

atheism, which Vergiani does not discuss. If, as Vergiani admits, Bhartṛhari believes in an “absolute” that is “light, consciousness, eternal, all-encompassing, etc.” (p. 585), well, some people have a word for that. True, that may seem different from the personal god of other religious traditions, which may be Vergiani’s criterion for theism. But is it really different? In what way? And what does that change? This is more than a semantic problem, because categorizing Bhartṛhari as atheistic without theorizing that word prevents Vergiani, or his readers, from connecting Helārāja’s treatment of Bhartṛhari to other similar appropriations of more clearly religious thinkers or works, such as, for example, Abhinavagupta’s Śaiva re-write of the Vedānta text *Paramārthasāra*.

Of the articles that discuss aesthetic/religious interactions, the most interesting, and theoretically the most far-reaching, is Somadeva Vasudeva’s article “*Lakṣaṇam Aparyālocitābhidhānam—Śobhākara’s Resistance to Ruyyaka*,” on the literary theorist Śobhākara. Rather than simply tracking the movement of terms and ideas between different fields, Vasudeva goes one step further and inquires into *why* these terms were transferred in such a way. Why do Śobhākara and his nemesis Ruyyaka bother to argue so extensively over how to categorize rhetorical figures? The suggestion is that there may be more at stake in these debates than first appears, which the theorists themselves do not explicitly describe. Vasudeva calls this the “underlying motivations and ideologies that steered the debate” (p. 497) and attempts to begin excavating them. One of Vasudeva’s methods—tracking the imagery of the *maṅgala* verses of different texts—reveals a potential hidden lineage of Saurya literary theorists who carried out a consistent, centuries-long argument against non-dual Śaiva literary theorists. His broader conclusion is that Ruyyaka and Śobhākara, in arguing about rhetorical figures, were partially arguing about the cogency of Nyāya philosophy of mind, and therefore perhaps, by extension, about the best way to uphold the validity of the Vedas. These conclusions are, by Vasudeva’s own account, provisional. Still, they seem on the right track, and illuminating. If we see that drawing minute distinctions between rhetorical figures formed part of a larger debate about religious and moral issues, we might start to gain a deeper appreciation of why these intellectuals would spend so much time on them.

There is doubtless further that can be done on this subject, and even on Abhinavagupta’s own corpus. No article in this volume addresses developments in Kashmiri poetry, although Kashmiri poets were clearly also involved in very sophisticated projects of inter-sectarian borrowing and experimentation. Similarly, the long and arguably influential presence of Vedānta in the valley is barely mentioned. These are not criticisms—the volume is already copious and informative. It is only to say that there is still much more to learn about this fascinating time and place, which may, if Bronner is correct, offer valuable lessons about the productive value of tolerance and exchange. And if future scholars are able to raise new questions and penetrate more deeply into the intellectual history of medieval Kashmir, it will only be because of thorough and informative volumes such as this one, which have already made great progress.

JAMES REICH
PACE UNIVERSITY

The Archaeology of Bhakti II: Royal Bhakti, Local Bhakti. Edited by EMMANUEL FRANCIS and CHARLOTTE SCHMID. Collection Indologie, no. 132. Pondicherry: INSTITUT FRANÇAIS DE PONDICHÉRY; Paris: ÉCOLE FRANÇAISE D’EXTRÊME-ORIENT, 2016. Pp. x + 609, illus.

This book is a companion volume to *The Archaeology of Bhakti I: Mathurā and Maturai, Back and Forth* (EFEO/IFP, 2014, also edited by Francis and Schmid and reviewed by me in this journal, 137.1, 2017). These articles are the result of a second workshop held in 2013 in Pondicherry under the auspices of the École Française d’Extrême-Orient. As the editors state, the purpose of the workshop and its resulting papers was to explore “the roles of kings, local elites, and devotional communities in the development of Bhakti.” The authors have examined textual and material records found “in inscriptions, sculptures, monuments, and places” in order to consider the “public” versus the “personal”

aspects of *bhakti* (p. 2). They see *bhakti* as a “strategy” or “style” (p. 4) and address issues of *bhakti* “agencies” (p. 5). In the course of this, many important questions arise: “What is the royal share in the development of a Bhakti deeply rooted in a specific place? What is the local share? How did royal Bhakti respond to local *bhakti*, and vice-versa? Is the patronage by members of royal courts, especially women, equivalent to that of ruling kings? Is it personal Bhakti or dynastic Bhakti” (p. 5)?

In the lead article, “*Tīrthas*, Temples, *Āśramas*, and Royal Courts: Towards a *Mahābhārata* Ethnography of Early Bhakti,” Alf Hildebeitel emphasizes the importance of *tīrtha* and *loka* as crucial parts of the epic’s narrative as it concerns the establishment of early sites for multiform religious expression and reward. Hildebeitel illustrates how *bhakti* practices and emotions emerge from charged nodes of significance on pilgrimage routes, especially where *tīrtha* and *loka* intersect, resulting in the ultimate eminence of Viṣṇu, which then paves the way for the development of *Kṛṣṇa-bhakti*.

In “*Bloß Glaube? Understanding Academic Constructions of Bhakti in the Past Century*,” Vishwa Adluri and Joydeep Bagchee also draw upon the *Mahābhārata* as the quintessential source for the “philosophy of *bhakti*” (p. 79) via the triad of “kingship, divine grace, and salvation” (p. 80). The authors urge us to rethink the received wisdom regarding just how *bhakti* as we now know it emerged and became what it now is: the whole story of *bhakti* as “revolution from below”; as a response to the religious needs of the masses; how religious elites were forced to accept and incorporate new religious forms or die out. Adluri and Bagchee examine two stances regarding *bhakti* and the *Mahābhārata*—James Fitzgerald’s “*bhakti*-as-interpolation” and the Biardeau and Hildebeitel hypothesis of “*bhakti*-as-philosophy” versus a philosophy that they see as permeating the entire text. They want us to see that it is all about “the textual problem of the king in relation to salvation” (p. 103), stressing what they see as the *Mahābhārata*’s full consonance with the Upaniṣads, stating that the epic is not “propounding a philosophy of mere feeling: a real cognitive transformation has to take place” (*bhakti* cannot be reduced to “emotionalism,” in other words). They claim that *bhakti* “has an irreducible intellectual dimension, no matter how it is formalized in cult praxis and expressed emotively” (p. 118). Is *bhakti* all about *mokṣa*, spiritual release? I would maintain that it all depends on who is doing the reading, and that Fitzgerald is just as “right” as Biardeau and Hildebeitel, who are in turn perhaps just as “right” as these authors. The fatal flaws of structuralism are on full display in these first two articles, I fear: *bhakti* in the *Mahābhārata* is like beauty, all in the eyes of the beholder.

In his “Devotional Elements in the *Sakkapañhasutta* of the *Dīghanikāya*,” Greg Bailey moves on to Buddhist contexts and to the problem of “respect” versus “devotion.” Bailey examines the creation of intimacy through Sanskrit/Pāli *upasargas* or “verbal prefixes” (p. 141). This is a very good piece. Bailey bases his case on linguistic grounds, and makes it well. Reminding us that he is speculating, he finds “strong devotional elements in this *sutta*,” but is careful to add that this is “not emotional *bhakti*” (p. 155). These first three articles, while fine, seem out of place to me in this volume. They do not quite live up to the project of the book, at least as I see it, and there are also unfortunate clarity issues with these first three essays. (The volume as a whole is not well edited. There are lots of mistakes and redundancies throughout.)

In Padma Kaimal’s very interesting and useful “Word-Image Tango: Telling Stories with Words and Sculptures at the Kailāsanātha Temple Complex at Kāñcīpuram,” we encounter the temple’s *vimāna* and its story elements in sculpture and in text (p. 160), which work “closely together but not in unison, each picking out separate but coordinated rhythmic steps while the two media periodically peel apart and wrap back together,” hence the “tango” image (p. 161). Kaimal’s delightful “sense-making” techniques encompass the whole mental experience of reading inscription and image, as word and image “converge around shared meanings even as they stake out quite separate paths of expression” (p. 165). Gods and Pallava kings are “woven together” and joined through “metaphor and eroticism” (p. 184). Kaimal does a marvelous job of riddling out how an inscriptional text written in varied meters and read from left to right (as it spools around the *vimāna* walls in an *apradakṣina*, “counter-clockwise” direction) should be understood as emplaced under specific sculptures on the walls of the *vimāna*, which are narratively arranged in a clockwise fashion.

In “Creating Royalty: Identity-Making and Devotional Images of the Wodeyars of Mysore,” Caleb Simmons takes us to Karnataka, where he explores the significance of the “stone devotional images (the *bhakta-viḡrahas*) that to date have been identified as Wodeyar kings.” There are nine images

in question, representing three kings (p. 210). The images are located in various Vaiṣṇava, Śaiva, and Śākta temples. Simmons traces their ascent from “local chieftains to kings vying for regional supremacy,” and in S. A. S. Sharma’s contribution, “The Servitude of the Travancore Royal Family to Śrīpadmanābhasvāmin,” we are given a rich description (but unfortunately, no analysis) of the “‘Royal Bhakti’ of the Travancore family of Kerala (p. 238).

Tiziana Leucci’s “Royal and Local Patronage of Bhakti Cult: The Case of Temple and Court Dancers” includes digests of the writings of European travelers on the status of Indian courtesans, both royal and the temple-dedicated (pp. 266–69). European observers were awed by courtesanal prestige and their lavish lifestyles, but they also expressed degrees of indignation and moral outrage. Leucci turns to a discussion of the figures of courtesan and wife in the Tamil twin epics *Cilappatikāram* and *Maṇimēkalai*. This essay has interesting moments, but it is disorganized, and I am not sure what Leucci’s ultimate argument is. There is no discussion of the figure of the *parattai*—*caṅkam* literature’s “other woman”—or of the *virali*, *caṅkam*’s “dancer,” which I find to be curious omissions.

In “Hagiography Versus History: The Tamil Pāṇar in Bhakti-Oriented Hagiographic Texts and Inscriptions,” Sudalaimuthu Palaniappan looks at *pāṇars*—“bards”—“who traveled all over ancient Tamiḷakam, played [the] *yāl* (lute) and sang songs before commoners as well as in the courts of rulers” (p. 305). Palaniappan tends to repeat himself, but this essay is well worth reading. Largely a stock character “go-between” in early *caṅkam* love poetry, Palaniappan traces the changing status of the *pāṇar* through layers of Tamil literature and commentary, paying particular attention to the hagiographies of Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva saints (and their wives), who have been traditionally identified as members of the *pāṇar* community. The hagiographic literature generally assigns a low-caste status to *pāṇars*, but, as Palaniappan points out, inscriptions tell a very different story (pp. 326–27). In the end Palaniappan steers us away from the hagiographies on issues of caste identity, stating that they are untrustworthy when it comes to such matters.

Nicholas Cane’s superb contribution, “Queen Cempīyaṅ Mahādevī’s Religious Patronage in Tenth-Century South India: The ‘Missing Link’ Between Local and Royal Bhakti?,” focuses on a local princess who also becomes “the spouse of a Cōḷa king and the mother of a future one.” Cempīyaṅ Mahādevī founded “at least ten temples dedicated to Śiva and made substantial gifts to many others” (p. 348). Quoting co-editor Charlotte Schmid, Cane identifies this queen as “the most important female ‘epigraphical *persona*’ ever known in South India” (p. 349). Cempīyaṅ Mahādevī is the subject of fifty-one inscriptions, located at thirty-one different sites. Noted for her “unmatched religious patronage,” this “Queen Mother of the Cōḷa house” was “royal” in the sense that through her donations she sought “religious legitimation and prestige for her and her kin,” but she was also “local” in the sense that she made an “outstanding contribution to the promotion of Tamil Śaivism” through her “unprecedented patronage of local Bhakti sites” (pp. 377–78), perhaps serving as a model for later Cōḷa kings (p. 379). This is an excellent essay, a solid piece of scholarship, and Cane states his evidence and arguments clearly. There is a precision in his writing that several of the other contributions lack.

Leslie C. Orr makes wonderful connections with Cane’s article in her essay titled “Chiefly Queens: Local Royal Women as Temple Patrons in the Late Cōḷa Period.” Orr focuses on extra-dynastic queens—the wives of chieftains—and takes a close look at five female donors, “chiefly queens who were very active as temple patrons in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries . . . at the other end of the heyday of Cōḷa rule” (p. 388). These are, in essence, “clan women,” and there is a moving intimacy in some of these inscriptions, as well as in Orr’s sensitive and careful readings of them. They are about daughters, mothers, lovers, love itself, devotion, blame, and mistrust, and record lavish gifts of sapphires and pearls. Many of these inscriptions were obviously dictated, for they are recorded in the first-person voice, giving them a very direct and living force.

In “Local Bhakti or Monastic Advertising? The Functions of Medieval Jain Rock-Reliefs in Tamil Nadu,” art historian Lisa N. Owen considers rock-cut Jain images and how they contribute to what Owen terms “power of place” (p. 424). She examines ninth- and tenth-century relief carving in five different sites, and Owen’s accompanying photographs are both stark and stunning.

Valérie Gillet’s “Gods and Devotees in Medieval Tiruttāṇi” focuses on a site that was clearly “an important religious center throughout the period, and many faiths converged on this site, including that of Murukan, which is now prominent” (p. 446). Gillet maps “the development and movement of

the various cults in this place, analyzing the available archaeological evidence from the earliest in the ninth century to the Vijayanagara period” (p. 446). Under her keen eyes are remarkable temples and equally remarkable inscriptions; the temples are to Śiva and Subrahmanya, and are Pallava and post-Pallava. While reading this essay, I felt as if I were looking over Gillet’s shoulder as she worked her way through the inscriptions. She provides a careful puzzling out of what is written and what is actually extant on the ground. Gillet looks, for instance, at how pilgrimage routes must have had a direct influence on temple construction; in this case, resulting in a “multi-religious hub” in Tiruttani (p. 472). As she writes, “. . . ninth-century Tiruttani saw the flourishing of two major cults” dedicated to Śiva/Subrahmanya with two additional temples to Murukan and a Viṣṇu temple perhaps a little later. Gillet concludes that medieval Tiruttani “appears thus as a place where mainly local Bhakti flourishes” (pp. 473–74).

In “Found in Paratexts: Murukan’s Places in Manuscripts of the *Tirumurukārruppaṭai*,” Emmanuel Francis asks, “How did Murukan become a Tamil god?” He concentrates on “the establishment of a six-fold pilgrimage network, looking at sources so far neglected, in which correspondence is drawn between abodes of the *Tirumurukārruppaṭai* and present-day *ārupaṭaivīṭus*,” Murukan’s “six encampments.” Francis utilizes two sources: “an inscribed ivory-inlay box and the available corpus of manuscripts of the *Tirumurukārruppaṭai*” (p. 498). Like Cane, Orr, and Gillet, Francis writes in a very clear demonstrative manner and is one of the first scholars to produce anything of significance on this crucially important text. He writes on the nearly hegemonic significance of the number six, as in the six “abodes” of Murukan mentioned in the text versus the six “encampments,” which constitute the contemporary route for pilgrims. And then, there is the marvelous ivory box, produced in Madurai in the eighteenth or nineteenth century and inscribed with six place-names, three of which are “abode” names, with the other three the names of encampments (p. 507). The item itself is possibly a manuscript box (p. 507 n. 24). Francis also examined fifty-two *Tirumurukārruppaṭai* manuscripts (p. 507), most from the nineteenth century, but some from an earlier date (p. 508). As with Gillet’s essay, I experienced a very satisfying sense of *being shown* where the intricacies and the fascinating problems are.

Uthaya Veluppillai looks at “two little-studied famous places of the Tamil Śaiva Bhakti tradition” (p. 535) in her contribution titled “Where Are the Kings? Sites of Birth and Death of Campantar.” These places are in the Kāvēri delta, in Cīrkāḷi and Āccālpuram, which, according to tradition, are the “places of birth and death of one of the *Tēvāram* hymnists, Campantar” (pp. 535–36). These places have been active as sites of worship since the twelfth century. Veluppillai looks at texts and sculpture, and it becomes clear from the inscriptions from these temple complexes that donations of everything from garden plots for flower garlands to items for basic temple upkeep came from “locals” rather than from “royals,” particularly from Brahmin assemblies, local political authorities, and from private individuals and landlords. But there are also little tragedies and idiosyncrasies in the inscriptions that Veluppillai has chronologically tabulated. They detail salaries for temple staff, records of forfeited land, gifts of areca nut and oil for the deities, funds to keep the music going, and to keep the gods and Campantar well fed with milk-rice and well supplied with salt and sandalpaste. There are also provisions made to feed *apūrvins*, “strangers” (p. 561). There is a palpable, intimate, everyday “feel” to some of these inscriptions.

With appropriate evocations of R. G. Collingwood, Richard H. Davis’s “Afterword” elegantly summarizes the whole project of both volumes, characterizing them as correcting an imbalance. As he rightly states, the textual materials related to *bhakti* have historically received much more scholarly attention than have “carved inscriptions, sculpted images, and constructed religious sites.” He writes that “an archaeology of Bhakti can point towards a more balanced, integrated historical view” (p. 568), especially in regard to medieval South India, where the “archaeological remains of the period provide an important counterbalance to the poetry of the devotional saints” (p. 573). As Davis concludes, “[O]nce we look more closely at archaeological evidence of the period, especially the abundant scriptural remains carved on the stone walls of temples, the Cōla imperial hegemony over Tamil Bhakti dissolves, and a more complicated historical picture of more localized devotional religion begins to take shape” (p. 575). He also observes that Murukan *bhakti* has often been occluded by scholars of devotional religions, but, as both of these volumes serve to remind us, “Murukan has a dual identity: both as a highly regional deity of the Tamil-speaking area, and as a deity with clear North Indian roots as Skanda” (p. 580).

As with most edited volumes of this sort, some of the contributions are of lesser quality than others, and some, while excellent all on their own, seem of lesser relevance to the “project” of both volumes overall. I would suggest that readers have a look at Richard Davis’s “Afterword” first, just to get a sense of precisely what is at stake, and then read Kaimal, Cane, Orr, Gillet, Francis, and Veluppillai: these articles are particularly fine, and the last three are methodologically important. I would certainly assign them to advanced students to give them a sense of why “being there” is so crucial to research, and why only readings of texts can never be enough.

MARTHA ANN SELBY
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

Shifting Stones, Shaping the Past: Sculpture from the Buddhist Stūpas of Andhra Pradesh. By CATHERINE BECKER. Oxford: OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, 2015. Pp. xxiv + 321, 108 illustr. \$35 (paper).

For historians of South Asian and Buddhist art, Amaravati is one of the most renowned places in India. In the period from around 200 BCE to 250 CE, architects and artisans constructed an extraordinary Buddhist edifice generously adorned with remarkable figural sculpture, as the center of a large monastic institution. Some 500 pieces of Amaravati sculpture remain, together with 300 inscriptions, making Amaravati the richest source for early Buddhist art and epigraphy in southern India. Along with Bharhut, Sanchi, Mathura, and Sarnath, Amaravati stands as one of the preeminent sources of early Buddhist sculptural art.

Yet the physical site of Amaravati may now evoke great melancholy. In *Shifting Stones, Shaping the Past*, Catherine Becker recounts her first visit to Amaravati in 2001. “For an art history student familiar with the site’s spectacular remains,” she recalls, “the state of the stūpa was bleak indeed” (p. 2). A modest sloping grass mound was surrounded by a ring of modern bricks, intended to simulate the drum of the ancient monument. For the most part, the actual stūpa was elsewhere. Beginning in the late eighteenth century, and escalating during the early nineteenth century under British colonial rule, the great stūpa of Amaravati was systematically looted. Local rulers, treasure hunters, and colonial officials all contributed their share to its destruction and dispersal. The abundant sculptural remains were carted off to Masulipatan, Calcutta, and Madras. A large number of the detached limestone panels made their way to London, known as the “Elliot Marbles” (intended no doubt to compete with the famous Elgin Marbles), where after languishing for a year in the open on a wharf in Southwark and then in a forgotten Whitehall storehouse, they eventually became part of the permanent collection of the British Museum. They currently hold court in the Asahi Shimbun Gallery, as the stars of the museum’s South Asian collection. Other Amaravati sculptures remaining in Madras, in the Government Museum, were embedded in a concrete wall, which damaged the pieces irreparably. They have since been pried out of the concrete frames and form one of the most valuable of the museum exhibitions. (Akira Shimada narrates much of this tragic story of archeological deconstruction in his 2013 book, *Early Buddhist Architecture in Context*, pp. 3–11.)

“How must this stūpa have appeared in its heyday?” Becker asks herself, remembering the sadness of her first encounter at the denuded site. In the early centuries CE it would have been the most extraordinary of the many Buddhist devotional sites of southern India. Yet because of the looting of the site and the failure to make adequate records at the time, it is not altogether possible to reconstruct just how that original structure might have appeared. Starting in the mid-nineteenth century, archeologists and art historians devoted great efforts to reimagine the actual shape of the stūpa and to establish a chronology of the sculptural remnants. But the objects themselves, of course, stubbornly remain in Chennai, London, and other museum collections around the world.

In some respects, however, Amaravati may be coming back to life. Catherine Becker’s book not only examines the original sculptural materials of the great stūpa, but also looks at efforts in the last several decades to promote and to ritually enliven Amaravati. She examines a collection of brochures