards on the second and upwards on the seventh, and so on, gives exactly the same sequence of syllables as reading from left to right in the normal way.” (GEROW 1971, pp. 178–179).

⁴ “A verse, having the same number of lines as syllables, which can be read backwards and forwards both vertically and horizontally.” (GEROW 1971, p. 189).

⁵ MITRA 1878, pp. 194–197; CUNNINGHAM 1892, p. 66; WICKREMASINGHE 1912, p. 2; *Epigr. Ind.* Vol. 5 (1898–99), Appendix, p. 85, No. 630.

⁶ See ŚĀSTRĪ 1931, No. 4857 (4754), pp. 430–431, and Preface, p. cccxxv.

the Tibetan canon by the name of Ratnaśrī or its variant forms is identical with the author of the *Ratnaśrīṭīkā*. Moreover, there is no evidence that Ratnaśrījñāna had ever been in Tibet, although his commentary has indeed greatly influenced the students of Indian poetics in Tibet.

The *editio princeps* of the *Ratnaśrīṭīkā* prepared by THAKUR and JHA in 1957 on the basis of a single undated palm-leaf manuscript privately possessed by JHA has been examined in the third section of the introduction (1.3). Partly because of the poor quality and legibility of the manuscript and partly due to the editors' incongruous approach, this edition leaves much to be desired. Not only are there a significant number of errors, omissions and inaccuracies, but also the printed root text of the *Kāvyaḍarsa* proves in many cases to be inconsistent with the readings commented on in the *Ratnaśrīṭīkā*. It has become evident that a new edition of this valuable commentary is urgently needed.

In this second section of the introduction the incomplete Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript used for the new partial edition of the *Ratnaśrīṭīkā* has been described in detail. The editorial approach applied in this publication has been explained, and the attempt has been made to compare the Nepalese codex with THAKUR's and JHA's manuscript, as far as this is possible on the basis of the *editio princeps* and the facsimile of a few leaves added there. There are indications that the two manuscripts have more in common than THAKUR's and JHA's edition would let us believe. These two codices certainly do not depend on each other; however, they appear to be distantly related and probably have a common hyparchetype.

The last major topic discussed in the introduction concerns the *Dpañ Ṭīkā* which is the first fully fledged Tibetan commentary on the *Sñan nag me loñ* (1.4). It is to Dpañ Lo tsā ba's credit to have introduced the *Ratnaśrīṭīkā* in Tibet. In his commentary he has made extensive, though unacknowledged use of Ratnaśrījñāna's work, by way of paraphrasing and oft literally translating many passages from the *Ratnaśrīṭīkā*. Internal and external evidence allows us to infer that the *Dpañ Ṭīkā* was composed in the Sa skya monastery sometime between 1309 and 1339, most probably in the 1330s. For the present *editio princeps* of the *Dpañ Ṭīkā* a single manuscript written in the Dbu med script by two different scribes has been used. This manuscript, which is in the private possession of Serkong Tsanshap Rinpoche, was reproduced photomechanically in 1981 by the Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, Dharamsala. Its peculiarities and the editorial techniques applied while editing it have been explained in this section.

The second part of the book is devoted to the evaluation of the primary sources used for the edition of the four texts presented here (2. Transmission). First, the essential information about the manuscripts, xylographs and other sources used for the constitution of the texts has been supplied (2.1). In the subsequent section the transmission of the Sanskrit and the Tibetan root texts has been reevaluated on the basis of fresh evidence (2.2). With the exception of the incomplete MS E, which does not contain the text of the

third chapter, and the MSS H and V, the same manuscript witnesses have been used. The newly evaluated material has provided further insights into the complicated transmission of the *Kāvyaḍarśa*. Thus, for example, the relationship between the old Nepalese MS A and the *Ratnaśrīṭikā* has become more evident. The position of the *Ratnaśrīṭikā* in the transmission has been defined more clearly. It has become obvious that the MSS F and U are actually parts of one and the same codex. After evaluating all witnesses, a more precise and complex stemma of the Sanskrit sources has been constructed. The analysis of the Tibetan material confirms in general all conclusions already made on the basis of the material from the first chapter of the *Sñan ñag me loñ*. Further evidence has been found for the closer relationship between the versions in the Ganden and Peking Tanjur editions. New variant readings support the assumed contamination of one of the non-canonical bilingual editions (MS Z^T) with the text version in the Peking Tanjur. Some readings clearly show that in a number of cases Si tu Pañ chen preferred variants which he must have known from a text version as found in the Derge Tanjur and commented on by Rin spuñs pa Ñag dbañ. The stemma of the Tibetan sources has been revised accordingly.

The third part of the book contains the critical edition of the Sanskrit and the Tibetan root texts (3. Edition). The same technique of constitution of the texts has been applied as in the edition of the first chapter. After the preliminary notes (3.1) and the tables of contents in Sanskrit and in Tibetan (3.2), the critical edition is presented (3.3). The Sanskrit text is printed in the Devanāgarī script and the Tibetan in the Dbu can script. The texts are given on facing pages with the critical apparatus supplied below each stanza. Wherever a different word separation is possible in the Sanskrit text, Ratnaśrījñāna's exegesis has been followed.

The fourth part contains the German translation of the third chapter of the *Kāvyaḍarśa* (4. Translation). In the explanatory notes (4.1) it has been pointed out that in his German translation of Dañḍin's work published as far back as 1890 BÖHTLINGK did not consider it worthwhile to translate twelve stanzas and parts of four other stanzas of the third chapter. After a table of contents in German (4.2), a complete German translation of this chapter has been presented for the first time (4.3). The German text renders the Sanskrit original as given now in the critical edition. When more than one interpretation is possible, the translation follows Ratnaśrījñāna's explanations and thus reflects the *Kāvyaḍarśa* through the prism of the *Ratnaśrīṭikā*.

The fifth part of the book entails the new edition of the *Ratnaśrīṭikā* and the *editio princeps* of the *Dpañ Ṭikā* (5. Commentaries). Since Dpañ Lo tsā ba's commentary very often largely depends on Ratnaśrījñāna's work, a direct comparison of the two commentaries proves particularly helpful for the constitution and a better understanding of both texts. For the sake of easy comparison, the commentaries have been presented on facing pages (5.1 and 5.2). The texts are printed in Roman transliteration, which allows for a more analytical presentation, and is especially important with regard to the Sanskrit text.

In the case of the exemplified figures of sound a special system of transliteration developed by COULSON,⁷ and slightly modified here, has been used. This system makes the lexical analysis significantly easier and allows one to see at a first glance how Ratnaśrījñāna has separated the words in Daṇḍin's examples, which may otherwise be quite confusing and time-consuming to analyse. Additional help has been supplied by highlighting in different colours the repeated groups of sounds in the exemplified *yamaka*, *pratilomayamaka* and *bandha* figures of sound.

In the sixth part of the book philological notes concerning the editions of the two commentaries are supplied (6. Philological Notes). First, the erroneous, corrupt and uncertain readings in the *Ratnaśrīṭīkā* have been discussed (6.1). Then follows a discussion of the most problematic readings in the Tibetan commentary (6.2). Further information about some noteworthy passages in both commentaries has also been given here.

In the seventh part two facsimile editions along with their corresponding diplomatic transcripts are presented (7. Facsimile and Diplomatic Transcript). The first section consists of the facsimile edition and the transcript of the Nepalese manuscript of the *Ratnaśrīṭīkā* (7.1). Only the part of the manuscript which contains the commentary on the third chapter of the *Kāvyaḍarśa* has been reproduced. The images were prepared in January 2006 in the National Archives in Kathmandu, where the manuscript is still well preserved. Although this codex is far from faultless and raises many philological problems, it represents a typical example of the palm-leaf manuscripts which were in use in Nepal some eight hundred years ago. It is written in a characteristic variety of the old Newārī script traditionally called Bhujimola.

In the second section the facsimile edition together with the transcript of the *Dpañ Ṭīkā* is included (7.2). Only fols. 76b–111 of Serkong Tsanshap Rinpoche's manuscript with the commentary on the third chapter of the *Sñan nag me loṅ* have been reproduced from the rare photomechanical print prepared in Dharamsala. The manuscript does not contain a scribe's colophon, and it is not possible to date it with certainty.

The remaining parts are supplementary and aim to facilitate work with the four editions presented in this book and the primary sources used for the constitution of the texts. There are eleven appendices (8. Appendices): 1. The first appendix includes a facsimile with a transcript of the remarkable recto side of the first folio of the Nepalese manuscript of the *Ratnaśrīṭīkā* which is filled in with hardly legible bilingual Sanskrit and Tibetan glosses written in the Dbu med script from the third chapter of the *Kāvyaḍarśa* and the *Sñan nag me loṅ* (Appendix 1);⁸ 2. A graphic and schematic presentation of all *yamakas* exemplified in the *Kāvyaḍarśa* (Appendix 2); 3. The contents of the first and the third chapter of the *Sñan nag me loṅ* as analysed and explained by Dpañ Lo tsā ba (Ap-

⁷ Cf. COULSON 1989, pp. lii–liii, and COULSON 1992, p. 36.

⁸ See DIMITROV 2006, pp. 4–7.

pendix 3); 4. Notes on BANERJEE's bilingual edition of the *Kāvyaḍarśa* and the *Sñan ñag me loñ* (Appendix 4); 5. Notes on the root text of the *Kāvyaḍarśa* as printed in THAKUR/JHA's edition (Appendix 5); 6. A list of abbreviations (200 entries) and contractions (150 entries) found in the Tibetan sources including the manuscript of the *Dpañ Ṭikā* (Appendix 6); 7. A list of the variously written transliterations of Sanskrit words in the Tibetan sources (Appendix 7); 8. A list of the citations found in the *Ratnaśrīṭikā* and the *Dpañ Ṭikā* on the third chapter (Appendix 8); 9. A list of orthographic variant readings not entered in the main critical apparatus of the edition of the *Ratnaśrīṭikā* (Appendix 9); 10. A list of palaeographically similar letters and ligatures from the Nepalese manuscript of the *Ratnaśrīṭikā* (Appendix 10); 11. A glossary (Tibetan-Sanskrit-German and Sanskrit-Tibetan) of the technical terms used in the *Dpañ Ṭikā* on the third chapter (Appendix 11); 12. A list of the direct paraphrases and the literal translations in the *Dpañ Ṭikā* based on the *Ratnaśrīṭikā*. (Appendix 12).

Six concordances are included in the book (9. Concordances). The first concordance specifies where the Sanskrit stanzas of the third chapter of the *Kāvyaḍarśa* can be found in the Nepalese manuscripts and the Tibetan bilingual editions (9.1). The second concordance helps in locating the Tibetan text of the third chapter of the *Sñan ñag me loñ* in both the canonical and the non-canonical sources (9.2). The third concordance facilitates a speedy location of the Tibetan stanzas of the *Sñan ñag me loñ* cited and explained in the particular versions of the four Tibetan commentaries by Dpañ Lo tsā ba, Snar than Lo tsā ba, Rin spuñs pa Ñag dbañ and Bod mkhas pa Mi pham (9.3). With the help of the fourth concordance one can quickly locate where Sanskrit stanzas from the third chapter of the *Kāvyaḍarśa* are cited in five Tibetan commentaries (9.4). The fifth concordance helps in locating where Ratnaśrījñāna's and Dpañ Lo tsā ba's commentary on a particular stanza from the third chapter begins in the primary sources (9.5). In the sixth concordance references of all stanzas cited in Bhoja's *Sarasvatikañṭhābharaṇa* and the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* as well as in Hemacandra's *Alaṅkāracūḍāmañi* and in the *Vivekā* ad *Kāvyañuśāsana* from the third chapter of the *Kāvyaḍarśa* are given (9.6).

There are five indices (10. Indices). For easy reference two indices of verses, for the Sanskrit and the Tibetan root texts, have been included (10.1 and 10.2). Here both texts are printed in Roman transliteration. In the third index all stanzas composed by Ratnaśrījñāna and cited in his commentary on the third chapter of the *Kāvyaḍarśa* are listed (10.3). In the fourth and fifth indices all proper names occurring in the *Ratnaśrīṭikā* and the *Dpañ Ṭikā* on the third chapter are noted (10.4 and 10.5).

At the end of the book are a bibliography, a list of the abbreviations, and this summary.