

8

Saffron in the Rasam

Whitney Cox

Sometime around the year 1087 CE, the poet Bilhaṇa suffered a bout of homesickness. Though born and raised in the village of Koṇamukha in Kashmir, Bilhaṇa had made his way in the world as a peripatetic paṇḍit and author and was at the time living at the court of the Cālukya king Vikramāditya VI in Kalyāṇa (now Basavakalyāṇ in Bidar district in northeastern Karnataka). It was perhaps as he was putting the final touches on his verse biography of his royal patron, the *Vikramāṅkadevacarita*, that he decided to include the following verse:

*sahodarāḥ kuṅkumakesarāṅgāḥ bhavanti nūnaṃ kavītvīlāsāḥ |
na śāradādeśam apāsyā dṛṣṭas teṣāṃ yad anyatra mayā prarohaḥ||*

It seems that those who really delight in poetry are close kin to the saffron flower, for I haven't seen a trace of them anywhere else since I left Kashmir, Sarasvatī's country!¹

We can feel some empathy for Bilhaṇa, still, he was not being entirely fair, or accurate. The late eleventh century was a time of fervid literary creativity in the southern peninsula; but more important, this was a creativity fueled in a great many ways by the learned culture of the Valley of Kashmir itself. Though we know more about Bilhaṇa's career than perhaps any other (and though he was a poet of genius), he was only a single player in the much wider drama of the dissemination of this culture. The abundant surviving evidence of this dissemination presents us with a centuries-long collective effort to import and domesticate the many discrete sectors of the learned culture of Kashmir. Authors like Bilhaṇa found themselves and their works met with interest throughout the peninsula, while in turn southerners made the long trek northward to study and return with fresh copies of the texts they studied there.

Clearly, what I refer to here is an episode in the history of the Sanskrit cosmopolis, that centuries-long political, cultural, and sociomoral complex

that Sheldon Pollock has described so compellingly. It is in light of this that I want to address the southern reception and adaptation of Kashmir's Sanskritic culture.² The movement of literati and their texts from Kashmir to the southern reaches of the subcontinent might appear to be simply a part of the steady state of cosmopolitan life, to be in fact just one of the many channels of cultural flows that knit this world together during the centuries that it perdured. For Sanskritic literati to have been cosmopolitan, after all, presumes and to some degree necessitates the fact that they participated in the cultural conversation with their counterparts in other parts of southern Asia. There are, however, a number of ways in which this particular process can be distinguished within the wider cosmopolitan order.

First of all, there is the nature of the specific contributions of Kashmir to Sanskrit literature and systematic thought. As McCrea (2008) has demonstrated for the history of Sanskrit literary theory (*alankāraśāstra*), and as I think can be argued more generally, Kashmir from the middle of the ninth century was home to a series of revolutions in systematic thought (*śāstra*) and literature (*kāvya*) both.³ The dissemination of this at once self-consciously Kashmirian and self-consciously avant-garde ferment already presents us with a series of discrete events, individual moments where the rules of the cosmopolitan game were substantially revised. And while the South was hardly the sole beneficiary of these innovations, it was powerfully and indelibly effected by them.

But more important, this suggests ways in which we might begin to understand the sociality of Sanskrit literature and knowledge more precisely, and so to track the historical contours of Sanskrit's career in the second millennium of the common era. In mapping the space of Sanskrit and the cosmopolitan vernacular literatures, Pollock has argued that it is royal courts that acted as venues for practically all consequential cultural production and reimagination, and he has presented massive amounts of documentation to support this claim.⁴ But while we do in fact see that the courtly milieu provided a site for the southern domestication of Kashmirian texts and authors, it was only one of a plurality of such forums. Poets like Bilhaṇa were surely attracted to these bright, glamorous centers of cultural life, but these can best be understood as the important nodes within networks that stretched through a multitude of different social spaces, ranging from individual households and Brahmanical estates to dispersed communities of shared religious discipline and collectively cultivated literary taste.

Equally, the southern reception of the diverse world of Kashmirian Sanskrit textuality provides yet another case of the continued vitality of Sanskrit as a

medium of thought and expression even in the midst of vernacular ascendancy. Kashmirian texts were as actively incorporated by authors writing in the Dravidian vernaculars as they were by those working exclusively in Sanskrit, and it is possible to see in the early centuries of the second millennium the creation and vital flourishing of the sort of Sanskrit cultures that were at once consummately cosmopolitan and deeply inflected by the local, of the sort to which Bronner and Shulman (2006) have recently drawn attention.⁵

It is with all of this in mind that I would like to linger for a moment on Bilhaṇa's rather melancholy verse, especially its poetic conceit or *utprekṣā*. People of real taste and sensitivity (*kavitāvilāsāḥ*) are just like the saffron crocus: you cannot find them anywhere but in the Valley of Kashmir. It is not just the crocus, but its pistil (*kesara*), that Bilhaṇa calls to mind here: it is this part of the crocus, of course, that is dried to make the spice or vegetable dye that we call saffron (*kuṅkuma*). And the only place in southern Asia where the saffron crocus grows is in fact Kashmir. But while saffron is only native to the valley, it was a luxury that some people possessed and a great many more knew about and desired throughout India, even into the deep South. One of the ways we know this is because an association of peddlars and merchants calling itself the Five Hundred Masters of Ayyāvoḷe mentions saffron specifically among the goods it had in trade in the Kannada and Tamil countries, both in the eulogistic advertisements that begin its surviving public records and in the details of its accounts.⁶

In the far South, however, something very peculiar happened to those saffron threads that wended their way down from the northern mountains. This rare, precious stuff came to be fused during its passage through the southern regions with something far more homely and nearer to hand, in the form of the powdered root of the turmeric plant. Turmeric, with its slight taste of bitterness and its penchant for dyeing clothes (and fingers) yellow is a sensible enough substitute for saffron, which—then as now—was an expensive luxury. This engendered an interesting and far-ranging confusion: in the medieval period, and in as places as far-flung as Basra and the Chinese imperial court, Indian saffron and Indian turmeric were so often referred to by the same name as to be indistinguishable. These spices (whatever they were) were almost certainly transhipped through the southern ports of Malabar or Coḷamaṇḍalam (where, it should be said, the two are always kept lexically distinct: *hāridrā* or *mañcal* is never the same as *kuṅkuma*). This confusion continued into the early modern period; A Portuguese account from the 1560s calls turmeric “country saffron” and points southward from Goa to Kerala and Karnataka as its source, noting that people all over the Arabian Sea and into Turkey were

confused by the two.⁷ The legacy of this substitution remains with us today; many European languages, as well as the Linnaean classificatory binomial for the turmeric plant, *Curcuma longa*, retain a distant echo of its conceptual fusion with saffron, that is, with *kuikuma*.

In laying my interests in texts alongside the curious history of saffron's cultural life in South India and beyond, I don't just mean this to be just a conceit, the way that Bilhana did. Rather, it is for me vitally important to try to understand the history of texts as a part of the history of social life and material culture. It was along the same routes that saffron traveled southward—and perhaps in the same caravans or even the same parcels—that the textual culture of Kashmir went global within the Indic world of the early second millennium, with massive and palpable consequences for intellectual, religious, and cultural life in the far south, the ramifications of which are still with us.

We can reject outright the explanation that this was the fallout from Turkic incursions in the North. There is no evidence that suggests that the depredations of Ghaznavid or other Central Asian warrior groups had any immediate effect on Kashmir in this period (indeed, al-Beruni and Kalhana both say just the opposite), and the continuous circulation of texts from the twelfth century onward suggests that the occupation of the northern Indian plains by the nascent Sultanate had a negligible effect on the steady trickle of manuscripts, scribes, and literati into and out of Kashmir.

Something that bears emphasis is how rapidly this process seems to unfold. Within a generation of Bilhana's lifetime, around the turn of the twelfth century, there is evidence of a great number of quite recently composed Kashmirian texts being studied in the South.⁸ While accounts as rich as Bilhana's are few and far between, a much richer attestation of this movement can be seen in the surviving manuscripts of texts of Kashmirian origin that were transmitted to the South and there copied and disseminated. As a result of the anonymous labors of thousands of copyists, interested readers, and bibliophiles throughout the peninsula, we find texts—especially works on poetics and Śaiva religious materials—that have since disappeared in the North, or that were studied much more intensely in the South.

A census of such works, published and unpublished, would be a valuable contribution to our knowledge. But what I think may be the most suggestive way to begin to understand the significance of this process of reception and adaptation is by tracing pieces of language rather than entire texts. By this, I don't mean quotation or commentary in the conventional way we think about these, though both occurred. Instead, I mean the ways that integral "chunks" of

Kashmirian works were unmoored from their textual surroundings by southern authors and then resituated within their own works. This is not plagiarism or simple epitome: the language of Kashmirian authors—ranging from key words and phrases to whole textual arguments—was borrowed, refigured, and transformed in southern hands.

The very fact of this process of textual recasting is very telling; what we are faced with in the southern materials is not evidence of a straightforward *translatio studii* or of the unmarked movement within some isotonic, putatively self-identical cosmopolitan space. Instead, we can begin to glimpse the workings of a complex negotiation between the local needs and problematics and the inheritance of several brilliant generations of thinkers and authors active within the Kashmirian hothouse. It is not just that Kashmirian texts and authors supplied a prestigious set of models to be adopted, whether in style or in content—invoking “prestige” in any case simply assumes what is to be proven. Instead, we can see their idioms, characteristic turns of phrase, and intellectual problematics being refitted to a different milieu. Refitted, but also rewritten in a way that at times makes the shape of the original almost indistinguishable. Once you begin to look carefully for these transformations, the distance from northern model to southern adaptation itself can tell us interesting things, ranging from data for textual criticism to larger issues of intellectual orientation and cultural ethos.

These traces of Kashmirian language can be difficult to track, until you learn how to see them. It is as if threads of Kashmiri saffron had been mixed into a dish of *rasam*, the prototypically southern broth of pepper and tamarind. The saffron traces are certainly there, adding something indelible, but their fragrance, flavor, and color are mixed up with local tastes and ingredients. Southern authors mixed in their Kashmirian ingredients with care, and the end result differed from anything you might have found in the valley.

There are three case studies of these textual transformations that I would like to briefly outline here. In these, we move successively away from Bilhaṇa’s adopted home in the northwestern Deccan, down through the west coast and into the heartland of the Tamil plains. The cases I will survey date from the second half of the twelfth to the end of the thirteenth century; while I lay no claim to being exhaustive—indeed, all three are not much more than sketches of deeply complex textual dynamics—they are meant to index separate but related tendencies within the transfiguration of Kashmirian knowledge and literary energy in the wider South. Successively but cumulatively, they are meant to highlight the resituation of Kashmirian problematics within the different social, intellectual, and institutional landscape of the peninsula.

Case I: Balligāve

In the twelfth century the town of Balligāve was the capital of the Banavāse region, the prize jewel of the western Deccan. Several of the town's Cālukya-style temples (notably the Dakṣiṇakedāreśvara and the Pañcaliṅgeśvara) are home to a remarkable corpus of epigraphical documents. These inscriptions, written in both Sanskrit and Kannada and detailing the workings of a series of institutions associated with the Śaiva order referred to therein as the Kālāmukhas,⁹ have been the subject of numerous studies since their initial publication by Rice in 1901.¹⁰ There is, however, a telling detail to be found there that has heretofore gone unnoticed. A great many of these records begin with a noteworthy invocatory verse, one familiar to any student of Sanskrit literature. It reads:

*namas tuṅgaśīraścumbicandracāmaracārove |
trailokyanagarārambhāmūlastambhāya śambhave ||*

Made lovely by that fly-whisk, the Moon,
as it kisses the top of His head,
praise be to Śambhu,
the central pillar in the construction of the city
that is the triple world.

This is the opening benediction to Bāṇa's *Harṣacarita*. The Balligāve records are hardly unique in this choice; interestingly enough, this *śloka* had a long and distinguished career as the industry standard opening to epigraphical charters throughout the Deccan. For centuries, and irrespective of the ruling dynasty, Deccani engravers long felt the need to open their works with this elegantly alliterative prayer to Śiva, employing it as what Pollock, in another context, has called their epigraphical "letterhead" (2006: 156). What is remarkable in a few cases among the Balligāve records is what comes next. In three cases, subjoined to this verse is a second invocation:

*namaḥ śāśvatikānandajñānaiśvaramayātmane |
saṃkalpasaphalabrahmastambārambhāya śambhave ||*

Consisting solely of sempiternal joy, wisdom, and power,
praise be to Śambhu,
at whose behest all the doings of the world,
from Brahmā to the merest blade of grass
are brought to fruition.

Even to a reader without Sanskrit, the close accord between these two verses

in their sound and shape is obvious. But this second *śloka*, written as a clear homage to Bāṇa's, was not a southern invention. Rather, it is the opening verse to Jayantabhaṭṭa's late-ninth-century *Nyāyamañjarī*, a masterpiece of philosophical speculation composed in the midst of the opening decades of Kashmir's intellectual revolution. The relationship between the two verses is, as I said, clear enough;¹¹ its three occurrences here (EC 7: Sk. 92, Sk. 96, Sk. 119), dated 1168, 1179, and 1181 CE, are all found in records containing the *birudas* of the Kalacuri king Bijjaḷa (/Bijjaṇa) and are all closely associated with an activist Kālāmukha abbot (*maṭhādhipati*) called Vāmaśakti.¹² This Śaiva guru appears to have closely linked his public fortunes with the Kalacuri king, as well as his son and successor Sovideva, who at the time had seized control of the Banavāse from their erstwhile Cālukya overlords.¹³ Interestingly, the use of the Jayanta verse can itself be placed in a longer historical narrative of the region, as for some decades the public narrative of Balligāve and Banavāse more generally had been in a state of flux. The anonymous poet-compilers of these and other local records had ceased by the early decades of the twelfth century simply to reproduce the words of the Cālukya chancellery (and had abandoned the Cālukya letterhead verse *jayaty āviṣkṛtam viṣṇor*, etc.) and entered a period of experimentation, trying out new poetic-rhetorical means in which to frame themselves and their charters' claims.¹⁴

On one level, these records function as a kind of epigraphic literary criticism, with the Kālāmukha composers drawing attention to the Kashmirian philosopher's source text. But in juxtaposing the two verses, exactly reproducing their text, the Kālāmukhas subtly but definitively announced themselves to be participants in the common cultural order that united the disparate kingdoms of the central and western Deccan. At the same time they implied that this did not form the limits of their textual horizons and that they saw themselves as heirs to the intellectual project embodied in Jayanta's great work. For the Balligāve Kālāmukhas' relationship to the *Nyāyamañjarī* does not in fact end with this invocation. These Kālāmukha inscriptions are primarily records of pious donations to the temples and their affiliated *maṭhas* (monastic institutions), but they also furnish a detailed perspective on the politics of knowledge in twelfth-century Kannada country. And in the language and rhetoric they use in crafting these representations, these records are indebted to Jayanta's effort to place logic, or Nyāya (and a decidedly Śaiva theistic spin on Nyāya at that), at the summit of the forms of Brahmanical knowledge. As Kei Kataoka (2003) and Csaba Dezső (2006) have recently demonstrated, Jayanta's proposition was that it is only Nyāya that could mount a reasoned defense of the traditional Vedic orthodoxy and so provide a bulwark against

the corrosive influence of Buddhism in late-first-millennium Kashmir.¹⁵

Key to this was an argument about disciplinarity, that is, about the hierarchy of the Brahmanical knowledges or the fourteen *vidyāsthānas*. Some years ago, Pollock drew attention to the importance of Jayanta's remounting of this old ideological commonplace in the opening section of the NM.¹⁶ The Kālāmukhas constantly point toward this hierarchy of accepted and rejected knowledge but in the different world of the Deccan in the early second millennium. The indebtedness of the Kālāmukhas to the *Nyāyamañjarī* does not seem to be traceable in the form of direct quotation of the text's arguments; instead, it rests on an adoption of its ethos and rhetoric. This is especially evident in the ornate eulogies to the leading members of the order found throughout the corpus. These eulogies are "workly" representations, in Pollock's terms (1998a, 2006), attempts to secure fame for their subjects while equally intervening into social life in consequential ways. It is Jayanta's particular vision of Vedic orthodoxy sustained and defended by Nyāya, with the other forms of knowledge as subsidiary, including the Kālāmukha/Pāśupata scriptures, that forms the key to these inscriptions' rhetoric, as in the following verse praising Vāmaśakti (Sk. 102, 1162 CE):

*vedo mūlam atho vṛtīr dṛḍhataṛaṃ nyāyādiśāstraṃ khalu
smṛtyādir viṣṭapas satāṃ kisalayo dharmānurāgaḥ kriyāḥ |
puṣpaṃ yat śivaśāsanoktividitaṃ saṅkalpitārthaṃ phalaṃ
dharmāḥ kalpataruḥ karotu bhavataḥ śrīvāmaśakter muneh ||*

The Veda is its root, and indeed Nyāya and the other knowledge systems are firmly [set as] a fence, the *smṛtis* and other [authoritative teachings] are its branches, good people's devotion to *dharmā* its fresh shoots, and their actions its blossom: Vāmaśakti, revered sage, may the wish-giving tree of your teaching yield up the promised fruit that is taught in Śiva's scriptures.¹⁷

The incorporation of Jayanta's hierarchy of knowledge, incidentally, goes some way toward explaining a feature of the records' rhetoric that has puzzled earlier readers: their studied ambivalence toward other schools of thought. When, in an early-twelfth-century record, the Kālāmukha official Someśvara is described as "The spring month of Caitra for [the blossoming of] the mango-tree that is [the Jain logician] Akalaṅka" and "the jangling pearl necklace on the wide throat of Lady Mīmāṃsā" and when, a generation later, his successor Vidyābharaṇa is called "a lion leaping to smash open the broad forehead of the elephant that is the Mīmāṃsā doctrine" and "a furious sun to the lotus cluster of the Jaina teaching," there is no implied difference in the attitudes of the two men or any change in their relations to other philosophies.¹⁸ Instead we can

see the ends to which the Kālāmukhas have remounted Jayanta's philosophy of knowledge in their own local world. The Kālāmukhas set out an aggressive universalism here that precedes their explicit citation of the *Nyāyamañjarī* but is clearly premised on a knowledge of the text.¹⁹

The Balligāve records are a very rich textual ensemble, and more work is needed on their structure, rhetoric, and place within the wider world of the twelfth-century western Deccan. Their relationship to Jayantabhaṭṭa and his NM is only a single facet in this complex picture. But it is only in light of this indebtedness that we can begin to understand what exactly these Kannadiga Śaiva intellectuals were interested in accomplishing and what their prodigious institution building really meant. Jayanta's work appears to have provided a charter or template with which the Kālāmukhas of Banavāse were able to improvise their own sociotextual project, what amounted to the creation of a sectarian city-state, with consequences for the domination of institutional space within Balligāve and beyond.²⁰

Case II: Uttaramerūr

The second case takes us into the Tamil country of the far south and into the question of the impact of the valley's signal cultural export, the discipline of literary theory or *alaṅkāraśāstra*. One of the key monuments of the field's southern reception can be seen in the dramaturgist Śāradātanaya's verse essay, the *Bhāvaprakāśana* (On the Displaying of Emotions).²¹ This is a text of profoundly synthetic ambition, but throughout—and especially in his understanding of the deep linguistic mechanisms of poetic language—Śāradātanaya relies on recognizably Kashmirian works, sometimes acknowledging them and sometimes not.²²

In the *Bhāvaprakāśana*'s sixth chapter, where the workings of affective communication form the principal topic, the text really becomes a half-rewritten palimpsest, so heavy is the layering of borrowings, adaptations, homages, and sometimes even invented citations. But my interest here lies in its pattern of systematic misquotation or maladaptation. In his recasting into verse what are often prose works, Śāradātanaya necessarily had to alter their wording. What a close look into these recastings shows, however, is that he often subtly rewrites these sources to deliberately change their argument. For instance, in the course of his extensive reworking of Mammaṭa's manual on the poetic arts, the *Kāvyaṅkāśa*, Śāradātanaya deliberately effaces the point under discussion, the distinction between two theories of sentential semantics associated with different schools of Mīmāṃsā ritualists. At issue here is the question of whether sentence meaning can be interpreted analytically, on the

Table 1: Bhāvaprakāśana and Kāvyaṣṭakāśa Compared

Bhāvaprakāśana, p. 160

śabdārthayoh svarūpaṃ tu

tad vivicyābhidhīyate ||
śabdāḥ tridhā vācakaś ca
tathā lākṣaṇiko 'pi ca |
vyañjakaś ca

tadarthaś ca
tridhā vācyādibhedataḥ ||

tātparyārthaḥ padārthebhyo
vākyārtho 'stīti kecana |

vācyādir artho vākyārtha
iti prābhākarādayaḥ ||

But [other teachers] explain
the real nature of word and
meaning

[as follows:] **word is threefold:**
denotative, figurative, and
suggestive,

and **meaning** is also so divided into
denoted, etc.

The meaning of a sentence is
the **overall meaning**, which
arises from the individual word
meanings—this is the way
that **some people** describe it.

The Prābhākaras and others say that
the sentence meaning ***is the**
(set of) meanings, the denoted, etc.

Kāvyaṣṭakāśa, pp. 25–27 (K= *kārikā*, V= *vṛtti*)

V: *krameṇa śabdārthayoh svarūpaṃ āha:*

K: *syād vācako lākṣaṇikah*
śabdo 'tra vyañjakaś tridhā |

V: *atreti kāvye eṣāṃ svarūpaṃ vakṣyate:*

K: *vācyādayas tadarthāḥ syuḥ*

V: *vācyalakṣyavyaṅgyāḥ*

K: *tātparyārtho 'pi keśucit ||*

V: *ākāṅkṣāyogyatāsaṃnidhivaśād*
vakṣyamāṇasvarūpāṇāṃ padārthānāṃ
samanvaye tātparyārtho viśeṣavapur
apadārtho 'pi vākyārthaḥ samullasatīti
abhīhitānvayavādināṃ matam.

vācya eva vākyārtha ity
anvitābhidhānavādināḥ

[V:] He successively speaks of

the real nature of word and meaning

[K:] In this, let **word** be **threefold:**

denotative, figurative, and suggestive.

[V:] 'In this' [means] 'in a literary
work.' He will subsequently
explain the real nature of these.

[K:] And let their **meanings** be the

denoted, etc. [V:] i.e. the denoted,
the figured, and the suggested.

[K:] For **some people**, there is also
an **overall meaning**.

[V:] When there is a connection of the word
meanings (whose nature will be explained
momentarily) owing to syntactic expectancy,
semantic cohesion, and proximity, a sentence
meaning—the overall meaning becomes
manifest. This has the form of a particular,
though it is not itself the meaning of word. This
is the theory of the supporters of the
abhīhitānvayavāda. The supporters of the
anvitābhidhānavāda [say] that the meaning of
a sentence is ***solely the denoted meaning**.

basis of the semantic contribution of each separate word (the theory of the followers of Kumāriḷa), or whether it can only be arrived at holistically, from the entire utterance (the position of the followers of Prabhākara). From the time of Abhinavagupta, Kashmirian literary theorists had been sympathetic to the former, Bhāṭṭa, view. A comparison of Śāradātanaya's re-presentation with Mammaṭa's original understanding of this distinction shows the dimensions of the change here (see table 1).

Śāradātanaya makes what appear to be two conscious changes here: he fails to exemplify part of the prose gloss on a single *kārikā* root-verse,²³ and—seemingly inexplicably—he changes both the wording and the sense of Mammaṭa's dismissively brief description of the *anvitābhidhānavāda*, the holistic theory of meaning associated with Prabhākara. Now, according to Śāradātanaya's rewriting, the basic criticism of the Prabhākara position, that it fails to account for the different levels of meaning, is replaced by an affirmation of the idea that sentences *can* in fact embody multiple meaning functions.

This is not, I think, evidence of his misunderstanding or mishandling of his sources. But the other ready-to-hand explanation is not sufficient either: that Śāradātanaya rewrote the passage simply to bring it into line with the Prabhākara view, that of the dominant southern tradition of Mīmāṃsā. Śāradātanaya does a perfectly adequate job of either quoting or closely paraphrasing Mammaṭa (as he does with his other sources) until he comes to the point of the earlier author's dismissal of the Prabhākara position. Here the language is more or less retained, but its intention is refigured or reset within a fundamentally different argumentative context.

For all that Śāradātanaya is writing under the influence of the mature, reception-oriented form of Kashmirian literary theory, it is obvious that he is departing from this model in crucial ways. The fact of this departure, and indeed its direction, can be seen even from the text's title. Other works written in the wake of the Kashmirian synthesis tend to topicalize aestheticized emotional flavor, or *rasa*, the end product of the process of the experience of the work of art, and they signal this in their titles—for instance, the *Rasārṇavasudhākara*, the *Rasakalikā*, the *Rasaṅgādhara*, *et mult. cet.* By contrast, the *Bhāvaprakāśana* is focused not on this endpoint but on its trigger or reagent, the *bhāvas*, or basic emotional states that are precursors to the *rasas*.

This is further borne out in the structure of Śāradātanaya's presentation; he begins his text, in fact, with a lengthy and wholly original etymological analysis of the *bhāvas*, and he develops his explanation of the ways in which

artistic language functions through constant reference to these elements rather than their endpoint. By contrast, his treatment of the *rasas* seems cursory. This constructive (as opposed to receptive) approach to literary art marks a real distinction over the Kashmirian theorists; it enables him to reverse the priorities of his inherited models, while retaining their terms and their characteristic style of argument, and instead of a literary theory centered on the sensitive reader or *sahṛdaya* and the moment of reception, we find the theoretical innovations applied to the poet's act of poetic creation. It is this emphasis that would seem to motivate his collapsing of the distinction between the two Mīmāṃsā theories; it is his interest in the effect of the whole that the Prābhākara theory enables, and not just parochial loyalties, that seems to drive his re-creation of his source text.²⁴

This idiosyncrasy on Śāradātanaya's part might suggest that he was influenced by a different, local set of aesthetic priorities, for instance, those embodied in the vernacular literary theory found in the Tamil *Tolkāppiyam* and its commentaries. And in fact there are some suggestive parallels between the *Bhāvaprakāśana* and these works. But more significantly, even the earliest surviving commentary on the *Tolkāppiyam*, that of Iḷampūraṇar, reflects the definite, if etiolated, influence of Abhinavagupta's distinctive theories of the working of *śāntarasa* or the sentiment of beatific calm.²⁵ This is a testament to the transmissional vigor of Kashmirian texts into the furthest and putatively least Sanskritized reaches of the far South and suggests that the synthetic ambitions of a Sanskrit pandit like Śāradātanaya were a part of a wider conversation, crossing the boundaries between genres and languages.

Case III: Cidambaram, and Beyond

Maheśvarānanda's *Mahārthamañjarī* ("Flower-Cluster of the Great Purpose," MM) was composed in the great temple city of Cidambaram and was in all likelihood completed in the latter part of the thirteenth century.²⁶ It is centrally concerned with teaching the nature of the worship of a complex pantheon of Śaiva goddesses, along with the theological principles that follow from this worship. Its base text, the *Mañjarī*, or "Flower-Cluster" properly speaking is a set of seventy-one verses composed not in Sanskrit but in Māhārāṣṭrī Prakrit, a language normally reserved for certain kinds of erotic and courtly poetry. These are accompanied by an autocommentary, the *Mahārthamañjarī-parimala* ("Fragrance" of the Flower-Cluster, MMP), which forms the major part of Maheśvarānanda's complex text and is full of ancillary discussions and digressions on a very wide range of topics. A great many of the texts that Maheśvarānanda cites, discusses, comments on, and integrates into his

own writing in the commentary are from Kashmir. While the integration and reworking of the scriptural and exegetical works of the Śaiva religion are often very intricate, and make for fascinating reading, here I will focus yet again on the place of literary theory in the *Mahārthamañjarī*, especially that of Ānandavardhana's *Dhvanyāloka* (Light on Literary Suggestion), written circa 850 CE.

It doesn't take too much detective work to argue that the *Dhvanyāloka* was influential upon Maheśvarānanda; he announces as much at the work's end, where he says (MMP 195),

sāhityābdhau karṇadhāro 'ham āsaṃ kāvyālokaṃ locanaṃ cānuśīlya |

I was a navigator on the sea that is Literature,
once I'd mastered the *Kāvyaāloka* (= *Dhvanyāloka*) and the *Locana*.

The *Locana* (properly, the *Dhvanyālokalocana* or “An Eye for the Light on Suggestion”) mentioned here is the authoritative commentary by Abhinavagupta; like many of their readers, Maheśvarānanda treats the text and commentary as a single, unified treatise. Ānanda's argument, in briefest terms, is not only that great pieces of literary art contain meanings that are inexplicit yet nevertheless understood by sensitive readers, but that the very capacity for this understanding depends on the existence of a previously untheorized power of language that is peculiar to literature, namely, its capacity for suggestion (*dhvani*). Over the course of the *Dhvanyāloka*'s four chapters, more and more complex examples are adduced, but the pride of place Ānandavardhana accorded to the Prakrit lyric verses was seemingly a deliberate decision. It is verses in Māhārāṣṭrī that are allowed to make the first, putatively self-evident demonstration of the existence of *dhvani*, as they “[lent] themselves naturally to the thesis which Ānanda set out to defend,” as Ingalls put it (1990: 12). While other works in the tradition of Maheśvarānanda's Krama goddess cult reflect a habit of composition in languages other than Sanskrit, it is the model supplied by the Kashmirian literary theory that provides a rationale for his decision to create his own very different bilingual work, the MM.²⁷

Certainly, the model for the particular form of MM's Prakrit root verses comes from the use of this literature as source texts in the earlier literary criticism. For Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta both, the erotic Prakrit verses provided an occasion for virtuoso interpretation, for them to fill in the contextual details left out of the artfully underdetermined text. But the Kashmirian literary theorists, for all their dependence on these poems, never to my knowledge make explicit the reasons why they are so particularly drawn

to this body of non-Sanskrit literature. Maheśvarānanda, thanks perhaps to his perspective from the outside, is able to argue out the nature of this fascination. Basing himself on the confident linguistic ideology of Sanskrit, he argues that Sanskrit is the prototype or matrix (*prakṛti*) of all other languages, and that Prakrit is a derivative from it, hence its name. It represents a deliberate and studied falling away from Sanskrit's absolute and unchanging standard; there is, he tells us, a certain pleasure that comes from recognizing a poet's ingenuity in using this other, less perfect language, especially its penchant for indeterminacy and equivocation. At the same time, the virtues of Sanskrit, its formal and semantic precision, can still be glimpsed, however dimly, to be at work within it. He calls this Prakrit's *ubhayathā camatkāraucityam*, the way that, seen from either perspective, it is suited to producing *camatkāra*, the sudden, surprised delight the art makes us feel.²⁸

Thus, while the MM is a work ostensibly devoted to a systematic theological purpose, it accomplishes this through means that are thoroughly literary. Both ends of the equation here derive from Kashmir, but Maheśvarānanda effects a fusion of them that was never ventured there. There is certainly a critical interanimation within Abhinavagupta's literary-critical and religious and philosophical writings: words and concepts (like the word *camatkāra*, in fact) move from one realm to the other very freely. But still, nothing in his surviving works approaches what the *Mahārthamañjarī* ideally wants itself to be: a deliberate and self-conscious application of literary theory within a work of the religious imagination, one that employs literary-theoretical means to attain visionary ends and promises nothing less than the liberation of the reader who reads it right.

Time and again, the Prakrit verses that form the MM's *mūla* or root text—some of which contain echoes of those that Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta had cited as exempla—are made to bear complex and surprising readings in the commentary, in a way that is clearly a creative extension of the virtuoso interpretations of the *dhvani* critics. What seems to be one thing on the first reading transforms into another, most often grounded in the indeterminacy of the Prakrit text itself.²⁹ This clearly parallels literary critics' efforts to extract every last drop of a verse's *rasa*, but in Maheśvarānanda's hands this again becomes a writerly rather than readerly suggestion.

This can be seen most clearly in the MM's closing section, and (by now unsurprisingly) in the form of an unacknowledged recasting of Abhinavagupta's *Dhvanīlōkālōcana*. Here, Maheśvarānanda describes in detail his text's ideal reader, a figure that (he claims) his worldly audience will be transfigured into through the very act of consuming the text. He directly takes his language

from Abhinava's description of the *sahṛdaya*, the connoisseur whose literary intuitions of suggested meaning the *dhvani* critics sought to explain and systematize. In Maheśvarānanda's source, Abhinavagupta plays etymologically on the name *sahṛdaya*, saying that they "partake of the concord in their own hearts" (*svahṛdayasaṃvādabhājah saṃhṛdayāḥ*).³⁰ Maheśvarānanda in turn restyles this to describe what happens at the moment that his *yogī*-reader's vision of the world is set right. It is then that they themselves can be said to "partake of their heart's concord." At two different points in the text, as he seeks to describe exactly the moment when the inhibitions of worldly life suddenly fall away, it is in these terms that Maheśvarānanda frames things.³¹

This moment of textual fusion neatly describes a fusion of the two distinct roles of Śaiva adept and cultivated aesthete. And in this explicit attempt to imagine his own community of readers, Maheśvarānanda points to an awareness of the social universe in which the southern synthesis of Kashmirian textuality took place, a decentered virtual community of authors and readers held together by their participation in a shared textual universe. It is not the case that the cosmopolitan world of the ecumenical *sahṛdaya* has here shrunk down to the small circle of sectarian affiliation; instead, both have come to possess an equipollent place in the imagination of this far-flung collectivity. While Maheśvarānanda describes himself as a resident of "that ever-celebrating country of the Colas" (*colās te satatotsavā janapadāḥ*, MMP 195) he does so without reference to any royal court whatsoever.

For all that Maheśvarānanda seems to approach this transformation of his Kashmirian sources in a self-conscious way, and to use this as a means of a thoroughgoing transformation of his readers' sense of themselves, his own *Mahārthamañjarī* was itself transformed in ways that he could scarcely have imagined. Unlike the great majority of South Indian Sanskrit works of its period, the MM managed to find an audience in the far North, in fact in Kashmir itself, an audience that reproduced the text many times over—of the surprisingly large number of manuscripts that survive of the MM, most are from Kashmir, written in either the Śāradā script or the local version of Devanagari. What other manuscripts survive are from the far South and no place else to my knowledge (there are no Gujarati, say, or Bengali script manuscripts). And these two regions, Kashmir and the deep South, are home to two massively different versions of the *Mahārthamañjarī*, a northern and a southern recension.³²

The northern version of the *Parimala* commentary is much shorter, and indeed simpler, than the southern one, with almost none of the southern text's lengthy asides or digressions. Ordinarily, this would warrant the judgment that

the southern recension was the victim of expansion and interpolation. Yet it is clear that the northern version is inferior and represents a nonauthorial redaction of the long text. The northern version of the Prakrit *mūla*, or root text, however, has fared even more poorly: it is for all intents gibberish. This gibberish, however, is the result of a transmissional process that we can reconstruct with great precision.

Throughout, we can see the problems encountered by a northern copyist faced with a manuscript written probably by a Tamil-speaking scribe in one of the scripts used to write Sanskrit in the far South, either the Grantha script used in the Tamil country or possibly the *āryalipi* script from over the mountains in Kerala. Time and again, the mistakes that can be found in the northern manuscripts that contain the Prakrit text (many do not) can be accounted for by two presumptions. In some cases we may presume a Tamilian copyist transcribing a text being read aloud to him (in a language that he poorly understood, as Prakrit was something cultivated by very few). Many of the mistakes and meaningless variants come from this postulated scribe mistranscribing sounds that were not in the repertoire of his mother tongue. The second presumption is even more thoroughgoing: it finds a Kashmirian scribe tentatively working in an unfamiliar script and ignorant of the way that southern scripts graphically represented Prakrit and Sanskrit in slightly different ways, using the Sanskrit conventions for both languages and in the process writing out a heavily nasalized nonsense that is not Prakrit, Sanskrit, or anything else.³³ Though less dramatic than this, the commentary ends up in an even sadder state in its northern version. The northern redactors of the *Parimala* left only a gloss of the simplest and least interesting meaning of the verses. Gone are almost all of the characteristic asides and linguistic games that make the commentary so interesting, and were really the point of the text, that were essential to Maheśvarānanda's fusion of literary theory and theology. Almost everything is pared away, leaving a text of which the best that can be said of it is that it makes for a quick read.

We can see, then, that the flow of texts from Kashmir to the south was not a one-way process; readers in the far North were interested enough in Maheśvarānanda's text to copy it, indeed to copy it many times over. But the work's life in the North has a certain irony to it. The Prakrit text became so garbled that, although the *Mahārthamañjarī* found itself a place in the home of the *Dhvanyāloka*, its passage through time and space was such that it made it all but unrecognizable, and its Sanskrit explanation was transformed into just a modest *īkā*, in which it is impossible to grasp the real interest of the text or the intentions of its author.

And so it is that we find ourselves in a way back where we began, with the strange, intertwined history of Kashmir's saffron and southern turmeric. Beyond the regional world where it was crafted, the *Mahārthamañjarī* ended up like that anonymous, yellow, astringent stuff that was passed from South India throughout Asia under the name of saffron. But this rather sad fate is in part a testament to the pathbreaking innovation to which the southern recasting of Kashmir's poetic and theoretical achievements gave rise. To adopt—and adapt—yet again the idiom of Pollock's work, we can see that Sanskrit's death in one corner of its immense domain could lead to its surprising rebirth in another.³⁴

Abbreviations

EC *Epigraphia Carnatica*. Sk. refers to the inscriptions of Shikarpur Taluq in vol. 7

EI *Epigraphia Indica*

MM *Mahārthamañjarī*

MMP *Mahārthamañjarīparimala*

NM *Nyāyamañjarī*

Notes

¹ 1.21; cf. the similar language and idea seen in 18.16. The reference to Bilhaṇa's birthplace is given in 18.71. The verse may have been an earlier product that Bilhaṇa included in the finished text of his long poem, as it appears as the last of the four "praise for the author" (*granthakartuḥ praśasti*) verses appended to the end of his earlier work, the harem comedy *Karṇasundarī* (*Karṇasundarī* of Bilhaṇa 1932: 56).

² The contours of Pollock's argument for the existence and coherence of the Sanskrit cosmopolitan order and its eventual transformation through the emergence of literized vernaculars was first laid out in a series of articles (especially Pollock 1996, 1998a, 1998b), now drawn together into his magnum opus (2006). It is perhaps especially fitting to begin this tribute to Pollock's work in medieval Karnataka, the central test case in his theory of the vernacular cosmopolitanism, and with Bilhaṇa, a poet whose work Pollock has long labored to give the recognition it merits.

³ For more on Sanskrit literary theory in general, and its Kashmiri component in particular, see the essays by McCrea and Leavitt in this volume.

⁴ On courts as the exclusive social venue for the initial stages of vernacularization, see Pollock 1998a: 19ff.; and 1998b: 46. This supposition holds true for his understanding of the domain of Sanskrit literary production as well. See Pollock 2006: 162–88, for his compellingly exhaustive defense of this claim on the Sanskrit side, and especially pages 410–36 on the side of the vernacular. See also the summarizing claim made on page 523: "All the critical innovations in the aestheticization of language and its philologization came from the stimulus offered by court patronage."

⁵ Pollock speaks of the late twelfth century—the period of or around the works discussed here—as a time "when the vernacular transformation was everywhere coming into evidence and the older mentality of cosmopolitanism was consequently being thrown into high relief" (2006: 298; he is referring inter alia to the *Bhāvaprakāśana*, discussed below). Still, the rudiments of a literary and cultural-historical periodization of the early second millennium—the period of the active coexistence of Sanskrit and the transformed vernaculars—await clarification.

⁶ On this group generally, see Abraham 1988; and Subbarayalu 2004. For saffron

in the opening *praśasti*, as well as the business portion of their records, see, for example, EC 7, Shikarpur 118 (p. 158).

⁷ See Hobson-Jobson, s.v. saffron, for the citations from Arabic (ibn Baithar, ca. 1200) and Portuguese (Garcia de Orta, 1563). See Schafer 1963: 125, 185–86, on the long-standing confusion in the T'ang court in China between the two products (both were indifferently called “yü gold,” and saffron was occasionally distinguished as “yü gold aromatic”). The *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. saffron, lists eighteenth-century attestations for both turmeric and “Indian saffron.”

⁸ Alexis Sanderson (2001: 35–38) has demonstrated that the scriptures of the South Indian Pāñcarātra Vaiṣṇava religion—especially its *Ahīrbudhnyasamhitā* and *Lakṣmītantra*—are directly indebted to the writings of Abhinavagupta's pupil, the Śaiva Kṣemarāja and may thus be dated after him, that is, to sometime after the middle of the eleventh century. That these works were composed in the South can be seen from their borrowing of mantras from versions of the *Yajurveda* that were particularly cultivated there. Religious confession thus did not present a barrier to borrowing and adaptation, indeed to rapid assimilation, as these texts were already well-known and accepted pieces of canonical literature to southern religious professionals by the thirteenth century at the latest; these works were written, introduced as divine revelation, and accepted as such within a few generations' time.

⁹ I use this term throughout, as it is the form that appears in the inscriptions themselves as well as in other southern sources (such as the text of the *Pampāmāhātmya* reproduced in Filliozat 2001). As Sanderson (2006) demonstrates, the earliest form of the name (as seen in Nepalese manuscripts as well as Kashmirian exegetical literature) is Kālamukha.

¹⁰ Among these, the most significant are Venkata Subbiah 1917 and Lorenzen 1991.

¹¹ The two verses' relation was first pointed out to me some years ago by Harunaga Isaacson of the Universität Hamburg. Dezső (2004: xl, n.) notes the close accord between these verses and draws attention to another direct reference to Bāṇa in the *Nyāyamañjarī*.

¹² On Vāmaśakti, see Lorenzen 1991: 123–29. It is possible—though not definite—that a still earlier record in this corpus, EC 7: Sk. 112 (1139 CE), contains an invocation modeled on the *Nyāyamañjarī*'s eleventh opening verse.

¹³ For the relationship between kings and sectarian gurus in the Deccan, see also the essay by Rao in this volume.

¹⁴ In addition to the example referred to in note 12 see Sk. 99 (1113 CE, on the Pāsupata/Kālamukha doctrine, *lakulasya śāsanam*), Sk. 100 (1129 CE, on Gautama, the earlier *adhipati*, in Kannada), and Sk. 103 (1149 CE, again on Gautama, in Sanskrit; a parallel verse [translated below] is used over a decade later in praise of Vāmaśakti, Sk. 103). In 1164 CE, just a few years before the first occurrence of the Jayanta verse, in a single record (Sk. 108), another verse just as closely modeled on

Bāṇa's original was introduced. This, incidentally, finds a parallel in a curious copper plate charter that details a land grant in the Gaṅgavāḍī 96,000 territory, to the east of Banavāse (edited and discussed in Rice 1879). Written in Devanagari and in a mix of Kannada and Sanskrit, it is fragmentary in its opening line, but what can be read of its opening invocation is again clearly modeled on the Bāṇa verse (it reads, *namaḥ śaśikalākoṭikalpamānānkura . . . lpakalpavṛkṣāya śambhave*). The record is spuriously dated to Śaka 366 (444 CE) and assigns itself to the reign of the (nonexistent) Cālukya king Vīraṇoṇamba; presuming that this charter is in fact also a reflex of the same crisis in imperial confidence that can be seen in the Balligāve records in the period ca. 1115–65, we may confirm Rice's brilliant conjectural dating of the record to the first half of the twelfth century (94). This would, however, entail abandoning his suggestion that the actual grantor of the charter be identified with Jayasiṃha III, who had by that time long since launched his unsuccessful rebellion against Vikramāditya VI.

¹⁵ See NM, vol. 1, 649; and *Āgamaḍambara* 2, ll.404–8; 3, vs. 3 etc. Alongside the Buddhists, the crypto-Tantric licentiousness advocated by the Nīlāmbaras presented the greatest challenge to the orthodoxy championed by Jayanta.

¹⁶ Pollock 1989: 21–23. Pollock translates and discusses this “first extended analysis of the *vidyāsthānas*,” rightly noting that Jayanta “operates with a far more restrictive view than the more popular tradition of what should be understood by ‘dharma’ . . . and so of what may be comprised in the ‘branches of knowledge’ liable to shastric codification.”

¹⁷ Cf. the almost identical verse found in Sk. 103, praising Vāmaśakti's predecessor, Gautama. *dharmānurāgaḥ* is my emendation for *dharmo 'nurāgaḥ*, found in both sources.

¹⁸ Someśvara: Sk. 98 (1103 CE), paralleled in a record from Ablūr (EI 5: 25); Vidyābharāṇa: Sk. 100 (1129 CE). Incidentally, the verse describing Someśvara is in Kannada, while Vidyābharāṇa's is in Sanskrit. It was Fleet, the editor of the Ablūr record, who expressed bewilderment at how a Śaiva logician could be described as a promoter of a Jaina philosopher (EI 5:219n). See also Lorenzen 1991: 111ff.

¹⁹ Compare here especially the complex relation of attraction and subordination that Jayanta shows toward Mīmāṃsā throughout his work. For just a single example of this, see his celebrated opening salvo (NM, vol. 1, 10), which reads, *na ca mīmāṃsakāḥ samyaḡvedaprāmāṇyarakṣaṇakṣamāḥ saraṇim avalokayituḡ kuśalāḥ. kutarkakaṇṭak-anīkaraniruddhasaṇicāramārgābhāsaparibhrāntāḥ khalu te iti vakṣyāmaḥ*, “Further, the Mīmāṃsakas are incapable of seeing the path that allows for the licit defense of the Veda's validity. As I will describe later on, they are well and truly lost on a false road where the way is blocked by the masses of thorns that are [their] specious arguments.”

²⁰ For example, the logic of the inclusion of non-Vaidika religious traditions within the Kālāmukha orbit—a real point of distinction with Jayanta—had a substantial real-

world corollary to it, the seeming ultimate Kālāmukha control over the several Jaina and Bauddha sites within the town's boundaries.

²¹ Śāradātanaya was active circa 1175–1250 CE, probably in the *brahmadeya* Uttamerūr in Kanchipuram district in northeastern Tamilnadu (cf. Pollock 2006: 95; he is mistaken in locating the town near Madurai).

²² See the list of citations given in Ramaswami Sastri's introduction to his edition of the text (*Bhāvaprakāśana*: 64–67). Not all of Śāradātanaya's source texts are of Kashmirian origin; several of his most important sources are drawn from the literary salons of the Paramāra court at Dhārā, especially the *Daśarūpaka* and the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*. These works were themselves written under the impress of or in reaction to Kashmirian models.

²³ Later in the same chapter (*Bhāvaprakāśana*: 175), Śāradātanaya epitomizes this missing part of Mammaṭa's text, where he once again alters his source.

²⁴ The question of the significance of the Prābhākara theory is discussed in Cox 2006: 195–201.

²⁵ I argue this in Cox 2009.

²⁶ Much of this section has been adapted from Cox 2006. See now Sanderson 2007 (412–16), which argues that Maheśvarānanda flourished around 1300 CE.

²⁷ See Sanderson's discussion (2007: 299–307, 333–343) on the Krama works composed in Old Kashmiri.

²⁸ This summarizes MMP: 185–86.

²⁹ For several examples of this, see Cox 2006: 205–21.

³⁰ *Locana ad Dhvanyāloka* 1.1: *yeṣāṃ kāvyānuśīlanābhyāsavaśād viśadībhūte manomukure varṇanīyatanmayībhavanayogyatā te svahr̥dayasaṃvādabhājāḥ sahr̥dayāḥ*, “Once the mirror of their minds have been polished by constant attention to and study of literature, those who come to possess the ability to identify themselves with the matter under discussion [are called] *sahr̥dayas*, those who partake of the concord in their own hearts.” This definition, in fact, is not original to Abhinavagupta (although it is clear that he is Maheśvarānanda's source); that it reflects an earlier understanding can be seen in Kuntaka's very similar phrase *sahr̥dayahr̥dayasaṃvādasubhagaṃ . . . prayojanāntaram (avataranīkā to Vakroktijīvita*, 1.5).

³¹ MMP, 145, 167.

³² This summarizes Cox 2006: 275–78.

³³ See *ibid.*, 278–80. To the example discussed there, it may be added that the text of *gāthā* 4 reads as follows in the southern texts (consensus of E_v 17–18 and A₁ f. 10r, In. 4–ln. 3v):

jaṃ jāṇanti jaḷā api jaḷahārō pi ja vijāṇanti |
jassa ccia jokkāro so kassa phuḍo ṇa hoi kuḷanāho ||

The northern texts, however, read (E_v 16; L f. 3, ln. 3–5, errors in boldface):

*jaṃ jāṇanti janā **abhi** janahārī **abhi** jaṃ vijāṇanti |*
***jaṃsaṃ** cia jokkāro so **kaḥsa puṭo** na hoi kulanāho ||*
(janā abhi] E; janā ābi L [unmetrical], janahārī abhi] E; janahārī ābi L
[unmetrical])

The errors here are especially significant, as they demonstrate both stages of the transmissional process. The variation between *abhi* and *ābi* in the two northern sources emerges from the problems that a Tamil-speaking copyist (whose mother tongue did not distinguish between *pa* and *ba* graphically and doesn't allow for aspiration at all) would have when transcribing a text being recited to him. This is equally the case with *puṭo* for the correct *phuḍo*. A Kashmirian scribe (or at least one not familiar with southern scripts) compounded the problem, producing *jaṃsaṃ* *cia* and the bizarre *kaḥsa* (itself the result of a tertiary corruption or mislection) for the correct *jassa ccia* and *kassa*.

³⁴ The swift decline of Kashmirian Sanskrit literary culture in the generations following Maṅkha (ca. 1140 CE) is detailed in Pollock 2001: esp. 395–400. Whether this moment of disjunction marks the language's "death" in the valley or perhaps just some as yet incompletely diagnosed period of radical change awaits the study it deserves (some of the dimensions of this problem are sketched in Hanneder 2002). Nevertheless it is significant to note that this is almost exactly synchronous with the beginning of most dynamic period of the southern reworking of Kashmirian Sanskrit described here.

References

Primary Sources

- Āgamaḍambara* of Jayantabhaṭṭa. See Dezső 2006.
- Bhāvaprakāśana* of Śāradātanaya. 1968. Edited by Yadugiri Yatiraj Swami and K. S. Ramaswami Sastri. Gaekwad's Oriental Series, no. 45. Baroda: Oriental Institute.
- Dhvanyāloka* of Ānandavardhana. 2000. With the *Locana* of Abhinavagupta. Edited by Jagannāth Pāṭhak. Reprint. Benares: Chawkhamba Vidyabhavan.
- Epigraphic Carnatica*. 1886–. Edited by B. Lewis Rice. Bangalore: Mysore Government Central Press.
- Epigraphia Indica*. 1933–. Delhi: Manager of Publications, Archaeological Survey of India.
- Karṇasundarī* of Bilhaṇa. 1932. Edited by Paṇḍit Durgāprasād and Kāśīnāth Pāṇḍurang Parab. Kāvymālā, no. 7. Bombay: Nirnaya Sagar Press.
- Kāvyaṇprakāśa* of Mammaṭa. 1983. Edited, with commentary, by V. R. Jhalkikar. Reprint. Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Mahārthamañjarī* of Maheśvarānanda. 1972. With the *Parimala* autocommentary. Edited by Vrajavallabha Dvivedi. Yogatantragranthamālā, no. 5. Vārāṇasī: Sampūrṇānandaviśvavidyālaya, (Cited as MMP, E_v). Also edited by Mukund Rām Śāstrī. Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies, no. 11. Bombay: Tatva-Vivecaka Press, 1918 (E_k). Also Adyar Library ms. no. 72866 (A₁) and University of Lucknow ms. no. 45778 (L).
- Nyāyamañjarī* of Jayantabhaṭṭa. 1982–84. Edited by Gaurīnāth Śāstrī. Varanasi: Sampūrṇānandaviśvavidyālaya.
- Vakroktijīvita* of Kuntaka. 1977. Edited by K. Krishnamoorthy. Dharwad: Karnatak University.
- Vikramāṅkadevacarita* of Bilhaṇa. 1945. Edited by Murari Lal Nagar. Benares: Princess of Wales Sarasvati Bhavana Texts. Also edited by Georg Bühler. Bombay Sanskrit Series, no. 14. Bombay: Central Government Book Depot, 1875.

Secondary Sources

- Abraham, Meera. 1988. *Two Merchant Guilds of Medieval South India*. New Delhi: Manohar.
- Bronner, Yigal, and David Shulman. 2006. “‘A Cloud Turned Goose’: Sanskrit in the Vernacular Millennium.” *Indian Economic and Social History Review* 43.1: 1–30.
- Cox, Whitney. 2006. “Making a Tantra in Medieval South India: The Mahārthamañjarī and the Textual Culture of Cōḷa Cidambaram.” PhD diss., Department of South Asian Languages and Civilizations, University of Chicago.

- . 2009. “*Mēyppāṭu and naṭuvunilaimai*: From Source-Criticism to Intellectual History in Medieval Tamilnadu.” Paper presented at the workshop Bilingual Discourse and Cross-Cultural Fertilisation: Sanskrit and Tamil in Mediaeval India, Cambridge University, May. Proceedings forthcoming, edited by Whitney Cox and Vincenzo Vergiani.
- Dezső, Csaba. 2006. “‘Much Ado about Religion’: A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation of the *Āgamaḍambara* of the Ninth-Century Kashmirian Philosopher Bhaṭṭa Jayanta.” Ph.D. thesis, Balliol College, Oxford University.
- Filliozat, Vasundhara, 2001. *Kālāmukha and Pāśupata Temples in Dharwar*. Chennai: Kuppaswami Sastri Research Institute.
- Gerow, Edwin, 1994. “Abhinavagupta’s Aesthetics as Speculative Paradigm.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 114.2: 186–208.
- Hanneder, Jürgen, 2002. “On the ‘Death of Sanskrit.’” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 46.2: 293–310.
- Ingalls, Daniel H. H., Jeffery M. Masson, and M. V. Patwardhan, trans. 1990. *The Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana with the Locana of Abhinavagupta*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Kataoka, Kei. 2003. “What Really Defends the Veda: Jayanta on *śāstraprayojana*.” *Journal of the Ganganath Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha Allahabad* 56: 226–51.
- Lorenzen, David. 1991. *The Kāpālikas and the Kālāmukhas: Two Lost Śaivite Sects*. Delhi: Motilal Barnasidass.
- McCrea, Lawrence. 2008. *The Teleology of Poetics in Medieval Kashmir*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Pollock, Sheldon. 1989. “The Idea of *śāstra* in Traditional India.” In *Shastric Traditions in Indian Arts*, edited by Anna Dallapiccola, 17–26. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- . 1996. “The Sanskrit Cosmopolis, A.D. 300–1300: Transculturation, Vernacularization, and the Question of Ideology.” In *Ideology and Status of Sanskrit*, edited by Jan E. M. Houben, 197–247. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1998a. “The Cosmopolitan Vernacular.” *Journal of Asian Studies* 57.1: 6–37.
- . 1998b. “India in the Vernacular Millennium: Literary Culture and Polity, 1000–1500.” In *Early Modernities*, edited by Shmuel Eisenstadt, Bjorn Wittrock, and Wolfgang Schluchter. *Daedalus*, special issue, 127.3: 41–74.
- . 2001. “The Death of Sanskrit.” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 43.2: 392–426.
- . 2006. *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men: Sanskrit, Culture, and Power in Premodern India*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Raghavan, V. 1975. *The Number of Rasas*. Rev. ed. Madras: Adyar Library and Research Centre.
- Rice, B. Lewis. 1879. "Two new Chalukya Grants with Comparison of the Professed Grants by Janamejaya of the Sarpa Yāga." *Indian Antiquary* 8:89–98.
- Sanderson, Alexis. 2001. "History through Textual Criticism in the Study of Śaivism, the Pāñcārātra, and the Buddhist Yoginītantras." In *Les sources et le temps*, edited by François Grimal, 1–47. Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry and École Française d'Extrême-Orient.
- . 2006. "The Lākulas: New Evidence of a System Intermediate between Pāñcārthika Pāśupatism and Āgamic Śaivism." *Indian Philosophical Annual* 24:143–217. Ramalinga Reddy Memorial Lectures, 1997.
- . 2007. "The Śaiva Exegesis of Kashmir." In *Mélanges Tantriques à la mémoire d'Hélène Brunner*, edited by Dominic Goodall and André Padoux, 231–442. Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry and École Française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Schafer, Edward. 1963. *The Golden Peaches of Samarkhand: A Study of Tang Exotics*. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Subbarayalu, Y. 2004. "Eṛivīrapaṭṭiṇam, Warriors, and the State in Medieval South India." In *South Indian Horizons: Felicitations Volume for François Gros on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*, edited by Jean-Luc Chevillard and Eva Wilden, 583–594. Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry and École Française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Venkata Subbiah, A. 1917. "A Twelfth Century University in Mysore." *Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society* 7.3: 157–96.