

Images of Language Mixture in Early Kannada Literature

Andrew Ollett

Introduction

Kannada literature was, from its very beginnings, deeply influenced by Sanskrit literature. Many of the earliest texts attest to a conscious calibration of manners of expression shared with Sanskrit and those found in Kannada alone, or as Pollock (2006: 331) has put it, “the long-term negotiation between cosmopolitan and vernacular.” Perhaps the most important of the “sites of negotiation” (Nagaraj 2003: 339) is the lexicon. Kannada’s path as a South Asian vernacular can be characterized by its mode of incorporation of Sanskrit lexical items. Unlike Prakrit and Tamil, which employed Sanskrit words only after modifying them to conform to their own phonological systems, Kannada very often employed Sanskrit words “as-is,” without phonological changes.¹ But unlike the Manipravalam of Kerala and Tamil Nadu, which used Sanskrit words complete with their inflectional endings, Sanskrit-derived lexical items had to have Kannada inflectional endings if they were to be used in a Kannada text. The use of unmodified Sanskrit lexical items — *tatsamas*, as people somewhat incorrectly tend to call them today, or *samasam̐skṛtas*, as they were known to early Kannada authors² — with Kannada inflection morphology has made Kannada, along with Telugu and Javanese, one of the clearest examples of what Pollock has called “the ‘cosmopolitan vernacular, that register of the emergent vernacular that aims to localize the full spectrum of literary qualities of the superposed cosmopolitan code” (2006: 26). And like Telugu and Javanese, the history of Kannada as a literary language can be told partly in terms of how authors approached the lexical and stylistic inheritance of Sanskrit.³

1 For Prakrit see Ollett 2017: 153–161.

2 Note that *tatsamas* are not the same as *samasam̐skṛtas*. The former refers to words that happen to be the same in the phonology of both Sanskrit and Kannada (such as *hari-*, *hara-*, and *kamala-*); the latter refers to Sanskrit words that are in principle subject to phonological changes (such as *sam̐skṛta-* itself, which would become *sakkada-*) but used in Kannada, at the author’s discretion, in the form that the word takes in Sanskrit. For a definition of *samasam̐skṛta-* see *Śabdamaṇidarpana* v. 80 (p. 12); this definition, however, excludes indeclinables, which are included in the category (implicitly) by the *Kavirājamārgaṇ* (see below).

3 Nagaraj 2003: 359–363. Although *maṇipravāla* is never (as far as I know) used to refer to language in Indonesia, it is no wonder that a scholar from Kerala identified Old Javanese as a kind of “Maṇipravāla.” See Panikkar 1946. For Telugu, see Narayana Rao’s classic article on “coconut and honey” (Narayana Rao 1995).

It takes some imagination even to pose the question of how the expressive resources of different languages might be combined, in certain ways and with certain effects, in a single literary work. Authors who reflected on this topic often availed themselves of metaphors. The best known of these metaphors is *maṇipravāḷam*, literally “gem-coral,” which has come to be a proper noun, designating a particular style of composition in which inflected Sanskrit words are used alongside the forms of a vernacular language. I will review the history of this metaphor shortly. A number of Kannada authors gave special attention to the question of language mixture and expressed their thoughts in metaphorical terms. I will focus on Śrīvijaya (late 9th c.) and Nāgavarma (mid 11th c.) in this paper. Both of these authors wrote programmatic works on Kannada literature (the *Kavirājamārgaṃ* and *Kāvyaḷavalōkanaṃ* respectively) and had occasion to reflect on language mixture in the course of their larger literary-theoretical projects. I make no claim to exhaustiveness, however. There may well be metaphors of language mixture in other early Kannada authors. Similarly, it is possible that the images of mixture discussed in this paper appear in other contexts where they have a metapoetic significance.

Gems and Coral

“Gem-coral,” as noted above, is probably the most widespread image of language mixture. Although the image has been discussed periodically in modern scholarship, I will nevertheless offer a brief overview of its history. Partly this is because I find the scholarly discussion rather uncritical, and partly because I am interested precisely in the *absence* of this image in early Kannada literature, in contrast to other images of language mixture, and what this absence might mean for the type of mixture that early Kannada authors envisioned.⁴

The earliest use of the image of gems and coral in reference to language, as far as I know, occurs in Jinasēna’s concluding remarks (*praśasti*) to the *Jayadhavalā*, a commentary on the *Kaṣāyaprabhṛtam*. This commentary was begun by Vīrasēna and finished by Jinasēna, his student, on February 8, 837 CE, under the reign of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Amōghavarṣa. This king, who ruled from Mānyakhēṭa (Malkhed) in northern Karnataka, would subsequently become an important proponent of the use of Kannada for literary and political expression (Pollock 2006: 332). The *Jayadhavalā*, however, was completed in a town called Vāṭagrāmapura, possibly outside of Nasik, under the immediate jurisdiction of a governor named Gūrjarārya (Jain 1964: 188). Jinasēna says the following about the composition of the commentary (v. 32 in Mukhtar and Jain 1954: 183–189):⁵

4 For Manipravalam see Venkatachari 1978: 167 (apparently based on an earlier discussion by Kodanda Ramayya 1972–1973 which is not available to me), Freeman 1995: 58, Monius 2001: 211 n. 37, Raman 2007: 63, Rao 2015: 16–17, Anandakichenin 2018a. This paper supercedes my own brief comments in Ollett 2017: 166. Several of these authors refer to work by Ezuthachan (1972 and 1975: 8–10) that is not available to me.

5 Mukhtar and Jain’s collection contains the most complete version of the *praśasti* that I have found to date. It was not printed with the *Jayadhavalā* itself, although portions of it are quoted in the introduction. Mukhtar and Jain’s primary source for the *praśasti* are copies made of the original palm-leaf manuscripts at Mudabidri by Tātyā Nēminātha Jī of Pāṅgala in August 1912, which were subsequently compared with other copies that had been “leaked” from Mudrabidri to Ajanepur, Saharanpur, and Ara. On Jinasēna’s career, see Upadhye 1968.

prāyaḥ prākṛtabhāratyā kvacit saṁskṛtamiśrayā
maṇipravālanīyāyēna prōktō 'yaṁ granthavistarahaḥ

In general this work has been composed in the Prakrit language, in some places mixed with Sanskrit, according to the principle of 'gems and coral.'

What is "the principle of gems and coral" (*maṇipravālanīyāyāḥ*)? I was able to find only one other instance of this phrase, in Sāyaṇa's commentary on the *Aitarēya Brāhmaṇa* (Satyavrat Śāmaśramī 1896: 369), where it is used to describe the alternation of *bṛhatī* and *satōbṛhatī* meters in the Vālakhilya hymns of the *Ṛgvēda* (VIII.49–54). This alternation seems to be likened to an ornament, such as a necklace, wherein gemstones and pieces of coral are strung up with each other in alternation. The alternation between Prakrit and Sanskrit in the *Jayadhavalā*, however, is not regular. As Jinasēna says, the general tendency is to use Prakrit. Precisely what motivates the authors to switch over to Sanskrit when they do is not clear, although it seems that they at least tend to switch over when introducing and discussing quotations in Sanskrit. It bears emphasis that the alternation of language in the *Jayadhavalā* happens no lower than the level of the *phrase*, and more often at the level of the sentence or section. That means that, in general, Sanskrit and Prakrit words are not combined with each other in a single phrase, and instead all of the words in a phrase will be either Sanskrit or Prakrit. And although the Prakrit of the *Jayadhavalā* is heavily influenced by scholastic Sanskrit style, one does not find Prakrit stems with Sanskrit inflections or *vice versa*.

Thus the "principle of 'gems and coral'" thus seems to involve an alternation between two elements, without fully specifying the parameters of alternation. The principle implies that the elements ought to be similar to each other, or at least belong to the same general category. Gems and coral were very frequently mentioned together as precious objects, and in particular in the phrase *maṇi-muktā-pravāla-* ("gems, pearls, and coral").⁶ I should note that there is nothing about the expression *maṇipravāla* itself that suggests that the *maṇi* refers to anything more specific than a "precious or semiprecious stone," although some authors, both premodern and modern, have taken it to refer to either pearls or rubies. An apt illustration of this principle might be the *Vīrastutiḥ* of the poet Dhanapāla (late 10th – early 11th c.), where each line of the eleven-verse hymn is composed alternately in Sanskrit or Prakrit. Whether the principle implies a difference in value between the two elements is difficult to say.

In the early eleventh century, almost two centuries after Jinasēna completed the *Jayadhavalā*, Abhinavagupta referred to *maṇipravālam*. Here is how I understand the passage (*Abhinavabhāratī* vol. 4 p. 387, commenting on *Nāṭyaśāstram* 3.382):

[divyāṇām saṁskṛtaṁ gānaṁ pramāṇais tu vidhīyatē

6 *Manusmṛti* 9.326, 11.168; *Arthaśāstra* 2.12.27, 2.13.59, 2.14.43. *Mahābhārata* 1.105.7.41, 1.105.17.1, 1.110.36.8, 13.110.52.2, 13.110.67.2. I found these references on Oliver Hellwig's *Digital Corpus of Sanskrit* (<http://www.sanskrit-linguistics.org/dcs/>). It is often mentioned that the second major section of a Tamil anthology, the *Akanāṅkūru*, is titled *maṇimiṭai pavalam* ("coral close set with gems"), although the significance of the title is unclear.

ardhasaṁskṛtam ēvaṁ tu mānuṣānām prayōjayēt ~ *Nāṭyaśāstram* 32.382]

... manuṣyānām ardhasaṁskṛtam trivargaprasiddham.⁷ padaṁ madhyē saṁskṛtaṁ, madhyē dēśabhāṣādiyuktaṁ tad ēva kāryam. dakṣiṇāpathē maṇipravālam iti prasiddham, kāśmīrē śāṭakulam iti.

[Authorities require the songs of divine characters, however, to be Sanskrit, whereas one should direct human characters to sing in half-Sanskrit.]

... For human beings [the song is] half-Sanskrit, well-known among the three higher castes. At one point there will be a Sanskrit word, and at another point the same word will be joined with the regional languages and so on. This is known as *maṇipravālam* in the South and as *śāṭakulam* in Kashmir.

Abhinavagupta gives a number of other interpretations for “half-Sanskrit,” but this one, which he equates to *maṇipravālam* in the South, appears to be a performance style in which the very same text that is read in Sanskrit is subsequently provided with a gloss in the regional language.⁸ Scholars have sometimes seen this passage as attesting a style of composition that would later be called Maṇipravālam in Kerala and Tamil Nadu, wherein fully-inflected Sanskrit forms are used alongside fully-inflected Malayalam or Tamil forms. But this does not seem to be the case.⁹

Finally, some decades after Abhinavagupta wrote these words, we finally encounter an explicit definition of *maṇipravālam* in the *Vīracōḷiyam*, a work of poetics in Tamil from about 1070 CE. Here is how verse 180 begins (p. 283):

īṭaiyē vaṭavelutt' eytil viraviyal īṇṭ' etukai-
naṭaiy ētum illā maṇippiravāḷa narreyvaccolin
īṭaiyē muṭiyum patam uṭait tāṇ ...

It is *viraviyal* (“mixture”) if there are Sanskrit speech-sounds within it. Here there need not be any second-syllable alliteration (*etukai*). If it has verses that are created with Sanskrit words within them, it is Maṇipravālam.

The implication is that *maṇipravālam* involves the use of fully inflected Sanskrit words within Tamil. As Monius (2001: 119) notes, this characterization seems to refer to verse rather than prose. The *Vīracōḷiyam*'s definition thus aligns with the type of Maṇipravālam familiar from Kerala. This type of language, “Kerala Manipravalam,” was explicitly theorized in the *Līlātilakam*,

7 The edition reads: (anyat) trigarva (varga) prasiddham padamadyē etc. The conventions and interventions of the editors are mysterious, especially for this fourth volume of the *Abhinavabhāratī* (which M. Ramakrishna Kavi left unfinished at the time of his death and was “triaged” by J. S. Pade).

8 A number of modern traditions of performing Sanskrit works involve a running commentary in the modern language (this is the case of the *gamaki* performances organized by Parampare in Mysore).

9 See, for example, Rao 2015: 16.

a work in Sanskrit that Freeman (1998: 42) dates to the “last quarter of the fourteenth century.” For this work, and the literary tradition it reflects upon, I can refer the reader to a number of recent studies (Freeman 1998; Sherraden 2014; Goren Arzony 2019). A similar type of language, “Tamil Manipravalam,” is associated primarily with the Śrīvaiṣṇavas of Tamil Nadu, although it is more an idiom of explanatory prose than literary verse (Venkatachari 1978; Raman 2007; Rao 2015; Anandakichenin 2018a and 2018b). Rao (2015: 17) hypothesizes that this idiom is based on the versified Manipravalam referred to in the *Vīracōliyam*, and represents a “self-conscious appropriation of an existing cosmopolitan vernacular by religious communities.” Nevertheless the use of the term Manipravalam to refer to this idiom seems to be modern, as authors of Tamil Manipravalam did not identify their language in this way (Venkatachari 1978: 5; Rao 2015: 13). There may, of course, be continuities between Tamil Manipravalam and earlier idioms in which Tamil and Sanskrit were combined, such as the inscriptional discourse of the Pallavas (Rao 2015: 16) or the prose of the *Pārataveṅpā* (Raman 2007: 63).

Kerala and Tamil Manipravalam both involve the use of inflected Sanskrit words within a “matrix” of a regional language. This appears to have been the common understanding of Manipravalam as a form of language after the eleventh century, even outside of Kerala and Tamil Nadu. Although Manipravalam never became well-established in the Kannada- and Telugu-speaking areas, there were a number of isolated experiments, discussed briefly by Venkatachari (1978). One such experiment is Pāḷkuriki Sōmanātha’s *Vṛṣādhīpaśatakam*. This is a hundred verses in praise of Basava, and most are entirely in Telugu. There is a stretch of verses, however, where Basava is addressed in Sanskrit (vv. 54–59), followed by verses where he is addressed in Tamil (v. 60, identified as *drāviḍabhāṣā*), Kannada (v. 61, *kannaḍabhāṣā*), and Marathi (v. 62, *nārebhāṣā*, probably “the language of men” in contrast to Sanskrit). Then follow four verses in languages that Pāḷkuriki describes as *maṇipravāḷam* (vv. 63–66). It seems, despite Venkatachari’s dismissal, that these are meant to illustrate four different types of *maṇipravāḷam*, since the first (v. 63) is clearly a mixture of Telugu and Sanskrit, and the last (v. 66) appears to be a mixture of Kannada and Sanskrit, although I suspect the text available to me has errors in it. The intervening verses, likewise labelled as *maṇipravāḷam*, are not very clear in the text available to me.

We now come, by way of a long detour, back to the question of Manipravalam in Kannada. The solitary reference to *maṇipravāḷam* in Kannada literature, as far as I know, is found in Pārśvapaṇḍita’s *Pārśvapurāṇam* (1222 CE), where he praises the poet Aggala (who wrote his *Candraprabhapurāṇam* in 1189 CE) for composing a hymn described as *maṇipravāḷam*.¹⁰ This hymn does not survive, although we might speculate that it had the same structure as Dhanapāla’s *Vīrastutiḥ*, mentioned above. Apart from this one hymn, however, the image of “gems and coral” is conspicuously absent from Kannada literature. Kannada is, aside from Tamil, the earliest-attested vernacular language, with a relatively large body of works describing the forms of literature (so-called *lakṣaṇagranthas*), so this absence is unlikely to be accidental. I would venture a twofold explanation. First, *maṇipravāḷam* never simply meant the use of Sanskrit lexical items in a South Indian language, as has sometimes been claimed. It

¹⁰ The *Pārśvapurāṇam* is not available to me at the moment. The verse is cited in Raja 1994–1997: 100, but it has several mistakes, and in fact it is not perfectly clear what *maṇipravāḷam* describes in the verse. It is also mentioned by Venkatachari (1978).

referred first to the “interlacing” of languages, first in a sentence-by-sentence manner (as in the *Jayadhavalā*), and then in a word-by-word manner (as in the *Vīracōḷiyam*’s definition). The latter could refer to a particular form of performance or commentary, as Abhinavagupta’s comments seem to suggest, or a particular literary style in which Sanskrit words are used freely alongside words of the regional language, best exemplified by Kerala Maṇipravāḷa. Sanskrit lexical items were used in all of the vernacular languages of South and Southeast Asia, with or without accommodation to the phonology of the vernacular. In itself, this does not make a language *maṇipravāḷam*, except in the loosest sense. Venkatachari said (1978: 169) that “[m]ere mixture of Saṃskṛt words and Kannaḍa words cannot be called Maṇipravāḷa, because, if one were to do so, the whole of Kannaḍa literature should be called Maṇipravāḷa.” But we ought to distinguish “mere mixture” from deliberate combination. Kannada literature exhibits combination, but precisely not the “mere mixture” of inflected Sanskrit and regional-language words. Second, Kannada authors had been reflecting on how to combine Sanskrit and Kannada lexical items for a long time before our earliest evidence for the specific type of mixed language called Manipravalam in Tamil Nadu and Kerala, and they were probably doing so independently of the development of that specific type of mixed language to the south. Hence when we ask about the images and categories through which language mixture was thought in early Kannada literature, we must look beyond *maṇipravāḷam*. And that is what we will now do.

Śrīvijaya’s *Kavirājamārgam*

The *Kavirājamārgam* (“Way of the Poet-King”) is the earliest Kannada work to survive in manuscript form. It was composed by the poet Śrīvijaya, probably in the latter years of the reign of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Amōghavarṣa (814–878 CE), who is referred to throughout the work.¹¹ It centers on the norms of composing literature in Kannada. The first of its three chapters focuses on the problem of articulating standards of correctness and refinement for Kannada literature, given the absence of earlier theoretical literature and the diversity of literary practice at the time. I will focus on two contiguous sections in this chapter which discuss the use of Sanskrit lexical items. They occur at the end of a general discussion of the Kannada language (1.36–61), before Śrīvijaya begins a section on faults.

The first section (1.51–55) introduces certain Sanskrit words that ought not to be used in Kannada on their own. I will quote the first verse in full because it introduces some of the terms that Śrīvijaya will use to talk about the mixture of Sanskrit and Kannada.

sama-saṃskṛtaṅgaḷoḷiḥ sait’

¹¹ See Ollett, Pierce-Taylor, and Ben-Herut (forthcoming) for a more detailed introduction to this work. I cite the *Kavirājamārgam* from the critical edition and translation that Sarah Pierce Taylor and I are preparing, and will refer to variants below the text. The sigla are listed under “Primary Sources” in the bibliography. I cite Kannada text in accordance with the conventions that Sarah Pierce Taylor and I have formulated in a forthcoming paper (“Representing Kannada Text”). The manuscripts do not consistently distinguish between long and short e/ē and o/ō, nor do they write ḷ, so those letters in the text (and lemmas of the apparatus) should always be read as editorial normalizations (whereas the variant readings reported from the manuscripts are not normalized).

amardire kannaḍaman aṛidu pēlg' embud' id' ā-
gama-kōvida-nigadita-mā-
rgam idarṅ berasalkam āgad' ī sakkadado! (1.51)

saiṭ] K; śait AB, sayt PSV, taiṭ C, taṭ M ♦ pēlg] AB PMSKV; pe! C

The Way proclaimed by experts in the tradition is that you should write Kannaḍa carefully, so that it mixes properly with Sanskrit-identical words. It must not be joined with the following Sanskrit words.

“The Way” is a reference to the specific norm articulated in this section, as well as to the overall system (*kramaṅ*) represented by the *Kavirājamārgaṅ*. “Sanskrit-identical words” (*samaśaṅskṛta-*) are lexical items that are identical to the corresponding Sanskrit lexical item, apart from the inflectional endings. It was probably a term of art in Kannaḍa before the *Kavirājamārgaṅ* was composed, since it is not defined in the text. It primarily refers to nominal stems that can be used in Kannaḍa by affixing the relevant derivational and/or inflectional morphemes (e.g., *mārga-* > *mārgam*), although it probably also refers to verbs (e.g., *prayuj-* > *prayōjisu*), and must include indeclinable forms, too, as we will see shortly. The verb *amar* means “to be mixed” and is the most common way of expressing the mixture of Sanskrit and Kannaḍa. The verb *berasu* “to join” (both transitive and intransitive) is especially used to refer to the formation of compound words, but here refers more generally to the presence of particular Sanskrit lexical items in Kannaḍa.

This verse introduces a list of Sanskrit indeclinable forms (1.52, only found in ms. C). These are forms that either end in a *visargaḥ* (*bahiḥ, antaḥ, muhuḥ, itaḥ, tataḥ, uccaiḥ, etc.*), or a vowel (*sahasā, ā, ahō, iha, etc.*). There is no problem in general with using Sanskrit indeclinables in Kannaḍa: the indeclinable adverb *aviratam*, for instance, can be used as an adverb in Kannaḍa. But that is because *aviratam*, which is formally speaking a neuter singular accusative in Sanskrit, can be read as a neuter singular zero-case form in Kannaḍa. The grammatical category used for adverbs in Sanskrit (neuter singular accusative) thus happens to coincide formally with one of the grammatical categories used for adverbs in Kannaḍa (neuter singular zero-case). This coincidence just does not happen in the case of other Sanskrit indeclinables. There is no way to read *iha* as a Kannaḍa word. And it certainly does not happen in the case of indeclinables that end in a *visargaḥ*, since the *visargaḥ* does not belong to the phonological system of Kannaḍa at all. Hence Śrīvijaya prohibits the use of such indeclinables on their own (*asahāya-*, 1.52). He describes the effect that their use has in the following terms:

berasire kannaḍado! ban-
dhuram āgadu kāvya-racane pēldode pīnarṅ
paraṣataram akkum ottuṅ-
garaḍeya maddaḷeya jharjhara-dhvanigaḷavol (1.53)

berasire] AC PMSKV; berasira B ♦ pēldode] AB PMSKV; pe!vode C ♦ ottuṅ] C MSKV; odarṅ A;
oduṅ B P ♦ garaḍeya] C MSKV; karaḍeya AB P ♦ maddaḷeya] AB PMSKV, maddhaḷeya C ♦

jharjhara C P; *jarjhara* AB MSKV.

If these are joined with Kannada, the poetic composition will not be pleasing. If they are used, it will be extremely harsh, like the clanking of loud *karāḍe* and *maddaḷe* drums.

We are meant to hear something “harsh” and dissonant. The dissonance arises from the fact that the indeclinable words don’t “sound” like Kannada words because they lack the morphology that would allow them to be recognized as such. Śrīvijaya provides two examples: one in which the prohibited indeclinables are used on their own as adverbs (1.54), and one in which they appear only as the first element in a compound with another Sanskrit-identical word (1.56). He introduces the second example as follows:

vidita-sama-saṁskṛtōdita-
padaṅgaḷoḷi pudidu berasi bare kannadaḍadoḷi
mudaman avu tarkum atiśaya-
mṛdaṅga-saṅgītakādi-madhura-ravambol (1.55)

tarkum] PMSKV; *takkum* ABC

When they appear in Kannada in compounds with what are clearly known to be Sanskrit-identical words, then they bring delight, like the sweet sound of a musical ensemble with the excellent *mṛdaṅga* drum.

If the image of 1.53 represents a bad combination of different elements, this image represents a good combination. The difference is not just between the tone of the different drums, the “harsh” *karāḍe* and *maddaḷe* in the one case and the “sweet” *mṛdaṅga* on the other, but between undisciplined clanking and disciplined playing within an ensemble. It is also probably significant that *mṛdaṅga* is a Sanskrit-identical word, joined with other such words in a compound, whereas *karāḍe* and *maddaḷe* are not. It corroborates the point that the way to use Sanskrit indeclinables that do not already happen to belong to the right grammatical category in Kannada is to attach them to a Sanskrit-identical stem that can be inflected as a Kannada word.

The next section (1.57–1.61) also discusses the incorporation of Sanskrit lexical items into Kannada, but this time from the perspective of forming compounds. The principle articulated in 1.57 is very general:

negaḷd’ irda kannadaṅgaḷoḷi
agaṇita-guṇa-vidita-saṁskṛtōkti-kramamaṁ
baged’ ondu māḍi pēḷdoḍe
sogayisugum kāvya-bandham endum anindyaṁ (1.57)

a: *negaḷd*] C PMSKV; *negaḷ* AB ♦ *irda*] ABC PMKV; *arda* S (a mistake?) ♦ *saṁskṛtōkti*] B V;
saṁskṛtokta AC PMSK ♦ *sogayisugum*] PMSKV; *sogayasugum* ABC

A poetic composition will always appear blameless if you compose it by carefully uniting a series of well-known Sanskrit expressions of innumerable good qualities with well-known Kannada words.

Precisely what this means can be understood, in part, from Śrīvijaya’s choices in this very verse. “Kannada words” (*kannaḍaṅga*) is modified by a Kannada expression that means “well-known” (*neḡaḷd’ irda*), and “Sanskrit expressions” (*saṁskṛtōkti*) is modified by a Sanskrit expression that similarly means “well-known” (*vidita-*). The idea is that a careful author should be aware of whether the word he is using is a Sanskrit or Kannada word, because the possibilities of combination for each are different. In general, Sanskrit words can only enter into compounds with other Sanskrit words (as in *vidita-saṁskṛtōkti*). Śrīvijaya does not say it here — he may have taken it as given from the preceding discussion — but his examples make it clear that the restriction does not apply to lexical items that are borrowed from Sanskrit (e.g., *sakkadam* from *saṁskṛtam*), but only to “Sanskrit-identical” words, which are borrowed from Sanskrit without any phonological changes at all. This is presumably why he speaks of a “series” of Sanskrit expressions in this verse: the Sanskrit expressions will form compounds with each other, ending in a Kannada inflection that forms their point of attachment into the syntax of the sentence.

Śrīvijaya once again gives two examples, one that disregards the rule he enunciated (1.59), and one that follows it (1.60). The first example includes what would later be called “enemy-compounds” (*arisamāsas*), where Kannada and Sanskrit stems are joined together in a nominal compound, such as *arasu-kumāra*- “son of the king.” The grammarian Kēśirāja (1260 CE) would reuse these examples in his *Śabdamaṇidarpaṇam* (v. 174, p. 217).¹² Śrīvijaya comments on these examples as follows:

taṛisand’ ā sakkadamuman
ariyade kannaḍamumaṁ samāsōktigaḷoḷ
kuṛitu berasidoḍe virasaṁ
maṛuguva pālg’ aḷeya panigaḷaṁ berasidavol (1.58)

kannaḍamumaṁ] AC PMSKV; *kaṁnaḍamum* B ♦ *berasidoḍe*] BC PMSKV; *berasidoḍe* A

If, in compound expressions, you unknowingly you join words that are well-known to be Sanskrit with Kannada, it will be as tasteless as mixing drops of buttermilk into boiling milk.

I leave the corroboration of this image to experimental philologists. The idea appears to be that the whole (the buttermilk and milk) will be ruined if the parts are incompatible. The image also hints at the possibility that an inattentive poet might fail to recognize that a certain word is either Sanskrit or Kannada, just as an inattentive cook will fail to note the difference between milk and buttermilk, and therefore use it in combinations that will turn out to be unsuccessful. Moreover,

¹² As noted by Pathak in his edition, and Fleet (1904: 275–276) in his review.

the constituent elements are indistinguishable from each other when they are combined. This advice may seem strange, especially to people like myself who are hopelessly monolingual. But Kannada poets were always in the position of having to negotiate two lexicons simultaneously, and it was not always certain whether a word belonged to one or the other. That, I believe, is why Śrīvijaya says “known to be” (*tarisanda*): once again, he is referring not to lexical items that ultimately come from Sanskrit, but to “Sanskrit-identical” items, which are “obviously” Sanskrit because of their phonological form.

Here is Śrīvijaya’s comment on the final example, which only compounds like with like (*narapati-tanaya-*, *kēḷadiyar-ōḍan*):

end’ intu samāsōktiyo!
 ond’ āgire sakkadaṅgaḷuṁ kannaḍamuṁ
 sundaram akkuṁ kavipadam
 ondidavol kanakaracaneyol maṇinikaram (1.61)

sakkadaṅgaḷuṁ] AB PMSKV; *sakkadaṅgaḷuṁ* C ♦ *kavipadam*] BC PMSKV; *kavipadam* A

When Kannada and Sanskrit words unite in compound expressions in this way, the poet’s word will be beautiful, like a cluster of gems inlaid in a golden setting.

The “uniting” that this verse speaks of is probably not the uniting of Sanskrit and Kannada words within a single compound, but the presence of Sanskrit-Sanskrit compounds alongside Kannada-Kannada compounds in the same text, as illustrated in the preceding verse (1.60). The image would allow for either Sanskrit or Kannada words to be the “gems,” so long as they form a “cluster” — that is, a compound word — with similar words. Thus, in contrast to the previous image, the identity of the individual elements remains clear when they are combined. The “golden setting” corresponds, in my reading of the image, with the syntactic matrix in which these compound words occur. Another point of contrast with the previous image is that this verse compares successful language use to a skillfully-crafted luxury item, consonant with the courtly and refined aesthetic that Śrīvijaya wants Kannada to have, rather than casting it in the humble language of cooking.

In my view (developed further in Ollett, Pierce Taylor, and Ben-Herut forthcoming) Śrīvijaya took Daṇḍin as a model not only for his treatment for ornament of meaning but for his overall method and tone, and as a consequence, Śrīvijaya is often playful and sly with his readers. This verse arguably contains one example of the “easter eggs” that Śrīvijaya leaves for his readers. Kannada readers will know that *padam* is a homophone in Kannada: it is, of course, a Sanskrit-identical word for a “word” and sometimes a “verse” (*pada-*), but also a Kannada word for “the proper condition” of something (Burrow and Emeneau 1984: 3907). The word *kavipadam* could thus mean something like the poet’s maturity of expression — if, of course, this verse did not occur at the end of a section that more or less explicitly condemns the compounding of Sanskrit-identical words like *kavi* with Kannada words like *padam*. Hence we are led to take it as the poet’s word. But the alternative interpretation is all the more present here because it has been explicitly rejected.

There is one further verse from the *Kavirājamārgam* that must be mentioned here. It occurs at the beginning of the second chapter, where Śrīvijaya justifies his decision to treat ornaments of sound (*śabdālaṅkāraṁ*) prior to ornaments of meaning (*arthālaṅkāraṁ*):

gaḷiyisid' arthaṁ sale pāṅg'
aliyadeyuṁ śabdāṁ ondad' irdoḍe muttuṁ
melasuṁ kōdant' irkuṁ
kaḷalci kaḷeg' ondi munde bārada padamaṁ (2.5)

gaḷiyisid'] conj. PMSKV; *gaḷiyasid* AC ♦ *irdoḍe*] C PMSKV; *irddade* A ♦ *muttuṁ*] A PMSKV; *muttu* C ♦ *irkkuṁ*] A PMSKV; *akkuṁ* C. B does not transmit this verse.

Suppose you have a meaning that works and that doesn't run aground of propriety at all. If the expression doesn't complement it, it will be like stringing up pearls and black pepper. You should slip off and throw out a word that lacks this accordance.

The accord in question here is not between Sanskrit and Kannada, but between meaning (*artham*) and expression (*śabdam*). The image of white pearls and black peppercorns strung up together is clearly one of contrast, although it is somewhat striking and unexpected. There are many references to dried-up berries used in garlands (*guñja* berries, *rudrākṣa* beads, etc.), but I am not familiar with black pepper being used in this way. There is, moreover, something slightly awkward about the image. It is more natural to think of the expression as the “container” of the meaning (Lakoff and Johnson 2003 [1980]: 127). Or as Kālidāsa put it, meaning and expression are ideally joined in a single body. The idea that meaning and expression could be alternating elements, like pearls and black pepper on a string, “runs aground of propriety” somewhat, to use the words of this verse (*pāṅg' aliyade*). This suggests to me that the image has been repurposed from its original context. I suggest that the original context was a verse from Śrīvijaya's other work, the *Raghuvamśapurāṇam*, that is quoted — without attribution — by two later authors.

Nāgavarma's *Kāvyaṅvalōkanam* and *Vardhamānapurāṇam*

Nāgavarma is best known as the author of the *Kāvyaṅvalōkanam* (“Literary Observations”), the second major work of literary theory in Kannada, after Śrīvijaya's *Kavirājamārgam*. He is also the author of a *campū*, the *Vardhamānapurāṇam*, which was completed in 1042 CE. He was a central figure — the *kaṭakōpadhyāya* or court scholar — at the court of the Cāḷukya king Jayasīrṁha II (r. 1015–1043), where his colleagues included the scholar Vādirāja Sūri, who corrected the *Vardhamānapurāṇam* (1.21). He certainly knew the *Kavirājamārgam*, and indeed praises Śrīvijaya at the very beginning of his *Vardhamānapurāṇam* (1.2). He does speak about the proper calibration of Sanskrit and Kannada in his *Kāvyaṅvalōkanam*, and carves out some

exceptions to the rule that Sanskrit-identical words can only be compounded with other Sanskrit-identical words (*sūtra* 63, p. 61). The most striking image of language mixture in the *Kāvyaavalōkanam*, however, is not found in Nāgavarma's *sūtras*, but in one of his examples. The following verse (ex. no. 15, p. 15) is meant to exemplify the *sandhi* rule (*sūtra* 11) according to which a voiceless stop (*k*, *t*, or *p*) turns into the corresponding voiced stop when it stands at the beginning of the second word in a compound. The same verse is quoted, for the same *sandhi* rule, in Kēśirāja's *Śabdamaṇidarpaṇam* (v. 102).¹³

paḷagannaḍam̐ puduṅgoḷe
 koḷesakkadamam̐ taguḷci jāṅgiḍe muttam̐
 melasam̐ kōdantire pēlv'
 aligavigaḷa kavite budharan erdegoḷisugumē

gannaḍam̐] N; *gannaḍade* Ś_N, *gannaḍada* Ś ♦ *jāṅgiḍe* KŚ] *jāṅkiḍe* N ♦
muttam̐ melasam̐ kōdantire N] *muttam̐ melasum̐ gōdantire* Ś, *muttam̐ melasungōdantire* [sic] Ś_N

Can the poetry of those awful poets who write by mixing up Old Kannada with decrepit Sanskrit, as if they were senselessly stringing up pearls and black pepper, really captivate the learned?

My translation does not differ much from that already offered by Fleet (1904: 276 n. 40). The source from which Nāgavarma drew it is not known, but the image is, of course, familiar from the verse of the *Kavirājamārgam̐* discussed above. Besides using the image of pearls and black pepper, Śrīvijaya had used the phrase “Old Kannada” (*paḷagannaḍam*) to refer to the language of a literary dispensation that was, by the late ninth century, fully in the past (1.48–49). This may well have been a term of art among early Kannada poets, in the same way that “New Kannada” was a slogan for poets of Nāgavarma's generation (see below). But I suspect that this verse came from the *Raghuvam̐śapurāṇam̐* Śrīvijaya is known to have written, and likely from a programmatic section at its beginning, which is mirrored, as we will see, in Nāgavarma's programmatic introduction to his *Vardhamānapurāṇam̐*. The reuse of this image in the *Kavirājamārgam̐* would therefore be a kind of self-reference that is paralleled, once again, in Nāgavarma's reuse of verses from his *Vardhamānapurāṇam̐* as examples for his *Kāvyaavalōkanam̐*.

A further, although subjective, argument for the image being reused in the *Kavirājamārgam̐* is that it works better in the context of language mixture (*Kāvyaavalōkanam̐* v. 15) than in the context of matching meaning to expression (*Kavirājamārgam̐* 2.5). In the verse quoted by Nāgavarma, the pearls are presumably “Old Kannada” words, and the dried-out black peppercorns are the “decrepit” (*koḷe*) Sanskrit words. Precisely what sense this qualifier has is hard to say: are the Sanskrit words decrepit because they are archaic and outdated, or because

¹³The initial *k* of *kannaḍam̐*, *koḷe*, *kiḍe*, *kavigaḷa*, and *koḷisugum* is changed to *g* in this verse. The variant readings are reported from: N = Dēvīrappa's edition of the *Kāvyaavalōkanam̐*; K = the variants from ms. K reported there; Ś_N = the variants from the *Śabdamaṇidarpaṇam̐* quoted in Dēvīrappa's edition; Ś = Kedaliya's edition of the *Śabdamaṇidarpaṇam̐*.

they have, in the course of being adapted to Kannada phonology, become almost unrecognizable? The latter seems more likely, as several radically-altered Sanskrit words (*poḍavi* for *pr̥thvī*, etc.) are mentioned by Śrīvijaya as examples of “Old Kannada” usage (1.49). The image would therefore suggest the combination of beautiful regional words with words that ultimately derive from Sanskrit but which are, to use the terminology of later grammarians, *apabhraṁśas* or *tadbhavas* rather than *samasaṁskṛtas*.

Whether the words used in this verse further support this interpretation is hard to say. *Muttu*, “pearl,” might have been taken to be a derivative of the Sanskrit word *muktā*, although the historical relationship is actually the other way around: *muktā* is a “Sanskritization” of the Dravidian word *muttu* (Burrow and Emeneau 1984: 4959; Mayrhofer 1954–1980 v. 2: 647–648). Similarly Kēśirāja derives *meḷasu* from the Sanskrit word *marīca-* (p. 421), although the word was probably independently borrowed into Sanskrit and Dravidian from an Austroasiatic source (Mayrhofer 1954–1980 v. 2: 588). If anything, these words are not what Śrīvijaya would describe as “clearly identifiable” (*vidita-*, *tarisanda*, *negalḍa*) Sanskrit or Kannada words.

The image is meant to contrast with the image of gems and coral strung in alternating succession. The contrast is in terms of the beauty, or lack thereof, of the individual elements (gems, coral, and pearls being beautiful, and peppercorns not), or even in terms of the congruence, or lack thereof, of the constituent elements (gems and coral being congruent, and pearls and peppercorns not). But in terms of the manner in which the elements are combined, the image of pearls and black pepper is strikingly similar to the image of gems and coral. And hence one implicit criticism in this verse applies equally to combinations of the “pearls and black pepper” type as well as of the “gems and coral” type: composing literature is more than simply stringing together words; it involves, as Śrīvijaya noted, the careful selection of words that can fit, in an aesthetically pleasing way, into an overarching syntactic structure.

Apart from quoting this verse, Nāgavarma had thoughts of his own about mixing Sanskrit and Kannada, which he revealed in the prologue of his *Vardhamānapurāṇaṁ* (p. 5):

[posaga]nnaḍado! amarkeyin
 esedire sakkadad' amardu kāñcanado! kī-
 lisida kisuga[llavol] rañ-
 jisugum̃ kṛti samupalabdha-bandhacchāyaṁ (1.11)

[posaga]nnaḍado! em.; [osedu]ṁ naḍedoḍ' ed. ♦ amardu] em.; amardure ed. ♦ kisuga[llavo!]
 ed.

When a work shines with a mixture of Sanskrit in New Kannada, imparting beauty to the composition, it will sparkle like rubies tightly set in gold.

I have emended the first two lines of Saṅṅayya's text. As we saw, Śrīvijaya had used the phrase “Old Kannada” to refer to the language of a literary past. He himself did not use “New Kannada” to describe the language of the literary present. But “New Kannada” (*posagannaḍaṁ*) became a slogan of sorts for the Kannada authors associated with Jayasimha's court (see Gurevitch forthcoming). Hence I think it is likely Nāgavarman is making a programmatic statement about

“New Kannada” here. The image reprises that of gems in a gold setting from the *Kavirājamārgam* (1.61). It makes it even clearer, however, that “beauty of composition” (*bandhacchāyā*) depends on structural features — the way the Sanskrit words are “staked” into the Kannada syntax — in addition to the mere fact of having both Sanskrit and Kannada lexical items. In my interpretation, Nāgavarma is not proposing a radically new approach to combining Sanskrit and Kannada, but rather giving the name of “New Kannada” to the approach that earlier generations of poets had pioneered and that Śrīvijaya had theorized.

Conclusion

Kannada authors displayed a concern with the proper calibration of Sanskrit and Kannada vocabulary from the very earliest texts that survive. But this calibration was never cast in the image of “gems and coral.” That image seems to have been first used for regular alternations of qualitatively-distinct elements, such as the alternation between Sanskrit and Prakrit in Vīrasēna and Jinasēna’s *Jayadhavalā*, before coming to refer to a specific type of mixture of inflected Sanskrit words and Tamil or Kerala-bhāṣā words. In fact Kannada authors unanimously insist that Sanskrit words cannot be used in Kannada *as is*. They cannot simply be “strung together” with Kannada words, as the negative example of pearls and black pepper shows. Rather, they have to be carefully and thoughtfully (*aṛidu, bagedu*) combined (*amar, berasu*) with Kannada words within the matrix of Kannada syntax. In effect they must become Kannada words themselves. One way for this to happen is by allowing Sanskrit stems, without phonological modification, to be used as Kannada stems and therefore to take Kannada inflections. Such words were called Sanskrit-identical (*sama-saṁskṛta-*), and their use was subject to various conditions, including the condition that they could not occur in compounds with words that were not Sanskrit-identical. Another way for a Sanskrit word to become Kannada is to be accommodated to Kannada phonology. These may be called the *sama-saṁskṛta* and the *tadbhava* routes, respectively. Both were accepted from the earliest Kannada literature, but Śrīvijaya only offers guidelines for the former, taking the latter for granted. Several of his images involve drums, which can be either harmonious or cacophonous, and one pair of images — buttermilk in boiling milk and gems inlaid in gold — offers specific and effective ways of thinking about language mixture that contrast not just in the manner of mixture but in their overall tonality. Stringing words together results in “mere mixture” that can easily be incongruous. Śrīvijaya insisted on Sanskrit words being “inlaid” into Kannada. About a century and a half later, Nāgavarma would quote and repurpose these images of mixture to imagine a “New Kannada” (*posagannaḍa-*) alongside other members of the Cālukya court.

Acknowledgements

I remember sitting in Bangalore traffic and discussing the “pearls and black pepper” verse with our honorand, Hampa Nagarajiah, who has already discussed some of these issues (Nagarajiah 2000) and who subsequently suggested that I write something on the topic. I am

grateful for his enthusiasm and encouragement. Thanks are also due to Sarah Pierce Taylor. I read all of the passages quoted from the *Kavirājamārgam* with her, and they will ultimately appear in our co-authored edition and translation of the entire work, which was supported by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities (RQ-255779-17). She also gave me valuable comments about other Kannada verses quoted here. Ilanit Loewy-Shacham helped me with the passages from the *Vṛṣādhipaśatakam*. I also thank Sivan Goren-Arzon, Whitney Cox, Eric Gurevitch, and Irene SanPietro for their comments and suggestions.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Abhinavabhāratī by Abhinavagupta (early 11th c. CE):

M. Ramakrishna Kavi and J. S. Pade (eds.). 2006. *Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharatamuni, With the Commentary Abhinavabhāratī by Abhinavaguptācārya (Chapters 28–37)*. Vol. IV. Second edition revised by V. M. Kulkarni and T. S. Nandi. Baroda: Oriental Institute.

Kavirājamārgam by Śrīvijaya (870s CE):

- P = K. B. Pathak (ed.). *Nṛpatuṅga's Kavirājamārgga: A Treatise of the 9th century on Alaṅkāra*. Bangalore: Mysore Government Press, 1898.
- M = A. Venkata Rau and H. Sessa Aiyangar (eds.). *Karṇāṭaka Kavirājamārgam*. Madras [Chennai]: University of Madras, 1973.
- S = M. V. Seetha Ramaiah (ed.). *Śrī Nṛpatuṅgadēvānumatamappa Śrīvijayakṛta Kavirājamārgam*. Beṅgaḷūru: B.M. Śrī Smāraka Pratiṣṭhāna, 1994 (rev. edition; first published in 1958).
- K = K. Krishna Moorthy (ed.). *Nṛpatuṅgadēvānumataṁ Śrīvijaya Prabhūtaṁ Kavirājamārgam*. Beṅgaḷūru: I.B.H. Prakāśana, 1983.
- V = T. V. Venkatachala Sastry (ed.). *Śrīvijayaprabhūtaṁ Kavirājamārgam*. Tumakūru: Tumakūru Viśvavidyānilaya, 2011.
- A = MS K 125 at the Kannaḍa Adhyayana Saṁsthe, University of Mysore
- B = MS K 110 at the Kannaḍa Adhyayana Saṁsthe, University of Mysore.
- C = MS K 1250 at the Government Oriental Manuscripts Libary, University of Madras (now at the Anna Centenary Library, Chennai).

Kāvyaḷalōkanam by Nāgavarma (1040s CE)

H. Dēvīrappa (ed.). 2004. *Nāgavarma viracitaṁ Kāvyaḷalōkanam*. Bengaluru: Kannaḍa Sāhitya Pariṣattu.

Jayadhavalā by Vīrasēna and Jinasēna (837 CE):

Phul Chandra, Mehendra Kumar and Kailash Chandra (eds.). 1944. *Kasāya-pāhudam by Gunadharāchārya with the Churni Sutra of Yativrashabhāchārya and The Commentary Jayadhavalā of Veersenchārya Upon Both [Pejjadosa Vihatti I]*. D. Jain Sangh Granthamala 1-1. Benaras: Benaras Hindu University Press.

- Vardhamānapurāṇam* by Nāgavarma (1042 CE)
 B. S. Saṅṅaya (ed.). 1974. *Eraḍaneyā Nāgavarma Viracita Vardhamāna Purāṇam*.
 Mysore: Kannaḍa Adhyayana Saṁsthe, University of Mysore.
- Vīracōḷiyam* by Puttiramittiraṅ (1065–1070 CE):
 K. E. Kōvintarāca Mutaliyār (ed.). 1970. *Poṅparri kāvalar Puttamittiraṅār iyarriya Vīracōḷiyam peruṅktēvaṅār iyarriya uraiyuṅaṅ*. Cennai [Chennai]: Tiruvelvēlit Tenṅintiya Caivasittānta Nūrpatippuk Kaḷakam.
- Vīrastutiḥ* by Dhanapāla (early 11th c. CE):
 Hirallal Kapadia (ed.). 1933. *Paramārḥata-kavīśvara-Śrīdhanapālapraṅṅitaḥ Rṣabhapaṅcāsīkā-Vīrastutidvayarūpakṛṅṅikalāpaḥ Ṭikāprastāvanādīsamalaṅkṛṅṅtaḥ*.
 Surat: Sheth Devchand Lalbhai Jain Pustakodḍhar Fund.
- Vṛṣādhīpaśatakam* by Pālkuriki Sōmanātha (12th/13th c. CE):
<http://andhrabharati.com/shatakamulu/vRishhAdhipa/index.html>
- Śabdamaṅḍarparaṅam* by Kēśirāja/Kēśava (ca. 1260 CE):
 Kedilaya, A. Shanker. 1964–1977. “Śabdamaṅḍarparaṅa.” *Annals of Oriental Research, University of Madras* 19–27: 1–460.

Secondary Sources

- Anandakichenin, Suganya. 2018a. “Maṅḍipravāḷa.” In P. Jain (et al.), *Hinduism and Tribal Religions*. Springer Science. DOI 10.1007/978-94-024-1036-5_163-2.
- . 2018b. *My Sapphire-hued Lord, My Beloved. A Complete, Annotated Translation of Kulacēkara Āḷvār’s Perumāl Tirumoli and Periyavāccāṅ Pillai’s Medieval Maṅḍipravāḷam Commentary, with an Introduction*. Pondichéry: École française d’Extrême-Orient/Institut français de Pondichéry.
- Burrow, Thomas and Murray B. Emeneau. 1984. *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary*. Second revised edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
<https://dsalsrv04.uchicago.edu/dictionaries/burrow>.
- Ezhuthachan, K. N. 1972. “Abhinavagupta on Maṅḍipravāḷa.” In G. N. Reddy and P. Somasekharan Nair (eds.), *Proceedings of the Second All India Conference of Dravidian Linguistics*, 113–114. Tirupati.
- . 1975. *The History of the Grammatical Theories in Malayalam*. Trivandrum: Dravidian Linguistics Association.
- Fleet, J. F. 1904. “Notes on Indian History and Geography: Kavīśvara’s Kavirājamārga.” *Indian Antiquary* 33: 258–280.
- Freeman, Rich. 1998. “Rubies and Coral: The Lapidary Crafting of Language in Kerala.” *Journal of Asian Studies* 57.1: 37–65.
- Goren-Arzon, Sivan. 2019. “Eighteen Poets and a Half: A Literary Renaissance in Medieval Kerala.” Ph.D. thesis, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Gurevitch, Eric. Forthcoming. “The Uses of Useful Knowledge and the Languages of Vernacular Science: Perspectives from Southwest India.” *History of Science*.

- Jain, Jyoti Prasad. 1964. *The Jaina Sources Of The History Of Ancient India (100 B.C. to A.D. 900)*. Delhi: Munshi Ram Manohar Lal.
- Kodanda Ramayya, T. 1972–1973. “Maṇipravāḷa Bhāṣa.” *Bharata* 49.12: 26–35; 50.1: 33–42.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 2003 [1980]. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1956-1980. *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen = A concise etymological Sanskrit dictionary*. Heidelberg: C. Winter. 4 vols.
- Monius, Anne. 2001. *Imagining a Place for Buddhism: Literary Culture and Religious Community in Tamil-Speaking South India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mukhtar, Jugalkishore and Parmanand Jain (eds.). 1954. *Jainagrantha-prasasti-saṅgraha: Prathama Bhāga*. Delhi: Vira-sēvā-mandira.
- Nagaraj, D. R. 2003. “Critical Tensions in the History of Kannada Literary Culture.” In Sheldon Pollock (ed.), *Literary Cultures in History: Reconstructions from South Asia*, 323–382. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Nagarajaiah, Hampa. 2000. *A History of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Maḷkhēḍ and Jainism*. Bangalore: Ankita Pustaka.
- Narayana Rao, Velcheru. 1995. “Coconut and Honey: Sanskrit and Telugu in Medieval Andhra.” *Social Scientist* 23 (nos. 10–12): 24–40.
- Ollett, Andrew. 2017. *Language of the Snakes: Prakrit, Sanskrit, and the Language Order of Premodern India*. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Ollett, Andrew, Sarah Pierce Taylor, and Gil Ben-Herut. Forthcoming. “‘A Mirror and a Handlamp’: *The Way of the Poet-King* and the Afterlife of the *Mirror* in the World of Kannada Literature.” In Yigal Bronner (ed.), *A Lasting Vision: Dandin’s Mirror in the World of Asian Letters*.
- Panikkar, K. M. 1946. “Maṇipravāḷa in Java.” *Dr. C. Kunhan Raja Presentation Volume*, 65–69. Madras [Chennai]: The Adyar Library.
- Pollock, Sheldon. 2006. *Language of the Gods in the World of Men*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Raja, K. K. 1994–1996. “Malayalam and Maṇipravāḷam.” *The Journal of Oriental Research, Madras* 64–67: 99–109.
- Raman, Srilata. 2007. *Self-surrender (prapatti) to God in Śrīvaiṣṇavism: Tamil Cats and Sanskrit Monkeys*. Routledge: Milton Park, Abingdon.
- Rao, Ajay K. 2015. *Re-figuring the Rāmāyaṇa as Theology: A history of Reception in Premodern India*. Routledge: Milton Park, Abingdon.
- Satyavrat Śāmaśramī (ed). 1896. *The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa of the R̥g-Veda, with the Commentary of Śāyaṇa Āchārya*. Vol. III. Calcutta [Kolkata]: Satya Press.
- Sherraden, Aaron Charles. 2014. *Red Rubies Colored Gold: Aureation in the Līlātilakam*. MA Thesis, University of Texas at Austin.
- Upadhye, A. N. 1968. “Jinasena and His Works.” In *Mélanges d’indianisme à la memoire de Louis Renou*, 727–732. Paris: E. de Boccard.

Venkatachari, Koil Kandadai Appan. 1978. *The Manipravāḷa Literature of the Śrīvaiṣṇava Ācāryas, 12th to 15th century A.D.* Bombay: Ananthacharya Research Institute.