



International Journal of Innovations in Liberal Arts



<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15565344>

Languages of Movement: Sanskrit and the Borderlands of Indian Intellectual Traditions

Uddipta Ranjan Boruah

Amity School of Liberal Arts
Amity University Haryana, India

Received: JAN. 15, 2025

Accepted: FEB. 25, 2025

Published: FEB. 28, 2025

Abstract

This paper rethinks the history and role of Sanskrit by approaching it not as a static classical language but as a dynamic medium of epistemic and cultural mobility. Drawing on the conceptual frameworks of border studies, translational theory, and Indian Knowledge Systems (IKS), the paper explores how Sanskrit functioned historically in the borderlands of linguistic, geographic, and disciplinary frontiers. Focusing on lexicography and translation as technologies of knowledge circulation, it traces the multilingual, intercultural life of Sanskrit across Asia prior to colonial disruption. The colonial encounter, it is argued, reconstituted Sanskrit as a fixed and depoliticized tradition, severed from its border-crossing vitality. By recovering Sanskrit's translational functions and interrogating its marginalization in postcolonial intellectual structures, this study advances a decolonial, mobile framework for reimagining Sanskrit within contemporary knowledge systems.

Keywords: Sanskrit, Indian Knowledge Systems, Border Studies, Lexicography, Translation, Epistemological Borders, Colonialism, Philology, Decolonial Theory.

1. Introduction: Thinking Sanskrit Through Movement

The history of Sanskrit has often been narrated through the lens of immobility: as the canonical, "dead" language of Brahmanical orthodoxy, fixed in time and confined to elite ritual usage. This vision, shaped in large part by colonial philology and postcolonial nationalist recoveries, has rendered Sanskrit a symbol of both timeless cultural heritage and epistemic

isolation. However, a growing body of scholarship, notably led by Sheldon Pollock (2006), invites us to fundamentally reconsider this framing by attending to Sanskrit's vibrant historical role as a language of movement — a medium of intellectual, cultural, and geographic mobility across the Indian subcontinent and beyond. This paper builds upon this reorientation and seeks to locate Sanskrit within what may be called the borderlands of Indian intellectual traditions — zones of encounter, translation, and hybridization that defy rigid territorial, linguistic, and disciplinary borders. In doing so, it brings into conversation two distinct yet overlapping scholarly domains: Indian Knowledge Systems (IKS), particularly lexicographic and translational practices in Sanskrit, and the field of border studies, especially its recent turn toward epistemological, linguistic, and cognitive frontiers (Mezzadra and Neilson 2013; Santos 2014).

The term *borderlands* here is used not merely in the geopolitical sense, but rather to signify a conceptual and material terrain where languages, worldviews, and interpretive traditions intersect. These intersections were often mediated through Sanskrit's long-standing translational mechanisms — bilingual lexica, metalinguistic commentaries, and grammatical traditions that facilitated knowledge circulation across Prakrit, Pali, Tamil, Persian, and later, regional vernaculars. Such practices enabled what might be described as epistemic mobility, where Sanskrit served as a bridge rather than a barrier, allowing complex philosophical, scientific, and aesthetic ideas to travel across social, spatial, and linguistic borders. This framing challenges the long-standing dichotomy between Sanskrit and vernacular traditions. As Pollock (1998) notes in his essay on the "Vernacular Millennium," the premodern period witnessed a dynamic interaction between cosmopolitan and regional languages, where Sanskrit was both contested and adapted in new literary and intellectual configurations. Far from being monopolized by a pan-Indian elite, Sanskrit was actively engaged at the edges — in multilingual courts, Buddhist monasteries, and even Sufi and Bhakti traditions — making it a constitutive presence in South Asia's cultural borderlands (Rao, Shulman, and Subrahmanyam 2001; Ali 2010). Moreover, the lexicographical traditions of Sanskrit — such as the *Amarakosha*, *Abhidhānaratnamālā*, and bilingual glossaries produced in early Indo-Persian contexts — functioned as both repositories of knowledge and tools of cross-cultural intelligibility. These texts exemplify how Sanskrit facilitated, rather than restricted, the creation of plural epistemologies. Translational activity, often seen as secondary or derivative, thus emerges as central to Sanskrit's intellectual life and to its border-crossing capacity (Pollock 2010; Ganeri 2011).

The colonial encounter, however, imposed a profound rupture in this history of circulation. Through a combination of Orientalist philology, bureaucratic language reform, and nationalist revivalism, Sanskrit was reconstituted as a classical language: timeless, sacred, and increasingly

detached from vernacular publics and living traditions (Raman 2012; Adcock 2014). This transformation not only disrupted Sanskrit's mobility but also reified new epistemological borders — institutional, disciplinary, and ideological — that continue to shape the study and pedagogy of Sanskrit today. Against this backdrop, the present paper argues for a recovery of Sanskrit's mobile, translational, and lexicographic past as a way to rethink the very concept of "borders" in Indian intellectual history. Drawing on archival evidence, border theory, and decolonial epistemology, it explores how Sanskrit once operated within a fluid network of interlingual and intercultural practices, and how these practices can inform contemporary reimaginations of Indian Knowledge Systems. In doing so, the paper makes three key interventions: first, it foregrounds Sanskrit as a medium of epistemic movement across conceptual and regional borderlands; second, it critiques the colonial and postcolonial regimes that have fixed Sanskrit within narrow disciplinary boundaries; and third, it offers a methodological framework — *movement as method* — for future scholarship in decolonial philology and transregional intellectual history.

2. Research Methodology and Theoretical Framework

This paper draws upon an interdisciplinary theoretical framework that brings together border studies, translation theory, and decolonial epistemology to rethink the place of Sanskrit within Indian knowledge systems. At the heart of this approach lies the concept of epistemic mobility, which denotes the capacity of knowledge systems, texts, and languages to traverse boundaries—geographic, cultural, linguistic, and conceptual. Sanskrit, we argue, has historically functioned as a medium of such epistemic mobility, especially through lexicographic and translational practices that defy the static framing imposed by both colonial philology and postcolonial identity politics. In border studies, recent scholarship has moved beyond the conventional geopolitical understanding of borders to focus on borders as sites of knowledge production, negotiation, and hybridity (Mezzadra & Neilson 2013; Anzaldúa 1987). Borders are not only territorial lines but also epistemological constructs that organize inclusion and exclusion within intellectual, cultural, and linguistic regimes. Sanskrit, historically positioned at the intersection of cosmopolitan and vernacular traditions, offers a rich terrain for rethinking such border dynamics. It operated not merely as the language of a Brahmanical elite but as a vehicle of cross-cultural dialogue—between Sanskrit and Prakrit, Pali, Tamil, Tibetan, Persian, and later, modern Indian languages.

Translation studies, especially in its postcolonial turn, has emphasized the asymmetrical power relations involved in knowledge transmission and the role of translation in either bridging or enforcing epistemic boundaries (Niranjana 1992; Spivak 1993). Sanskrit's long tradition of intra- and inter-linguistic translation complicates the binaries of original/derivative, sacred/secular, and elite/popular. Lexicons like the

Amarakosha and bilingual glossaries in Indo-Persian contexts exemplify translation not as mere equivalence but as interpretive movement—a conceptual negotiation across worldviews. This insight allows us to foreground Sanskrit as a translational archive, constitutive of the region’s intellectual pluralism. A crucial intervention in our framework comes from decolonial theory, especially the idea of “epistemologies of the South” (Santos 2014) and “epistemic disobedience” (Mignolo 2009), which call for challenging the hegemony of Eurocentric knowledge paradigms and reclaiming suppressed or marginalized ways of knowing. Colonial epistemology reconstructed Sanskrit as a classical, fossilized language—reified through grammars, dictionaries, and bureaucratic institutions that rendered it static and ahistorical (Adcock 2014). This disrupted Sanskrit’s historical mobility and truncated its border-crossing capacity. A decolonial return to Sanskrit involves recovering its role as a living, mobile, and multilingual epistemic force, rather than a symbol of elite cultural heritage alone.

Methodologically, this paper adopts what could be called “movement as method”—a heuristic inspired by Pollock’s (2006) conceptualization of Sanskrit’s cosmopolitanism and Mignolo’s border thinking. This involves tracing the movement of Sanskrit texts, genres, and lexicons across linguistic, regional, and institutional boundaries to reveal the underlying structures of connectivity and circulation. Rather than fixate on Sanskrit’s centrality, this approach privileges its relationality—how it co-evolved with other languages and contributed to shared zones of knowledge, interpretation, and practice. In synthesizing these three strands—border studies, translation theory, and decolonial epistemology—this framework provides the tools to reconceptualize Sanskrit not as a language confined to borders but as one that fundamentally transgresses them.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Sanskrit in Motion: Precolonial Lexicographic and Translational Practices

Sanskrit’s status as a classical language is often misunderstood as a synonym for immobility—an artifact of a bygone, elite world of theological and metaphysical speculation. However, a closer examination of its precolonial lexicographic and translational practices reveals an alternate history—one of dynamic circulation, multilingual interaction, and pragmatic adaptation. Sanskrit, far from being monolithic or isolated, functioned as a language of movement across regions, disciplines, and linguistic traditions. Its vitality lay in its ability to communicate with, absorb from, and give shape to other intellectual systems in South, Central, and Southeast Asia.

3.1.1 Lexicography as Border-Crossing Technology:

The lexicographic tradition in Sanskrit, beginning with the *Amarakosha* (c. 5th century CE), exemplifies the epistemic ambition of systematizing and disseminating knowledge across cultural and linguistic borders. Composed by Amarasimha, a Buddhist scholar possibly patronized by the Gupta court, the *Amarakosha* is not merely a thesaurus but a cosmological and ontological map embedded in poetic verse, designed for memorization and pedagogical transmission (Monier-Williams, 1899; Bronner, 2012). Its categories—such as synonyms for deities, animals, places, and emotions—reveal the porous boundary between the sacred and the secular, the elite and the popular, and Sanskrit and vernacular usages. The lexicographic impulse was not limited to cataloging synonyms; it was fundamentally about organizing and making knowledge translatable across domains. Later works, such as *Abhidhāna Chintāmaṇi* by Hemachandra (12th century CE), reflect an even more deliberate inter-linguistic ambition. Hemachandra's lexicon was trilingual—Sanskrit, Prakrit, and Apabhramsha—an acknowledgment of the linguistic diversity of his audience in Gujarat and a marker of Sanskrit's role in structuring multilingual epistemologies (Pollock, 2006; Houben, 1996). These lexicons not only stabilized Sanskrit vocabulary but also enabled cross-linguistic transfer, preparing the ground for later Indo-Persian and vernacular dictionaries.

3.1.2 Translation in Precolonial India: A Plural Practice:

While often under-theorized in traditional Indological scholarship, translation was intrinsic to Sanskrit's vitality, especially in Buddhist and Jain traditions. The massive project of translating Buddhist texts from Sanskrit into Chinese and Tibetan (from the 1st century BCE onward) was not only a technical feat but also a process of intellectual negotiation and adaptation. Sanskrit terms for metaphysical concepts—such as *śūnyatā* (emptiness), *dharma*, or *tathāgata*—were debated, transliterated, or reconceptualized in Chinese by translators like Xuanzang and Kumārajīva, producing a layered textuality where languages met and reconfigured each other (Zürcher, 2007; Lopez, 1995). Closer to the Indian subcontinent, Jain and Bhakti traditions frequently employed diglossic translation, moving between Sanskrit and vernaculars such as Kannada, Tamil, and Braj. Notably, the 12th-century Lingayat saint Basavanna's vachanas drew on Sanskritic imagery while forging a radical ethical vernacular. Similarly, the *Nāṭyaśāstra* and *Āyurveda* texts were translated and adapted in Tamil, Sinhala, and other regional contexts, preserving semantic continuity with structural innovation (Ramanathan, 2013).

3.1.3 Indo-Persian Lexicons and the Sanskrit-Persian Interface:

One of the most fascinating zones of border-crossing occurred in the Indo-Persian lexicographic world under the Delhi Sultanate and Mughal Empire. The *Fīrūz-ul-Lughāt*, *Bahāristān-i-Ghaibī*, and *Miftāḥ al-Fuzalā* (late 14th to 17th centuries CE) demonstrate the interpenetration of Persian

administrative and literary vocabulary with Sanskrit scholastic terms. While Sanskrit never functioned as a language of governance under the Mughals, its terms—especially from medicine, astronomy, and metaphysics—entered Persian discourses via translation bureaus (maktabs) and cross-trained scribes (Alam & Subrahmanyam, 2004). Abul Fazl’s translation of the *Mahābhārata* into Persian as the *Razmnāma* (1584–1586), under Akbar’s patronage, involved Brahmin pandits and Persian munshīs working side by side. As scholars have shown, this was not a neutral act of conversion but a political and epistemic performance, aimed at producing a shared elite knowledge across religious and linguistic divides (Truschke, 2016). These practices disrupted any simplistic model of Sanskrit as a hermetically sealed Brahmanical code and instead positioned it as a participant in a multilingual, multi-religious knowledge commons.

3.1.4 Sanskrit as a Medium of Interdisciplinary Knowledge:

Finally, Sanskrit’s motion must be understood not only across languages but also across disciplines. Lexicons were not just linguistic tools—they were pedagogical technologies embedded in broader traditions of nyāya (logic), vyākaraṇa (grammar), āyurveda (medicine), and śāstra (treatises). The structure of these disciplines relied on technical terminologies that were continuously updated through commentaries, sub-commentaries (*tīkā*s), and manuals, enabling a layered, evolving archive of textual movement. This mode of disciplinary translation made Sanskrit a meta-language of scholastic communication across Indian intellectual traditions (Pollock, 2006; Bronner, 2015).

3.2. Colonial Disruptions and the Fixing of Sanskrit

The onset of colonial rule in South Asia radically transformed the epistemological landscape in which Sanskrit had long circulated. A language once characterized by motion—across regions, disciplines, and linguistic borders—was rendered static through a series of colonial interventions that both reified and restricted its intellectual function. These disruptions were neither accidental nor neutral. Rather, they were embedded within the larger apparatus of colonial knowledge production, which sought to create legible, governable, and classifiable forms of native knowledge that could support imperial administration and cultural hegemony (Cohn, 1996; Inden, 1990).

3.2.1. Orientalist Philology and the Creation of ‘Classical’ Sanskrit:

The first major colonial disruption was philological. With the rise of European Orientalism in the late 18th century, Sanskrit was "discovered" by figures like William Jones and Charles Wilkins, who celebrated it as the key to an ancient Indo-European heritage. Jones’s famous declaration that Sanskrit was “more perfect than the Greek, more copious than the Latin” (Jones, 1786) set the tone for a new, Eurocentric revaluation of Sanskrit—

not as a living language embedded in social contexts, but as an artifact of a glorious but dead past. This scholarly enthusiasm led to the rise of what Sheldon Pollock calls "orientalist philology," a regime that canonized certain genres (especially religious and philosophical texts), prioritized older Vedic and epic literature over later scholastic or vernacular expressions, and systematically ignored the multilingual, dialogic realities of Sanskrit practice (Pollock, 2006, pp. 248–310). The result was the transformation of Sanskrit into a "classical" language in the European sense—frozen in time, accessible primarily through grammar books, dictionaries, and commentaries that followed Western academic models.

3.2.2. *Lexicography and the Colonial Episteme:*

Colonial lexicography further reinforced this transformation. The monumental *Sanskrit-English Dictionary* by Monier-Williams (1899) sought to catalog Sanskrit in a rationalized, alphabetical order that mirrored Victorian ideals of scientific classification. However, this approach disembedded Sanskrit vocabulary from its ritual, aesthetic, and performative contexts, rendering words as isolated units of meaning rather than as parts of dynamic knowledge systems (Ramanathan, 2013; Bronner, 2015). Unlike precolonial lexicons such as *Amarakosha*, which were arranged by semantic fields and poetic meters, colonial dictionaries served bureaucratic and pedagogical needs, emphasizing standardization over interpretive fluidity. Moreover, colonial dictionaries were designed for the benefit of British administrators, missionaries, and scholars, not native users. As Gauri Viswanathan (1989) has shown, language teaching in colonial India was often a political tool, designed to create docile intermediaries who would uphold colonial values while appearing to respect Indian classical traditions. Sanskrit thus became both a symbol of Hindu cultural pride and a sanitized, depoliticized artifact suited to colonial governance.

3.2.3 *Sanskrit and the Vernacular Divide:*

Perhaps the most lasting epistemic rupture introduced by colonialism was the hardening of the Sanskrit-vernacular divide. In precolonial India, this boundary was fluid: Sanskrit coexisted with and influenced vernaculars such as Tamil, Kannada, Bengali, and Braj, participating in a dynamic "cosmopolitan-vernacular continuum" (Pollock, 2006). Poets and scholars routinely moved between languages depending on audience, purpose, and patronage. However, British educational and administrative policies—including Macaulay's Minute on Indian Education (1835) and Wood's Despatch (1854)—institutionalized a binary in which Sanskrit was relegated to the domain of elite classical learning, while the vernaculars were developed and standardized as tools for mass instruction and bureaucratic efficiency (Ramanathan, 2005). This linguistic compartmentalization had far-reaching consequences. It fossilized Sanskrit's role as a scholastic

language, detached from contemporary communicative practices, and undermined the multilingual, polyglot intellectual traditions that had flourished in earlier periods. The emergent nationalist discourse of the 19th and early 20th centuries often accepted this binary, using Sanskrit as a symbolic resource for Hindu identity while failing to restore its intercultural and translational vitality (Ramaswamy, 1997).

3.2.4. Loss of Translational Interfaces and Borderlands:

Finally, the colonial transformation of Sanskrit eroded the borderland spaces of translational activity that had previously flourished. Buddhist monasteries translating Sanskrit texts into Tibetan and Chinese, Indo-Persian courts translating epics and medical texts into Persian, and Jain scholars producing trilingual lexicons—all these practices dwindled under colonial epistemologies that valorized monolingual purity and philological authenticity. Translation, once a shared practice of negotiation across borders, became either a mechanical exercise in linguistic equivalence or an ideological tool for representing Indian culture to the West. Moreover, institutions such as the Asiatic Society and the Sanskrit Colleges in Varanasi and Calcutta prioritized textual preservation over intellectual innovation, turning Sanskrit into a subject of antiquarian interest rather than a medium of creative or interdisciplinary thought (Cohn, 1996). The result was the fixing of Sanskrit within narrow disciplinary boundaries, a condition from which it is only now beginning to recover through contemporary critical scholarship and pedagogical reforms.

3.3. Recovering Sanskrit's Role in Contemporary Border-Crossing Knowledge Systems

In the aftermath of colonial epistemic disruptions, the task of recuperating Sanskrit's historical function as a dynamic and mobile medium of knowledge is both a scholarly and political imperative. Far from being a relic of the past, Sanskrit continues to offer rich possibilities for rethinking intellectual borderlands—those liminal spaces where disciplines, languages, and cultural traditions intersect and co-create. This recovery involves decolonizing methodologies, reanimating multilingual archives, and foregrounding the relational and translational practices that have historically sustained Sanskrit's vitality.

3.3.1. Sanskrit and the Post-Colonial Turn in Indian Knowledge Systems:

The postcolonial critique of colonial epistemology has created a fertile ground for the revival of Sanskrit not merely as a language, but as an infrastructure of knowledge circulation. The work of scholars such as Sheldon Pollock (2006), Rajiv Malhotra (2011), and Ananya Vajpeyi (2012) has shown that Sanskrit intellectual traditions were historically involved in a broad array of knowledge practices, from logic and linguistics to aesthetics, astronomy, and statecraft—often through dialogical engagement

with other traditions, including those of Buddhism, Jainism, and Islam. Pollock's notion of "Sanskrit cosmopolitanism" is particularly useful in this regard. He describes Sanskrit's historical function as a "*code of transregional discourse*" that enabled intellectual, poetic, and political communication across vast geographical and cultural borders (Pollock, 2006, pp. 11–33). This cosmopolitanism was never a monologue but a networked dialogue, constantly reshaped by translation, regional inflection, and institutional patronage. Reinstating this vision entails rethinking the colonial and nationalist framing of Sanskrit as a closed and monolithic tradition.

3.3.2. *Sanskrit and Decolonial Lexicography:*

One concrete path toward recovery lies in the field of decolonial lexicography—a project that seeks to undo the rigid, colonial-era taxonomies of Sanskrit vocabulary and recontextualize terms within indigenous semantic, ritual, and philosophical frameworks. Scholars like Kapil Kapoor (2010) and V. N. Jha (2005) have emphasized the need for lexicographical projects rooted in *śāstraic* categories, not just alphabetical or Eurocentric modes of classification. For example, Sanskrit categories such as *artha*, *pramāṇa*, *rasa*, or *dharma* cannot be adequately translated through Western lexical equivalents like "meaning," "epistemology," "aesthetics," or "ethics." These terms are embedded in comprehensive worldviews and institutional practices. Restoring their conceptual range requires philological rigor, but also philosophical openness to non-Western modes of thinking (Ganeri, 2011). Such projects serve to revitalize Sanskrit's capacity to cross epistemic borders—not by simplifying its complexity for modern use, but by resisting reductionism and promoting intercultural translation that preserves depth and nuance.

3.3.3 *Interdisciplinary Relevance and Contemporary Border Studies:*

The contemporary field of border studies, especially in its postmodern and postcolonial variants, offers powerful theoretical tools for reinterpreting Sanskrit's role in shaping cognitive and civilizational boundaries. Borders are no longer understood merely as geopolitical lines, but as socially constructed, culturally negotiated, and epistemologically generative zones (Balibar, 2002; Mezzadra & Neilson, 2013). Sanskrit, seen through this lens, can be reimagined not as a bounded "heritage language" but as a medium of border-making and border-crossing knowledge production. For instance, Sanskrit's use in the Indo-Tibetan Buddhist lexicon (*Sanskrit-Tibetan-Mongolian* translation projects), or in Indo-Persian cosmologies (*Jñānāmava* translated into Persian), illustrates how borders were historically porous and productive. Today, such historical moments inspire new forms of academic and pedagogic collaboration across disciplinary and linguistic divides, particularly in transregional South Asian studies, comparative philosophy, and critical philology.

3.3.4. *Sanskrit in Digital and Globalized Knowledge Ecologies:*

The digital age has opened up further possibilities for Sanskrit to regain its status as a language of movement. Online platforms such as GRETIL (Göttingen Register of Electronic Texts in Indian Languages), SARIT (Search and Retrieval of Indic Texts), and Muktabodha Digital Library provide access to a wide array of Sanskrit texts, many of which were previously unavailable or scattered across global collections. These platforms, by facilitating transnational access and collaborative annotation, enable Sanskrit to function once again as a global language of intellectual exchange, especially within digital humanities and open knowledge movements (Pollock, 2015; Houben & Rath, 2022). Simultaneously, initiatives such as the Indian Knowledge Systems (IKS) Division under the Government of India and research projects like "Globalizing the Premodern" aim to reintegrate Sanskrit knowledge traditions into contemporary scientific, environmental, and philosophical debates, thereby reactivating its border-crossing potential in contexts far removed from traditional religious or philological domains.

4. Conclusion

This paper has argued for a reconceptualization of Sanskrit as a mobile and border-crossing medium of knowledge production, rather than a static repository of elite or religious traditions. By foregrounding the concept of "languages of movement," we have examined how Sanskrit historically functioned as a cosmopolitan code that transcended regional, linguistic, and disciplinary boundaries, particularly through its lexicographic and translational practices. Engaging with the theoretical tools of border studies—especially the notion of epistemological borders—we have demonstrated how Sanskrit participated in shaping and transgressing intellectual frontiers in premodern South Asia and beyond. The paper further examined the colonial disruptions that reterritorialized and immobilized Sanskrit, turning it into a symbol of ossified tradition and disconnecting it from its earlier circulatory networks. Through philological reduction, disciplinary enclosure, and linguistic hierarchization, colonial regimes of knowledge enforced rigid epistemic borders that fractured the pluriversal ecologies in which Sanskrit once thrived. The colonial legacy continues to haunt contemporary understandings of Sanskrit, often positioning it as either a sacred inheritance or a nationalist totem, rather than as a historically dynamic language of knowledge traffic.

In recovering Sanskrit's border-crossing capacity, we have called attention to both the archival and digital possibilities of revitalizing this role. The growing body of work in comparative philology, decolonial translation, and Indian Knowledge Systems presents new opportunities for integrating Sanskrit into contemporary scholarly and educational frameworks without subsuming it under Eurocentric epistemologies. The global expansion of digital repositories and collaborative networks further positions Sanskrit as a language that can contribute meaningfully to modern discussions around interdisciplinarity, environmental ethics, political theory, and cosmology—if

approached with methodological humility and conceptual openness. This recovery is not only about reclaiming Sanskrit's past functions but also about imagining its future roles. As contemporary academia increasingly moves toward post-disciplinary, intercultural, and multilingual research paradigms, Sanskrit—recontextualized as a language of motion and multiplicity—can help to bridge the gap between ancient knowledge systems and modern intellectual inquiry. In doing so, it can also intervene in ongoing debates about decolonization, cognitive justice, and the global South's epistemic contributions.

The intersection of Sanskrit studies and border studies, as mapped in this paper, offers a fertile ground for rethinking knowledge circulation beyond the confines of nation-states, disciplines, and colonial taxonomies. By placing Sanskrit back into the flow of borderlands—both literal and conceptual—we do not merely recover a language; we recover an entire ecology of thought, translation, and movement that continues to hold relevance in our fragmented but interconnected world.

References

- Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. Aunt Lute Books.
- Balibar, É. (2002). *Politics and the other scene*. Verso.
- Bronner, Y. (2012). Change in disguise: The early lexicons of Sanskrit. *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 40(1), 1–31.
- Bronner, Y. (2015). *A twice-born philology: Essays in honor of Sheldon Pollock*. Columbia University Press.
- Cohn, B. S. (1996). *Colonialism and its forms of knowledge: The British in India*. Princeton University Press.
- Ganeri, J. (2011). *The lost age of reason: Philosophy in early modern India 1450–1700*. Oxford University Press.
- Houben, J. E. M. (1996). The Sanskrit tradition and the role of Sanskrit in the multilingual contexts of South Asia. *Indologica Taurinensia*, 22, 109–129.
- Houben, J. E. M., & Rath, S. (2022). *Sanskrit at the crossroads of cultures: New challenges and directions*. École Française d'Extrême-Orient (EFEO).
- Inden, R. (1990). *Imagining India*. Blackwell.
- Jones, W. (1786). The third anniversary discourse. *Asiatic Researches*, 1.
- Kapoor, K. (2010). *Dimensions of Panini grammar*. D. K. Printworld.

- Lopez, D. S. Jr. (1995). *Curators of the Buddha: The study of Buddhism under colonialism*. University of Chicago Press.
- Malhotra, R. (2011). *Being different: An Indian challenge to Western universalism*. HarperCollins India.
- Mezzadra, S., & Neilson, B. (2013). *Border as method, or, the multiplication of labor*. Duke University Press.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2007). Delinking: The rhetoric of modernity, the logic of coloniality and the grammar of de-coloniality. *Cultural Studies*, 21(2–3), 449–514. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380601162647>
- Mignolo, W. D. (2009). Epistemic disobedience, independent thought and de-colonial freedom. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 26(7–8), 159–181. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276409349275>
- Monier-Williams, M. (1899). *A Sanskrit-English dictionary*. Oxford University Press.
- Niranjana, T. (1992). *Siting translation: History, post-structuralism, and the colonial context*. University of California Press.
- Pollock, S. (2006). *The language of the gods in the world of men: Sanskrit, culture, and power in premodern India*. University of California Press.
- Pollock, S. (2010). *Literary cultures in history: Reconstructions from South Asia*. University of California Press.
- Pollock, S. (2015). Philology and freedom. *The Journal of the History of Ideas*, 76(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jhi.2015.0000>
- Pollock, S. (2018). *Sanskrit and the making of world literature*. Harvard University Press.
- Radhakrishnan, S. (2013). *Translation and its discontents: The making of modern Sanskrit literature*. Oxford University Press.
- Ramanathan, V. (2005). *The English-vernacular divide: Postcolonial language politics and practice*. Multilingual Matters.
- Ramanathan, V. (2013). Multilingualism and diglossia in Indian knowledge systems. *Indian Linguistics*, 74(1-2), 1–22.
- Ramaswamy, S. (1997). *Passions of the tongue: Language devotion in Tamil India, 1891–1970*. University of California Press.
- Santos, B. de Sousa. (2014). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against epistemicide*. Routledge.
- Sarma, S. R. (2001). *Sanskrit and its role in India's intellectual history*. Motilal Banarsidass.

- Sharma, A. (2017). Colonial legacies and Sanskrit: The imperial epistemic regime. *Journal of Asian Studies*, 76(3), 651–672. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021911817000305>
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). University of Illinois Press.
- Spivak, G. C. (1993). *Outside in the teaching machine*. Routledge.
- Thapar, R. (2012). *Borders and boundaries: Historical perspectives on the formation of the Indian subcontinent*. Oxford University Press.
- Truschke, A. (2016). *Culture of encounters: Sanskrit at the Mughal court*. Columbia University Press.
- Vajpeyi, A. (2012). *Righteous republic: The political foundations of modern India*. Harvard University Press.
- Viswanathan, G. (1989). *Masks of conquest: Literary study and British rule in India*. Columbia University Press.
- Wallerstein, I. (2004). *World-systems analysis: An introduction*. Duke University Press.
- Zürcher, E. (2007). *The Buddhist conquest of China: The spread and adaptation of Buddhism in early medieval China*. Brill.