SAIH

BRILL

A Revisionist Account of the *Campū*

Andrew Ollett | ORCID: 0000-0002-2425-2806
University of Chicago, IL, USA
ollett@uchicago.edu

Published online 19 April 2024

Abstract

The Sanskrit word *campū* is usually understood to refer to a literary composition that combines prose and verse. I argue that this sense of the word was not available before the tenth century CE, and the vast majority of compositions that have been called *campū*s, either in premodern commentaries or in modern scholarship, were not and could not have been so called by their authors. This is true of almost the entirety of so-called "*campū* literature" in Kannada. The reference to *campū* as "a particular type of composition consisting of prose and verse" in Daṇḍin's *Mirror of Literature* (ca. 700 CE) was probably not a definition, despite the fact that it has almost-universally been taken as such by the tradition of Indian poetics and modern scholarship. I propose that the *campū* might have originated as a subliterary comic performance, and that Daṇḍin (unknowingly) and Trivikramabhaṭṭa (knowingly) helped to establish the now-familiar sense of the word.

Keywords

campū – *kāvya* – prosimetrum – *uparūpaka* – Daṇḍin – Trivikramabhaṭṭa

---

1   **Rewriting the History of the *campū***

In principle, the *campū* poses a number of fascinating literary-historical problems: its sudden appearance in literary theory around the year 700 CE, and its appearance in actual literature only two centuries after that; its underdefinition, or perhaps even lack of definition, as a genre; the varieties of verse and

prose it includes and their respective roles; its spread across several linguistic traditions, including at least Sanskrit, Kannada, Telugu, and Malayalam (or rather, the fact that modern scholars have recognized works in all these languages as *campū*); its links to various other literary genres; the suggestion, embedded into its form and occasionally mentioned by the texts themselves, of recitation before an audience.

These questions have hardly been formulated, much less addressed, in scholarship on the *campū* so far, which has been of a bibliographic rather than historical character. Apart from short notices in literary histories of the early twentieth century, modern scholarship on the *campū* generally starts from Nanda Kishore Sharma's brief survey of the genre in the introduction to his edition of the *Ānandakandacampū* (1931), in which he listed 73 *campū* works, provided a speculative derivation of the word *campū* from a root *cap* meaning "to go," quoted definitions of the form from Daṇḍin, Hēmacandra, and the *Agnipurāṇa*, and noted that Trivikramabhaṭṭa's *Damayantīkathā* or *Nalacampū*, composed around 915 CE, is the earliest surviving representative of the genre. These observations have been expanded in subsequent scholarship, most extensively in C. D. Deshpande's 1992 monograph, and in a few other contributions that have traced the formal characteristics of *campū*s.[1] The historical narrative presented in this scholarship is that the *campū* genre developed organically from the literary refinement of Sanskrit prose. Implicitly or explicitly, scholars maintain that *campū* had developed by Daṇḍin's time, but all of the early examples, prior to Trivikramabhaṭṭa's *Damayantīkathā*, are lost.[2] One challenge to this narrative is R. S. Mugali's idea that *campū* literature

---

[1] C. R. Deshpande, *Studies in Campū Literature* (Delhi: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, 1992); see also S. K. De, "The Campū," *Journal of the Ganganath Jha Research Institute* 1 (1943): 56–65, K. Suryanarayana Rao, "Origin and Development of Campūs," in *Felicitation Volume Presented to Mahamahopadhyaya Dr. V. V. Mirashi* (Nagpur: Vidarbha Samshodhan Mandal, 1965, 175–188); Chavināthā Tripāṭhī, *Campū Kāvya kā Ālōcanātmaka ēvaṃ Aitihāsika Adhyayana* (Varanasi: Caukhambā Vidyābhavana, 1965); and G. Vedia, "Campū: An Experiment in Free-Style Composition," *Sambodhi* 14 (1990): 49–56, and the same author's *Campūkāvya, Sāhitya ane Svarūpa* (Gandhinagar: Saṃskṛta Sāhitya Akādamī, 1998). A characteristically thorough and critical survey of the scholarship (in Kannada) is found in T. V. Veṅkaṭācalaśāstrī, "Campu," in H. M. Nāyaka (ed.), *Kannaḍa Adhyayana Saṃstheya Kannaḍa Sāhitya Caritre, Mūraneya Sampuṭa* (Mysore: Kannaḍa Adhyayana Saṃsthe, Maisūru Viśvavidyālaya, 1976), 300–330 (reprinted in T. V. Veṅkaṭācalaśāstrī, *Śāstrīya* vol. 2, Mysore: Sapna Book House, 290–319).

[2] So Deshpande, *Studies in Campū Literature*, 67 (going so far as to say that the *Vāsavadattā* referred to by Bhōja was not Subandhu's work but a *campū* composed prior to Patañjali in the second century BCE!); Veṅkaṭācalaśāstrī, "Campu," 315 (*daṇḍige pūrvōttarakālagaḷalli huṭṭidda campugaḷu kālagatiyinda naṣṭavāgirabahudē*).

originated in Kannada and spread to Sanskrit, but Deshpande rightly rejected his arguments.[3]

This paper presents an alternative history of the genre called *campū* in Sanskrit. I argue that *campū* was a *subliterary* performance genre centered around a raconteur who told humorous stories. Daṇḍin referred to it in his *Mirror of Literature* (*Kāvyādarśa*, ca. 700 CE), but probably it was already unknown to most of his contemporaries. The word was taken up again by Trivikramabhaṭṭa, but this time to refer to a *literary* composition in Sanskrit prose and verse, almost certainly based on a misunderstanding (or reinterpretation) of Daṇḍin. Trivikrama started a new "wave" of *campū* compositions that spread radially from his homeland of Karnataka. Around the same place and time, a similar genre spread in Kannada and then in Telugu, employing a mixture of prose and verse, and although these works seem to have ridden the "wave" started by Trivikrama, they are nevertheless *not* identified as *campū* and probably harken back to earlier prosimetric forms. The development of prosimetric forms in all their historical variety is obscured by the use of the word *campū* in reference to works whose authors did not call them by that name.

2 Daṇḍin Mentions but Does Not Define the *campū*

The earliest use of the word *campū* to refer to a literary genre, at least in the texts that survive, appears to occur in verse 31 of the first chapter of Daṇḍin's *Mirror of Literature*. There he says, in the context of genres which consist of a "mixture" of prose and verse (*miśra*), that "there is a particular type of composition, consisting of prose and verse, that is called *campū*."[4] Daṇḍin composed his *Mirror* around 700 CE, probably in Kāñcīpuram, where he was associated with the court of the Pallava king Narasiṃhavarman II (r. ca. 690–725). *Campū* as a genre is not mentioned by earlier authors, including Daṇḍin's predecessor in the realm of poetics, Bhāmaha.

Almost everyone has taken Daṇḍin's verse to define the *campū*.[5] But this is wrong for two reasons. First, the "mixed" composition is already defined by having a mixture of prose and verse. If the *campū* were to be defined by this

3 Deshpande, *Studies in Campū Literature*, 61–65.
4 *gadyapadyamayī kāpi campūr ity abhidhīyatē* (1.31; so the Thakur & Jha ed., as well as the Sinhala *sannaya*; the Kṛṣṇamācārya ed. reads *kācic*).
5 This is also true of the premodern renditions of Daṇḍin's *Mirror*, such as the Kannada *Ornament of Mādhava* (*Mādhavālaṅkāraṃ*); see note 26.

mixture, then everything exhibiting both prose and verse would be a *campū*. This is obviously not the case, since Daṇḍin mentions stage plays as the first example of "mixed" compositions (*miśrāṇi nāṭakādīni*, 1.31*a*). Second, in the case of the stage play, Daṇḍin does not offer a definition, but rather notes that "it is dealt with at length elsewhere" (*tēṣām anyatra vistaraḥ*, 1.31b). Daṇḍin seems to refer to *campū* as a specific (*kāpi*) example of a mixed prose-verse composition, but he is silent on its defining features.[6] The commentators universally take *campū*, however, as defined merely by the mixture of prose and verse.[7] The same is true for nearly every definition of the *campū* in the tradition of poetics following Daṇḍin. They all contain the qualifier "consisting of prose and verse" (*gadyapadyamaya*), always borrowed directly or indirectly from Daṇḍin.[8]

Daṇḍin is also silent about the language of the *campū*. He does not mention it when discussing the languages of different genres. One anonymous Sanskrit commentary says that *campū* is mentioned to give an example of the mixed composition in Sanskrit alone.[9]

Finally, Daṇḍin does not give any examples of *campū*. And most commentators do not, either. The one exception is Ratnaśrījñāna (early tenth century) who says that it includes the *Jātakamālā* (or *Jātakamālā*s) and *Damayantī*.[10] The exact same comment is found in the Sinhala gloss (*sannaya*) on the *Mirror*, which is no surprise. As Dimitrov has shown, the Sinhala gloss very often reproduces Ratnaśrījñāna's remarks.[11]

---

6   Deshpande, *Studies*, 3 notes that Daṇḍin's *kācit* (= *kāpi*) serves the purpose of "suggesting […] that each and every work containing a commingling of prose and verse may not necessarily be called a Campū."

7   See Yāmuna (*campukāvyasya gadyapadyayōr miśraṇamātram iti paścādupādānam iti mantavyam*, p. 21, explaining why *campū* is mentioned second after *nāṭaka* in the *miśra* category).

8   See appendix D (pp. 79–80), "References to Champū," in T. V. Venkatachala Sastry, *Mahākāvyalakṣaṇa* (Mysore: Centre of Excellence for Studies in Classical Kannada, 2015).

9   The anonymous Sanskrit commentary printed with Vādijaṅghāladēva and Taruṇavācaspati, *saṃskṛtasyaivāpi gadyapadyamayatāstīty āha—gadyapadyēti* (p. 29).

10   *Ratnaśrīṭīkā* p. 23 (*sā ca jātakamālādamayantyādi*).

11   Dragomir Dimitrov, *The Legacy of the Jewel Mind: On the Sanskrit, Pali, and Sinhalese Works by Ratnamati: A Philological Chronicle* (*Phullalocanavaṃsa*) (Naples: Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale," 2016), 138 (*ē campūkāvya nam jātakamālādamayantīādiya yi datayutu*). Note that Dimitrov considers Ratnaśrījñāna to have actually written the *sannaya*; I consider it more likely that the *sannaya* borrowed liberally from Ratnaśrījñāna's Sanskrit commentary.

3   Most Works that We Identify as *campū* Do Not Identify Themselves as *campū*

Ratnaśrī's examples bring us to the question: which works are *campū*? We should probably start by asking: which works call themselves *campū*? The answer is none, until at least two centuries after Daṇḍin's *Mirror*.

I emphasize this point because it is now fairly common to use the word *campū* to refer to any composition (a) of mixed prose and verse (b) of a sufficiently high literary quality.[12] The first criterion is formal, and on its own, it would result in a massive overextension of the term *campū*, from boundary inscriptions to the *Upaniṣad*s and beyond.[13] The second criterion is somewhat subjective. The idea is that for something to be considered a *campū*, it must in the first place be considered a *kāvya*. But scholarly judgments have differed on this point. Winternitz thought that the *Jātakamālā* of Āryaśūra, as well as Hariṣēṇa's inscriptional panegyric to Samudragupta, could be considered *campū*; Lienhard advocated a more restrictive use of the term, ostensibly because of his insistence that a *campū* had to follow all of the conventions of *kāvya* literature.[14] Both were no doubt aware that the earliest texts to describe themselves as *campū* date from the tenth century, which made them somewhat reticent to apply the term to earlier texts; hence Lienhard calls the *Damayantīkathā* "the earliest real campūkāvya."[15] The added qualification "real" suggests the introduction of another criterion: either (c) the author himself or (d) another premodern author designates the work in question as a *campū*.

Michael Hahn repeatedly cited Ratnaśrījñāna's application of the term *campū* to Āryaśūra's *Jātakamālā* as a reason for considering this work a genuine example of the genre. And not just Ratnaśrījñāna: the anonymous commentator on the *Jātakamālā* also calls it a *campū*, citing Daṇḍin's definition (with,

---

12   For a review of the positions of Winternitz, Keith, von Glasenapp, Lienhard, and Warder, see Basu, *Eine Literatur-kritische Studie zu Āryaśūras Jātakamālā zusammen mit einer kritischen Edition der anonymen Jātakamālāṭīkā und einer kritischen Edition der Jātakamālāpañjikā des Vīryasiṃha* (Ph.D. thesis, Bonn, 1989), 95–96.

13   Indeed many discussions of *campū* start from these alleged precedents; see Deshpande, *Studies in Campū Literature*, 34–60.

14   Maurice Winternitz, *History of Sanskrit Literature*, *Volume III* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1985), 411–413; Siegfried Lienhard, *A History of Classical Poetry: Sanskrit—Pali—Prakrit* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1984), 265: "[…] it is inadvisable to use the term campū indiscriminately of any mixture of verse and prose or to define as campū works like Āryaśūra's Jātakamālā or, still less, a book of fables like the Hitopadeśa, as it is often done.".

15   Lienhard, *A History of Classical Poetry*, 267.

however, some interesting differences).[16] This, together with Hahn's appreciation of the literary quality of early Buddhist Sanskrit works, has led him to consider a wide variety of other works as *campū*: stories about the Buddha's former lives, especially the Sanskrit collections by Saṅghasēna, Āryaśūra, Haribhaṭṭa, and Gōpadatta; or the diverse stories collected in Kumāralāta's *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā Dṛṣṭāntapaṅkti*; or finally the narrative portions of the *vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins. None of these works refer to themselves as *campū*.

Despite his insistence that Trivikrama wrote "the first real campūkāvya," Siegfried Lienhard noted that some earlier Prakrit texts might fulfil criteria (a) and (b), and considered them "transitional" forms between prose and "real" *campū*. In this connection he mentioned the *Kuvalayamālā* of Uddyōtanasūri (779 CE).[17] Chojnacki doubled down on this argument in the introduction to her translation of this work. She argued that the *Kuvalayamālā* is "the historically earliest example of the *campū* in Indian literature that has come down to us," and distinguishes a *campū* from other possible mixtures of prose and verse on account of the fact that the verses "appear to be more closely tied and woven into the narrative plot."[18] Similar arguments could be made for Haribhadra's *Story of Samarāditya* (*Samarāiccakahā*, somewhat earlier than the *Kuvalayamālā*) and Śīlāṅka's *Fifty-Four Great Men* (*Caüppaṇṇamahāpurisacariya*, somewhat later than it), as well as Guṇacandra's *Mahāvīracariya* (1082).[19] In fact, however, none of these works identify themselves as *campū*. They use more generic terms, such as *kathā* "story" or *carita* "account."

16   Michael Hahn, *Haribhaṭṭa and Gopadatta* (Tokyo: The Reiyukai Library, 1977), 4, and following him Ratna Handurukande, *Five Buddhist Legends in the Campū Style* (Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 1984); Michael Hahn, *Haribhaṭṭa in Nepal: Ten Legends from His Jātakamālā and the Anonymous Śākyasiṃhajātaka* (Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 2007), 40; Basu, *Eine Literatur-kritische Studie*, 241–242: *gadyapadyam artharūpi campūr ity abhidhīyatē*.

17   Lienhard, *History of Classical Poetry*, 265–266.

18   Christine Chojnacki, *Kuvalayamālā: Roman jaina de 779 composé par Uddyotanasūri: Vol. 1. Étude* (Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 2008), consulted in the English translation of Alexander Reynolds (*Uddyotanasūri's Kuvalayamālā: A Jain Novel from 779 AD, First Volume*, Bangalore: Sapna Book House, 2018), pp. 84, 74. See also Chojnacki's "The emergence of the Campū genre in Prakrit before the 10th century: Uddyotana's *Kuvalayamālā* and Śīlāṅka's *Cauppannamahāpurisacariya*," in Luitgard and Jay Soni (eds.), *Sanmati: Essays in Honour of Prof. Hampa Nagarajaiah's 80th Birthday* (Bangalore: Sapna Book House, 2015), 97–117.

19   K. K. Handiqui, *Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture* (Sholapur: Jaina Saṃskṛti Saṃrakshaka Sangha, 1968), 86. Note that Guṇacandra's work in mixed prose and verse is different from the *Mahāvīracariya* composed by Nēmicandra in verse just two years later.

Some support for Chojnacki's identification of the *Kuvalayamālā* as a *campū* is provided by Ratnaprabhasūri, who wrote a *Kuvalayamālākathā* in the later thirteenth century in which he claimed to "put into Sanskrit the *campū* that had earlier been composed by the sage Dākṣiṇyacihna (i.e., Uddyōtana)."[20] The *Kuvalayamālā* therefore fulfills criterion (d) as well.

In addition to Sanskrit and Prakrit works, there is at least one notable Tamil work that modern scholarship has occasionally identified as a *campū*, namely the *Pāratavēṇpā* of Peruntēvaṉār. This work was composed under the patronage of the Pallava king Nandivarman III (r. 846–869). It consists, according to Zvelebil's notes, in verses in a high poetic register of Tamil, together with passages in "ornate and vigorous prose," of which the language exhibits a considerably greater influence of Sanskrit.[21] As far as I am aware, this work neither calls itself a *campū* (or *campu*) nor was recognized as such by any premodern author.

The earliest surviving literature in Kannada, with the exception of the *Way of the Poet-King* (discussed below) is made up of compositions in mixed prose and verse divided into chapters. Modern scholarship knows these compositions as *campū*—indeed the earliest period of Kannada literature is often called "the *campū* period" (*campukāla*)—and indeed some premodern authors use this term (see below).[22] But the earliest authors—Pampa (941), Ponna (950), Nāgavarma I (990), Ranna (1008), and Nāgavarma II (1042)—never use it with reference to their own works. The tendency to call such works *campū*, while strictly speaking anachronistic, makes sense when we consider the strong resemblance between the Kannada prosimetric form (which was perhaps originally called *gadyakathe*, see below) and the Sanskrit *campū*.

I do not read Telugu or Kērala Maṇipravāḷam, but there are a number of works in both languages that modern scholarship has called *campū.* Indeed the *campū* is considered one of the characteristic genres of both Telugu and Maṇipravāḷam. I am, however, told by colleagues who work on these languages that the works in question do not describe themselves as *campū*s.[23]

---

20   *Kuvalayamālākathā*, p. 1, v. 10 (*dākṣiṇyacihnamunipēna vinirmitā yā prāk prākṛtā vibudhamānasarājahaṃsī | tāṃ saṃskṛtēna vacasā racayāmi campūṃ sadyaḥ prasahya sudhiyaḥ pravilōkayantu ||*).

21   Kamil Zvelebil, *Companion Studies to the History of Tamil Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 68.

22   T. V. Veṅkaṭācalaśāstrī gives the title "Campu" to his contribution on this literary form.

23   I thank Harshita Mruthinti Kamath, Ilanit Loewy Shacham, and Sivan Goren-Arzony for this information.

4   Some of the Earliest References to *campū* are in Contexts Clearly Derived from Daṇḍin's Discussion

We have a gap of nearly two hundred years between Daṇḍin's use of the word *campū* and the next earliest uses of the word. Most of these uses are clearly derived from Daṇḍin's discussion, and hence it appears that Daṇḍin was the vector by which the term *campū* entered into discussions of literary genre.

4.1   *Not* The Way of the Poet-King (*870s, Karnataka*)
On the topic of South Indian vernaculars, I noted above that modern scholars associate the *campū* with early Kannada and Telugu literature, despite the fact that not a single work of Kannada literature from this period calls itself a *campū*. In this context I put forward one important negative example, that is, a place where the word *campū* is not used despite our expectations.

The earliest Kannada work to survive in manuscript form, the *Way of the Poet-King* (*Kavirājamārgaṃ*), is, among other things, an extended response to Daṇḍin's *Mirror of Literature*. The *Way* was completed in the final decade or so of the reign of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Amōghavarṣa (r. ca. 814–878). The author, Śrīvijaya, establishes a baseline of intertextuality with Daṇḍin's *Mirror* in order to diverge from it at key points, a phenomenon that Sarah Pierce Taylor and I have called "extratextuality."[24] Śrīvijaya's discussion of the "body of literature" (*kāvyaśarīra*) is one such point.

Daṇḍin had classified the "body of literature" into three types: prose, verse, and mixed. The *Way* simply removes the "mixed" category and speaks only of two major divisions (1.24), as Bhāmaha did (*Ornament of Literature* [*Kāvyālaṅkāra*] 1.16b). This is itself a significant intervention. A later adaptation of the *Mirror* into Kannada, the *Ornament of Mādhava* (*Mādhavālaṅkāraṃ*)*,* does indeed define the *campū*, using the by-now obligatory phrase *gadyapadyamaya*.[25] But there is more to Śrīvijaya's intervention than simply deleting the reference to the "mixed" category. After introducing prose, and referring to such outstanding Sanskrit examples as the *Deeds of Harṣa* and *Kādambarī*, the *Way* adds something (1.27, from the edition and translation I am preparing with Sarah Pierce Taylor):

---

24   See Andrew Ollett and Sarah Pierce Taylor, "The *Way of the Poet-King*: Authority, Intertextuality, Language," in Yigal Bronner (ed.), *A Lasting Vision: Daṇḍin's Mirror in the World of Asian Letters* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2023), 111.

25   *pesaroḷe campuvin' ikku gadyapadyamayaṅgaḷ* (Veṅkaṭācalaśāstrī, "Campu," 301).

mige kannaḍa-gabbaṅgaḷoḷ
agaṇita-guṇa-gadya-padya-sammiśritamaṃ |
nigadisuvar gadya-kathā-
pragītiyiṃ tac-cirantanācāryarkaḷ ||

Moreover, in Kannada poems,
those revered teachers of old called
the mixture of prose and verse with countless good qualities
by the name of the "prose story" (*gadyakathā*).

The next verse appears to list authors who had composed such works in Kannada, although their works are all lost, and in fact all of them except Durvinīta (the Western Gaṅga king who ruled in the later sixth century) are known only from this one reference.[26]

And that's it. As Mariyappa Bhaṭṭa has noted, the word *campū* does not appear in the *Way of the Poet-King* at all.[27] This is somewhat unexpected, since the *campū* is supposed to have been the dominant literary genre in Kannada from its beginnings up to about the twelfth century.

Is *gadyakathe* just another name for the *campū*? T. V. Veṅkaṭācalaśāstrī argued that Śrīvijaya *avoided* using the word *campū* to refer the style that he calls *gadyakathe*, suggesting that the latter was really a prose work that

---

26   *Way of the Poet-King* 1.28:
   vimaḷōdaya-nāgārjuna-samēta-jayabandhu-durvinītādigaḷ ī |
   kramadoḷ negaḷci gadyāśrama-pada-gurutā-pratītiyaṃ keykoṇḍar ||
   "Vimaḷōdaya and Nāgārjuna, together with Jayabandhu, Durvinīta and others acquired the fame of being gurus in the ashram of prose by writing in this category."
   The list is probably not arranged in chronological order, if we consider the corresponding list of verse writers in 1.31 (Guṇasūri, Nārāyaṇa, Bhāravi, Kālidāsa, and Māgha). Durvinīta tells us in several copper-plate inscriptions that he (a) composed a work called *śabdāvatāra*, (b) composed the *vaḍḍakathā* in Sanskrit, and (c) wrote a commentary on the fifteenth sarga of the *Kirātārjunīya* (Uttanūr, Divē Āgar, and Gummareḍḍipura, nos. 21, 22 and 24 respectively in K. V. Ramesh, *Inscriptions of the Western Gangas* [Delhi: Indian Council of Historical Research, 1984]). None of these works appears to be a Kannada *gadyakathā*, although the *Śabdāvatāra* might have been in Kannada (note that Pūjyapāda, who is said to have been Durvinīta's teacher, composed a *Śabdāvatāra* in Sanskrit that comments on Pāṇini's *sūtra*s). See H. K. Jayadēva, "Kavirājamārgadavarigina Sāhitya Kr̥tigaḷu mattu Śāstragranthagaḷu," in *Samagra Kannaḍa Sāhitya Caritre 1* (Beṅgalūru: Beṅgalūru Viśvavidyālaya, 1974), 71–78, who reports Chidananta Murthy's opinion that we are dealing with two separate Durvinītas.

27   M. Mariyappa Bhaṭṭa, "Campūkāvyada Prārambhakāraru," in *Samagra Kannaḍa Sāhitya Caritre 1* (Beṅgalūru: Beṅgalūru Viśvavidyālaya, 1975), 57. Also noted by Veṅkaṭācalaśāstrī, "Campu," 323–324. The much-discussed *bedaṇḍe* and *cattāṇaṃ*, which are mentioned in several works of poetics, including Śrīvijaya's, but of which no examples survive, do not appear to have featured prose; see the discussion of Janna's *Anantanāthapurāṇaṃ* below.

happened to be interspersed with verses.[28] I more or less agree: Śrīvijaya did not use the word *campū* because he did not understand any of the relevant Kannada works to be described by that word. Śrīvijaya was adapting Daṇḍin's *Mirror* to Kannada literature. Śrīvijaya certainly knew what a *nāṭaka* was, and he nevertheless left it out, because there were no Kannada *nāṭaka*s. I personally doubt that Śrīvijaya understood *campū* to be simply a mixture of prose and verse, as all later commentators have understood it to be, because if he did, then he could have used it to describe what he calls the *gadyakathe*. In fact, Śrīvijaya might not have known what a *campū* was at all. This interpretation would open up the possibility that the prosimetric form used by Pampa and later authors—universally called *campū* by modern scholars, but rarely and only later by the poets themselves—is actually a continuation of what Śrīvijaya called a *gadyakathe*. Authors after Śrīvijaya, however, do not use this term.

4.2   Ornament of Our Own Language (*Early Tenth c., Sri Lanka*)
Let me begin with *The Ornament of Our Own Language* (*Siya bas lakara*). This is a work of poetics in Sinhala that is heavily indebted to Daṇḍin's *Mirror of Literature*. After rehearsing Daṇḍin's threefold distinction between the "body of literature" (*kāvyaśarīra*), viz. prose, verse, and mixed, the author says (and here I give Charles Hallisey's translation):[29]

> *vanu mänavi siyabasi nē kavbaňdek siridu yam* |
> *vadan pabaňdek da kiyū peden visituru sapu yī* ||

> It would be good
> if there were to be in this language of ours
> beautiful campū poetry (*sapu*)
> which brings together
> both verse and prose.

The date of the *Siya bas lakara* remains unsettled. It is attributed to a king identified only by the generic epithet Salamevan (Śilāmēghavarṇa). Most recently Dimitrov has convincingly suggested that he is to be identified with king Kassapa V (913–923), and that the author of the prose commentary (*sannaya*)

---

28   Veṅkaṭācalaśāstrī, "Campu," 324.

29   *Siya bas lakara* 1.13. Ruvanmi's commentary on this verse is: *sapu yī kiyū, campūyayi kivāvū; peden visituru, padyayen vicitravū; yam vadan pabaňdek da; yam vacana prabandhayek ädda; ē kavbaňdek siridu, ē kāvyabandhana śriyada; siyabasin vanu mänavi, svakiyavū siṅhala bhāṣāven varṇanā kaḷa mänavi.* I thank Charles Hallisey for generously providing me with the text and the translation of the relevant passages, since I sadly do not read Sinhala.

on the *Siya bas lakara*, known by the Sinhalese name Ruvanmi, is actually the great tenth-century scholar Ratnamati, also known as Ratnaśrījñāna. Dimitrov considers it likely that the commentary was completed soon after the text, in the 920s.[30]

The main point to be made here is that one of the earliest uses of the word *campū*—here in its Sinhala form *sapu*—occurs in a context that is heavily indebted to Daṇḍin. *The Ornament of Our Own Language* is itself a transcreation of Daṇḍin's work. There are some reasons to think that Ruvanmi, who was likely Daṇḍin's earliest and most important Sanskrit commentator Ratnaśrījñāna, did not just compose a gloss on the *Ornament*, but provided critical scholarly assistance to Salamevan in composing it.[31]

One important difference between the *Ornament* and Daṇḍin's *Mirror* may be noted here. In the *Mirror*, the *campū* is merely mentioned as an example, just like the *ōsara*—and who even remembers the *ōsara*, or knows what it is?[32] By contrast, the *Ornament*'s mention of the *campū* occurs in the context of an aspiration for vernacular literary creation. For Salameva and Ruvanmi, the *campū* was not like the *ōsara* at all. It did not name an obscure literary genre, but a genre that had very recently been revived, or as I will argue, reinvented.

4.3 *Abhinavagupta's* Eye (*but Not Ānandavardhana's* Light on Resonance)

At verse 3.7 of his *Light on Resonance* (*Dhvanyālōka*) and the following prose *vṛtti*, Ānandavardhana refers to "divisions" (*bhēda*) of literature. The divisions with which he was primarily concerned with were single-verse poems (*muktaka*) and longer compositions (*prabandha*). He does not mention the *campū* at all.

This is exactly what we would expect. It is well known that Ānandavardhana, writing about a century and a half after Daṇḍin, either did not know the *Mirror*, or, if he did, he gave it "the cold shoulder."[33] Since Daṇḍin was the first, and for a long time the only, author in the field of poetics to mention the

---

30   Dimitrov, *The Legacy of the Jewel Mind*, 113, 122. See also Charles Hallisey. "'May It Always Be about Adding Beauty to Beauty': The Story of the Mirror in Sri Lanka," in Yigal Bronner (ed.), *A Lasting Vision: Dandin's Mirror in the World of Asian Letters* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2023), 145.

31   See also Dimitrov, *Legacy of the Jewel Mind*, 116–117.

32   *Mirror of Literature* 1.37c (*ōsarādir apabhraṃśô*). The *ōsara* was composed in Apabhraṃśa alone; no examples survive.

33   Yigal Bronner, "Dandin and the Dawn of Kashmiri Poetics," in Yigal Bronner (ed.), *A Lasting Vision: Dandin's* Mirror *in the World of Asian Letters* (New York: Oxford University Press: 2023), 264.

campū, it should come as no surprise that poeticians who ignored him also ignored the *campū*.

The only reference to Daṇḍin's *Mirror* in Abhinavagupta's *Eye* (*Lōcana*), composed in the late tenth century, appears in the commentary to this passage. Ānandavardhana had given an open-ended list of longer compositions that ends with "and so on," and Abhinavagupta, as a good commentator should do, explains what is left out of the list. "The *campū* is included because the phrase 'and so on' is used, as Daṇḍin says: 'a *campū* contains both verse and prose.'"[34] Abhinavagupta *had* to quote Daṇḍin to make this point, because none of the poeticians whom he obviously preferred—Bhāmaha, Udbhaṭa, Vāmana, and Rudraṭa—say anything whatsoever about the *campū*.

4.4 The Analysis of Literature (*Early Eleventh c., Karnataka*)

The earliest Kannada author to use the word *campū*, to my knowledge, is Nāgavarma II, the author of another work of poetics, called *Analysis of Literature* (*Kāvyāvalōkanaṃ*). He must have completed this work after finishing his *Vardhamānapurāṇaṃ* in 1042. Consciously or unconsciously, he undoes Śrīvijaya's interventions, and reverts back to Daṇḍin's schema wherein the "body of literature" can be classified in three ways, namely as prose, verse, or a mixture of both.[35] He gives examples of the principal genre in each category, and for the "mixed" category he gives the *campū*, defining it only as "a mixture of both prose and verse."[36] His discussion appears to be derivative of Daṇḍin's (whose influence he explicitly acknowledges), except that he mentions the *campū* and not the *nāṭaka*.[37] Nāgavarma does not exclusively follow Daṇḍin in his accounting of Kannada genres, however. In fact he adds quite a few that Daṇḍin does not mention at all, but none of them appear to be mixed prose-verse forms. I take Nāgavarma's inclusion of the *campū* and not the *nāṭaka* to mean that he believed that Kannada literature included examples of the *campū* but not the *nāṭaka*. If I am right about this, then Nāgavarma quite possibly considered the mixed prose-verse genre favored by poets such as Pampa and Ranna to be called *campū*—something he was in a position to do, as

---

34 *Eye* p. 324 (on the prose *vṛtti* to 3.7: *ādigrahaṇāc campūḥ, yathāha daṇḍī gadyapadyamayī campūr iti*); Ingalls, Masson and Patwardhan, 420.

35 *Analysis of Literature sūtra* 238 (v. 949): *gadyamayaṃ padyamayaṃ tad-yamaḷa-vimiśram endu kṛti mūṟuteṟaṃ*.

36 *Analysis of Literature sūtra* 239 (v. 950): *berasi bare gadyapadyamav eṟaduṃ kṛti campuv emba pesaraṃ paḍeguṃ*.

37 For Daṇḍin's influence, see *Analysis of Literature* v. 961: *vāmananuṃ rudraṭanuṃ bhāmahanuṃ daṇḍiyuṃ manaṅgoḷe pēḷd' ant' ī mahige negaḷe pēḷdaṃ dāmōdaratanayan ī vacōlaṅkṛtiyaṃ*.

I argue below, only because Trivikrama had reinvented the *campū* in the mean-time. Nāgavarma himself, however, does not appear to use the word at all in his own contribution to the genre, the *Vardhamānapurāṇaṃ*.

After Nāgavarma, *campū* is defined in a few other Kannada works of poetics, such as the *Ornament of Udayāditya* and the aforementioned *Ornament of Mādhava*.[38]

4.5   The Illumination of the Erotic (*Early Eleventh c., Malwa*)

Bhōja is, after Daṇḍin, one of the earliest authors to mention the *campū*. Bhōja restates Daṇḍin's threefold classification (prose, verse and mixed) in both of his poetic works (*Necklace of Sarasvatī* [*Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa*] 2.18 and *Illumination of the Erotic* [*Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*] ch. 3, p. 187). But it is only in the *Illumination of the Erotic* that Bhōja gives examples, among which the *campū* figures. His characteristically multitiered classification involves compositions in which either prose or verse predominates, and those in which they are equal; in each kind, the elements of prose and verse can be similar (*sajātīya*) or dissimilar (*vijātīya*). The *campū* is listed, along with the *samīkṣā* and the *saṭṭaka*, as a composition with relatively equal parts prose and verse, wherein the two elements are similar (p. 190).

Bhōja mentions the *campū* again as one of the genres that is "to be heard" (*śravya*) rather than "to be seen" (*prēkṣya*).[39] In that context he says (p. 674):

> *yākhyāyikaiva sāṅkā sōcchvāsā divyapadyagadyamayī |*
> *sā damayantīvāsavadattādir ihōcyatē campūḥ ||*

> An *ākhyāyikā* in heavenly prose and verse,
> which has *aṅka*s and *ucchvāsa*s, is called *campū*,
> such as *Damayantī* and *Vāsavadattā*.

Note that the "basis" for the definition of the *campū* is the *ākhyāyikā*, for which Bhōja gives Bāṇa's *Deeds of Harṣa* as an example (p. 672). The *ākhyāyikā* also is divided into *ucchvāsa*s, and critically, Bhōja says that it should be in Sanskrit prose (*saṃskṛtēna gadyēna*, p. 672). The differences appear to be (1) the inclusion of verse; and (2) the inclusion of *aṅka*s. The latter criterion is a bit mysterious to me, because I only know *aṅka* in the sense of an "act" of a

---

38   Udayāditya: *kannaḍadoḷ campūkṛti sannutatara vacanakāvyam enikuṃ* (Veṅkaṭācalaśāstrī, "Campu," 325); for Mādhava see note 25 above.

39   In his discussion of the "non-separation from *rasa* at the level of the composition" (*prabandhaviṣayō rasāviyōgaḥ*, ch. 11, p. 659).

play. But clearly Bhōja has Sanskrit examples in mind, given the basis of the *campū* in the *ākhyāyikā*, and given the examples he names. *Damayantī* is obviously Trivikrama's work, which I argue below was responsible for reintroducing the term *campū* after two centuries. *Damayantī* is divided into *ucchvāsa*s, and indeed this might have been the reason for Bhōja to incorporate this feature into his definition of the genre. But *Vāsavadattā* is unexpected, if it refers to Subandhu's work by that name, since it is mostly in prose, and of course does not call itself a *campū*.

The apparent exclusion of vernacular works from the category of *campū* might come as a surprise. I consider it unlikely that Bhōja was ignorant of the effusion of prosimetric literature in Kannada in the century or so preceding him. In fact Nāgavarma I claims to have recited his *Kannada Kādambari* before Bhōja himself. This probably means that, for Bhōja at least, the *campū* was not a vernacular genre, and was represented above all by Trivikrama's work.

One small point: the *Campūrāmāyaṇa* is ascribed, in its colophons, to a certain Bhōja who was a "Vidarbharāja," and this author has sometimes been identified with the Paramāra king. I consider this attribution to be false, and probably the *Campūrāmāyaṇa* is later than Bhōja; he certainly does not appear to know it.[40]

5   Trivikrama (Re)invents the *campū*

The above survey has run from the very first usage of the word *campū* to refer to a literary genre, in Daṇḍin's *Mirror of Literature*, to a number of other occurrences in the following centuries, where authors clearly seemed to be relying on Daṇḍin to tell them what a *campū* was and where it fits in the larger picture of literary genres. One striking fact emerges from the above survey: despite several engagements with Daṇḍin's work in the time period in question, and despite considerable activity in the field of poetics in Kashmir, *nobody ever mentions the campū in the two-hundred-odd years between Daṇḍin's Mirror*

---

40   Bhōja doesn't mention it or quote from it in his literary-theoretical works, and Bhōja calls himself *mahārājādhirājaparamēśvaraśrībhōja* in (e.g.) his *Śṛṅgāramañjarīkathā*, rather than *vidarbharāja*. Several colleagues have suggested to me that premodern authors considered the *Campūrāmāyaṇa* to be a work of the Paramāra king Bhōja. This may be true, given that "Bhōja(rāja)" without further qualification would probably have been understood to refer to the most famous bearer of that name. But neither Lakṣmaṇasūri (who wrote a *yuddhakāṇḍa* to complete the *Campūrāmāyaṇa*) nor Rāmacandra Budhēndra (who wrote a commentary on the *Campūrāmāyaṇa*, including Lakṣmaṇasūri's *yuddhakāṇḍa*) mention any further details about the author.

(*ca. 700*) *and Trivikrama's Damayantī* (*ca. 915*). Śrīvijaya doesn't, nor do Udbhaṭa, Vāmana, Rudraṭa, or Ānandavardhana. Once we get to Trivikrama, however, the situation changes radically. Not only do people start mentioning the *campū* in their own works (in Sanskrit, Sinhala, and Kannada), but when they have to give an example of the genre, they invariably mention Trivikrama's *Damayantī*. These facts alone should suggest, as a hypothesis, that early authors read Daṇḍin's mention of the *campū* as a reference to a strange and unfamiliar literary genre, but when Trivikrama claimed it as the name of the combination of prose and verse on display in his *Damayantī*, he provided Daṇḍin's *lakṣaṇa* with a *lakṣya*, thereby allowing it to finally serve its purpose of modeling a literary phenomenon. Subsequently, poets, literary theorists, and commentators felt that they had finally understood what Daṇḍin meant by the word *campū*.

Trivikramabhaṭṭa was a court poet of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Indra III (r. 915–927), and composed the latter's Nausari copper plates. His *Damayantī*, also known as the *Nalacampū*, is the first text to explicitly identify itself as a *campū* in Indian literary history. The following verse of his is well-known (1.25):

> *udāttanāyakōpētā guṇavadvṛttamuktakā |*
> *campūś ca hārayaṣṭiś ca kēna na kriyatē hṛdi ||*

> The *campū* is like a necklace.
> Its hero is exalted, and it has prose[41]
> and verse rich in literary qualities.
> Who doesn't take it to heart?
>> Its central jewel is very valuable,
>> and it is threaded with large pearls.
>> Who wouldn't wear it on their chest?

I think Trivikramabhaṭṭa composed *Damayantī* prior to obtaining a position in the court of Indra III, so it was likely finished by 915 CE.[42] In any case, it must have been extremely popular for the Sinhalese monk Ratnaśrījñāna to know of it within more or less a decade of its composition. He referred to it in his commentary on the *Mirror* of Daṇḍin, and I strongly suspect that the reference

---

41   I follow Caṇḍapāla's commentary in taking *muktaka* as referring to prose, in contrast to *vṛtta*, but it could of course refer to isolated verses as well.

42   Naresh Keerthi suggests ("Bāṇana Mukuṭatāḍitaka mattu Rannana Gadāyuddha," *Kannaḍa Sāhitya Pariṣat Pattrike* 100 [2022]: 73) that Trivikrama acknowledges his patron in v. 2 (*kandarpadēva* = Indra III). I am not certain. That would place the composition of the *Damayantī* between 915 and 927. But in any case Indra III is the only king with whom Trivikrama is known to be associated.

to *campū* in the *Ornament of Our Own Language* is due in part to Ratnaśrī's acquaintance with Trivikrama's work. As noted above, the *Nalacampū* was *the* example of the *campū* for Bhōja as well.

Scholars have long considered Karnataka to be the "heartland" of the *campū*, partly based on the assumption that this was the name of the genre in which Pampa, Ponna, and Ranna wrote their famous Kannada works.[43] As I noted above, that assumption needs to be revised, given that there is no evidence that these poets, or indeed any Kannada author before the mid-eleventh century, understood their works to be *campū*s. Nevertheless it is a fact that the earliest literary work to call itself a *campū*, and to clearly characterize the *campū* as a mixture of prose and verse, was composed in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom, with its capital at Mānyakhēṭa in northern Karnataka.

5.1 Trivikrama's Followers in Sanskrit

The next earliest *campū* is Sōmadēva's *Yaśastilakacampū*, composed in 959 CE at the court of Baddega, the king of the Cāḷukyas of Vemulavāḍa.[44] He doesn't actually describe the work as a *campū*, except in the title, and for him the choice of prose and verse appears to be less motivated by a desire to follow a certain generic template than it was to include "the best of both worlds." He almost appears defensive about the choice in the following verse (1.24):

> *na gadyaṃ padyam iti vā satāṃ kurvīta gauravam |*
> *kintu kiñcit svasaṃvēdyam anyat sukham iva striyaḥ ||*

> Good people shouldn't care about whether
> a work is in prose or verse.
>   … or what is conveyed
>   through words or gestures.
> Rather it is that special something
> that only they can feel,
> like a female orgasm.

Handiqui points out that Sōmadēva's primary influence is Bāṇa, although he considers it likely that Sōmadēva knew the works of Pampa, which were composed at the very same court less than twenty years previously; there are some

---

43   As noted by Handiqui, *Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture*, 86: "There is […] no doubt that this form of composition became popular in the Deccan in the tenth century in Sanskrit as well as in Kanarese literature."

44   Handiqui, *Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture*.

verbal echoes of Trivikrama, but Handiqui is silent on whether Sōmadēva knew him.[45]

After the tenth century, *campū* in Sanskrit begins to move beyond Karnataka proper. Sōḍḍhala composed his *Udayasundarīkathā* in Thane, near today's Mumbai, at the court of one Mummuṇirāja in the early eleventh century; Warder suggests that it was revised after the death of Bhōja, who is mentioned in the work.[46] Sōḍḍhala's composition of the work is part of the story itself, and he says there (p. 13):

> *prakramē tu ramaṇīyaṃ na nāma kēvalaṃ gadyaṃ nāpi kēvalaṃ padyam ubhayānubandhinī campūr ēva śrēyasī, yasmād anyaiva ratnair vipañci-tasya śōbhā kanakabhūṣaṇasya, anyad ēva pāṭalāmiśritasya saurabhaṃ vicakilaguluñchasya, anya ēva vaṃśadhvanigarbhitasya manōhārimā gītasya, anyad ēva karpūramilitasya śaityaṃ malayajadravasya, anyaiva ca hṛdyatā padyānuṣaṅginō gadyasyēti cētasi vicintya campūm ēva kathāṃ karttum upajanitaniścayas taddinam ativāhayāñ cakrē.*

> But right at the start he thought:
> What will really be pleasing is not just prose, and not just verse, but rather
>   a *campū* which partakes of both.
> For the beauty of a golden ornament is transformed when it is inlaid with
>   jewels;
> the fragrance of a cluster of jasmine flowers is transformed when it is
>   mixed with *pāṭalā* flowers;
> a song becomes captivating in a totally different way when it includes the
>   sound of the flute;
> the coolness of sandal paste is transformed when joined with camphor;
> the pleasantness of prose is transformed when it accompanies prose.

> When he had thus resolved to compose his story as a *campū*, the day
>   passed.

As with Trivikrama and Sōmadēva, Bāṇa is Sōḍḍhala's primary stylistic influence. In fact Bāṇa plays a major role in the story. These *campū*s thus belong to the long tradition of Sanskrit art-prose, except that they make frequent use of Sanskrit verse as well, which Bāṇa (and for that matter Subandhu) did not

---

45   Handiqui, *Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture*, 86, 76.
46   A. K. Warder, *Indian Kāvya Literature, Volume Six: The Art of Storytelling* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1992), §4586.

do. It is as if the label *campū* gives these authors permission to "enliven" their stories with verse.

We might at this juncture mention a text which is more or less exactly contemporaneous with Sōḍḍhala's *Udayasundarī* and which was composed at Bhōja's court: Dhanapāla's *Tilakamañjarī*. This work is best characterized as a prose novel in the style of Bāṇa's *Kādambarī*, but he begins with some critical observations on the use of prose and verse (p. 2, vv. 15–18):

> *akhaṇḍadaṇḍakāraṇyabhājaḥ pracuravarṇakāt |*
> *vyāghrād iva bhayāghrātō gadyād vyāvartatē janaḥ ||*
> *varṇayuktiṃ dadhānāpi snigdhāñjanamanōharām |*
> *nātiślēṣaghanā ślāghāṃ kṛtir lipir ivāśnutē ||*
> *aśrāntagadyasantānā śrōtṝṇāṃ nirvidē kathā |*
> *jahāti padyapracurā campūr api kathārasam ||*
> *satkathārasavandhyēṣu nibandhēṣu niyōjitāḥ |*
> *nīcēṣv iva bhavanty arthāḥ prāyōḥ vairasya hētavaḥ ||*

> With its forest of unbroken rhythmic runs,
> and its density of descriptive passages,
> people get scared and run away from art-prose
> as if from a color-striped tiger
> that haunts the thick Daṇḍaka forest. (15)
> A work receives praise if, although joining
> syllables together, it is nevertheless
> charming because they are straightforwardly
> disentangled, and not too dense with *ślēṣa*,
> just like handwriting: although the letters
> are joined, they are not too scrunched together,
> and the glossy lamp-black makes them charming. (16)
> A story will get rid of its readers
> if it is made up of uninterrupted prose.
> And even a *campū* that has too much verse
> will lose the savor of a story. (17)
> When worked into compositions that are completely
> lacking in the savor of a good story,
> meanings will generate hostility,
> like wealth entrusted to base people. (18)

As Sharma has noted, this is a relatively clear rebuke of the prose style of some of the followers of Bāṇa: he mentions Vādībhasiṃha, author of the

Gadyacintāmaṇi, but we can see it as a criticism of Trivikrama Bhaṭṭa as well.[47] In fact Trivikrama, whom we could certainly expect Dhanapāla to have known, is pointedly left off the relatively long list of earlier authors whom Dhanapāla praises. These passages confirm that Dhanapāla knew the genre of *campū* as a mixture of prose and verse, about a century after Trivikrama reintroduced the term, and elected not to compose his story in that genre, but rather to follow in the footsteps of Bāṇa and write a story (mostly) in flowing prose.

There is a long tradition of writing in *campū* after the eleventh century, but I don't think it adds much to our understanding of how the genre came into being and how the term *campū* came to be applied to it. I note, however, that is largely a South Indian genre. One apparent exception is the *campū* of the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas, but the foundational figures of that movement, the Gōsvāmins, belonged to a family of Kannadiga Brahmins.[48] Still, by the sixteenth century, no special pleading is needed to account for the knowledge and cultivation of the *campū* throughout the subcontinent.

5.2   *Trivikrama's Followers in Kannada*

Above, we saw that the earliest works of Kannada literature, which are almost universally called *campū* by modern scholars, were not so called by the authors themselves or by contemporary literary critics. How did this "mistake" come about? When did the term *campū* come to be applied to works in a mixture of prose and verse in Kannada?

I suggest that Trivikrama's redefinition of the *campū* is the *conditio sine qua non* for this change. Once Trivikrama had placed a composition in mixed prose and verse before readers and called it a *campū*, it was in principle possible for any such composition to be recognized as a *campū*. And as I suggested above, it seems that Nāgavarma, writing in the middle of the eleventh century, did indeed recognize *campū* as a genre of Kannada literature, represented perhaps by the works of Pampa, Ponna, and Ranna.

In principle, yes, but in practice? We can point to two works composed in the early thirteenth century to see when and how the word *campū* actually came to be used to refer to works of literature in Kannada. Let's first look at

---

47   Sudarshan Kumar Sharma, *Tilakamañjarī of Dhanapāla: A Social and Cultural Study* (Delhi: Parimal Publications, 2002), 23.

48   I thank Aleksandar Uskokov for pointing this out to me. I note that Rembert Lutjeharms, *A Vaisnava Poet in Early Modern Bengal: Kavikarnapura's Splendour of Speech* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 251 n. 29, mentions a *Campūlakṣaṇam* attributed to Jīva Gōsvāmin, which I have not seen.

Janna's *Anantanāthapurāṇaṃ*, composed around 1230.[49] That work presents the story of the fourteenth *tīrthaṅkara*, Anantanātha, in mixed prose and verse. Like earlier examples of the genre, it does not call itself a *campū*, but unlike them, it does in fact use the word. The author provides an extremely brief synopsis of literary genres when mentioning the praises that a character recites (*ōdi pogaḻva*) at a Jain temple:[50]

> *muktakaṃ kulakaṃ kōśaṃ saṅghātam emba racanā-vaicitrya-citrāyatana-*
> *vaidaṇḍika-prabandha-bandhura-padya-bandhadoḷam,*
> *utkaḷike cūrṇike latike khaṇḍaṃ vṛttagandhi citram emba gadya-*
> *bandhadoḷaṃ,*
> *tad-yugaḷa-sammiḷita-rasa-bhāva-sampac-campūkṛtiyoḷam*

> With charming verses in *vaidaṇḍika* compositions, which are stunning abodes of a diversity of arrangements, known as *muktaka, kulaka, kōśa,* and *saṅghāta*;
>
> with prose compositions called *utkaḷike, cūrṇike, lalike, khaṇḍa, vṛtta-gandhi* and *citra*;
>
> and with *campū* works, a mixture of the two, the realization of the *rasa*s and *bhāva*s.

The verse genres are quoted *verbatim* from Daṇḍin's *Mirror* (1.13), except here they are imagined as constituents of the genre *vaidaṇḍika* (also known by its Kannada name *bedaṇḍe*), which is defined, here and elsewhere, by a diversity of metrical forms. The invocation of the *vaidaṇḍika*, which is a Kannada rather than Sanskrit genre, strongly suggests that Janna was thinking of Kannada rather than Sanskrit literature in this passage. The forms of prose named here are very interesting, because only three of them (*utkalikā, cūrṇikā,* and *vṛttagandhikā*) are represented in mainstream Sanskrit poetics, whereas here we have a broader spectrum that seems to align more closely with classifications found in other vernacular sources.[51] *Campū* is here defined as a mixture of the two—that is, of prose and verse.

---

49 For the date see R. Narasimhacharya, *Karṇāṭaka Kavicarite, Volume 1 (To the end of the 14th Century)* (Bangalore: Bangalore Press, 1924), p. 335. I thank an anonymous reviewer for *JSAIH* for directing my attention to the works of Janna and Cauṇḍarasa in this context.

50 *Ananthanāthapurāṇaṃ*, p. 225 (prose after verse 10.78).

51 See Jamal Jones, *A Poetics of Power in Andhra, 1323–1450 CE* (Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 2018), 106. Gaurana has *cūrṇakam, kalikā, utkalikā, citra, lalita, khaṇḍam,* and *gadyapadyam*.

It is not altogether surprising to see *campū* being used in this way by this time. Janna's contemporary, Cauṇḍarāja (also called Cauṇḍarasa), composed a work called the *Naḷacampu*. According to the editor, Trivikrama was one of Cauṇḍarāja's models, as the title would lead us to expect.[52] A cursory glance at the text reveals, however, that it is almost entirely in verse and is not divided into chapters or *ucchvāsa*s. To me it seems to match the description of a *campū* least among the texts to which this designation has been attached, and I wonder whether it was original. In the text itself, the work is called *naḷacaritram*.[53]

After Janna, the earliest use of the word *campū* in Kannada literature — that is, not in a work of poetics — known to me is in the *Critique of Religion* (*Dharmaparīkṣe*) by Vṛttavilāsa, probably composed in the middle of the fourteenth century.[54] Here is verse 1.37:

> *munnina cārusaṃskṛtada dharmaparīkṣeyan ōdaballanuṃ*
> *kannaḍadiṃ dal arthav isaballavan illadoḍ' āgad' end' adaṃ |*
> *sannutam āgiy ellar aṟiv' ant' ire campuv enippa bandhadiṃ*
> *kannaḍadinde pēḷden idan ōduge kēḷuge kūrtu sajjanar ||*

Even if someone knows how to recite the earlier
Critique of Religion in pleasing Sanskrit,
he might not be able to give its meaning in Kannada.
To prevent this, I have composed it in Kannada,
in a form called *campū*, so that it will remain famous,
and everyone might know it.
May good people please recite it and listen to it.

52 See Rangaswamy Iyengar's preface, p. xii (*īgranthadalli mukhyavāduvu trivikramabhaṭṭana naḷacampu, śrīharṣana naiṣadakāvya mattu ivellakū modalāda bhāratada naḷōpākhyāna*). The editor notes that Mallikārjuna has borrowed a few verses from the *Naḷacampu* in his *Sūktisudhārṇava*, which should place the work before 1245 (p. viii). R. Narasimhacharya (*Karṇāṭaka Kavicaritre* p. 403), assigns him the oft-repeated date of 1300, which is a guess based on the poet's *Abhinavadaśakumāracaritraṃ*.

53 See v. 8 (p. 2).

54 For the date, see Heleen De Jonckheere, *The Never-ending Test: A Jain Tradition of Narrative Adaptations* (Ph.D. thesis, Ghent University, 2020), 214–216. The entry for *campū* in the largest Kannada dictionary cites only Nāgavarma and the *Kannaḍa Kaipiḍi*. See G. Veṅkaṭasubbayya (ed.), *Kannaḍa Sāhitya Pariṣattina Kannaḍa Nighaṇṭu, volume 3* (Beṅgalūru: Kannaḍa Sāhitya Pariṣattu, 1977), 2721.

6   Preliminary Conclusions

Before jumping back in time, before Daṇḍin, we can put some of the pieces together.

– There is a long history—really several long histories—of prosimetric genres in South Asian literature, both before and after the word *campū* appears in Daṇḍin's *Mirror* in around 700.
– Daṇḍin does not define the *campū* as a mixture of prose and verse, but only say that this is one of its characteristics.
– No surviving works before Daṇḍin's *Mirror* call themselves *campū* (including all of those that scholars have claimed to be *campū* or proto-*campū* etc.).
– None of the so-called *campū* works of Kannada literature call themselves *campū*, either, and in fact one that does appear to call itself a *campū* (viz. Cauṇḍarasa's *Naḷacampu*) does not actually fit the description.
– After Daṇḍin, the word *campū* is used in works of poetics in contexts that are clearly dependent on Daṇḍin's discussion (e.g., in Salameva's, Bhōja's, and Nāgavarma's works).
– After Daṇḍin, the word *campū* is first used in literature by Trivikrama around 915 to refer to his own prosimetric composition in Sanskrit, and in the following hundred years or so it is used exclusively to refer to compositions in Sanskrit in mixed prose and verse, almost certainly following Trivikrama's model.
– Bhōja and Ratnaśrījñāna read Daṇḍin with Trivikrama in mind, and understand the word *campū* in the *Mirror of Literature* to refer to the style in which Trivikrama composed his *Damayantī*.
– Only afterwards, once the word *campū* is widely understood to mean a composition in prose and verse, is it applied to such compositions in vernacular languages (and in the case of Kannada and Telugu, however, this is centuries after the so-called *campū*-period).

If I am right, what has happened is that Daṇḍin casually mentioned an obscure prosimetric genre, but because of the enormous influence of his *Mirror*, this mention was read as a definition, and more than that, as an invitation to compose literature in a mixture of prose and verse. Although the prosimetric genre had developed on its own, in both Sanskrit and Kannada, the word *campū* was not applied to such compositions in Sanskrit until the tenth century, and was not applied to such compositions in Kannada until even later (perhaps by Nāgavarma in the eleventh, perhaps by Janna and Cauṇḍarasa in the thirteenth, and definitely by Vṛttavilāsa in the fourteenth). The new use of the term was inspired, directly or indirectly, by Trivikramabhaṭṭa.

7   *Campū* Does Not Have a Sanskrit Etymology

What could Daṇḍin possibly have had in mind? If there are no earlier attestations, we might draw some help from etymology. Nandikishore Sharma and C. R. Deshpande have provided fanciful derivations from a non-existent Sanskrit root *√*cap*. We don't need to spend time on these suggestions.[55] Similarly, we can probably ignore Bailey's suggestion that it comes from a palatalized form of a root *√*kamp*, meaning "bend," and hence means "the 'twisted composition,'" showing the suffix -*ū*-." The root is not attested in Sanskrit in this meaning, but is found in other Indo-European languages.[56]

The most important discussion is an article by Kuiper, who noted a number of striking parallels from Austroasiatic and Austronesian languages. What might appear to be the most promising piece of evidence is the word *campur* in Malaysian and other languages in the Malayic branch of the Austronesian language family (namely Sakei, Tembi, and Semang). This word means "mix." Kuiper found it hard to believe that is is mere chance that Sanskrit *campū* meaning a "mixed" genre of prose and verse corresponds to closely in form and meaning to Malay *campur* "mix." Kuiper went on to ask the obvious question: if *campū* is a borrowing, where was it borrowed from? And does this imply that the source language already had a well-developed literary tradition?[57]

The parallel is indeed striking, but there are a handful of problems with the suggestion that Sanskrit borrowed the word from an Austronesian source. The first is just its *prima facie* unlikelihood. I don't know of any other Sanskrit words that have been borrowed from Austronesian. That doesn't exclude the

---

55   Deshpande, *Studies in Campū Literature,* 21–26; reviewed in Suryanarayana Rao, "Origin and Development of *Campū*s," and Veṅkaṭācalaśāstrī, "Campu," 309–312.

56   Harold Bailey, *Dictionary of Khotan Saka* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 99. Helmut Rix, *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2001), 342, 351, provisionally takes *√*kamp* "bend" to be a separate root, reconstructed for Proto-Indo-European, from *√*k⟨ᵘ⟩emp* "tremble," which is only reconstructed for Proto-Indo-Iranian.

57   F. B. J. Kuiper, "Indoiranica," *Acta Orientalia* 16 (1938): 310: "Ob man dieser Erklärung zustimmt oder nicht, eine auffallende Tatsache ist es jedenfalls, dass ein einheimischer Name gerade für eine so verfeinerte Kāvya-Kunst gewählt worden ist. Dies setzt, wie mir scheint, die Existenz einer verwandten einheimischen Literaturgattung mit Notwendigkeit voraus. […] Hat man aber den Namen erst gewählt, als diese Kāvya-Kunst schon voll entwickelt war, so kann dies nur geschehen sein, weil ihr in den einheimischen Sprachen etwas entsprach, wenn auch nicht gleichwertig, doch wenigstens nicht allzu roh und barbarisch schien."

possibility of course, because there was intense communication by sea between India—especially South India, where Daṇḍin lived—and Austronesian-speaking areas in Southeast Asia.

But thing brings us to the second question: Kuiper's examples were all modern. Did these language families have a word *campur* meaning "mixed" at the time in question, that is, before 700 CE? Javanese is the only Austronesian language I know of to have a premodern literature in which the word is actually used. The first definition that Zoetmulder gives in his Old Javanese—English Dictionary is "mixed," but that is certainly because of the sense of the modern Indonesian word.[58] In fact, as the attestations in his dictionary show, the basic meaning of the word in Javanese was "impure" or "inappropriate." The word first appears in the *Ādiparva*, in the middle of the tenth century, incidentally right at the time that *campū* was becoming popular in Karnataka. In fact I would argue that none of the Javanese usages carries the sense of "mixed" at all.[59]

Finally, the Austronesian word *campur* begins with a *c*. Such words are reconstructed only for one branch of the Austronesian language family, namely Proto-Malayic. Adelaar notes that there are few words with *c* reconstructed for Proto-Malayic, and quite a few of these may turn out to be loanwords.[60] We might therefore expect *campur* to have been borrowed into Proto-Malayic from a neighboring language, whatever it might have originally meant. The most likely source of such a borrowing would be a neighboring language in Mainland Southeast Asia, and hence probably a language belonging to the Austroasiatic family.

---

58   P. J. Zoetmulder, *Old Javanese–English Dictionary* ('s-Gravenhage: Nijhoff, 1982), 296: "*campur* mixed; unclean, in a state of impurity (because of menstruation), defiled."

59   *vruḥ yan campur avaknya*, "they thought that its child was impure," *Ādiparva* p. 7 (what Janamējaya's brothers think of Sāramēya); *sāvitrī ṅaran ira strī pativrata, tan dadi katōn dēniṅ vvaṅ campur* "Sāvitrī is what they call a *pativratā* woman, for whom it is impossible that she should be seen by an inappropriate man" (p. 13); *apan atyanta campur ikaṅ naramāṅsa* "for this human flesh is extremely impure" (p. 163). There are many similar examples from later literature. I found these references using sealang.net, although the functionality for searching the Javanese corpus appears to have disappeared in the meantime.

60   K. A. Adelaar, "More on Proto-Malayic," in Mohd. Thani Ahmad and Zaini Mohamed Zain (eds.), *Rekonstruksi dan Cabang-Cabang Bahasa* (Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia, 1988), 62; quoted in Graham Thurgood, *From Ancient Cham to Modern Dialects: Two Thousand Years of Language Contact and Change* (Honolulu: University of Hawaiʻi Press, 1999), 81–82. See also Robert Blust, *The Austronesian Languages* (Canberra: The Australian National University, 2013), 563–567.

Perhaps for some of these reasons, Mayrhofer concluded that the etymology of Sanskrit *campū* was ultimately uncertain.[61]

8   *campū* "Joke"

But here is where things get interesting. The Austroasiatic languages connect India and Southeast Asia. And as Kuiper already noted, the Austroasiatic language Santali, spoken in northeastern India, has a word *cạmpur*, which Campbell defines as "made up, concocted; yarning, joking," and Bodding as "jocular, jocose, facetious (bordering on indecency); joke, lark, make fun."[62] Kuiper did not make much of this word, since its meaning is rather different from what *campū* means in Sanskrit. But if I am right, *campū* only came to mean "a composition in mixed prose and verse" in the tenth century or so, due to a misunderstanding of Daṇḍin. We don't actually know what it meant for Daṇḍin or for earlier authors.

Or do we? There is one earlier use of the word *campū* in Sanskrit. It occurs in *Śrīghana's Manual of Conduct* (*Śrīghanācārasaṅgraha*), composed around the third century CE. Or more precisely, it occurs in Jayarakṣita's commentary on the work, composed around 500 CE. *Śrīghana's Manual* itself does not survive, since the copyist of the single surviving manuscript of Jayarakṣita's commentary left spaces for the base text but did not ultimately add it. Jayarakṣita's word-for-word commentarial style, however, allows the base text to be reconstructed in most places.[63] At the beginning of the eleventh chapter it says:

---

61   Manfred Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 2001), v. 3, p. 181.

62   Kuiper, "Indoiranica," 309; A. Campbell, *A Santali-English Dictionary* (Pokhuria: The Santal Mission Press, 1899), 88; P. O. Bodding, *A Santal Dictionary, Volume I, A-C* (Oslo: Hos Jacob Dybwad, 1932), 498. The examples Campbell gives are: *cạmpur katha alom roṛa* "do not tell a concocted story" and *ạḍi cạmpur hoṛ kanae* "he is a great yarning fellow." Bodding gives *cạmpur katha ḍher menaḱtaea* "he has a large amount of jocular language." Note the co-occurrence of *cạmpur* with *katha*.

63   J. Duncan Derrett, *A Textbook for Novices: Jayarakṣita's « Perspicuous Commentary on the Compendium of Conduct by Śrîghana »* (Torino: Edizioni Jollygrafica, 1983), 6–7; for a reconstruction, see Sanghasen Singh, "On the Restoration of the *Śrīghanācārasaṃgraha*," in H. S. Prasad (ed.), *Philosophy, Grammar, and Indology: Essays in Honour of Professor Gustav Roth* (Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1992), 283–302. Note that, for lack of an alternative, I follow Derrett's dating of the *Śrīghanācārasaṅgraha* and its commentary, although one may take issue with some of his reasons.

campūkalahadantādakāṣṭho vṛddhāntiko yatiḥ |

A monk who engages in jokes, fights, or the chewing of toothpicks is called a *vṛddhāntika*.

Jayarakṣita glosses *campū* here with *hāsya*.[64] This is an unexpected piece of evidence that fits in very well with the hypothesis that *campū* was borrowed into Sanskrit from an Austroasiatic language, where it meant something like "joke." We have very little other evidence, but it is suggestive that *cạmpur katha* still means "a made-up story, a yarn, a tall tale" in Santali. I do not know where Śrīghana was from, but if he was from the northeast, and might have encountered Austroasiatic-speaking people (or might have been one himself) then this hypothesis would be corroborated slightly. It doesn't require too much imagination, or too many steps, to think of a situation where a local word *cạmpur* was used for a particular type of literary composition, or more likely a type of literary performance, in which someone would tell an amusing story using a mixture of prose and verse. Many folk traditions have something similar.

I note that in the case of many other "minor" genres, Sanskrit has borrowed both the name and the thing from local languages. These minor genres are not very well known, because they were presumably located more on the "performance" side of the "performance/permanence" scale.[65] In the case of the performing arts, these minor genres are generally classed as *uparūpaka* or "minor forms." These are not discussed in the foundational *Treatise on Theater* (*Nāṭyaśāstra*), but are mentioned in subsequent works. Abhinavagupta (eleventh century) mentions about ten of these in his commentary to the *Treatise*, relying on earlier authorities.[66] A few have names that strongly suggest a borrowing from a language other than Sanskrit.[67] Here I will briefly review the scholarship on those minor forms.

The *saṭṭaka* is a romantic comedy in Prakrit, full of verses and musical interludes, of which several examples survive.[68] It is mentioned in the *Agnipurāṇa*

64   Derrett, *A Textbook for Novices*, 79, suggests "lampoon."

65   For this distinction see Christian Novetzke, *Religion and Public Memory: A Cultural History of Saint Namdev in India* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008), 100.

66   See *Abhinavabhāratī* vol. 1 pp. 169, 178–179 and Bose, Mandakranta. "*Uparūpaka*: A Hybrid Genre of Drama in the Sanskritic Tradition." *International Journal of Hindu Studies* 4.3 (2000): 295–296.

67   Noted already by A. N. Upadhye, *Rudradāsa's Candralekhā* (Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1967), 29; for these genres see V. Raghavan, *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa* (Madras: Punarvasu, 1963), 536–568.

68   See Chandramouli S. Naikar, *The Prakrit Plays of India* (Dharwad: Medha Publishers, 1998).

and was defined by Hēmacandra, who considered it a *rūpaka* based on the *nāṭikā* (and hence, unlike the other forms discussed here, not an *uparūpaka*).[69] The name is now agreed to come from a word *āṭṭa*, derived from a Dravidian root √*āṭu* meaning "dance" (cf. Tamil *āṭu* and Kannada *āḍu*), with the Sanskrit prefix *sa-* and suffix *-ka*, hence meaning "[the form] with dancing."[70]

The *ḍōmbikā* or *ḍōmbalikā* was known to Abhinavagupta, who quotes a definition according to which it was performed to please a king or prince, and deals with clandestine love.[71] The connection with the caste-name *ḍōmba* (*ḍōm, rōm*) is obvious; Mayrhofer thinks that the caste-name itself is based on the sound of the drum with which members of this caste were associated; Kuiper has suggested that the name is from a "Proto-Muṇḍa" root *ḍVb*.[72] H. C. Bhayani has brilliantly reconstructed the underlying language and meter of the very corrupt citations of two *ḍōmbikā*s that are quoted in the *Abhinavabhāratī* and Hēmacandra's *Kāvyānuśāsana* (titled *Cūḍāmaṇi* and *Guṇamālā*): three our of the four quotations are Apabhraṃśa *rāsaka*s, and one is a Prakrit *gāthā*.[73] Bhayani further established the the *durmilikā* found in Bhōja's list of *uparūpaka*s is a Sanskritization of *ḍōmbilikā*.[74]

The *ṣiḍgaka* was known to Abhinavagupta. Bhōja calls it *śrīgadita*, which Raghavan and Bhayani identified as a Sanskritization; Hēmacandra reads the earlier sources as *śiṅgaka* in his *Kāvyānuśāsana* and *śiṅgaṭaka* in his *Vivēka*, but also adds *śrīgadita-* as a different type.[75] Bhayani adduced the forms *ṣiḍga*, *khiḍga*, *ṣiṭga*, *ṣiṅga*, and *khiṅga*, which are defined by "commentators and lexicographers" as "a synonym of *viṭa*, *pallavaka*, *kāmuka*, *vidagdha* etc., and this meaning of 'a voluptuary,' 'a gallant,' 'a person fond of women' is supported by the actual usage in literature"; he further connects the word to *hiṅga*, defined as a "lover" (*jāra*) in Hēmacandra's Prakrit lexicon.[76] Bhayani notes that the

---

69   Bose, "*Uparūpaka*," 305.

70   Upadhye, *Rudradāsa's Candralekhā*, 29.

71   *Abhinavabhāratī* vol. 1 p. 178.

72   Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, v. 3, p. 232; F. B. J. Kuiper, *Proto-Munda Words in Sanskrit* (Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen, 1948), 87.

73   Harivallabh Bhayani, "Ḍombikā and Ṣiḍgaka," in *Indological Studies: Literary and Performing Arts, Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa Studies* (Ahmedabad: Parshva Prakashan, 1993), 25.

74   Bhayani, "Ḍombikā and Ṣiḍgaka," 27–28.

75   Bhayani, "Ḍombikā and Ṣiḍgaka," 29.

76   Bhayani, "Ḍombikā and Ṣiḍgaka," 30.

word, of uncertain origin, may be behind the common Sanskrit word *śṛṅgāra*, which otherwise lacks a compelling etymology.[77]

The *cillī* or *callī* was known to Bhōja as a dance with two rows facing each other other to the accompaniment of a drum.[78] If this is connected to the Sanskrit word *cillī* "cricket," which has a bewildering variety of spellings (*jhillī*, *cillikā, jhillikā, jhirikā, jhiñjhī* etc.), then it is clearly borrowed from a language other than Sanskrit.[79]

The *hallīsaka* or *hallīśaka*, known to Abhinavagupta, was in fact already attested in literature as a kind of group dance, going back at least to the *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana.[80] Its etymology is "unclear" according to Mayrhofer, and the root to which it has sometimes been linked, *√hall* "move," is probably itself borrowed into Sanskrit.[81] Contrary to what lexicons say, the word *hallīsaka*/*hallīśaka* does not occur in Daṇḍin's *Mirror*.[82]

Note that these are, for lack of a better term, *uparūpaka*s of *dṛśyakāvya*, i.e., minor genres related to the theater. They can feature dialogue, but they also feature song and dance, and in fact their status as "minor" genres is correlated with the predominance of song and dance in them. We do not, to my knowledge, have a corresponding list of *uparūpaka*s of *śravyakāvya*, i.e., minor genres

77   Bhayani, "Ḍombikā and Ṣiḍgaka," n. 24. See Kuiper, *Proto-Munda Words*, 125–126. The derivation from *śṛṅga* "horn" is considered difficult (at least by scholars who don't speak a language where the word "horny" is in common use), and I am incapable of evaluating Kuiper's claims, but the idea that *śṛṅgāra* is a Sanskritization of *siṅgāra* makes very good sense to me. See also Kuiper, *Proto-Munda Words*, 144, for a similar word meaning "young," possibly attested across Prakrit *siṅgaa* "boy," Marathi *śigā* "foal," and Santali *cęṅgoṛ* "small, immature."

78   Raghavan, *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa*, 566.

79   Kuiper, *Proto-Munda Words in Sanskrit*, 135.

80   Bose, "*Uparūpaka*," 296, 305.

81   Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, v. 3, p. 535. According to R. L. Turner, *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages* (London: Oxford University Press, 1962–1966), entry 14018 (**hallati*) on p. 811, the verbal root *√hall* is not found in Sanskrit apart from lexicons, but is attested in Prakrit and later Indic languages (for example Hindi *hālnā*).

82   The *Petersburger Wörterbuch* (Otto Böhtlingk and Rudolph Roth, *Sanskrit Wörterbuch* [St. Petersburg: Eggers, 1855]) cites a page range of a specific edition of the *Mirror of Literature* as evidence for the word *hallīśaka* (p. 1570). The edition used, however, is never identified. Daṇḍin's *Mirror* never uses the word, and nor do any of the premodern commentators, as far as I can tell. It does occur, however, in Jibananda Vidyasagar's modern commentary (p. 19, on v. 1.39). The confusing citation probably led Monier Monier-Williams (*A Sanskrit-English Dictionary* [Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1899], 1293) and Manfred Mayrhofer (*Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, vol. 3. p. 535), likely independently, to state incorrectly that the word is found in the *Mirror of Literature*.

that feature a single reciter, although such genres are known in abundance throughout South and Southeast Asia. I can think Cākyār Kūttu, the monologues performed by Cākyārs in Kerala, which are often a kind of "stand-up" routine, especially when the Cākyār is in the costume of the *vidūṣaka*.[83] The *Harikathā* performance, widespread throughout Southern India, is another example of the type, and the admixture of songs and prose narration has prompted some scholars to compare it to the *campū*.[84]

9   The History of *campū* as a Genre-name Must Be Separated from the History of Prosimetric Forms

The long history of prosimetric forms in South Asia has not been told, and this paper does not even attempt to tell it. If I am right, however, then we have to separate the development of the prosimetric form within the context of Indian Buddhism, which Michael Hahn and others have written about at length, from a second, later, development of prosimetric forms, tied to the influence of Bāṇa. The first includes the genre of *Jātakamālā* and other story collections, including some that only survive in Chinese, but which must have been spectacular examples of the mixed prose-verse form: I am thinking of Kumāralāta's *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā Dṛṣṭāntapaṅkti* (third century CE), Saṅgharakṣa's story of the Buddha's life in the *Saṅgharakṣasamuccaya* (僧伽羅剎所集經, T194, second century CE), and Saṅghasēna's *Jātakamālā* (菩薩本緣經, T153, third century CE).[85] As noted above, these works never call themselves *campū*, or even use the word, but Ratnaśrījñāna considered the *Jātakamālā* (or perhaps several *Jātakamālā*s) to exemplify the genre.

I have suggested that up until the time of Daṇḍin, the *campū* was really the *campur*, a popular genre (but "minor" from the elite perspective of Sanskrit discourse) wherein a storyteller would combine prose and verse to tell a comic story. Of course we would like more evidence for this suggestion.

---

83   As already compared by Vedia, "Campū," 51 and *Campū—Sāhitya ane Svarūpa*, 8, citing K. Kunjunni Raja, *The Contribution of Kerala to Sanskrit Literature*, (Madras [Chennai]: University of Madras, 1958).

84   Suryanarayana Rao, "Origin and Development of *Campū*s," 179.

85   Hahn, *Haribhaṭṭa in Nepal*, 40–41; also the table in Hahn, *Haribhaṭṭa and Gopadatta*, 4: "early Campū" includes "Kumāralāta's *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā* and Saṅghasena's legends," "Campū" includes "Āryaśūra's *Jātakamālā* and *Maitrakanyaka*," and "Degeberated (sic) Campū" includes "Gopadatta's *Saptakumārikāvadāna*." See Martin Straube, "Narratives: South Asia," in Jonathan Silk (ed.), *Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism, Volume 1* (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 500–502, who points out that *Bodhisattvāvadānasūtra* (菩薩本緣經) is "most likely not the original title" of Saṅghasena's work.

The *campū* as we know it, however, is a post-Bāṇa development. It appears that Bāṇa's revolutionary use of Sanskrit prose in his *Kādambarī* and *Deeds of Harṣa* inspired many poets to undertake similar experiments. I suspect that the use of mixed prose and verse in Prakrit, as we see it in Haribhadra's *Story of Samarāditya* (early eighth century) and Uddyōtana's *Kuvalayamālā* (779), is an attempt to combine Bāṇa's innovative use of prose with the use of verse that earlier Prakrit stories, such as *Taraṅgavaī*, had established for narrative. Similarly Bāṇa had many admirers in Karnataka, where the use of mixed prose and verse characterizes the earliest period of intense literary production, from Pampa (941) to Nāgavarma (1042). Mixed prose and verse was surely one of the most popular genres of literature in the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries of the common era. Clearly there was a complex set of influences that account for the trend, and only a careful study of Bāṇa and his successors in Sanskrit, Prakrit, and Kannada will start to identify those influences. These traditions, however, did not refer to themselves, and were not referred to by others, with the name *campū*, until Trivikrama (ca. 915). Trivikrama, I argued, is probably "patient zero" for the use of *campū* to refer to a mixed prose-verse composition *per se*, and he probably learned (or mislearned) the word in this sense from Daṇḍin's *Mirror of Literature*. Trivikrama started the trend of calling such compositions *campū*, and Sanskrit compositions that took him as a model also took from him this sense of *campū*. Eventually any work, in any language, that combined prose and verse could be called by this name.

References

Primary Texts

Abhinavabhāratī of Abhinavagupta (early eleventh century): K. Krishnamoorthy (ed.). *The Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharatamuni with the Commentary Abhinavabhāratī by Abhinavaguptācārya.* Vol. 1 (Chapters 1–7). Fourth edition. Vadodara: Oriental Institute, 1992.

Ānandakandacampū of Mitramiśra: Nanda Kishore Sharma (ed.). *The Ānanda-kanda-champū by Mitra Miśra.* Benares: Vidya Vilas Press, 1931.

Anantanāthapurāṇaṃ of Janna (ca. 1230 CE): D. Srinivasachar and H. R. Rangaswamy Iyengar (eds.). *Anandanathapuranam by Janna.* Mysore: Government Branch Press, 1930.

Analysis of Literature (*Kāvyāvalōkanaṃ*) of Nāgavarma II (ca. 1042 CE): H. Dēvīrappa (ed.). *Nāgavarma Viracita Kāvyāvalōkanaṃ.* Bengaluru: Kannaḍa Sāhitya Pariṣattu, 2004.

Bhārata in Veṇpā Verse (*Pāratavēṇpā*) of Peruntēvaṉār: A. Kōpālaiyaṉ (ed.). 1924. *Peruntēvaṉār Pāratam eṉṉum Pāratavēṇpā, Uttiyōka Paruvam.* Ceṉṉai: Centamiḻ Mantiram.

Campūrāmāyaṇa: Vāsudēva Śarmā (ed.). *Campūrāmāyaṇam Lakṣmaṇasūriviracitaṃ Yuddhakāṇḍam, Rāmacandrabudhēndraviracitayā vyākhayā samētam.* Mumbaī: Tukārāma Jāvajī, 1917.

Critique of Religion (*Dharmaparīkṣe*) of Vṛttavilāsa (early fifteenth century): K. Raghavendra Rao (ed.). *Vṛttavilāsa Viracita Dharmaparīkṣe.* Mysore: University of Mysore, 1982.

Illumination of the Erotic (*Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*) by Bhōja (early eleventh century): Rewāprasāda Dwivedī (ed.). *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* [*Sāhityaprakāśa*] *by Bhojarāja.* 2 vols. New Delhi: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts, 2007.

Jātakamālā of Āryaśūra (ca. 400 CE): See Basu 1989.

Kuvalayamālā of Uddyōtana (779 CE): A. N. Upadhye (ed.). *Kuvalayamālā of Uddyotana Sūri. A Unique Campū in Prakrit.* Bombay [Mumbai]: Bhāratīya Vidyā Bhavana, 1959.

Kuvalayamālākathā of Ratnaprabhasūri (1260s CE): A. N. Upadhye (ed.). *Kuvalayamālā of Uddyotana Sūri. A Unique Campū in Prakrit. Part II: Ratnaprbha* [sic] *Sūri's Kuvalayamālā Kathā.* Bombay [Mumbai]: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1970.

Mirror of Literature (*Kāvyadarśa*) of Daṇḍin (ca. 700 CE): (1) With Yāmuna's *Vyākhyā*, British Library OR 9340 (copied from a palm-leaf ms. on Sept. 29, 1923 by V. Venkaṭarāma Śarmā Śāstrī); (2) With the commentaries of Vādijaṅghāladēva, Taruṇavācaspati, and an anonymous commentator: Vē. Kṛṣṇamācārya (ed.). *Ācāryadaṇḍiviracitaḥ Kāvyadarśaḥ.* Tiruvādi: Tiruvādi Śrīnivāsa Mudraṇālaya, 1936. (3) With the commentary of Ratnaśrījñāna: Anantalal Thakur and Upendra Jha (eds.). *Kāvyalakṣaṇa of Daṇḍin* (*Also Known as Kāvyādarśa*)*, with Commentary Called Ratnaśrī of Ratnaśrījñāna.* Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning, 1957. (4) With the commentary of Jivananda Vidyasagar: Jivananda Vidyasagar (ed.). *Kāvyādarśaḥ.* Kalikātā [Kolkata]: Nārāyaṇayantra, 1890. [Second edition.] (5) With a Sinhalese *sannaya*: Ratmalānē Dharmakīrti Śrī Dharmārāma (ed.). *Pūrvācāryaya Varapaṇḍitavyākhyānasahita Mahākaviśrīdaṇḍyācāryaya Viracita Kāvyādarśaya.* Peliyagoda: Satyasamuccaya Press, 1925.

Nalacampū of Trivikrama (ca. 915 CE): Śivadatta (ed.). *Damayantīkathā athavā Nalacampūḥ. Mahākaviśrītrivikramabhaṭṭaviracitā Caṇḍapālakṛtayā Viṣamapadaprakāśākhyavyākhayā Sahitā.* Mumbaī: Nirṇaya Sāgara Mudraṇayantrālayaḥ, 1884.

Naḷacampu of Cauṇḍarāja (ca. 1220 CE): H. R. Rangaswamy Iyengar and S. N. Krishna Jois. *Nalacampu of Caundaraja.* Mysore: Government Branch Press, 1952.

Ornament of Literature (*Kāvyālaṅkāra*) of Bhāmaha: Printed as an appendix in Kamalâśaṅkara Prâṇaśaṅkara Trivedî (ed.). *The Pratâparudrayośobhûshaṇa of Vidyânâtha. With the Commentary, Ratnâpaṇa, of Kumârasvâmin, Son of Mallinâtha,*

and With a Critical Notice of Manuscripts, Introduction, Critical and Explanatory Notes and an Appendix Containing the Kâvyâlaṅkâra of Bhâmaha. Number 65 in Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series. Bombay: Government Central Press, 1909.

Ornament of Our Own Language (*Siya bas lakara*) of Salameva (ca. 920 CE): Don Baron Jayatilaka (ed.). *Siyabas Lakara or Siṇhalese Rhetoric by King Silámeghavarṇa paraphrased by Ratnamadhvácárya.* Colombo, 1892.

Ratnaśrīṭīkā of Ratnaśrījñāna (ca. 925 CE): See *Mirror of Literature* (3).

Śrīghana's Manual of Conduct (*Śrīghanācārasaṅgraha*): See Singh 1992.

Udayasundarī of Sōḍḍhala (ca. 1025 CE): C. D. Dalal and Embar Krishnamacharya (eds.). *Udayasundarîkathâ of Soddhala* [sic]. Baroda: Central Library, 1929.

Way of the Poet-King (*Kavirājamārgaṃ*) of Śrīvijaya (ca. 870 CE): T. V. Venkatachala Sastry (ed.). *Śrīvijayaprabhūtaṃ Kavirājamārgaṃ.* Tumakūru: Tumakūru Viśvavidyālaya, 2011.

Yaśastilakacampū by Sōmadēva (959 CE): Śivadatta and Kâshînâtha Pâṇḍurang Parab (eds). *The Yaśastilaka of Somadeva Sûri, with the Commentary of Śrutadeva Sûri.* Kâvyamâlâ 70. Bombay [Mumbai]: Nirṇaya-Sâgara Press, 1901.

Secondary Literature

Adelaar, K. A. "More on Proto-Malayic," in Mohd. Thani Ahmad and Zaini Mohamed Zain (eds.), *Rekonstruksi dan Cabang-Cabang Bahasa*, 59–77. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia, 1988.

Bailey, Harold W. *Dictionary of Khotan Saka.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Basu, Ratna. *Eine Literatur-kritische Studie zu Āryaśūras Jātakamālā zusammen mit einer kritischen Edition der anonymen Jātakamālāṭīkā und einer kritischen Edition der Jātakamālāpañjikā des Vīryasiṃha.* Ph.D. thesis, Bonn, 1989.

Bhayani, Harivallabh. "Ḍombikā and Ṣiḍgaka." In *Indological Studies: Literary and Performing Arts, Prakrit and Apabhraṁśa Studies,* 20–33. Ahmedabad: Parshva Prakashan, 1993.

Blust, Robert. *The Austronesian Languages.* Canberra: The Australian National University, 2013.

Bodding, P. O. *A Santal Dictionary, Volume I, A-C.* Oslo: Hos Jacob Dybwad, 1932.

Böhtlingk, Otto and Rudolph Roth. *Sanskrit Wörterbuch.* St. Petersburg: Eggers, 1855.

Bose, Mandakranta. "*Uparūpaka*: A Hybrid Genre of Drama in the Sanskritic Tradition." *International Journal of Hindu Studies* 4.3 (2000): 289–312.

Bronner, Yigal. "Dandin and the Dawn of Kashmiri Poetics," in Yigal Bronner (ed.), *A Lasting Vision: Dandin's* Mirror *in the World of Asian Letters*, 259–264. New York: Oxford University Press. DOI 10.1093/oso/9780197642924.003.0006.

Campbell, A. *A Santali-English Dictionary.* Pokhuria: The Santal Mission Press, 1899.

Chojnacki, Christine. *Kuvalayamālā: Roman jaina de 779 composé par Uddyotanasūri: Vol. I. Étude*. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 2008. Translated from French into English by Alexander Reynolds, *Uddyotanasūri's Kuvalayamālā: A Jain Novel from 779 AD, First Volume.* Bangalore: Sapna Book House, 2018.

Chojnacki, Christine. "The emergence of the Campū genre in Prakrit before the 10th century: Uddyotana's *Kuvalayamālā* and Śīlānka's *Cauppannamahāpurisa-cariya*," in Luitgard and Jay Soni (eds.), *Sanmati: Essays in Honour of Prof. Hampa Nagarajaiah's 80th Birthday*, 97–117. Bangalore: Sapna Book House, 2015.

De, S. K. "The Campū." *Journal of the Ganganath Jha Research Institute* 1 (1943): 56–65.

De Jonckheere, Heleen. *The Never-ending Test: A Jain Tradition of Narrative Adaptations.* Ph.D. thesis, Ghent University, 2020.

Derrett, J. Duncan. *A Textbook for Novices: Jayarakṣita's « Perspicuous Commentary on the Compendium of Conduct by Śrîghana ».* Torino: Edizioni Jollygrafica, 1983.

Deshpande, C. R. *Studies in Campū Literature.* Delhi: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, 1992.

Dimitrov, Dragomir. *The Legacy of the Jewel Mind: On the Sanskrit, Pali, and Sinhalese Works by Ratnamati: A Philological Chronicle* (*Phullalocanavaṃsa*). Naples: Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale," 2016.

Hahn, Michael. *Haribhaṭṭa and Gopadatta.* Tokyo: The Reiyukai Library, 1977.

Hahn, Michael. *Haribhaṭṭa in Nepal: Ten Legends from His Jātakamālā and the Anonymous Śākyasiṃhajātaka.* Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 2007.

Hallisey, Charles. "'May It Always Be about Adding Beauty to Beauty': The Story of the *Mirror* in Sri Lanka," in Yigal Bronner (ed.), *A Lasting Vision: Dandin's* Mirror *in the World of Asian Letters,* 141–201. New York: Oxford University Press, 2023. DOI 10.1093/oso/9780197642924.003.0004.

Handiqui, K. K. *Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture.* Sholapur: Jaina Saṃskṛti Saṃrakshaka Sangha, 1968.

Handurukande, Ratna. *Five Buddhist Legends in the Campū Style.* Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 1984.

Jayadēva, H. K.. "Kavirājamārgadavarigina Sāhitya Kṛtigaḷu mattu Śāstragranthagaḷu," in *Samagra Kannaḍa Sāhitya Caritre 1*, 71–78. Beṅgalūru: Beṅgalūru Viśvavidyālaya, 1974.

Jones, Jamal. *A Poetics of Power in Andhra, 1323–1450 CE.* Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 2018.

Keerthi, Naresh. "Bāṇana Mukuṭatāḍitaka mattu Rannana Gadāyuddha." *Kannaḍa Sāhitya Pariṣat Pattrike* 100 (2022): 70–78.

Kuiper, F. B. J. "Indoiranica." *Acta Orientalia* 16 (1938): 203–220, 295–326.

Kuiper, F. B. J. *Proto-Munda Words in Sanskrit.* Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen, 1948.

Kunjunni Raja, K. *The Contribution of Kerala to Sanskrit Literature.* Madras [Chennai]: University of Madras, 1958.

Lienhard, Siegfried. *A History of Classical Poetry: Sanskrit—Pali—Prakrit*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1984.

Lutjeharms, Rembert. *A Vaisnava Poet in Early Modern Bengal: Kavikarnapura's Splendour of Speech.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.

Mariyappa Bhaṭṭa, M. "Campūkāvyada Prārambhakāraru," in *Samagra Kannaḍa Sāhitya Caritre 1*, 57–59. Beṅgalūru: Beṅgalūru Viśvavidyālaya, 1975.

Mayrhofer, Manfred. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1986–2001. 3 vols.

Monier-Williams, Monier. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1899.

Naikar, Chandramouli S. *The Prakrit Plays of India.* Dharwad: Medha Publishers, 1998.

Narasimhacharya, R. *Karṇāṭaka Kavicarite, Volume 1 (To the end of the 14th Century).* Bangalore: Bangalore Press, 1924.

Novetzke, Christian. *Religion and Public Memory: A Cultural History of Saint Namdev in India.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.

Ollett, Andrew and Sarah Pierce Taylor. "The *Way of the Poet-King:* Authority, Intertextuality, Language," in Yigal Bronner (ed.), *A Lasting Vision: Dandin's* Mirror *in the World of Asian Letters,* 94–111. New York: Oxford University Press, 2023. DOI 10.1093/oso/9780197642924.003.0003.

Raghavan, V. *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa*. Madras: Punarvasu, 1963.

Ramesh, K. V. *Inscriptions of the Western Gangas.* Delhi: Indian Council of Historical Research, 1984.

Rix, Helmut (ed.). *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2001. Second edition.

Sharma, Sudarshan Kumar. *Tilakamañjarī of Dhanapāla: A Social and Cultural Study*. Delhi: Parimal Publications, 2002.

Singh, Sanghasen. "On the Restoration of the Śrīghanācārasaṃgraha," in H. S. Prasad (ed.), *Philosophy, Grammar, and Indology: Essays in Honour of Professor Gustav Roth*, 283–302. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1992.

Straube, Martin. "Narratives: South Asia," in Jonathan Silk (ed.), *Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, *Volume 1*, 489–506. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Suryanarayana Rao, K. "Origin and Development of *Campū*s," in *Felicitation Volume Presented to Mahamahopadhyaya Dr. V. V. Mirashi*, 175–188. Nagpur: Vidarbha Samshodhan Mandal, 1965.

Thurgood, Graham. *From Ancient Cham to Modern Dialects: Two Thousand Years of Language Contact and Change*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999.

Tripāṭhī, Chavināatha. *Campū Kāvya kā Ālōcanātmaka ēvaṃ Aitihāsika Adhyayana*. Varanasi: Caukhambā Vidyābhavana, 1965.

Turner, R. L. *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages.* London: Oxford University Press, 1962–1966.

Upadhye, A. N. (ed.). *Rudradāsa's Candralekhā.* Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1967.

Vedia, G. "Campū: An Experiment in Free-Style Composition." *Sambodhi* 14 (1990): 49–56.

Vedia, G. *Campūkāvya—Sāhitya ane Svarūpa.* Gandhinagar: Saṃskṛta Sāhitya Akādamī, 1998.

Veṅkaṭasubbayya, G. (ed.). *Kannaḍa Sāhitya Pariṣattina Kannaḍa Nighaṇṭu, volume 3.* Beṅgalūru: Kannaḍa Sāhitya Pariṣattu, 1977.

Veṅkaṭācalaśāstrī, T. V. "Campu," in H. M. Nāyaka (ed.), *Kannaḍa Adhyayana Saṃstheya Kannaḍa Sāhitya Caritre, Mūraneya Sampuṭa.* Mysore: Kannaḍa Adhyayana Saṃsthe, Maisūru Viśvavidyālaya, 1976, 300–330. (Reprinted in T. V. Veṅkaṭācalaśāstrī, *Śāstrīya vol. 2*, Mysore: Sapna Book House, 2018, 290–319.)

Venkatachala Sastry, T. V. *Mahākāvyalakṣaṇa.* Translated by H. V. Nagaraja Rao. Mysore: Centre of Excellence for Studies in Classical Kannada, 2015.

Warder, A. K. *Indian Kāvya Literature, Volume Six: The Art of Storytelling.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1992.

Winternitz, M. *History of Indian Literature, Volume III.* Translated by Subhadra Jha. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1985. (First edition 1963.)

Zoetmulder, P. J., with the collaboration of Stuart Robson. *Old Javanese–English Dictionary.* 's-Gravenhage: Nijhoff, 1982.

Zvelebil, Kamil. *Companion Studies to the History of Tamil Literature.* Leiden: Brill, 1992.