

श्रीः

ज्ञानानन्दमयं देवं निर्मलस्फटिकाकृतिम् ।

आधारं सर्वविद्यानां हयग्रीवमुपास्महे ॥

A Parīkṣā of Sheldon Pollock's Three-dimensional Philology

Bhāratīya Jñāna Paraṃparā

अङ्गानि वेदाश्चत्वारो मीमांसान्यायविस्तरः ।

पुराणं धर्मशास्त्रं च विद्या ह्येताश्चतुर्दश ॥ वि.पु.३.६.२७ ॥

पुराण-न्याय-मीमांसा-धर्मशास्त्राङ्गमिश्रिताः ।

वेदाः स्थानानि विद्यानां धर्मस्य च चतुर्दश ॥ या.१.३ ॥

Similar Framework in Buddhist and Jaina Traditions

- Revealed sources
- A body of literature to understand the revealed sources
- श्रीमद्रामायण
- न्यायशास्त्र

Vātsyāyana Maharṣi's Nyāya bhāṣya

The Validity of Pramāṇās

प्रमणतोऽर्थप्रतिपत्तौ प्रवृत्तिसामर्थ्यादर्थवत् प्रमाणम् । प्रमाणमन्तरेण नार्थप्रतिपत्तिः । नार्थप्रतिपत्तिमन्तरेण प्रवृत्तिसामर्थ्यम् । प्रमाणेन खल्वयं ज्ञाताऽर्थमुपलभ्य तमीप्सति जिहासति वा । तस्य ईप्साजिहासाप्रयुक्तस्य समीहा प्रवृत्तिरित्युच्यते । सामर्थ्यं पुनरस्याः फलेनाभिसम्बन्धः । समीहमानस्तमर्थमभीप्सन् जिहासन् वा तमर्थमाप्नोति जहाति वा । अर्थस्तु सुखं सुखहेतुश्च, दुःखं दुःखहेतुश्च । सोऽयं प्रमाणार्थोऽपरिसङ्ख्येयः प्राणभृद्भेदस्यापरिसङ्ख्येयत्वात् ।

By the pramāṇās, the artha (object) is comprehended and this results in pravṛtti-sāmarthya (successful activity). Therefore, pramāṇa is arthavat or always connected with artha. Without pramāṇās, artha cannot be comprehended. And without the comprehension of artha, successful activity does not arise. By the pramāṇās, the jñātā (knower) comprehends artha and either desires or avoids it.

The samīhā (effort) of the jñātā in desiring or avoiding artha is called pravṛtti (activity). Sāmarthya is the capacity of the jñātā to achieve phala (result). Making an effort in desiring or avoiding an object, the jñātā either obtains it or avoids it. The arthas are classified into four: sukha, the reason for sukha, duḥkha, and the reason for duḥkha. The arthas known through pramāṇās are uncountable since the number of living beings are also uncountable.

Position of 3D Philology

This prabandha examines the three-dimension philology (3D Philology) of Sheldon Pollock (pūrvapakṣin) using the conceptual framework of Nyāya śāstra and the pramāṇas in particular. Nyāya bhāṣya begins with an observation on how one gains knowledge and this is equally applicable to Pollock. As will be shown in the following sections, he cannot deny the pramāṇas as denying it would essentially deny valid knowledge. That he is using pramāṇas to understand the world around him, or to be specific, the Indian Sanskrit traditions is clear from reading any of his writings and will be illustrated when defining the four pramāṇas.

Using Pramāṇas to Evaluate 3D Philology

Since the pramāṇas are used to evaluate the pūrvapakṣin, an objection could be raised regarding the validity of the pramāṇas. Moreover, since the pramāṇas have not been established and agreed upon by the pūrvapakṣin, the basis of evaluating Pollock's philology using the pramāṇas could also be questioned. *Without establishing and agreeing upon the pramāṇas, how is it possible to conduct a vakyārtha with anyone?*

प्रमणतोऽर्थप्रतिपत्तौ इत्यस्य विवरणम्

Explanation of the first vākya of Nyāya bhāṣya

This vākya states that artha is comprehended by pramaṇas and they are dependent on each other: without pramāṇas one cannot comprehend any object. Where is this established? In the loka itself. We can directly perceive all the four pramāṇas, namely pratyakṣa, anumāna, upamāna and śabda being used in the world around us. No child is taught about the pramāṇas but uses them instinctively. Similarly, in discussions and debates, the participants use these pramāṇas without having established them first.

Loka Siddha aspect

- In all śāstra texts discussion takes place without having established pramāṇas
- Most of Sanskrit Literature is in the form of discussion

All this can be seen in the world around us, that any discussion or debate takes place without the establishing pramāṇas since they are loka siddha.

Position of 3D Philology

Without establishing the pramāṇas, how is it possible to conduct a vakyārtha with anyone? Therefore, it should be clear that this discussion with the pūrvapakṣin, Pollock in this case, would initially be to see if the pramāṇas are being used correctly and if so, to discuss the issues (premeya) that are being speculated by him. Examining the pramāṇas for validity would have to be agreed by the pūrvapakṣin, the adherents of the three-dimensional philology.

न्या.सू. ॥ १.१.२८ ॥

सर्वतन्त्राविरुद्धस्तन्त्रेऽधिकृतोऽर्थः सर्वतन्त्रसिद्धान्तः

Proved doctrine on the basis of [the unanimity of] all siddhānta (branches of learning) is an object not contradicted by (*aviruddha*) any of the other siddhāntas and admitted in one's own branch of learning. (1.1.28)

न्या.भा. ॥ १.१.२८ ॥

यथा घ्राणादीनीन्द्रियाणि गन्धादय इन्द्रियार्थाः पृथिव्यादीनि भूतानि प्रमाणैरर्थस्य ग्रहणमिति ॥

For example, the five senses relating to smell etc., the objects of the senses like smell etc., the five elements like earth etc., and acquiring of valid knowledge of artha through the pramāṇas. All of these are accepted by all the siddhāntas.

Position of 3D Philology

The Nyāya bhāṣya clearly states that pramāṇas as a means of obtaining valid knowledge is acceptable to all siddhāntas and this includes the proponents of the three-dimension philology also. That Pollock uses all these pramāṇas is known by a casual reading of his works and will be discussed in the section on the four pramāṇas.

प्रत्यक्षानुमानोपमानशब्दाः प्रमाणानि (न्या.सू.१.१.५)

pratyakṣa anumāna upamāna śabdāḥ pramāṇāni

The four pramāṇas are pratyakṣa, anumāna, upamāna and śabdā.

Vatsyāyana discusses the etymological meanings of the four pramāṇas.

The word akṣa in pratyakṣa means indrīyas or sense organs. In this sūtra, pratyakṣa implies the pramāṇa or the instrument of valid knowledge. It could also refer to the knowledge arising from pratyakṣa or the objects of pratyakṣa itself.

Position of 3D Philology

The definition and process of pratyakṣa is to be understood clearly since Pollock defines philology as “making *sense* of texts” and the word *sense* here refers not to the three aspects of pratyakṣa mentioned above. Obviously, he is not referring to the pratyakṣa pramāṇa, nor to the knowledge arising from pratyakṣa and certainly not to the objects of pratyakṣa itself.

Definition of Pratyakṣa

इन्द्रियार्थसन्निकर्षोत्पन्नं ज्ञानम् अव्यपदेश्यम् अव्यभिचारि व्यवसायात्मकं प्रत्यक्षम् ॥

१.१.५ ॥

As far as Pollock and his school of thought are concerned, pratyakṣa pramāṇa (perceptual knowledge) is certainly accepted. We see it being used by him in his own writings.

The first mention of Rāvaṇa's boon in Books II-VI of the Rāmāyaṇa occurs in the Aranyakāṇḍa, when the rākṣasa is introduced to us for the first time: "It was he who long ago in the great forest had practiced asceticism for ten thousand years, and unflinchingly offered up his own heads to the Self-existent Brahma. It was he who had no longer to fear death in combat with any beings-gods, dānavas, gāndarvas, piśācas, birds or serpents-any beings but man (111.30.17-18)." (1984b:509)

Definition of Anumāna

अथ तत्पूर्वकं त्रिविधम् अनुमानं पूर्ववत् शेषवत् सामान्यतो दृष्टं च (१.१.५)

Anumāna is discussed next. Anumāna or inference is preceded by pratyakṣa and is of three types: pūrvavat, śeṣavat and sāmānyato dṛṣṭam.

Position of 3D Philology

Pūrvavat – When the effect is inferred from its cause, e g. from the rising cloud (it is inferred that) it will rain.

Inscriptions and praśastis are being written by kings and that too in poetry and thus we should infer power structures from them. Now, a careful reading of the inscriptions he is showing as evidence will show that the inscriptions themselves will not mention any such power structures. As per the definition, this cannot be anumāna since it is without any basis on pratyakṣa. Pollock will be using western deductive techniques to infer that some power structures existed.

Śeṣavat - when the cause is inferred from its effect. On perceiving the water of the river as different from what it was before (and further perceiving) the fullness of the river and the swiftness of the current, this form of anumāna is used to show that it has rained.

Pollock infers that since vyākaraṇa works were sponsored by kings, they were written to control the society. The effects here are grammatical texts and the cause is inferred to be kings since they were patrons for the pundits who were writing these texts. But he does not mention many other scholars who wrote vyākaraṇa texts such as Annambhatta or even Panini for that matter who were not supported by Kings. So, this anumana cannot be true for all cases.

sāmānyato dr̥ṣṭam - the perception of an object at some place which was previously somewhere else is due to its movement. The example here is of the sun which has movement that cannot be directly perceived. Therefore, it is inferred that though imperceptible, the sun has movement.

Position of 3D Philology

The introductory paragraph to the *Language of the Gods in the World of Men* could be considered under this category.

*This book is an attempt to understand **two great moments** of transformation in culture and power in pre-modern India. The **first** occurred around the beginning of the Common Era, when Sanskrit, long a sacred language restricted to religious practice, was reinvented as a code for literary and political expression. This development marked the start of an amazing career that saw Sanskrit literary culture spread across most of southern Asia from Afghanistan to Java. The **second moment** occurred around the beginning of the second millennium, when local speech forms were newly dignified as literary languages and began to challenge Sanskrit for the work of both poetry and polity, and in the end replaced it.*

(2006a:1)

Definition of Upamana

प्रसिद्धसाधर्म्यात् साध्यसाधनम् उपमानम् ॥ (१.१.५)

prasiddhasādharmyāt sādhyasādhanam upamānam

An object which is known through its similarity to another well-known object is upamāna.

Position of 3D Philology

In the nexus of poetry and polity we also encounter what is most salient and most neglected for a cross-cultural historical analysis of vernacularization. This analysis is initiated in chapter 11, where parallels between India and Europe in cultural and political regionalization are examined. Temporal, spatial, and other synchronies and symmetries abound. (2006a:29)

आप्तोपदेशः शब्दः ॥ न्या.सू.(१.१.७)

āptopadeśaḥ śabdaḥ

Sabdaḥ is the upadeśa (communication) of an āpta or a trustworthy person.

आप्तः खलु साक्षात्कृतधर्मा यथादृष्टस्यार्थस्य चिख्यापयिषया प्रयुक्त उपदेशः ।

साक्षात्करणमर्थस्याप्तिः । तथा प्रवर्तत इत्याप्तः । ऋष्यार्यहेच्छानां समानं लक्षणम् ।

Position of 3D Philology:

As will be seen in the section examining the works of Pollock, he substantiates all his thesis statements from western theories. This by itself is not wrong as according to Vātsyāyana an *āpta* can be anyone (including a western scholar) as long as the *āpta* has direct knowledge and communicates it without falsifying. But substantiating from a western *āpta* could not be included under the second dimension of the three-dimensional philology since it would not be the traditional Indian viewpoint.

Even if this is included in the presentist dimension, these are only theories and they have not been proved. From example, to show that śāstras were descriptive in the beginning and then became prescriptive, he draws from western anthropological theories which have not been proved. So strictly speaking, as far as Pollock's works are concerned, śabda is not a pramāṇa as the *āpta* (some western theorist) does not have direct knowledge of an object, i.e., it has not been established.

Parīkṣa of Three-dimensional Philology

Historical – author's intention – ऐतिहासिक

Traditional – how the tradition saw itself – सांप्रदायिक

Presentist – view of Pollock – स्वेच्छा

Plane 3: Present view or Subjective

Reading as presentists, upon Plane 3, we encounter the astonishing spectacle of an ancient text repurposed as an anti-Muslim tract by Hindu fundamentalist politicians - which in 1992 led to the destruction of a mosque in Ayodhya, Rama's putative birthplace, brought the nation-state to the brink of civil war and is still producing social upheaval.

Such a reading prompts us to reflect on the presence of past texts in contemporary India, on this particular text's malleability and availability for repurposing, and, not least, on our obligations (via Planes 1 and 2) to critically register the history of this malleability and repurposing. (p.408)

Without showing any evidence as to how the text was re-purposed, Pollock feels morally obliged to start a project to “critically register the history of this malleability and repurposing.” Interpreting *Rāmāyaṇa* along Planes 1 and 2 is the methodology used in carrying out this project. Thus, according to Pollock himself, in this plane there is no śloka in the *Rāmāyaṇa* itself that could be called political.

Plane 1: At the time of authorship (Historical)

It bears the clear impress of Ashoka's new quasi-Buddhist political theology, where power takes on a marked and unprecedented spiritualized dimension. Within this specific historical horizon, the Rāmāyaṇa appears to seek an imaginative answer to the profound problem of the centrifugal dynamic of power: How is it possible to produce a political order that can both acknowledge and transcend the violence constitutive of the political.(p.407)

Thus, in the first or historical plane, two aspects needed to be proved: *Rāmāyaṇa* is post-Ashokan and that it is a political text. Neither has been proved with sufficient evidence from within the text itself. In essence, there is no evidence within the text that lends itself to pratyaksha pramana: that *Rāmāyana* is a political text is not directly perceived in this historical plane.

Plane 2: Traditional commentators/interpreters

Such a vision of the text emerged only in the early second millennium, and even if derived from the older political theology, it is no longer recognizably such. For these readers, medieval theologian-commentators, the poem is an absolutely true record of God's deeds on earth – Rama as avatar of the god Vishnu – a conviction that made the vernacular versions, above all the sixteenth-century Hindi adaptation Rāmcaritmānas, among the most important religious texts of India.(p.407)

Pollock claims that *Rāmāyaṇa* was political in its genesis. But we have seen from his interpretation along plane 1, that there is no evidence to support this. Here, along the second plane, he says that according to tradition, *Rāmāyaṇa* is not recognizable as a political text. In the vast literature that has sprung from *Rāmāyaṇa* over a period of thousand years, according to his own admission there is nothing in the texts themselves to show that it was political in nature.

This implies that there is no *pratyaksha* *pramana* for saying *Rāmāyaṇa* is political text, i.e., the political nature cannot be directly perceived. Now it has been shown in Pollock's interpretation of planes 1 and 3, not even one śloka has been provided from *Rāmāyaṇa* to make it a political text. Thus, in all three planes Pollock has not given any śloka to support his thesis of *Rāmāyaṇa* being a political text. Since *anumāna* or inference depends on *pratyakṣa*, *anumāna pramāṇa* cannot be used in plane 2 to show that *Rāmāyaṇa* is a political text.

Examining Sheldon Pollock's Works

अथावयवाः

प्रतिज्ञाहेतूदाहरणोपनयनिगमनान्य् अवयवाः ॥ १.१.३२ ॥

pratijñā hetu udāharaṇa upanaya nigamanāni avayavāḥ ||1.1.32||

The five components or avayavas of a nyaya or inference are stated and generally explained.

1. pratijñā vacana – thesis statement – the hill has fire
2. hetu – reason – because of smoke
3. udāharaṇa- example – wherever there is smoke there is fire
4. upanaya - application – there is smoke on the hill also
5. nigamana- conclusion – thus because of the smoke, the hill has fire

The Theory of Practice and the Practice of Theory in Indian Intellectual History (1985c)

pratijñā vacana

In ancient India, however, there were special factors, which we shall examine, that contributed to transforming śāstra into a rigorously normative code, enabling it to speak in an injunctive mood, with the authority appropriate to vedic vidhis.(p.504)...the transformation of śāstras from descriptive catalogue to prescriptive system set in. (p.504)...I have suggested was a development from descriptive catalogue to prescriptive plan. (p.511)

hetu

Various śāstras are quoted, but there is no pratyakṣa pramāṇa, nothing within the Sanskrit texts themselves that say that such a transformation occurred. He simply states that in the beginning, śāstras such as grammar were descriptive and later on they became prescriptive. Thus, the hetu to support the pratijñā vacana would have to be questioned.

udāharaṇa

For here, on a scale probably unparalleled in the pre-modern world, we find a thorough transformation adopting now Geertz's well-known dichotomy of "models of" human activity into "models for," whereby texts that initially had shaped themselves to reality so as to make it "graspable," end by asserting the authority to shape reality to themselves.

Upanaya – Such a transformation (as stated in the udāharaṇa above) has occurred in the śāstras also.

nigamana – Therefore, because of the hetu stated above śāstras have become prescriptive from being descriptive initially.

Nirṇaya

To establish this transformation, he uses Geertz's models as pramāṇa. So the second dimension of his three-dimension philology, how Indian tradition viewed itself is not seen here. Using Geert's as pramāṇa is not valid since his theories have not been proved and thus cannot be called a pramāṇa. Thus, there is no three-dimension philology, only his own interpretation which results in essentially a one dimensional philology.

Moreover, if such a transformation occurred, then it should be asked when it happened? Did it happen instantaneously or over a period of time? In the paper Pollock is careful not to mention any dates even in the footnotes. This should be contrasted with later papers and the *Language of the Gods*, where dates are conspicuously mentioned as they are very important to his thesis.

Intellectual History of Sheldon Pollock

The first phase represents the pre-Orientalism period and includes most of his works on Rāmāyana.

The second phase, in responding to Edward Said's criticism, begins with Pollock trying to "exhume" power and domination within the Sanskrit texts themselves and to this period belongs most of his works on śāstra and mīmāṃsā in particular.

The third phase begins in 1993 with what he calls the "poetry of power" - seeing kāvya compositions as exercising political power.

The fourth phase begins with his study of Rasa in the late nineties.

The last phase is represented by his works on philology and his efforts in trying to formulate a theory for interpreting Sanskrit texts. Some of his works are also a direct reaction to the events taking place in India.

Early Works (1979 – 1984)

Text Critical Observations on Valmiki Rāmāyana (1979a)

The Rāmāyana and Critical Edition (1984a)

Pollock's translation and papers on Rāmāyana are based on the critical edition published by Oriental Institute, Baroda. He considers the critical edition as authentic but still having some mistakes (ślokas that are included or excluded incorrectly) which he corrects in his own translations.

The Divine King in the Indian Epic (1984b)

Atmanam manusham manye: Dharmakutam on the Divinity of
Rama (1984c)

Rakshasas and Other (1985a)

The Rāmāyana of Valmiki: An Epic of India, Volume II:
Ayodyākāṇḍa (1986a)

The Rāmāyana of Valmiki: An Epic of India, Volume III:
Araṇyakāṇḍa (1991a)

All these works are written before the 1985 śastra paper even though the publication dates show otherwise. This can be seen both by internal evidence and also by the writing style. There is generally no effort to show how the Indians viewed themselves which will be predominant in papers written after 1985. As can be seen, all these works are related to Rāmāyana and there is no “poetry of power” or aesthetization of power to be seen in these works.

On Sastra (1985 – 1993)

The Theory of Practice and Practice of Theory in Indian Intellectual History (1985c)

Mīmāṃsā and the Problem of History in Traditional India (1989a)

The Idea of Sastra in Indian Tradition (1989b.)

Playing by the Rules: Sastra and Sanskrit Literature (1989c)

From Discourse of Ritual to Discourse of Power in Sanskrit Culture (1990a)

Kriyakalpataru of Lakshmidhara (1993a)

From the first paper on śāstras and in all subsequent papers, he tries to show how the Indian tradition viewed itself, how the “actors” saw themselves. The main gist of these six papers is that śāstra and mīmāṃsā in particular went from being descriptive to prescriptive or normative and then were used to control society. No pramāṇa from within the śāstric texts are shown to substantiate this process of going from descriptive to prescriptive. No aesthetization of power is seen in these works which are only about power and domination seen in the Sanskrit texts themselves.

The 1800 Motif (1993)

Deep Orientalism? Notes on Sanskrit and Power beyond the Raj
(1993a)

In his philological works, Pollock makes a concerted effort to deny the birth of modern philology in Germany at around 1800. The influence of Sanskrit on European thought and culture is rarely mentioned by Pollock. His recent theory of “parallel traditions” concept where he shows that there are similar philological developments in the India, China and the West is again deny any Indian influence on Europe.

Poetry of Power (1993)

Rāmāyaṇa and Political Imagination in India (1993b)

This work begins the third phase of Pollockian philology and he himself calls it “poetry of power” or aesthetization of power. There seems to be two aspects to this aesthetization of power theory. One being the Gramscian and the other Saidian. In the first, culture has an effect on politics and vice versa. This would be true for a certain time period, as for example in Italy or Germany. But this would not be sufficient to explain how a political aspect within a text as that of Rāmāyana could be carried over for a period of two thousand years. So he draws on the Saidian aspect of aesthetization of power. Edward Said’s aesthetization of power is described in *Future Philology*.

Since Rāmāyana or kāvyas themselves do not contain references to political aspects directly (meaning there would be no pratyakṣa pramāṇa), inscriptions are used to infer the connection between politics and kāvya. This paper also begins his reliance on inscriptions and epigraphs to establish his thesis.

Sanskrit Cosmopolis and Kaviprasaṃsā (1995 – 1997)

In Praise of Poets: On the History and Function of Kaviprasaṃsā
(1995a)

Literary History, Religion and Nation in South Asia: Introductory
Note (1995b)

Literary History, Indian History, World History (1995c)

Public Poetry in Sanskrit (1995d)

Philology, Literature, Translation (1996a)

The Sanskrit Cosmopolis, A.D. 300-1300: Transculturation,
Vernacularization and the Question of Ideology (1996b)

By now Pollock assumes that he has established two things with respect to Sanskrit texts: power and domination in śāstras and power and politics in kāvyas, all this without showing any pramāṇas. The power structures in kāvyas are used to show how the Sanskrit cosmopolis spread over vast areas of South Asia. Most of these papers deal with how the Sanskrit cosmopolitan world was created at the beginning of the first millennium and existed for over a period of thousand years. Inscriptions and epigraphs are used to infer that such a cosmopolis came to exist. Sanskrit praśastis in particular are used and from this it is inferred that kāvya came to existence at the beginning of the first millennium.

Rasa Sastra (1998)

Bhoja's Sringaraprakashika and the Problem of Rasa: A Historical Introduction and Annotated Translation (1998a)

This begins the study of Rasa śāstra by Pollock and represents the fourth and perhaps the most important phase. The approach in this work is to see how the Rasa of a kāvya is used by Kings such as Bhoja to control their subjects. He says that the “whole point of Sṛṅgāraprakāśa, for its part, is to discipline and correct the reading of Sanskrit literature, and by creating readers who thereby come to understand what they should and should not do in the particular life world constituted by this literature, it aims to create politically correct subjects and subjectiveness.”

1. Power and domination in śāstras - vyākaraṇa use by Kings to control the populace
2. Poetry of Power – The spread of Sanskrit cosmos is linked to praśastis
3. Rasa śāstra – again meant to control the subjects

Amara Bhāratī (2001)

The death of Sanskrit (2001b)

This work is a response to the efforts of the then BJP government to popularize Sanskrit by declaring 1999-2000 as year of Sanskrit. He claims that in some essential way Sanskrit is dead. That Sanskrit was very much alive till 1800 CE and greatly influenced European sciences can be known from Pollock's own works. Again, since Pollock seems to be using techniques learned from Rasa siddhanta in his own works is proof again that Sanskrit is alive and has the capacity to influence modern thought.

Early-Modern India (2000 - 2004)

New Intellectuals in Seventeen Century India (2001a)

Introduction in Forms of Knowledge in Early Modern South Asia (2004b)

Early-Modern is a term that is used to indicate Islamic rule in India before the coming of the British. Even though innovation can be directly perceived by the number of Sanskrit texts written over any given period, Pollock limits it to early-modern period implying that Islamic rule had something to do with it. An important project is started to collect and analyse manuscripts during this early-modern period to show innovation. It should be noted that the 1985 paper on śāstra had claimed that there could be no newness or innovation in Indian tradition.

Literary History (2003)

Introduction in In Literary Cultures in History: Reconstructions from South Asia (2003b)

Sanskrit Literary Culture from the Inside Out (2003c)

As the title suggests, Pollock does not discuss history of literature but literary cultures, how the culture, in this case Indian, viewed literature. As he says “...knowing something of the history of Sanskrit literary culture and the unparalleled power it exercised in premodern Asia” (2003c:121) is the main theme of these papers and this collection.

Vernacularization (2004)

India in the Vernacular Millennium: Literary Culture and Polity,
1000-1500 (1996b)

The Transformation of Culture-Power in Indo-Europe, 1000-1300
(2004c)

A New Philology: From Norm-bound Practice to Practice-bound
Norm in Kannada Intellectual History (2004a)

Pollock develops a theory of vernacularization, a dramatic shift that happened at the beginning of second millennium from Sanskrit to Kannada and other languages signifying the end of Sanskrit dominance. He uses Kannada as the prime example of this transformation and the grammatical texts composed in Kannada and Telugu to signify this shift.

This theme reaches its culmination in the *Language of the Gods*. However, Tamil poses a significant problem to this theory and so he calls it a historiographically difficult language and places Tolkappiam at around 12th century.

Literary History (2003)

Introduction in In Literary Cultures in History: Reconstructions from South Asia (2003b)

Sanskrit Literary Culture from the Inside Out (2003c)

As the title suggests, Pollock does not discuss history of literature but literary cultures, how the culture, in this case Indian, viewed literature. As he says “...knowing something of the history of Sanskrit literary culture and the unparalleled power it exercised in premodern Asia” (2003c:121) is the main theme of these papers and this collection.

Vernacularization (2004)

India in the Vernacular Millennium: Literary Culture and Polity, 1000-1500 (1996b)

The Transformation of Culture-Power in Indo-Europe, 1000-1300 (2004c)

A New Philology: From Norm-bound Practice to Practice-bound Norm in Kannada Intellectual History (2004a)

Pollock develops a theory of vernacularization, a dramatic shift that happened at the beginning of second millennium from Sanskrit to Kannada and other languages signifying the end of Sanskrit dominance. He uses Kannada as the prime example of this transformation and the grammatical texts composed in Kannada and Telugu to signify this shift.

This theme reaches its culmination in the *Language of the Gods*. However, Tamil poses a significant problem to this theory and so he calls it a historiographically difficult language and places Tolkappiam at around 12th century.

The Language of the Gods in the World of Men (2006a)

Pollock's major work discusses two major movements that happened, one at the beginning of the first millennium and the other at the beginning of the second. The first was Sanskrit cosmopolitanism and the second was vernacularism. Since no *pratyakṣa pramāṇa* is there to substantiate his two thesis statements, Pollock provides a lot of data from inscriptions and epigraphy. That *vyākaraṇa* texts were being written in vernacular languages such as Kannad and Telugu is used as evidence for the shift from Sanskrit. He seems to be using the knowledge gained by a study of Bhoja's *śṛṅgāraprakāśa* and by giving numerous sources not directly related to his thesis statement, tries to invoke the feeling in the readers that actually this transformation has occurred. Western universalism imposed on Indian tradition using techniques found in Bhoja's work.

Rasa Sastra (2009 – 2016)

Rasamanjari and Rasatarangini of Bhanudatta (2009a)

What was Bhatta Nāyaka Saying? (2010b)

From Rasa Seen to Rasa Heard (2012a)

Works on Philology (2008 – 2016)

The works on philology represent the fifth and the final phase of Pollock. In these papers he tries to formulate a theoretical basis for philology that he claims to be practicing for the last three decades. The primary reason for putting forth a theory is that philology is a dying humanistic science as it is essentially based on interpretation which remains undefined. A theoretical basis would perhaps secure philology a permanent place in the academia along with the sciences.

Future Philology: The Fate of a Soft Science in a Hard World (2009b)

Critical Philology (2014b)

Philology in Three Dimensions (2014c)

These three papers attempt to give a theoretical basis for philology. *Critical Philology* and *Philology in Three Dimensions* are identical with no new material. Both of them give two examples, one on Rāmāyana and the other on Sakuntalā illustrating his approach to understanding Sanskrit texts. *Future Philology?* tries to vaguely define the three dimensions or planes needed in understanding texts.

Liberating Philology (2014d)

Philologia Rediviva (2015a)

Introduction in World Philology (2015h)

What was Philology in Sanskrit? (2015g)

Philology and Freedom (2016b)

All these works put together runs into about two-hundred pages, but is mostly intended to University administrators and thus very little theorizing. Philology is defined as “making *sense* of texts” and sense here means looking into the mind of the “actors” (Indian tradition) and see the world that they saw. The term philology itself becomes political philology then critical philology then liberating philology and now is equated to freedom. The correct term would be sense philology to reflect his definition.

The Living Nyāya Paramparā

Nyāyadarśana by Mahāmahopadhyāya Phaṇibhuṣaṇa

Tarkavagīśa (Bengali samvat. 1282-1348)

Paṇḍitaratnam K.S.Varadācārya

वाचस्पतिमिश्रः न्यायवार्तिकतात्पर्यटीकायाम्

परमकारुणिको हि भगवान् मुनिः जगदेव दुःखपङ्कमग्राम् उद्दिधीर्षुः
शास्त्रं प्रणितवान् ।

तत्र यदि कश्चिन्न प्रवर्तेत किमायातं शास्त्रस्य ?

न च अनधिकृतपुरुषव्युत्पादनेन अस्य तपोनिधेः कश्चिदस्ति दोषः

न्यायभाष्यम्

प्रदीपः सर्वविद्यानामुपायः सर्वकर्मणाम् ।
आश्रयः सर्वधर्माणां विद्योद्देशे प्रकीर्तिता ॥